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THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY,

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH.

FAH HIAN'S KINGDOM OF THE DAKSHINA.

By THOMAS FOULKES, F.I.S., M.R.A.S., CHAPLAIN OF SAINT JOHN'S, BANGALORE.

It was apparently Fah Hian's original intention to pass from North India to Ceylon through Southern India, but on making inquiries into the state of the country through which his route would lie, he was obliged, for some unmentioned reason, to give up this portion of his enterprise. The short report which he has left of the results of those inquiries is very interesting, and contains allusions which seem to me to be capable of being developed into an outline of the condition of an important portion of Southern India during the earliest centuries of the Christian era.

He tells us that "two hundred yasayan to the south there is a kingdom called Tha-thsen," and he then proceeds to describe two or three circumstances respecting it which had come to his knowledge. The object of this paper is to try to identify this kingdom by a development of the meaning of these words and their context, and by a comparison of the interpretation so obtained with other information respecting the condition of South India at the time to which his description refers.

M. Kalpochth long ago recognized the word "Tha-thsen" as Fah Hian's equivalent of the word "Dakshina" ('the South'), a denomination applied to the vast country called at present the Dakshina, which is the vulgar pronunciation of Dakshina; and no question is likely to arise regarding the correctness of this identification.

The limitation of the word 'Dakshina' to that portion of South India which lies between the Vindhyan and a moveable line in the neighbourhood of the Krishna, I need scarcely say, is comparatively modern; in Fah Hian's time the word 'Dakshina,' when used in a geographical sense, embraced the whole country between the Vindhyan and Cape Kumari (Comorin). It is therefore remarkable that he should use this word as the name of a kingdom. He does not indeed say that there was no other kingdom besides this within those limits, and it is well known from other sources that the whole of that region was not in his time under the rule of a single monarch; still, what had been conveyed to his mind by his informants, who were themselves 'people of the country,' was, that there was a kingdom in the south, whatever its other name or names may have been, which was at that time sufficiently preeminent amongst its neighbours to be entitled to be called 'The kingdom of the south.' Perhaps it may be allowable to infer that this kingdom had received that name on account of its comparatively large extent of territory, or from having established some kind of paramount authority over the rest of the kingdoms of South India.

1 The present paper is based on Mr. Laidley's translation of the French edition of M.M. Remusat, Kalpochth, and Landress.
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Fah Hian's short description contains several indirect indications that this great kingdom was in an advanced state of civilization:

1. Architecture and sculpture were represented by the Buddhist monastery, carved out of an isolated rock, and containing 1560 cells, of which he gives a somewhat particular description. The rock was cut down to represent a building of five storeys rising above each other in pyramidal form; each storey was carved into the shape of an animal, or series of animals, culminating in a pigeon of sufficient size to contain a hundred monks' cells. This pigeon also held a reservoir of water, and the water was conducted from it in channels which ran round each of the five storeys in succession, and ultimately flowed out through the outer gate of the monastery. This colossal curiosity of architectural and sculptural art may very justly be regarded not as an isolated and entirely singular monument, but as a very remarkable instance or copy of a class of structural buildings of various degrees of resemblance to it, which were to be found in the surrounding country: since it can scarcely be thought probable that the architect and sculptor would rise at one bound to the conception of an edifice of this high character, to be carved, in the first instance, out of the solid rock. It may therefore fairly be regarded as an example of the style of architecture, whether indigenous or imported, which prevailed at the time of its construction, and which had existed for some time previously, in this part of South India.

2. The existence of this vihāra would of itself be sufficient to justify the conclusion that the Buddhist religion had taken considerable root in the 'kingdom of the south,' and that those who professed it were a respectable class of its subjects. But Fah Hian does not leave this circumstance to be merely conjectured: for he distinctly refers to the Buddhist monks, as well as to the Brāhmaṇas and heretics, who dwelt in this kingdom. Religion, therefore,—regarding it here as a mark of the civilization of the 'kingdom of the south,'—was represented by each of the highest forms of religious philosophy to which the intellect of India had then risen.

3. This last circumstance involves another mark of the civilization of this kingdom: for in the fact that Buddhist monks, Brāhmaṇas, and dissenters from both, lived side by side within it, there is an indication that religious toleration was both understood and practised, in some measure or other, by both the rulers and the subjects of 'the kingdom of the south.' And this is the more remarkable since Fah Hian distinctly states that the masses of the people were perversely opposed to the Buddhist religion, notwithstanding their voluntary or compulsory toleration of it.

4. The presence of these 'Samanaṇas, Brāhmaṇas, and Heretics' implies the corresponding existence of the voluminous literature of each of these religious denominations in 'the kingdom of the south.'

5. Fah Hian was informed by the people the existence of this vihāra would of itself be sufficient to justify the conclusion that the Buddhist religion had taken considerable root in the 'kingdom of the south,' and that those who professed it were a respectable class of its subjects. But Fah Hian does not leave this circumstance to be merely conjectured: for he distinctly refers to the Buddhist monks, as well as to the Brāhmaṇas and heretics, who dwelt in this kingdom. Religion, therefore,—regarding it here as a mark of the civilization of the 'kingdom of the south,'—was represented by each of the highest forms of religious philosophy to which the intellect of India had then risen.

3 This is in accordance with Mr. Laidley's version, from which Mr. Laidley's differs in this particular.
of the country that a service of state-guards existed in this kingdom, and that they were paid for their services, through the government officials, at a regulated price, and that this price had to be paid in advance by the traveller on his entrance into the country. This I understand to be the meaning of his words,—"Those who desire to proceed thither should first pay a certain sum of money to the king of the country, who will then appoint people to accompany them and show them the way."

6. This service of guides, considered, as it is by Fah Hian, as a remarkable feature in the character of this kingdom, could scarcely have arisen as a state institution in any but one possessing extensive territory. His description of the route through this kingdom implies as much also:—"The roads of the kingdom of Tha-ti-ken are dangerous, toilsome, and not easy to know;" for, written as these words were after he had accomplished the difficult land-journey from China to India, he is clearly referring to an extensive tract of country abounding in mountains and deep rivers, and jungles infested by robbers and wild beasts. The same conclusion seems to arise from the context of this description of the roads: for he proceeds at once to add, first, that the traveller had to pay down "a certain sum of money to the king of the country" before he made the journey on these roads; and, secondly, that he "was unable to proceed thither." I gather from this, first, that it was principally, if not entirely, the necessity of advancing this money which deterred him from proceeding by the land route to Ceylon: for it seems very improbable that the great zeal and intrepidity which had already accomplished the Himalayan journey would shrink before the lesser difficulties of the Dakhan, provided those difficulties were of a similar kind. And, if this was the deterring reason, I gather, secondly, that the sum of money required to be advanced was not a mere passenger's toll, but a considerable sum, which Fah Hian's purse was unable to meet, or which he did not consider advisable to spend in this manner.

7. Fah Hian, as a zealous Buddhist, looked at this institution, as he did at everything else during his sojourn in India, only as it affected himself and others of his own profession: he speaks of this service simply as one of guides, and of the persons who benefited by it as "the Clergy of Reason of the other kingdoms," who proceeded "thither to practise the rites." Religious mendicants, unencumbered with property, would need nothing more than to be shown the way of their journey: but I cannot imagine a powerful state setting about the establishment of an elaborate and expensive service of this kind for the benefit of these monks alone, if their travels were made for exclusively religious purposes. If we could learn more of this institution, it would probably turn out to be the old police service of Southern India; and the persons for whose benefit it was more especially instituted, and applied in the form to which Fah Hian refers, were the merchants who traversed the Dakhan in those days with the lighter and most precious articles of the commerce of the East. Their valuable merchandise would need and could well pay for this kind of state escort; and the rich benefits of this commerce which they brought into the kingdom would afford efficient motives to induce the state to create or to apply a police service of this kind for their protection. This service, therefore, thus regarded, suggests another mark of the civilization of the kingdom of the south, namely, its valuable commerce, and its inland trade-routes.

These instances of the political, intellectual, and religious condition of Fah Hian's "kingdom of the south," taken in connection with the several matters which lie beneath them and lead up to them, seem fully to warrant the conclusion that it was both extensive and powerful, and that it was advanced in the best forms of the civilization which India had worked out in those early times.

Fah Hian mentions the king of the country, and there seem to be some considerations in his description which lead to the conclusion that this or some previous ruler or rulers of this kingdom was a patron of Buddhism, if not himself a Buddhist:—

1. The presence of Buddhist monks is sufficient to show that the rulers of the kingdom were not inimical to the Buddhist religion. Brāhmaṇas and Jains were already on the scene, ready to take advantage of any ascendency of their religion at court to crush their hated rivals; and the common people, in at least one part of the kingdom, were avowedly rejectors of Buddhism.

2. It is much more likely that the toleration
of these rival religions should have proceeded from a mild Buddhist monarch than from a king whose sympathies were with the party of innovation, whose earliest appearances on the stage of the history of the times which succeeded Fah Hian’s days are associated with bitter controversies, and a fanatical hatred of their Buddhist opponents, which prepared the way for their general extermination.

3. It is scarcely probable that a colossal work of art, like Fah Hian’s rock-cut monastery, could have been undertaken by any one but a powerful, rich, and prosperous king,* or rather, considering the time which such a work would require for its completion, by a succession of such kings. And it is similarly improbable that a costly and everlasting monument of this description would have been so undertaken unless the king or kings had religious convictions in harmony with the object for which such a magnificent building was constructed.

We may now pass on to investigate the locality of the kingdom of Tha-thisen.

Fah Hian places it “two hundred yeowyan to the south”—namely, to the south of the place where he was when he described it. In the preceding chapter we find him ascending the Ganges (Ganges) from Palianfoo (Pataliputra) until “he came to the town of Pho-lo-nai (Varaṇasi, Banaras), in the kingdom of Kiu-shi” (Kāshī). Banaras, therefore, is the starting-point of his measurement of the two hundred yeowyan.

The yeowyan, as the equivalent of the Sanskrit yojana, is “a measure of distance equal to four kroshas, which at 8000 cubits or 4000 yards to the krosha or kos will be almost exactly nine miles; other computations make the yojana but about five miles, or even no more than four miles and a half.” (Wilson, Sansk. Dict.) The Chinese appear to have used the word not so much as a definite measure of length, as to express the distance from one halting-place to another during royal progresses on the imperial highways, and between the relays of the post; and the actual length of the different stages appears to have depended upon the level or hilly character of the country, and so to have varied much everywhere. “The translations of Buddhist works,” says M. Rémasat, “distin-

guish three kinds of yojana:—the great yojana of 80 li, which is used in the measurement of level countries, where the absence of mountains and rivers renders the road easy; the mean yojana of 60 li, when rivers and mountains oppose some difficulties to the traveller; and the little yojana of 40 li, adapted to those countries where the mountains are precipitous and the rivers very deep.” Fah Hian says that “the roads of the kingdom of the Dakshina are dangerous, toilsome, and not easy to know;” and it therefore seems natural to suppose that the little yojana of forty li would be selected by him as the most applicable in this instance. M. Rémasat, in fact, adopts the little yojana of ½ English miles as “applicable with exactness to the most celebrated localities” which have been identified in these travels of Fah Hian. For the present purpose, therefore, it seems reasonable to adopt this measurement of 4½ miles for the yojana in the interpretation of Fa Hian’s report; and his words then, put into plain English, will be, “Nine hundred miles to the south of Banaras there is a kingdom called the kingdom of the south.”

The question now arises, What point had he in his mind at the other end of his line? He starts from a fixed point, Banaras; and it seems natural to suppose that he is referring to some equally definite spot, which it had been his wish to visit in Southern India—very probably the capital city of the kingdom which he is describing, or, possibly enough, the remarkable rock-cut Pigeon Monastery, which he immediately proceeds to describe.

One more preliminary question needs to be answered, namely, With what degree of exactness does Fah Hian indicate the directions of the localities which he mentions? What is to be understood by his expression ‘to the south’? An examination of several passages of his travels leads me to the conclusion that, short only of scientific exactness, he lays down the relative positions of places very correctly, but he does not go beyond the four cardinal points of the compass and the four intermediate points. Any place, therefore, lying between south-south-east and south-south-west would be ‘to the south,’ within the usual meaning of his words. On a map of India I mark off by its scale a line 900 miles in length. Applying this line to the map

* Hiwen Thang calls the monastery Po-lo-mo-lo-hi-li, and says it was built by king So-to-po-ho (Śīrāhāna ?).—Mém. sur les Cont. Occid. II. p. 101.
in a southerly direction from Banaras, and deflecting it a little to the west, to keep within the limits of the land, the end of the 900 miles will be found in the neighbourhood of Madras; and, as Madras is only about 23 degrees to the west of the meridian of Banaras, any place in the neighbourhood of Madras will suit Fah Hian's distance and direction, according to this mode of measurement. It seems certain, however, that while we may consider Madras to be about the extreme south point to which his description can apply, Fa Hian had a more practicable route in mind than the crow-flight-line; and when he says that "the roads of the kingdom of Thai-thsen are dangerous, tedious, and not easy to know," he seems to suggest an intricate inland route, rather than the road by the coast. If so, allowance must be made for the circuitousness and sinuosities of that route, and the end of the 900 miles will then fall a good deal north of Madras. In this long distance perhaps an allowance of about one-fourth will be sufficient to cover these deflections from the straight line; and the end of Fah Hian's line will then fall in the neighbourhood of the Krishnâ.

The result of this method of interpreting Fah Hian's 35th chapter may now be stated in these words:—Two hundred travelling stages to the south of Banaras—that is to say, somewhere between the basin of the Godâvarî and the basin of the Pâlar—lay, in the year 400 A.D., the heart of an extensive kingdom, namely, the 'kingdom of the south,' where the arts of architecture and sculpture had attained a high stage of progress; where religion, philosophy, and literature were represented by Buddhist monks, Brahmanas, and other religious sectarians; where internal order was maintained by a well-organized police, whose services were available for the protection of pilgrims of religion, as well as for merchants and their merchandise; which possessed Buddhist monuments of sufficient interest and importance to induce "the Clergy of Reason of the other kingdoms [to] go thither and practise the rites;" whose material progress was apparently aided by a rich and extensive commerce; and which was governed by a mild and enlightened monarch, who, while he seems to have himself possessed Buddhist sympathies, was nevertheless tolerant of all other religions.

We may now proceed to compare this interpreta-
the north-western districts of the Dakhaq; while at about the same time the whole of the
seaboard from the northern limits of the Chola kingdom at or about the southern Pennar up
to the southern boundary of Orissa, together
with the whole of the inland country westwards as far as the borders of the Cheras and the
Kadamba\s, was in the possession of these kings. Vemij remained in their possession for about two centuries later than the time of
Fah Hian, when (about A.D. 600) it was wrested
from them by Kubja Vishnu Varhna, the younger brother of the Chalukya king; and Kan\ci continued to be the capital
of their curtained but still very powerful kingdom until a much later date, and, with the
further curtailment of territory, very probably, until the tenth century, when the
Cholas, taking advantage of the decay of their power, and of the anarchy which resulted from it, carved the new state of Ton\damala\m out of the last remnant of their possessions.
They were in the height of their power in Southern India, therefore, at the time of Fah Hian's visit; and their extensive dominions were then fully entitled to be called the 'kingdom of the Dakshina.'

2. That they were at least patrons of Buddhism seems clear from the fact of the existence of Buddhist and Buddhist institutions in their kingdom and their capital city; and that they were also tolerant of the Brahmanical religion is shown by the circumstance that all their grants of lands which are as yet known were bestowed as Brahmanical endowments. These facts, therefore, run parallel in this respect with Fah Hian's report of the Samanesas, Brahmans, and Heretics living together in the 'kingdom of the Dakshina.'

3. Whether they were themselves Buddhists or not, they were at any rate patrons of Buddhist architecture. Mr. Fergusson has shown that the culminating point of Buddhist architecture was attained, or at least most prominently represented, in the Tope of Amravati, the banks of the Krishn, which stood in the very centre of the dominions of the Pallavas, and that the

most exquisite portions of the sculpture of that magnificent Buddhist monument were carved about the very time of Fah Hian's visit to India.

And this splendid example of a Buddhist tope forms a fitting companion to his correspondingly
grand Buddhist Vihara, as a twin example of the high style of architecture which prevailed in these parts in his days.

4. Hiwen Thasang has shown that throughout the whole course of his journey along the upper eastern coast the monasteries of the Buddhists abounded everywhere, many of them still flourishing, and many more of them in ruins; and that the greatest number of ruined Buddhist buildings, as well as the three preponderating numbers of Brahmanical temples, lay in those parts of the route which had but lately passed from the Pallavas into the hands of the Vishnu-worshipping Chalukyas.

5. The identity of the Pallava style of architecture with that of Fah Hian's kingdom of the south is strikingly exemplified by the 'Great Ratha' at Mahamallapuran, on the seashore about 35 miles from the Pallava capital, Kapelahpuram, and apparently its commercial port. Mr. Fergusson has called this Buddhist monument "a literal copy" of the Pigeon Vihara of Fah Hian's kingdom of the south; and he regards it and the other rathas at that place as "the prototypes of the style" of Dravidian architecture, and the "originals from which all the Vimanas in Southern India were copied." Sir Walter Elliot, many years ago, connected these rathas with the Pallavas; and Mr. Fergusson assigns them to the 5th or 6th century, "if not indeed earlier"—a date, especially when it is expressed in this tentative form, which brings their construction sufficiently near to Fah Hian's day to connect the "Great Ratha" with his rock-cut monastery in point of time, as its form so remarkably does in point of architectural style.

6. While these considerations lead to the conclusion that the kings of the Pallavas were powerful, enlightened, and prosperous, the sources of their great prosperity are not far to seek. The central emporium of the whole of

\* He places the monastery in Kao-sa-lo or Komala, the capital of which may have been about Vairavadi or Bh\ndak; thence he goes south 800 li to An-lo or Andhara, the capital of which he calls Ping-k\lo, from which he proceeded southwards 1000 li to To-ma-tse-tse-ki (Dhara-ku\bha) or Ta-\n-tse-ki (Mah\ndhara), at the capital of which were two famous monasteries, the Prat\l\-and

Avarami-mak\h\fRamas. Probably this was B\wl\d. After another 1000 li to the south-west and south he came to Ch\li-yo, the capital of which Ferguson would place at Nelur on the coast, and Cunningham at Karnali on the Yungah\d. May it not be the Western Chalukya kingdom?—Eo.
the commerce between India and the Golden Chersonese and the regions to the further East, and so of every sea-board beyond India between China and the western world, was within their territory; and all the diamond mines then known to the world were also within their dominions, and had probably supplied every diamond which up to that time had ever adorned a diadem. The bulk of that commerce went southwards from that "locus unde solvent in Chryseum naves" in coasting vessels around Cape Kumari to the ports of departure for the markets of the West on the western coast: but the lighter and most valuable articles, and especially the diamonds and other precious stones, would naturally find their way by the shorter land-route to those ports; and merchants laden with these precious commodities would be protected along the wild roads across the peninsula, and could well afford to pay for that protection Phah Hian's "certain sum of money to the king of the country."

For these reasons the conclusion seems to me to be irresistible that Phah Hian's 'kingdom called Tha-thisen is the great kingdom of the Pailavas of Kanchi.'

If this identification is well established, it will supply an important missing link in the history of India between the times which are covered by the classical and the Buddhist relations, and by the evidence of coins, and the dawn of the unbroken period from the 5th century downwards which is covered by Sir Walter Elliot's Chalukya inscriptions; it will prepare the way for an investigation of the next earlier link in the chain, namely, the question of the origin of these kings of the Pailavas, which will probably fill in the remainder of the gap; it will account for the possibility of the splendid commerce of these parts up through the age of Ptolemy to the times of the Periplus, by showing the existence of a local government sufficiently powerful for its protection; it will also, I hope, contribute something towards the completion of Mr. Ferguson's almost perfect continuity of Buddhist architectural history from the tope and vihāra of Gandhāra, through the Tope of Amrāvatī, the nine-storied Chaitya of the Diamond Saads, the Pigeon Monastery of Phah Hian, and the Vihāra Ratha of Mahāmallapura, down to the many-storied vihāras of Java, and the pyramidal vimānas and Gopuras of medieval India; and it will help to restore an almost forgotten empire to its due place in the ancient history of India.

FRAGMENTS RELATING TO ÂNANDAPURA IN SAURĀSHTRA.

BY MAJOR J. W. WATSON.

The Ánandapura of Hiwen Thsang is stated by that author to be 700 li, or about 135 miles, to the north-west of Vālabhi. General Cunningham, in his Ancient Geography of India (p. 493), says that the town has been identified with Barnagar (Vadnagar in Gujarāt) by M. Viven de Saint-Martin;1 he, however, mentions that Vadnagar is 150 miles to the east of north, and he subsequently suggests that the kingdom of Ánandapura may correspond with the triangular tract lying between the mouth of the Bānā river on the west, and the Sābarmati river on the east.

Now Ánandapura in Saurāshtra, or more correctly in the Deva-Panchāla,2 is about 64 miles to the north-west of Vālabhi as the crow flies; but as the hilly country between Vālabhi and Ánandapura, commencing near Gadhrā, was in former times not only covered with thick jungle, but also devoid of roads, it is not only possible, but probable, that a traveller would be obliged to make a détour of forty or fifty miles to reach that town, the territories subordinate to which, after making so long a détour, one might be apt to consider of greater extent than they really were. It is, therefore, just possible that the Ánandapura in the Panchāla is really the Ánandapura of the Chinese pilgrim. It is doubtless of very respectable antiquity, and

---

1 Julien, Misce. sur la Cont. Occid. tom. II. p. 406. This was on the authority of Stevenson, Kātipā Sāhā, pp. 2, 15. Cunningham makes 6 li equal one mile, and so makes Ánandapura only 117 miles from Vālabhi. Cont. Archæol.

---

2 The Deva-Panchāla is a subdivision of Saurāshtra.
has a fine temple, the founding of which is commonly attributed to Sidhrāj Jayasinh of Anbilvāḍā, besides another older temple, now in ruins, which was sacred to a Naga, or snake-deity. Three kos east of Anandapura was a town called Dhokalvā, and east of this is a small hill called the Dhumahan town hill. Dhundhan is now waste, but its old site can be shown, and close to this spot the Bhādar river rises. At this place Dhumho Rāksha was said to have been born; he afterwards went to Chobāri, the inhabitants of which village he devoured, and from this spot he devastated the neighbouring villages, devouring their inhabitants. So great were his ravages that he rendered the Panchāla desolate, and a vast forest sprang up there. Dhumho Rākṣaṣa, was, however, at last slain by Rājā Risālū, reputed to be the eldest son of Gohil Sākānandhi Śāliyāhāna, king of Mungipūr Pātan. Rājā Risālu is said to have gone to marry at Ujjain, but there being offended broke off the match and went to Dhokalvā; here he played a game of chess with the Rājā for the hand of his daughter Phulmati, and winning married that lady and took her with him to the Panchala, then suffering from the ravages of Dhumho Rākṣaṣa. Here Risālu heard that the Rākṣaṣa resided at Chobāri, and an old woman informed him that the Rākṣaṣa every morning went to the Panch-Mukhi Wāv at Chobāri to bathe and pay his adorations to the Sun, and that at such times his body was turned into wax. She further added that if at that time some prince of royal blood would sever his head from his body he would certainly die, though otherwise he was impervious to mortal arms. The prince accordingly, next day, went to the spot and snatched off the head of the Rākṣaṣa while occupied with his devotions to the Sun, and slew him. After this Risālu brought Phulmati to Chobāri and reigned there. After sometime a Wanjāro (Brinjāra) named Häthio, leader of a caravan of 900,000 beasts of burden, came to Chobāri, and an improper intimacy sprang up between him and Phulmati. Risālu, discovering this, slew Häthio, and a large pile of stones (241, chag) marks the spot between Chobāri and Anandapura where he was buried. As far, however, as I can ascertain, Anandapura was founded in Sama 1124 by Chudissamā Ananda, after whom it was named This, if true, would place its foundation subsequent to Hwen Thsang's visit to Saurashṭra. The following havita celebrates the founding of Anandapura:—

कविता।

संवत 1124, मास आथु गर्दन।
गारौ भीम त्यस प्रेम, नाथज सृणाम सोहित।
पांचाल देव जयम श्राम, नर नरेन्द्र गद शारीर।
रचिये धरी ज्ञानीय, दुर भाषा छाय गन्धीय।
खरी वीर बंगाल शाहर खड़, करार राज वेदन्त होयी।
अभासमय ज्ञानिये, राज आशीर्वाद पर रामीय।

"In Sama 1124, in the pure month of Aṣu,
On Tuesday the second day of the month in the delicate nakṣatra of Suvāt,
In that best place the land of Panchāla, the man, a king of men, the fort-lord,
The Jādvā Rāi founded the city, the umbrella-lord (founded) Anandapura.

Brave men of the thirty-six races standing by
him, he imprisoned Rai Kawāt.
Anant Rāi, son of Kanaka, founded the kingdom of Anandapura."

And so the following ḍhāsu:—

हुरोः
वो कविते पांचालमुनि, नरपति वर्धीनु नाम;
राज आशीर्वाद पर राज्यं, करियं भौम नाम.

"That Ananta in the Panchāla
Assumed the title of 'Lord of men';
He founded the kingdom of Anandapura,
And in so doing performed a most excellent deed."

हुरोः २
वंश रुप धुर बलवीनी, मरण राज्यं नाम;
संसार आस्थं, भूमि विश्रामग्नं.

"He, that Jādvānāi king of illustrious family,
Who assumed the title of 'Lord of men,'
BUILT a mighty temple
To Antesvar in Anandapura."

So far for the founding of Anandapura by Ananta Chudissamā, and according to this the large temple should be attributed to this Ananda, and not to Sidhrāj who is reputed its founder.

But the custom of attributing all works of archaeological interest in Gujarāt to Sidhrāj or Kamara Pāls is too well known to need any comment from me. And though the date forbids
us to think that this can be the Ánandapura alluded to by Hwén Thēng, it is just as likely as not that the date quoted in the duḥā is wrong, and it may be Saṅvat 624, which would place the founding of the city in 568 a.d. There is, however, one great objection to this, viz., that in a.d. 568 the Chaukāsamās had not, as far as our present knowledge extends, entered Saurāshṭra. Other solutions of the difficulty are—that this Ánanda of the legend following is quite another person than the Ánanda mentioned in the two duḥas, and that the first Ánanda was a Yādava, and the second Ánanda, though a Yādava also, one of the Chaukāsamā branch. The following verses show that the second Ánanda imprisoned Rā Kauḍā of Junāgadh, and in vain desired him to perform obeisance. The four duḥas are evidently fragments of a longer poem, and the name Ánanda, as well as the imprisonment of Rā Kauḍā by a king of the name of Ánanda, corresponds to the famous story of the imprisonment of Rā Kauḍā on the Shīlābēj by a Rāja of Kalyāṇa, and his release from bondage by Ugrā Watā. As, however, the first kavita alludes to the imprisonment of Rā Kauḍā, I give them for what they are worth:—

``

``Thy feet are in the stocks,
What avails it now to lay your hand on your moustache?''
Your strength is fully known:
Make, O Kawāt, a humble salutation.''

``

``Kawāt replied angrily:—
'O Rāja, do not be obstinate;
Ánant! the sun would not rise,
And the ocean would abandon its bed (were I to act thus).''

``

``Kawāt, make your salutation,''
So Rāja Ánant directs:
'Having, married you (to some one) I will restore you to your throne,
I will establish you lord of Giriñāgadh.'''

``

``The Rā replied in a kingly manner,
'How should I bow myself to you?
Gadā Gardar śould be shamed,
And the nine divisions of Soraṭ would have to look down.'''

This Ánanda and his successors reigned at Ánandapura till Saṅvat 1320. It is said there were seven kings of this dynasty, of whom the last was Ámarasiṇha. After his time the Panchāla was deserted, owing first to the invasion of the emperor Mūhammad Toghlak of Dehli, and afterwards to the incursions of the Sultāns of Gujarāt, and Ánandapura itself became waste. In Saṅvat 1664, however, a Chārān named Budhān, an inhabitant of a nāl, or hamlet, in the adjoining hills, having lost his cattle in the forest which then covered the Panchāla country, wandered hither in search of them, and seeing the town wall, temple, tank, &c., on his return told the Kāthi āṅāma, under whose protection he lived, of the fact of Ánanda-praśāntri lying thus desolate. Those chieftains, viz. Khāchārs Jethsur and Mījāl, who sprang from the Khāchār house of Chotiāl, on hearing this, moved thither from their previous residence in the Thāngā range and took possession of the place, and ruled there for twenty-seven years, and their descendants are now to be found at Anilī, under Jasdan, and other places. Now Khāchār Mulu Nāgājan of Sojakapura was the son of their maternal aunt, and was therefore cousin of the Ánandapura Khāchārs Jethsur and Mījāl, and constantly used to go and stay with them at Ánandapura for ten and twenty days at a time. Now there was in the ruined gate of Ánandapur one stone in the archway which looked as if about to fall; when the Khāchārs Jethsur and Mījāl rode under this archway they used to put their horses to a gallop for fear lest this constantly alluded to in both tradition and bardic poetry.

1. To twist or curl the moustache is considered among Bājpūtas as a gesture of defiance.
2. The word kāthi means the three solders made by an inferior when saluting the Rāja in kachher.
3. The nine divisions of Soraṭ, no-khaṇḍa-Soraṭ, are called the Māndhāva range.
stone should fall on them. Mulu Khâchar, perceiving their lack of courage, determined to seize Anandapura, and accordingly attacked it at the head of five hundred horse. Fearing his prowess, Jethsur and Miâjil Khâchar fled away at night with their property, and Khâchar Mulu and his brother Lâkho (sons of Nâgâjan) took possession of Anandapura in Sahvat 1691 on Sunday, on the second day of the light half of Paush. The present tâlukdâr of Anandapura are descended from the above-mentioned Mulu. After this capture of Anandapura its former proprietors went out in bârvatâ (outlawry) against Mulu Khâchar, and harassed the Anandapura country. Afterwards Jhâlã Khetoji of Kudni joined them, and Khetoji with the assistance of the Kâthis conquered Li m bâdi from the Chûjâsamâs, but refused to give the Kâthis a half-share in the estate, as he had promised, and they consequently harassed and plundered the Limbâi country. Finally in Sahvat 1072 Khetoji made peace with them by giving them the village of Jh ã bâlã, after which they renewed their feud with Anandapura. Khâchars Wâjsur and Râmã, however, who were the sons of Mulu, settled the feud by giving them some land at Dha rî, and after this they went and settled at Jhôbâlî, and their descendants are called Jh ã bâlîs to this day. After this, Khâchars Mulu and Lâkho enjoyed the permanent possession of Anandapura, although they usually resided at Sejakapura. It is said that 1800 horse were under their authority, and they were the principal chiefs in the Panchalâ. Lâkho was known by the name of Lâkho Khandhâr. The brothers now became very formidable, and at last Jâm Tamâchi of Navânagar, Râj Jâwantasîng of Halwad, and Salâbat Khân Bâbî combined against them and laid siege to Anandapura, but failed to take it. The following rupaka is said regarding this achievement of the Kâthis:

rupaka 9.

नमः जाय सर्पी जाय || सलसकपान नाम || कौटी मर देवी कर जाय || नान्क मेरी कर देन नामनी || लघुदर दामहर देन दे॥ धोर बाजी समका कटक जोले॥
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रे कल्पने दर्ग आयंगर माहरा || मोराया गाया दर्गान हादी।।
स नेपाल मुलक एक खान बछादार || दुकान कारण रच ठाण मांरे।।
सारी हलवत भाई जबल नृगा नागरा || हालायी भाषाय भाङीहर।।
जम तमाचै राखोज, दारोत जान, एवं सलाह खान, लेड एक अत्यन्त शूद्र, लेकिन से उन्होंने समय के लायक काम किया। भूत वे घनीभूत नहीं, बल नहीं।

ā This alludes to the Kâthi's Jâm Hâlã, who gave his name to the division of the province called Hâlã.

12 This alludes to the Kâthi's Jâm Hâlã, who gave his name to the division of the province called Hâlã.

13 Alluding to Salâbat Khân Bâbî being an imperial servent.

A district under Vibarangâm, so named because it originally comprised forty-four villages.
"While fighting, the cymbals dashed on every side,
And he dashed down the umbrellas of many kings of the earth.
O Mulu, thou hast caused funeral shroud to be dear,
But hast made chaḍḍa (bracelets) to be cheap,
in the Chanwál.
On that Detroj land the descendant of Rámá caused the umbrellas to shake.
They who sold scarfs (śādīs) had ornaments in their houses,
While they who sold bracelets (bangāḷa) were overwhelmed with debt.
O son of Nágā, thou hast diminished the number of the lords of men,
And also, as they say, the lords of arrows and horses."

The houses of the Wâpiás were filled with merchandise,
While the houses of the Manîs were ruined.
You slew the strong together with the army in the battle-field,
In the country of Kâño you killed many;
The wives of the enemy's soldiers buy sidī only,
But they do not purchase bracelets."

Hearing of Mulu's fame, a bard from Chitor composed the following kavita in his honour:—

**Kavita.**

मोहि भोज नृसिंह || मोहि लघदेव सीतराम ||
बल मक्के राजी || मक्के कारण राजा गीती ||
करण मके परमाम || सय वसी धीरी कुरी ||
मके नेत्रधीर गोर || मके साही मुकपुरी ||
पारवायु देव मुंडे कारी || पण जाता भवाकर धीरी ||
मंडळीकार पारस एतामला || णुरानले ते नागा तणा ||

"Bhoja and Vikrama may be found; Jagadeva, the preserver of life,
Bal Kâthod may be met, and so can a second Kâran;
Chandan Parmâr may be found, he may be met whose fame is spread over the world;"

18  चेंड़ा, chendá, a funeral shroud.
17  Widow break their chaḍḍa or bracelets and do not wear others, hence they would be sold cheap; while, for analogous reasons, shroud would be dear.
18  i.e. the bowmen and horsemen.
19  The dealers in female apparel.
20  Manîs are workers in ivory, who make armlets, bracelets, &c.
21  Sidā is a kind of muslin. The meaning is that the Thirty-three kṣiras of gods may be seen; Lâkho Phulâni may be seen;
But thou, O Mulu, good lord of Panchâla, who art very charitable and invested with authority,
If one meets thee, O son of Nágâ, then one has seen all those noble kings."

The following dukhas are also in praise of Mulu:—

**Dukha 1.**

मोहि लघदेव सीतराम || मोहि लघदेव सीतराम; ।
बल मके राजी || राजा गीती ||
"Ganga, Jamnâ, and Gomti; the pilgrimage to Kâti and Kedârâth;"
But if you see the face of Râjâ Mulu, that is the holy place, and thence you will derive advantage."

**Dukha 2.**

मुलू मल्लान्गे, मल्लू मल्लान्गे; ।
मोहि लघदेव सीतराम नाही; ।
"Mulu is among men such a one that no man can be compared with him;
Only in the form of Indra, there may you see the form of the son of Nágâ."

**Dukha 3.**

सबी भक्तकार अर्नी || राजा एक बड़े; ।
"The anthill of Sejakapura remained safe; The vâdid returned, O Mulu, throwing away their flutes."

Mulu had a feud with the chief of Chuḍâ, and defeated him with the loss of three guns, as described in the following dukha:—

**Dukha 4.**

राजार वियारीयर नाही || नाही; ।
"There remained of the Râjâ
But nine carts and three cannon;
These three (cannon) cannot accompany him,
Because Mulu has them."

The following dukha is said in praise of Sejakapura:—

widows bought clothes, as they need must, but, being widows, could not buy bracelets.
22  The word vâditha is used here to signify a king.
23  The Gomti is the river of Dwârakâ.
24  Here there is a play on the word sidā. The couplet likens Mulu to a king residing in the anthill of Sejakapura. The word sidā means a snake-catcher, but also means 'enemy.' It probably refers to the siege of Anandapura by the Jân, the chief of Halwâd, and Sâlîlhot Khâ, mentioned above.
“The women who draw water have silken clothes, and on their necks necklaces of pearls. King! Sejakapura is Indrawati, where the great king Mulu resides.”

When, as above mentioned, Jâm Tamâchi, Salâbat Khân Bâbi, and Jhâlâ Jâswantaingâhi of Halwad attacked Ánandapura, Lâkhâ Khâchar of Shâhpur assisted his brother Mulu Khâchar, and the following rupaka is said in his praise:—

“Thou, O descendant of Joga, Gavest thine ear to the complaints of the mendicants; You assembled an army of Kâthis, O son of Mulu, to strike Tikar.”

The Patris (i.e. Jhâls of Patris), should not fight with the Pariks (i.e. Kâthis). For their (the Kâthis’) army will advance to oppose them (the Jhâls).

If I lead an army of horsemen through Halwad, you should call me Lakhdhir.

Having seized his sword the Jhâlo arose, the commander of the chiefs of the army; While the Lakhdhir, drawing up his army close, arose also, to drive the Mlechhas from Ánandapura. When he rose up, his arms reached the sky, and sword in hand he cut down the Moghuls. Yet the Bâbi, of immeasurable strength, would not move, nor would Jaso or the Jâm move either.

The cannons roared and the cannon-balls flew, and the sword made the army of the enemy as grain in the grainyard.”

Râmo Khâchar, son of Mulu Khâchar, succeeded his father in the Sejakapura and Ánandapura gîrds in Sañvat 1730, A.D. 1674. The following duho is said in his praise:—

22 A play on the name of Lâkhâ.
24 Jâswantaingâhi of Halwad.

The pdar is the open space immediately round the village.
He, the great hero, who never bowed to any one, did not bow now.

Many other chiefs, leaving their pride, fled away,

But the grandson of Mularaja did not lose his courage.

The fame of the brave is never forgotten;
You, Khāchar, son of Rāmo, supported the earth on your shoulder.”

"Thou, the son of Rāmā, art never wearyed
Of fighting with the enemy;
An unbending Kāthi
Art thou, O Ebhal of Ānandapura.”

"Your powerful push,
O son of Rāmā, none can bear.
At the unconquered Ānandapura,
Thou, O Ebhal, in the flower of thy youth, residest.”

Ebhal Khāchar was succeeded by his son Rāmo Khāchar, who had : the hundred horsemen under him and was called Rāmo Melikar.”

He used to ravage the surrounding country, but was once or twice defeated by Jasoji and Sartanjih, two brave chiefs of Kotā Sāngāni, who had also defeated other Kāthis raiders. Rāmo Khāchar, however, avenged himself on them by capturing the town of Sar dha rī from them and the Rājkoṭ chieftain, and made it his capita, and then contemplated the subjugation of Kotā Sāngāni. Both Rājkoṭ and Kotā now united against him and endeavoured to recover Sardhār, but in vain. They, however, gave him so much annoyance that eventually he agreed to surrender Sardhār to them on condition of being paid the chaath (or fourth part of the revenue). The Jādeja, however, feeling insecure with so daring a neighbour, determined to crush him, and consequently, though they agreed to his terms and received

23 Query—Is this the Lomā alluded to in Bās Māli, vol. 1, pp. 455, 456?
24 मेलिकार, means ‘a person in command of a large number of mounted men.’
25 Sardār was the joint property of Rājkoṭ and Kotā.
26 The Rājkoṭ and Kotā chiefs are of the Jādeja clan.
possession of Sardhr, they withheld the chauth. Afterwards, when Rama Khachar had gone on a distant raid, they summoned the Jam of Navanagar to their assistance, and making an unexpected attack on Anandapura overpowered the garrison and plundered the town, demolishing the town wall and the towers. They also carried away the western gates of the town, and placed them in one of the Sardhr gateways, where they are to this day. When Rama Khachar on his return found Anandapura thus desolate, he commenced a warfare with Sardhr, and harassed the inhabitants by constant raids and forays until they agreed to pay him the chauth; on their agreeing to this, peace was concluded between them.

Rama Khachar emulated his ancestors in plundering Halwad and Navanagar territory, as the following verses testify:

**Verse 1**

Haldew taney hamsha || daitya jagny dhaney ||
Narag taney narsha || rahi bhakar raja ||

"The whole world knows that you are the enemy of Halwad;
But you, O Rama, lord of men, were equal also to Nagar."

**Verse 2**

Kanta dama kahi khaam kadey || baaral dhal bhalo baarag ||
Jhalaabar bhalonadar || halbad nakh dera hamsah ||
Kejre kek dada hantara || Rama barshy khaam kada ||
Emaa dhal bhalay baraya || pabu khraua khaam kada ||

"O Kati, you have assembled numerous forces.
And the Rana had also with him a mighty army.
After causing Jhalaabar to shake, he (Rama) conquered it,
And rode his mounted bands through Halwad itself.
The Pachias closed the gate against you, and confusion reigned in the shops and the bazaar,
When the young obstinate son of Ehal openly drove away large herds.
The Mawana Rana climbs to his upper story, and hears from thence

---

The music of victory loudly resounding.
From the balcony of Halwad the descendant of Niga was looked upon by the Rani as Rama Raja."

Rama Khachar was succeeded by his son Visaman Khachar, who rebuilt the town wall of Anandapura. The following rupaka commemorates his fame:

**Verse 1**

Bahar peery pura toore yamr || par par samud bhiq yuna ||
Sotri game game yuna || tama valanty rama thara ||

"The king of Anandapura has built a fort like Idar,
In every house there are brave men like Samaat,
He has increased the population of every village.
Thou art fortunate, O son of Rama.
Herds of cows and buffaloes and horses stand near your dwelling,
Innumerable guests dine on your good food,
Your fertile land bears flowers of gold,
In the bazar the shops on both sides look splendid.
The brave descendant of Ehabal (reigns) there mercifully,
The throne of the lord of Pawar is fortunate,
The poems sing poetry and praises before you,
Every day the kacheri is well attended.
Your good fortune, O Vishal, has increased;
You are most bountiful, though also of a fierce temper.
King of men, like Indra, may your fortune increase,
You prince of the race of Mula!"

The sons of Visaman are Jethur, Desa, Rama, and Mesur, and they are at the present day the talukdars of Anandapura.

With our present scanty knowledge of the Chudasaams of Junaga it would be premature to pronounce with any certainty as

---

36 जाग, jhado, is a technical word for a herd of bufaloes only.
37 बास, aho, 'a horse.'
to the dates assigned to Chūdānasā Ananda, and it is of course possible that he may have founded Anaṇḍapura on an old site of that name, but the probabilities seem to point out that this Anaṇḍapura is too modern to have been the Anaṇḍapura of the Chinese pilgrim and the author of the Kalpa Sūtra. The dates of the Kāthi chieftains are no doubt correct within a few years, as they synchronize with contemporary history, and the above sketch may illustrate the roving, daring lives led by the Kāthas for successive generations in times when their hand was against every man, and every man’s hand against them.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo. C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from vol. VI., p. 142)

No. XXXIV.

I have had occasion to refer, at p. 72 of the previous volume, to the separation of the Western and Eastern branches of the Chālukya family. With the exception of Dr. Burnell’s remarks at pp. 18-20 of his South-Indian Paleography, no account of the Eastern branch seems to have been as yet published. The Elliot facsimile collection contains several grants of this dynasty, and I have selected from them the present inscription, the first eighteen lines of which are given as Plate xxv. of Dr. Burnell’s book. In preparing my transcription, I have also consulted the original plates.

The original consists of five plates, each about 7½" long by 3½" broad. The writing commences on the inside of the first plate, and ends on the inside of the fifth plate. The ring, on which they are strung, is about ⅛" thick and 4½" in diameter. The seal is circular, about 2½" in diameter, and bears— at the top, a boar, facing to the proper left, with the moon on its right, the sun above it, and an elephant-goad on its left; in the centre, the words ‘Sri-Tri-bhuvana-daka,’ i.e. ‘the elephant-goad of Sri-Tri-bhuvana;’ and at the bottom, an ornamental device. A comparison of the facsimile plates will show that the characters of this inscription are radically the same as those of the Kādambara and early Western Chālukya copper-plate grants and stone-tablet inscriptions that I have already published in this series, and that they approximate closely to the characters of the later Western Chālukya and Kādambara stone-tablet inscriptions. But, by the time of the present inscription, the characters used by the Western and Eastern Chālukya dynasties had diverged enough for Dr. Burnell to decide that “there is no real connexion between them palaeographically, except so far as their common origin through the Cave-characters is in question.” The chief points of distinction, as noted by him, are—1, the tendency of the Eastern alphabet to preserve archaic forms; 2, the greater freedom with which the Western alphabet uses cursive forms; and 3, the remarkably square and upright character of the Eastern alphabet, as contrasted with the slope given to the letters of the Western alphabet from about the sixth century a.d.

The present inscription is subsequent to the Śaka year 867 (A.D. 945–6), as it mentions that Amma II. succeeded to the throne in that year. It records a grant by a certain Vijāyāditya; but it does not explain who this person was. However, Kollabhiṣaṇa-Vijāyāditya was the grandfather of Amma II., and possibly the grant was made by him before his death, and was recorded in writing at the time of the accession of Amma II. Or, ‘Vijāyāditya’ may be a second name assumed by Amma II. The grant is of the village of Pādaṃkalāru, in the Pennatavadi district. I do not know to what part of the country these localities belong; nor have I any information as to where the plates were discovered.

A genealogy of the Eastern Chālukya, with historical notes on them, will be furnished when more of their grants are ready for publication.

**Transcription.**

**First plate.**


SECOND PLATE; FIRST SIDE.

2. Śvāmi-Mahāśeṇa-pād-ānubhātyānāṁ bhagavan-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāsādi

10. tā Vīṣṇuvardhanas-tam-aucheñāya sapta-trīśatāṁ | Tat-putrā Vījayaśita-bhagta-rakō

11. sātāṁ | Tat-suṭō Vīṣṇuvardhanas-shat-trīśatāṁ | Tat-suṭō Vījayaśita-nareṇdra

14. māgaraṇāḥ-chāśā-tvānāśatāṁ | Tat-sutaḥ Kali-Vīṣṇuvardhanā dūḥyābhyām-dhānakā

15. Tat-suṭō Gaṅgāñkā-Vījayaśita-chautā-chāśā-tvānāśatāṁ | Tat-

18. d-anuja-yuvarāja[ja]-Kvrramāṇa-bhūpatōḥ sūnnaś-Chālukyaā

tā

19. dīnya śan-ās man | Tat-sa[nu*] Amma-rajaś sapta varsha(raḥā) | Tat-sutaṃ Vījayaśī
tā

dīnya bālam-aucheñāya Tālapō māsam-ekam | () Taṃ jīva yudhi Chālukyaā


SECOND PLATE; SECOND SIDE.

20. Tatas-Tālapa-rājasaẏa sūnnaś-sunītā-vāk-prabhūḥ Yuddhamalla-dharaṇāī

nirṛgaṣa

28. yodhitaṃ dāyādāna-inā-bhāāna-līna-bha-gaḥ-ākāraṇ-viśāyāḥ-ētārāṇa | Vā-

30. je-ra[ra]-ājītiya-nākān Amma-niripatā[taḥ]-bhrata kanīyān-bhuvāṃ Bhūma Bhuma-parākra

32. maś-samabhūnāk[sa] vatsarāṇaṃ-dvā[da] jē | Tasya Mahābārā mūrtteṣ-Uma-

33. samān-ākriteḥ Kumārābhāḥ Lōkamahādevyāḥ khalu yas-sama

34. bhavad-Amma-rājākhyāḥ | Jalajātapatra-chāmara-kalāsānkuṣa-lakṣayā-an


36. sān-ūrūkhaḥ | Vidita-dhāraya-vidyō vividhāyudha-kūvid vílin-ārī
tā

THIRD PLATE; FIRST SIDE.

36. kulaḥ | kari-turag-āgama-kusālo Hari-charaṇ-āṃbhōja-yugala-madhupāḥ


38. yāchaka-jana-chintanamār-vāniśaya-mar-mahā-āgra-mahāśā dyanaṃ
ta[taḥ]

38. Gīrī-raasa-vasa-vaṅkhyā-ādī | Saka-samayē Mārgaśiśa-māsā smin

40. krishṇa-trayodasa-dinē Bhīrīvaṇe Maitra-nakhatrē | Dhanaski ravaṇ gha-

42. ta-ṇgaṇe dvādaśa varśaḥ[raḥ] tu janaṇaṁ pataṁ[ta] | yō dhād-yudha-gri

42. nārō(nārō) ravira-iva lōk-āṇaurāgya | Yasmin śāsāti nripē[pa] tu pariṇavānika

43. saya-saṃpach-chhāliḥ | satā-payōdhenaḥ-abhur-nirirāśarṣu[pa]ng(m) nirāśa-chō

43. rō dēśāḥ | Yō rōpena Mahāṇaṭa | vibhāvaṇa Mahāśrāma-anikarana[ra]-u

THIRD PLATE; SECOND SIDE.

47. mahaśāla Hari-ari-pura-ha[n]a[na] nyakκurvav[avaran]-bhāti vidita-dīg-avari-rk[k]lit-

48. Sa mahāṣṭa-bhuvan-abśra-Vījayaśita-mahārajā-ādirājā[ha]

48. param-dvarāḥ parama-bhūntaṛākṛ̣̃aḥ parama-brahmanyāḥ Pennātavādi-viśabha

49. ya-nivāsinī Rāṣṭhrakūta-pramukhān kuṣṭhimānas-sarvān[na]

49. hūṣ-ābhāna-ajnāpayati | Viditam-astu vaḥ | Jagati prathi-
Copper-plate of the Eastern Chalukya Dynasty.
Dated about Śaka 867.
COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE EASTERN CHÂLUKYA DYNASTY.
DATED ABOUT ŚĀKA 867.
COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE EASTERN CHÂLUKYA DYNASTY.
DATED ABOUT ŚAKA 867.

III a.

III b.

IV a.
Translation.

Hail! Kubja-Vishnuvardhana,—the brother of Satyārāya-Vallabhaṇḍara, who adored the family of the Chālukyas, who are glorious; who are of the lineage of Mānasva, which is praised over the whole earth; who are the descendents of Hāriti; who have acquired sovereignty through the excellent favour of Kauśika; who have been cherished by the assemblage of (divine) mothers; who meditate on the feet of Svarājaka, who have the territories of their enemies made subject to them on the instant; who have acquired sovereignty through the excellent sign of the Bear, as they acquired the throne of the holy Nārāyaṇa; and whose bodies are purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—ruled over the country of Vaiṣṇa for eighteen years.

His son, Jayaśīh, (ruled) for thirty *(years).*

Vishnuvardhana,—the son of his younger brother, king Indra,—ruled for nine *(years).*

His son, the Yuvadhva Mañgi, (ruled) for twenty-five *(years).*

His son, Jayaśīh, (ruled) for thirteen *(years).*

His younger brother, Kokkili, (ruled) for six months.

His elder brother, Vishnuvardhana, having expelled him, (ruled) for thirty-seven *(years).*

His son, Vijayaśīh, (ruled) for eighteen *(years).*

His son, Vishnuvardhana, (ruled) for thirty-six *(years).*

And his son, Vijayaśīh, who was a very lion of a king, (ruled) for forty-eight *(years).*

His son, Kali-Vishnuvardhana, (ruled) for one and a half years.

* This mark of punctuation, also, is not in the original.
* This mark of punctuation, again, is not in the original.
* This letter, =k, is omitted in the original.
His son, Gunaṅgāṅka-Vijayāditya, (ruled) for forty-four (years).

The king, Chālukya-Bhima,—the son of his younger brother, the Yuvardja, Vikramāditya, (ruled) for thirty (years).

His son, Kollaṅgāṅda-Vijayāditya, (ruled) for six months.

His son, king Ama, (ruled) for seven years.

Having expelled his son Vijayāditya, (while he was) a child,—Tālapa (ruled) for one month.

Having conquered him in battle,—king Vikramāditya, the son of the king Chālukya Bhima, ruled the earth for eleven months.

Then king Yuddhamalla,—the son of king Tālapa; the lord, whose speech was pleasing yet truthful,—ruled the earth for seven years.

Having conquered him, and having driven him out from the country, and having made the other claimants to assume the appearance of stars absorbed in the rays of the sun,—the younger brother of king Ama, (viz.) Bhima, who was like Arjuna, and who was possessed of terrible prowess, ruled the earth for twelve years, just as the wielder of the thunderbolts (rules) the mighty (expanse of the) sky.

To him, who was like Mahāvāra, from Loka mahādevi, who was like Uma, there was born king Ama, who was like Kumāra. The palms of his hands, and the soles of his feet, were marked with lotus-leaves and chowris and water-jars and elephant-goads; his arms, which were as strong and massive as iron door-bars, were charming, and hung down as far as his knees; and his chest was as broad a table-land of the king of mountains.

He acquired the learning of kings, and was skilled in the use of various weapons; he destroyed the families of his enemies; he was versed in the treatises (relating to the management) of elephants and horses; he was a bee at the lotuses which are the feet of Hari, and he was glorious. He was a very tree of paradise to poets and minstrels; he was a very cow of plenty to the twice-born and holy men and the poor and the blind and his relations; he was a very philosopher's stone to those who begged of him; he was a very jewel of a king, and a very sun by reason of his fierce brilliance.

Like the sun on the mountain of dawn, to the delight of mankind, he assumed the crown in the twelfth year of his birth, in the year that had the enumeration of the seven mountains and the six flavours and the eight kinds of demigod called Vasu, in the Saka era, in the month Margaśīrśa, on the thirteenth day of the dark fortnight, on Friday, under the constellation Maitra, under the zodiacal sign of the bow, while the sun was in the sign of the watering-pot. While he was reigning, the country abounded in many ripened grains and rice, and had cows that were always yielding milk, and was free from fear and free from drought and free from sickness, and had all thieves banished. Putting the Mind-born to shame with his beauty, and Mahāendra with his power, and the hot-rayed (sun) with his great splendour, and Hara by the destruction of the cities of his foes,—he is resplendent, having his fame recognised over the quarters of the regions and over the earth.

He, ŚrīVijayāditya,—the asylum of the universe, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, the most venerable, the worshipper of Brāhma as the supreme God,—having called together the householders, headed by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, who inhabit the district of Pennatavājī, thus issues his commands:

"Be it known to you! The Vājasaṇēya charana of Brāhmaṇas,—full of religion that is inculcated by the sacred texts, and following the domestic ritual of Yājñavalkya, the excellent chief of ascetics,—is renowned in the world. In it there was Puliyapeṇḍiya, of the Bharadvajagītra, a worthy man, the best of Brāhmaṇas, an inhabitant of (the village of) Kalvatorṛu.
And his son was Gudāsarmanā, the perfect one, the powerful one, virtuous, and compassionate, and wealthy, and liberal, and highly honoured, and worshipped by men. His son was Panḍiya,—worthy to be prescrib'd as an example for good people, possessing a personal appearance that was commended, having an undisturbed mind, pure, versed in the three Vedas, and resolute in investigating proper behaviour. To him, the religious student; the pilgrim, who has devoted himself to conciliating my feet, the village named Paḍamkālūru, in your district, has been given by us, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, as an Agrahāra grant, with relinquishment of all dues, in order to free him from the necessity of continuing his pilgrimages. The boundaries of it are:—On the East, (there is) the village of Maṇpadavā; the boundary of this is the boundary. On the South, (there is) the village of Ēndalūru; the boundary of this is the boundary. On the West, (there is) the village of Kāḍṛu; the boundary of this is the boundary. On the North, (there is) the village of Ālapuru and (the village of) Dṛṅthamapūri. On the North-east, (there is) the village of Nandigamā; the boundary of this village is the boundary of it. No molestation is to be offered to this (grant), he, who offers it, becomes guilty of the five great sins! And so it has been said by the holy Viṣṇu:—Land has been given by many, and has been preserved (in grant) by many; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefit of it! He is born for the duration of sixty thousand years as a worm in ordure, who appropriates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another! A gift of land, and the preservation (of a grant of land),—both of these are said to be the means of performing religious duty; as to this matter, everyone gives from pleasure; therefore preservation is more worthy than giving! The specification is Kātakārāja. The poetry is the composition of Mādhava Bhātta. It has been written by Jontacakārya.

NOTICE OF A REMARKABLE HYPERATHRAL TEMPLE IN THE HILL TRACTS OF ORISSA; WITH REMARKS ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF ANCIENT SITES.

BY SIR WALTER ELLIOT, K.C.S.I.

In the month of October 1853 I received a letter from my friend Colonel Campbell, C.B., Agent for the Suppression of Human Sacrifices, and Female Infanticide in Orissa, who had not long before returned to Russel Konda from his annual tour through the Khond Mānas, enclosing a very rough sketch of a singular temple he had met with, some months before. It exhibits an open circular temple or enclosure of plain cut stone exteriorly, the interior of the wall occupied by niches, each containing a statue or figure, which the Colonel described as "goddesses," but of which no exact representation or description had been preserved. In the centre, fronting the single doorway, is a shrine, or maṇḍapa, covering a slab, on which is carved in relief a sitting figure, with the right foot on an elephant, the left on a bullock; but whether Colonel Campbell meant over, or actually resting on the animals, I cannot say. The figure appeared to have three faces, in the right hand a sceptre (?), in the left a lotus, but from the imperfection of the sketch it is impossible to speak with any certainty on all the minutiae of detail. Regarding the niches round the inside of the wall, all that can be said is, that they were ranged side by side, and amounted to some sixty or seventy in number: of these the Colonel wrote, "I am not sure whether there was any ornamental work over these figures, or whether they were seated or standing."

The following is the extract I got from Colonel Campbell's journal, when I met him at a subsequent period, which contains all the information he was able to furnish:—

"[Wantara], 28th January 1853. Went to see
the temple of (...............), near Surddā; there and back 32 miles. About 120 temples of from fifteen to forty feet high, built on an extensive flat (area of) rock, all of cut stone, without cement. (Among them is) a circular wall (or enclosure) seventy yards round and twelve feet high; also of cut stone, with sixty-five or sixty-nine nches inside, containing figures of about sixty goddesses, and in the centre a square open place (or shrine) with a remarkable figure tolerably carved, as were all. Many of these figures were unknown to my people. There was also a large temple of bricks (or brickwork constructed) without cement, and rapidly going to decay, as were the stone temples (also, many of which were) tumbling down. 1

It was a most interesting sight. The tradition is that these were built by (people called) the —, who were driven out by the Khonds. The country has all the appearance of having been at one time prosperous and highly cultivated. On the large temple there is some writing, (apparently) in the Dēvanāgarī character. The next entry in the journal is "Saturday, 28th January.—Tirtalgarh, where there is another strange temple."

Although the foregoing description is somewhat loose and vague, it indicates unmistakably the existence of remains possessing no common interest. We must remember that it was the result of a hasty visit by an officer engaged in very harassing and important duties in an unhealthy country, that no notes were made at the moment on the spot, and that the details are given from subsequent recollection.

The place is again described in a narrative printed for private circulation in 1861, in terms differing little from the foregoing, but which enable us to fix the site with more exactness. 2 Leaving Goderi, in the Chinha Kimedi Zamin-dārī, to the west of Barhāmpur, on the 12th of January 1853, Colonel Campbell marched to Bissām Katāka, in the Jepur Zamin-dārī, from which he entered the Kalāhāndi or Khārong Zamin-dārī, the capital of which is Junāgadh. North of Kalāhāndi is the Pātā or Paṭāna Zamin-dārī, into which he had passed when he discovered the temples on the 28th of January, and from which he then proceeded to (Madanpur), a district tributary to Kalāhāndi. All of these places are shown in Walker's large Map of India, published by Allen in 1871, except Bissām Katāka, which appears, however, in the very defective sheet (as regards the hill tracts) of the Great Trigonometrical Survey 4-inch scale sheet No. 107. It may therefore be assumed that the proximate position of the ruins is a little to the north of lat. 20°, and about long. 83°.

One of the most obvious reflections suggested by these remain is the indication they afford of the existence at an early period, in tracts now everrun with unhealthy jungle, of a high state of civilization, of the origin and decay of which no account, nor even reliable tradition, survives. Nor is this a singular instance. Colonel Dalton describes the conquest of Chutiā Nāgpur by an invasion of the Kōls and Hōs, people living under a republican confederation of tribes like the Kurumbars of Southern India, at a period so distant that it is impossible to assign even an approximate date, but probably more than 2000 years ago. According to their own tradition, they displaced a still earlier race, vaguely called Jainas and Bhūyāhs (autochthonous), 3 who appear to have made a considerable advance in the arts; for Mr. Vincent Ball, of the Geological Survey, in another paper describing the remains of extensive metallurgical operations, as well as remains of tanks, in Singhbhum, found them attributed by tradition to an extinct race called Seruks, who

---

1 I have supplied the words within brackets.—W. E.
2 Probably Tīntalgarh.
3 Narrative by Major-Gen. John Campbell, C.B., of his Operations in the Hill Tracts of Orissan, &c. &c., printed for private circulation, (London, Hurst and Blackett, 1861), where at page 167 he writes as follows: —

"At some distance from a village called Surddā may be seen a remarkable collection of pagodas, which I visited, and counted one hundred and twenty of various dimensions. They were built of cut stone, without cement, and most of them are in a state of dilapidation. On the largest temple is some writing in the "Dēvanāgarī" character, but now illegible. In the centre of the group of pagodas was a circle of stones, twelve feet in circumference, surrounded by a wall of cut stone twelve feet high, with sixty-five niches on the inner side, containing sixty figures of goddesses in a variety of attitudes, and in the centre of the circle, placed upon a raised platform, sat a remarkable figure, tolerably carved, as were also the others, in stone. Few of these deities were recognized by my people, though among them were two Brahmanes. The tradition here is, that these temples were built by magicians; and the guide, who pointed out the way, would not go within two miles of them. Even my own people were rather uneasy. The conclusion that I came to was, that this part of the country must have been occupied by a race of Hindus of whom there is now no trace. It is now thinly inhabited by a comparatively civilized people who call themselves Khonds, though they do not speak their dialect. Their language and dress are Coryah (Uṛya), and they are very industrious."

had been governed by a Rāja with two tongues [do-jībha], which Col. Dalton explained to signify that the potentate to which it alludes must have been a Nāg, or one of the serpent race. These and similar tales point to a time when Dasyus, Rākshasas, Paisāchis,—monkeys, as they are contemptuously designated,—were the ruling occupants of the land, every trace of whom it is the business of the archaeologist to collect and preserve.

One of the most useful functions of the Indian Antiquary is the preservation of casual notices of objects of interest which may serve to stimulate a more complete examination of them by those who have time and opportunity for the task. Curious and often extensive remains are found in many parts of India, an exact topographical description of which would help greatly to the identification of names and places still a puzzle to the archaeologist and geographer.

The late Dr. John Wilson, when President of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, read a memoir on the Cave Temples and other ancient remains of Western India, in 1850, in which he dwelt strongly on the importance of investigations of this description. Among other desiderata, he called special attention to the inspection of the sites of ancient towns in all parts of the country, and to the vigorous prosecution of research connected with their ruins, and relics, their wells and tanks, and even of their foundations."

I can bear witness to the value of these suggestions from my own experience. Some years ago I published an inscription on copper, relating to the little-known dynasty of the Pallavas, whose capital was stated to be Vengipuram, the name and site of which were till then unknown. After much inquiry, I pitched on a place in the Masulipatam district, which, accepted as correct by General Cunningham, has been considered open to question elsewhere. Subsequently I had an opportunity of examining the place in person, and satisfied myself that my first surmise was right. I found a parallelogram of considerable extent enclosed by lofty mounds within which were many ruins and the débris of ancient temples, &c. I regretted not being able to procure a regular plan and survey, but time and other avocations did not permit.

South of this spot on the banks of the Krishna is Dhāranikota, close to the recent town of Amrāvatī. It is probably the ancient capital of the Andhrā kings. The remains are extensive, and a survey and topographical description of them is greatly to be desired.

In Ganjam a remarkable site is found in the Pabekondah Talukā near the rock inscribed with another of Asoka's celebrated edicts. It is called Jogadha. The grass-grown walls were of great height, and coins of a peculiar character are found in and around it. It would well repay careful examination.

I could name many other spots of historical interest of which little more is known than the name. Such are the old Chola capital of Nagondaram, in South Ārkāṭ; Talakāṇḍa, a seat of the Čhēras in Muisur, now half buried in the sand; Ratnapur, in the Raipur division of the Central Provinces, where are extensive ruins; Korke, an early Pāṇḍya city, where Bishop Caldwell has lately been making excavations; &c. &c., of all of which, and of many more that could be named, accurate plans illustrated by sketches and descriptive details would be very valuable. But my object now is only to draw the attention of readers of the Antiquary to objects, within the reach of many of them, possessing surpassing interest.

---

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

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

(Continued from vol. VI. page 216.)

No. XVI.—Chivalry in Lower India.

Europeans are apt to imagine that few races are more devoid of the spirit of knight-errantry and chivalrous daring and courtesy than the Hindus, and that the feudal ideas of allegiance

---

in the chronicles of romance; and even down in the far South, amid nations of Dravidian descent, there are stories popularly current of champions and exploits which Don Quixote would have put on the same shelf with the deeds of Amadis and Palmerin. Some instances selected from the collection of Oriental Historical Manuscripts, edited by the Rev. W. Taylor, may not be uninteresting; or unbecoming the Indian Antiquary.

Told still under village trees and at festival gatherings is the story of king Viśvanātha, who ruled over the broad regions of Pāṇḍya-land from Arkā down to Travankor. His birth was not, of course, like the births of common men. In medieval romance some fairy lady or enchanted princess would have been his mother, but in the East the tale goes that his father, Nāgama, whom Don Quixote would have called the Knight of the Serpent, was a great warrior and leader of armies, and, after being long childless, vowed to go in pilgrim guise to Kāśi, and try whether penitence and devotion would win his patron saint or god to grant him a son. So there he went, and after forty days of abstinence and prayer by the sacred stream the god vouchsafed a sign of acceptance, for, whilst bathing, his foot struck against a stone that proved to be an emerald līgām, and in a dream it was conveyed to him that if he returned home he should have a child. So in due time a boy was born, whom he named Viśvanātha, as a gift from the god, and who, when he was sixteen, surpassed all his peers in beauty, accomplishments, and skill in all weapons.

Afterwards, when he came to the throne, he made his capital city, Mādrura, a moated and walled town, building a mighty rampart round it with circular bastions at intervals, seventy-two in all. Each bastion, with its adjoining wall, he gave in charge to one of his chiefs to hold, defend, and keep in repair; and, on the further condition of their raising and keeping always ready a contingent of troops for his service in time of need, he gave withal extensive districts to the chiefs in fief-liege. This was the origin of the Pāḷīgars, a class well known to us in our early wars. Many of the bastions and much of the wall remain still, or did till lately, and many of the representatives of the chiefs survive on the lands then granted to this day. Here was feudal tenure and service established as firmly as by William the Conqueror and his barons, and Viśvanātha surrounded by his chiefs recalls, not so remotely, king Arthur and his Round Table.

Of the many stories told of king Viśvanātha we will take that regarding how he dealt with five rebellious chieftains; it will perhaps be better told in minstrel measure, into which the words of the old chronicle readily slip:

"Five chieftains in the Southland had tribute used to bring,
As vassals liege and loyal, to the great Pandion king.
But now, together banding, to their sovereign lord said they,
'Fetch the tribute if you want it, for we will no longer pay.'
'Is it so?' said Viśvanātha; 'be ye sure we'll not be slack
To come with men enough withal to bring the tribute back.'
So with an army forth he marched, and carried war amain
O'er all those rebels' lands; but they the contest did sustain,
For stout and fierce they were; and men on both sides thickly fell,
Till in camp and all the country round did moan and wailing swell;
And Viśvanātha heard it, and in his heart he thought
That for him and for his glory such misery was wrought.
Forthwith he wrote a letter and bade his herald go
And to the rebel leader this royal message show:
'Be think ye now: ye are but five, and I one man alone,
Yet for our sakes ariseth up such grievous wail and moan.
This may not be; now list to me: let either force draw back
And a stone pillar build between, restraining all attack;
And let us write a solemn pledge, and lay it on the stone,
That ye five chiefs shall thither come and fight with me alone,
And if I conquer, then all ye, with but the weeds ye wear,
Yielding to me your lands and wealth, away on foot shall fare;
But should ye overcome, then I to you will render all
My kingdom and my riches, and abide your humble thrall.
Now let this vow be written, and on the pillar laid,
And meet me in fight before it, and so this feud
be stayed.'
The five chiefs hearkened together, and thus reply
made they:—
'For one to fight with five men it were no equal
fray;
Better it were that one this quarrel with thee
should try.'
So answer they sent; and thus Viśvanātha made
reply:—
'Look now; ye are five rulers and o'er countries
five bear sway,
And I, one king, come hither to force ye to obey,
And to me alone yield homage; 'tis therefore meet
and right
That ye five all together with me alone should
fight.'
Howbeit they would not hearken, but chose the
mightiest lord
In chain-mail dight, and girded with the goodliest-
tempered sword,
Mounted upon a war-steed; and so in the midway
space
The chief met Viśvanātha by the pillar face to
face.
Lighthearted the Pandion said to that champion
lord,
'Strike first,' and he smote, but deplorably the monarch
turned the sword.
'Now strike in thy turn,' undaunted the rebel
foeman cried.
'Be sure thou need'st not hasten,' the warrior-king
replied,
'But three more blows yet strike thou, nor stint
to strike amain.'
And thrice the chieftain smote him, but over the
stroke was vain.
Then the Rāja Viśvanātha spake high to the
rebel foe,
'Now take good heed,' and smote him an exceeding
mighty blow;
No mail the dint might hinder, it clave him right
in twain,
And the sundered trunk fell right and left upon
the reddened plain.
Then their lands the four chiefs rendered, and all
in sad array,
Alone, as their oath had bound them, went wander-
ing far away.'

Now this was a passage of arms hardly sur-
passed in any chronicle of romance, and instinct
with the true spirit of chivalry. The king's
compassionate feeling for the feeble, his desire
to take all the consequences of his own quarrel
upon himself, and unselfish offer to encounter
desperate odds, his courtesy and forbearance to
his opponent, all show him to have been what
old Chancer would have called "a very parfit
gentil knighte." Nor was knightly feeling lacking
in his opponents, rebels though they were,
as proved by their repeated refusal to accept his challenge at great advantage to them-
selves, and obedience to their vow on defeat.

King Viśvanātha reigned till a.d. 1438, in the
days of our Henry VI., when, though men could
remember the heroic deeds of Jeanne d'Arc, the
institutions of chivalry were beginning to wane.

About two centuries later, when the old Pāṇḍya dominion had become broken up into
lesser states, and the Muhammadan power had
begun to overshadow the peninsula, Śrī Rāja
Rāṅgarāṇa Kṛishṇa was ruling in Trichināpalli,
which the great king Viśvanātha is said to
have first fortified. He was a gay and gallant
monarch delighting in bold and adventurous
exploits, not a little after the fashion of the fifth
James of Scotland. In those days, it is said,
the Mughul Pādisahāh used to send to all coun-
tries one of his slippers, which was placed in
a state howdah on an elephant, attended by
two Nawābs and several thousand cavalry and
infantry. It was fanned by chauris, shaded
by a royal umbrella, and attended by banners,
kettledrums, and music. On reaching the
boundaries of the various kingdoms the pro-
cession halted, and the attendant Nawābs sent
word to the king of each country. These kings
came at the head of their troops, paid homage
to the slipper, lowered their own ensigns to it,
accompanied it to their capitals, and placed it on
their thrones. Costly presents were then made to
the Sardārs, and tribute-money delivered up to
them. The Pāṇḍya a country, however, being so
far, the imperial slipper had not hitherto reached
it. Nevertheless, whilst Rāja Raṅgarāṇa Kṛishṇa was
reigning, the two Nawābs, with all the troops and
insignia attendant, set their faces thitherward,
and came to the boundary of the kingdom north
of Trichināpalli. Halting there, the Nawābs sent
chabādas with silver sticks to inform the king
that the imperial slipper had arrived. The Rāja
having heard the message replied, "Return and
tell the Nawābs that we are unwell, and cannot
come so far, but if they and all the retinue
will come to the other bank of the Kāvāri river
outside the town we will meet them there." The
Nawābs received the answer with some
anger, but nevertheless advanced, and on crossing
the Kāvēri and still not seeing the king became excessively enraged. Messengers, however, came and appeased them, saying that the Rāja, being exceedingly ill, would meet them in a palanquin just within the fort gate. Meanwhile orders had been given to the guard only to allow the elephant and slipper, with the Nawābs and principal men, inside the gate, but not the rest of the troops. So the chief men in charge of the slipper entered, and still not seeing the king grew more enraged, but the others said, “Our king is too sick to enter a palanquin; come with us to the palace gates.” Accordingly they came to the gates of the palace, but the king did not appear. Then, filled with fury at the disrespect implied, they took the slipper from the howdah and carried it into the hall of audience, where they found Śrī Rāja Raṅga Kṛṣṇa arrayed in royal robes, seated on his throne, and surrounded by his nobles and retainers. Seeing that he did not make the least motion of respect towards the slipper or themselves, the Pādīshāh’s Nawābs and men, highly incensed, pushed roughly forward, and coming near offered to give the slipper into the hands of the king. He angrily bid them place it on the floor, but without heeding they again tried to put it into his hands. Thereupon the king called loudly and angrily for men with whips, saying, “We will see whether the Pādīshāh’s men will put the slipper down or not.” Then they became alarmed and threw it down, and the king putting one of his feet in it said to them, “Has your Pādīshāh lost his senses? When sending foot-furniture for us, why sends he not two slippers instead of one? Get ye back and bring another slipper.” On their answering fiercely, the king had them beaten and driven out. When they got outside they began to draw up their troops threateningly, but the king sending out a great force fell on them and cut them up. When the matter came to the Pādīshāh’s ears, on thinking it over he came to the conclusion that in those distant countries, if such messages were sent, the daring of one would be imitated by others; and so, after the high bearing of Rāja Raṅga Kṛṣṇa, he ceased sending his slipper round to the different rulers.

The editor of the Manuscripts hardly knows what to make of this singular affair, and inclines to think that, if true at all, it refers to the pride of A urangzib, who styled all native princes merely zamīndārs, and aimed at the subjugation of all the south of India. Ferishtah states that Aurangzib’s general made a long journey to Trichināpalli and Tanjor, and received tribute from the zamīndārs of those capitals. This was doubtless done with all Muhammadan haughtiness, and if the long distance emboldened a native prince to offer a successful check, pride might not have tolerated so humiliating an admission by Ferishtah, who gives no details, whilst the narrative of the native historian is very minute and circumstantial, and wears much appearance of truth.

Another adventure of this gay and débonnaire king is thus told. One evening he mounted a very fleet horse, and going out by the eastern gate of the town turned his horse’s head towards Tanjor, some thirty miles distant, and rode there at speed unattended, though he was not on good terms with the Tanjor king. Arriving after dark he mingled with the people returning into the city and entered within the gate. Proceeding up the bāzār street he went to a shopkeeper and said, “I am just arrived, my attendants and money are coming after, meantime advance me one pagoda (3½ rupees) on the deposit of this ring, and get me needful supplies.” Then, having had his horse tethered and fed, he entered a Brāhman choultry and partook of fruits and milk. Subsequently, in the first watch of the night, he disguised himself as a sepoy, entered the palace on foot in the dark, and sat down in the hall of the throne near the king, and listened to all the affairs under discussion. He then surveyed the whole of the palace, and wrote on the door of the private apartments, “To-day we, Rāja Kṛṣṇa of Trichināpalli, came here, and having heard all the news of the palace left it and went away.” Then quitting the palace he returned to his quarters. Early in the morning he called the shopkeeper and, said, “As our people and money have not come, we will send you your pagoda; you will then return the ring.” Then mounting his horse he set off at full speed in high glee, and soon reached Trichināpalli and entered his palace. Forthwith sending for the ambassador of Tanjor he said, “We have been to your king’s town, entered the palace, surveyed the whole of it, and written our name on such a door. We also left our ring with a shopkeeper; write now to your
king to get and send it us. Your king does not keep a proper look-out. He is just and charitable, so we did him no harm, but having penetrated so far we might have slain him and thrown him out of doors. Tell him, therefore, in future to maintain a good guard.” So the ambassador wrote, and the king in great amazement went to the door of the private apartments, read what was written on it, and calling the shopkeeper gave him ten pagodas, and taking from him the ring sent it forthwith to the Trichinâpalli king. From that time forward he had the palace and fort gates very carefully watched.

Again it is told of Raṅga Krishṇa that when a great vassal Pālīgār, who lived some twenty miles from his capital, had been slow in sending, as a sort of tribute-heriot, an incomparably fine elephant which the king desired to have, the latter mounted a swift white horse and rode out fast toward the Pālīgār’s castle, ordering some troops to follow as fast as they might. Arrived at the castle, he rode in, thrusting aside the men who disputed his entrance, tied his horse to a pillar, and, sitting down on the high seat under the porch, bade the warders go and tell their master that the king was come. The chieflain was then bathing, but, hastily arraying himself, hastened with a golden dish of jewels and laid them submissive before the king’s feet. The Rāja then demanded the wonderful elephant that had no fellow. The overawed Pālīgār answered, “For such a trifle it needed not the king to have come hither. The elephant is my lord’s, but now he is in a furious state, and none dare approach him; when the fit is past I will send him.” “Do not think,” replied the Rāja, “that we cannot rule an elephant; let it be brought.” “But,” the Pālīgār urged, “the elephant is exceedingly furious: if he sees a white horse he will rush at it and none can stay him. Now my lord is mounted on a white horse.” The Rāja, however, heeded not the caution, but commanded the elephant to be brought, and its chain cast off whilst he mounted his horse. This was done with no small danger and difficulty, and the men when the chain was loosened ran aside. So soon as the elephant saw the white horse he rushed at it furiously; but the king, eluding the attack, wheeled and galloped about with most skilful horsemanship, sometimes facing the elephant and sometimes flying, and so drawing on the infuriated animal, till by degrees he at last brought him all the distance to Trichinâpalli and within the walls, where the elephant was mastered by stratagem and bound with strong chains—a display of skill and daring well calculated to impress the people. “Long he ruled,” says the chronicle, “with great courage and high justice, and much beloved was he by all folk.”

We will conclude with a tale of the downfall of a royal family that shows more high resolve, courage, and devotion than Western people commonly associate with Hindus. About A.D. 1680 an octogenarian king, Achyuta Vijaya Rāghava Naikār, ruled in Tanjor. He had a daughter endowed with extraordinary beauty and ability, the rumour of which reaching the neighbouring king of Trichinâpalli he demanded her in marriage, but in a more brusque and peremptory way than the old king her father could stomach. So he refused in no gentle terms. Enraged at this, the Trichinâpalli ruler assembled all his forces, and commanded his general to march to Tanjor, invest and storm the fort, and subdue the entire country. The Tanjor troops came out to meet them, but were defeated and driven back, and the fort invested and stormed, and the invading troops surrounded the palace of the old king. The Trichinâpalli general, being a high-minded man, now sent to offer terms, and engaged to retire with his troops if the king would ask for peace. The messengers found the ancient monarch engaged in prayer to his favourite god, Nārāyaṇa. He dissembled to speak or to interrupt his devotions, but merely made a gesture signifying, “Though all be lost, I will neither sue for peace nor yield my daughter.” So the messengers returned and reported to the general, who then advanced his troops up to the gates of the palace. Meanwhile the aged king had finished his devotions, and ordering his daughter, crowned wives, and attendants to assemble in a hall, surrounded them with great vessels filled with powder, laid a train and commanded them to fire it on a given signal. Then he arrayed himself for his last fight, and is described as young-looking for his years, with extremely overhanging eyebrows held up by gold wires, costly robes studded with gems wrapped round him, and in each hand a long brightly burnished gauntlet sword. Most of his people had fled.
Five faithful officers of his bodyguard remained by him. It happened that some time before, in a fit of anger, he had caused his son to be imprisoned, and one of his followers, reminding him of this, said that now was the time for pardon. “It is well,” said the old king, “let him be brought.” On his appearance, the son, bowing to his father with closed hands, uttered this verse:—

“The sea buries jewels and throws up a straw,
Of the treacherous element that is the law;
But, father and ruler, we'll show now to them
That a straw is a straw, but a gem is a gem.”

Then Achyuta Vijaya Rāghava Rāja embraced his son, and commanded the signal to be given to the women. Instantly a tremendous explosion took place, and the palace was filled with fire and smoke, walls fell crashing, and flames spread fast. Again the Trichinēpalli commander, coming forward, offered terms. “Once we have spoken,” was the reply, “and use no double speech. Is life or honour greatest? We through all ruin will keep our honour. Cease words, and come and fight with us.” Then the five devoted followers, rushing in turn before the king, fell after slaying many; and lastly the king and his son, sword in hand, attacked the foe, and were slain, after each had cut down several.

The chronicle adds a circumstance which may interest some in the days when Spiritualism has many adherents. The old king, when his relations with the Trichinēpalli ruler were friendly, used to resort regularly and pay his devotions at Śrīraṅga, the great temple adjoining Trichinēpalli, and on the very time of his falling in combat it is said that he appeared at Śrīraṅga with all his children, wives, and followers who perished with him, whereas the attendant Brāhmaṇas said, “See! here is the Tanjor king come to pay his visit to the Lord of Śrīraṅga;” and, taking them all to the inner shrine, they gave them the sacred tula, and put the customary crowns upon their heads, when the king with all his retinue, entering the inner recess, disappeared, and were seen no more. Therefore, upon all the Brāhmaṇas exclaimed in amazement, “Here is a miracle!”

One reflection occurs. These tales, and many like them, are told amongst the people, and the countries in which the scenes are laid now form three contiguous sīllās. Many of the palaces and forts built by those bygone kings still remain, and some are used as law-courts and dwelling-places, but though the strangers from the West who sit in them deal out peace and justice, they can hardly replace in the heart and imagination of the people the stirring times and bold deeds of the rulers of their own race.

MISCELLANEA.

GOLDEN MASKS.

The golden mask found by Dr. Schliemann at Mykēne has somewhat perplexed savants, who find it difficult to account for the presence of such an article where it was found. Without pretending to solve the difficulty, I wish to note a use of golden masks in this country which may perhaps give some clue. In the royal family of Kolkāpur it has been the custom to build temples, dedicated to the tutelary deity of the family, in memory of deceased Rājas. In one instance I know of a golden mask, supposed to represent the Rāja whose memory was thus to be perpetuated, being presented to the temple, to be affixed to the head of the image, and I believe this instance is not a solitary one.

In Mr. Nairne’s Historical Sketch of the Konkans (p.72) he mentions a temple (at Sindhudurg, on the coast) dedicated to Śivāji where “the idol which represents him has a silver mask for common use, and a gold one for festivals, both bearing the semblance of an ordinary Marāthā face.”

Doubtless further investigation would show this custom to be not peculiar to Śivāji’s family, but to be widely spread in India. We may have here the survival of an ancient Āryan practice which has died out among the Āryan races in Europe.

Edward W. West.

Sanghī, 12th Oct. 1877.

SEPULCHRAL URNS IN THE DISTRICT OF KOIMBATUR.

In the Indian Antiquary, vol. VI. p. 279, there appeared an interesting article by the Right Reverend Bishop Caldwell on the sepulchral urns found in various parts of the district of Tinnivelly.1 A well-informed friend, whose attention I drew to that article, has favoured me with valuable information on similar exhumations.

made in the district of Koimbatur, a part of the Madras Presidency with which he is intimately acquainted. I subjoin it, in the hope that it will interest your readers:

"These sepulchral urns are found in vast quantities in the Koimbatur district, but the urns are there of a totally different shape—something like this, and even more pointed at the base, and they generally have a little ornament.

"The places of sepulture are also different. Above ground the spot is marked generally by a circle of rough boulders, and in digging within the circle you come upon a massive stone chest, oblong in shape and composed of ponderous slabs. On removing the covering slab it is found that the chest is sometimes divided into two compartments by a transverse slab in the centre. One of the end slabs always has a hole of about six or nine inches in diameter cut in its centre, the edges of which are polished. In these compartments urns of sizes are found full of mould, in which fragments of bones may be discovered. Other urns contain spear and arrow heads. I think the bodies were burnt and the ashes put in the urns, as the fragments of bones seemed to me partly calcined. The local name for these places of sepulture is Pudavu höji; but, notwithstanding, the legend is that they are the habitations of a race of pygmies, and that the circular holes were the entrances to the dwellings."

Rama Varma.

Queries.

Names of Countries ending in 'stán.'

We see on maps sundry countries, not now intimately connected with India, and sometimes not now occupied by purely Aryan races, but still mainly on the border-lands of the Aryan, Semitic, and Turanian peoples, marked by names ending in 'stán.' Thus 'Daghstán,' 'Kurdstán,' 'Lazistán,' 'Gurijstán' (Georgia), &c. The ordinary derivation of 'Hindustán' is from 'Hind-ustána,' the 'place of Hindás,' and here I believe it is universally acknowledged the right one. The same may be said of 'Balkhstán,' 'Seistan,' 'Zubulstán,' 'Afghánstán,' all of which are near enough to India for the meaning of the word to be known and applied even within historic times.

* 'Thán' is still used in India as the designation of the "place" of a horse or other animal. 'Stall' is the English equivalent. 'Stable' in English is almost identical, both in sound and meaning, with the Persian 'Istábál.' 'Thana' is Indian for a police 'station.' All are undoubtedly connected with the Aryan root 'sth,' indicative of locality—including I believe, the 'sth,' in question. The main point is whether the meaning of the termination

But I feel doubtful if this can be the case in the instances noted above. Does a Kurd know that 'Kurdstán' means 'place of Kurds,' or one of the Mongolian tribes of the Caucasus recognize 'Daghstán' as the place of 'Dagh?' (By the way, does this word indicate the appellation of some obscure or extinct tribe, or is it connected with 'Dagh' [dą], 'burnt,' or 'Dagh' [dąs], 'mountain')? Are these designations now used, or not, by the present inhabitants? Or were they once in use, but are not so now, but only hold their place in maps and books? Or are they merely conventional terms invented by map-makers and authors, and used for convenience sake for indicating districts designated by other names by those who dwell in them? Does the 'stán' come from some other root, and has it been 'symmetrized' into conformity with 'Hindustán'? Supposing these terms to be in indigenous use, do those using them retain any inkling of the fact of the word 'stán' meaning a 'place'? Are these names traces of the spread of ancient Aryan power,—'survivals,'—the signification of which is unknown to those who apply them to characterize their native countries? Or is it the case that though the exact meaning of 'stán' may be unknown to Georgian or Kurd, yet that there is enough communication with the East to enable them to understand half-instinctively that as 'Afghánstán' and 'Hindustán' mean the 'places' of the Afghan and the Hindos, so 'Gurijstán' and 'Kurdstán' must mean the 'places' of the Georgians and the Kurds?

The whole subject of the names on the border-land of 'Irán' and 'Turán' is interesting, and I think, if fully gone into by a competent hand, would furnish many facts tending to form materials for another chapter in prehistoric annals, or to illustrate obscure passages of more modern history. I believe it is pretty certain that the districts in question have had their populations repeatedly changed within comparatively modern times. Now, supposing the names ending with 'stán' to have been originally conferred by pre-historic Aryans, is not the transmission of the names by so many different races a striking instance of the vitality of designations? Or have these names been given by Aryan races first occupying them within the comparatively late historic era only, though when 'stán' was still in use for the ordinary expression of 'place'? Either conclusion is now understood by people of the localities indicated (either positively, as being known to mean 'place'; or indirectly from deduction and connection), and whether, if so, this knowledge is inherited from their Aryan ancestors, or (supposing a Semitic or Turanian superposition of people so complete to be almost a substitution) by tradition communicated from an earlier race of settlers.
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if established would demonstrate an interesting example of philological phenomena.

GAUKVĀDĪ.

THE DIGAMBARĀ JAINAS.

At Dehli I visited the two temples of the Digambara Jainas in company with Pandit Viśve-varṇāthā, and was received by their chief priest, the Bhaṭṭārka, and the ascetics (who are called pāṇḍītas) in a very friendly manner. They readily answered my questions regarding their religion; they showed me one of their libraries which is kept in the temple near the Chāndnī Choṅk, gave me a list of the Bhaṭṭārka's books, and offered to copy anything I might require.

During a fortnight's stay [at Jaypur] I became acquainted with some of the best Digambara pāṇḍītas, and obtained through them a good foundation for a collection of the works of their sect, and more copious information regarding their faith than has fallen to the share of other Saṅgkarṇikas. From the statements of the Jaypur pāṇḍītas, which agree in general with those of their Dehli brethren, it appears that the Digambara Jainas are scattered over a great part of eastern Rājputāna, of the Panjāb, of the North-Western Provinces, and of the Central India Agency, and have even some outlying settlements in Gujarāt. They name the following towns as the locations of their Vidyadāthana, or seats of learning:—1 Jaypur, 2 Dehli, and Sonpat (where a large bhāvyad is said to exist), 3 Gwalior, 4 Ajmir, 5 Nāgar in Rājputāna, 6 Rāmpur-Bāhnpur near Indor, 7 Kāрг, and 8 Surat. These cities, together with Kārnāṭa, and a fabulous island Jainabadhri, which is placed 1600 kos from Jaypur, beyond Rāmāvatam, are said to contain altogether sixteen vidyadāthana, among which that at Jaypur is the principal one. The list does not fit the state of things in our days. For instance, in Ajmir and in Surat there is now no learning. There are only small Digambara communities, whose spiritual wants are attended to by very ignorant Bhaṭṭārka. It is also clear that the author of the list had no very clear idea of the extent of the Jain colonies of Southern India, as one vidyadāthana only is allotted to the Kārnāṭa country. But the list seems to give the pāḍita, or seats of high-priests, correctly for Central and North-Western India. It is also indisputable that Jaypur is now the chief seat of Digambara learning. The Digambaras called themselves the Muṇāsāmgha, or 'primitive church,' and assert that the Śvetāmbaras seceded from them, while the latter state exactly the opposite.

Like the Śvetāmbaras, they are divided into ascetics and laymen, or Śrāvakas. The former are now divided into Bhaṭṭārka, or high-priests; and pāṇḍīta, or common ascetics; and into four gachhas, sects or schools, viz., the Nandi-gachha, the Sarasvatī, the Bhārati-gachha, and the Svaṃagachha. In older times the Digambara ascetics used to go naked, and from this custom they derive the names Digambara, 'sky-clad,' Nirgranthas, 'without a knot,' Nāgarātas, 'naked mendicants.' Now they make a compromise with the spirit of the times and the British law. They maintain, as formerly, in theory that a man can only obtain salvation when he is perfectly nirvāṇa, free from all possessions and all desire to possess, and that hence clothes ought not to be worn by a true ascetic. But the pāṇḍītas wear the usual dress of the country, and even the Bhaṭṭārka cover themselves with a chaddar, which they put off when eating. At their meals they sit perfectly naked, and a pupil rings a bell to keep off all strangers. The laymen are divided into three Jātis, or sub-divisions,—Khandawāl, Agra, and Bahārī, who will eat with each other, but each marries within his own class. Where, as in Dehli, a portion of the Jainas have left the faith and turned Vaishnavas, still intermarriages between them and their Jain caste-fellows may take place. There are, besides, further sub-divisions of the three Jātis. Thus among the Jaypur Khandawāls there are Visāntis and Thāapanthis. The former worship standing, &c., and the latter seated. The literature of the Digambaras is divided into four Vedas, viz.,

1. The Prathamadnyaya, which comprises all works on their Rihāna, their legends and history; to this division belong the twenty-four Purānas, which give the lives of the twenty-four Tirthankaras, the Uтраprāṇa, Hariṇākṣapurāṇa, etc.
2. The Karanadnyaya, which includes the works describing the origin and the order of the universe, e.g., Trilokasudra, Tukhābhāsana, Jōtisadhra, Bhājanā, Chamdraprajnāpati, Sārayānāt, etc.
3. The Dravyānāt, which treats of their doctrine or philosophy. Some of the chief works belonging to it are the Jomadādrā, Pārvacchānavbara, Aṣṭasaharan, Prameyakamala-Mārtranta, Adhavaṅka, etc.
4. The Charanadnyaya, which treats of the Āchāra, customs, worship, &c. To this subdivision belong the Trivāričāandra, Muladhāra, Joga-śāstra, Ashtapāda, Padmānandas-vachchās, &c.

These divisions are likewise known to the Śvetāmbara Jainas, though they usually prefer to classify their sacred literature as Angas, Upāgas,
Pāṇḍava, Chhoda, and Māhāśāstra. I was particularly anxious to find out whether the Digambaras agreed with the Śvetāmbaras about any of their inspired works. I soon found that the former hold twelve Angas, the Ṛddīdṛān, in as high esteem as the latter. A list of the Angas which they gave me agreed very nearly with that of the Śvetāmbaras. But they asserted that their Angas, though bearing the same names as the Śvetāmbara books, differed in substance. In order to test this assertion, I handed to the pandits a copy of the Śvetāmbara Ekhāgavai, and they at once conceded that it was the same text which they used every day. In a like manner they recognized the Juddhaḥrāmakathā, the Updeśa-vadana, and the Asaṇyaṣādāna. But they were very positive in rejecting as spurious the Śvetāmbara Aṣṭādṛī, Śūtra-Kṛṣṇam, Nīśṭhā, Rājapati, Kalpa, Vṛhīth Kalpa, Nandi, Mahamāthā Asaṇyaṣādāna, and Vasanādāna, as well as ten Pāṇḍava. Of some they declared they actually possessed different versions. But, as they produced no manuscripts, I have my doubts on this subject. On the whole it would appear that their libraries are poor in Angas and other Agamas, and that they do not explain them daily, as is done by the Śvetāmbaras. But the important point which my inquiries have settled is that some of the Angas, at least, are common to both Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras, and that the two sects do not possess entirely different sets of scriptures, as has been hitherto supposed. I secured nearly one hundred Digambara works referring to all the four Vedas, and a few works belonging to their profane literature, among which I may mention copies of Jainaṃdra's Grammar, with a short commentary and another one. The former was written 1356 A.D. in the neighbourhood of Kōhpur; arrangements were also made with one of the pandits to get copies made of a number of works which could not be procured at once. He has since sent me several packets of manuscripts. I visited also the library of the Mahārāja of Jaypur, which is extensive, but has, unfortunately, no trustworthy catalogue. I selected a few Nāṭakas and astronomical works for copying. The collection is rich in the latter, as the Mahārāja Jesingh, the founder of Jaypur, was a great mathematician and astronomer, and many of his manuscripts are still extant.

The libraries of the Digambara and Śvetāmbara Jainas who live there [at Ajmer] are not considerable; still I acquired a few of the common Śūtras for Cambridge. On the 20th December I proceeded to Merta, the bhāṇḍār of which town had been mentioned to me in Bhānder as one of the oldest and best of the Śvetāmbaras. It was very fortunate that Mr. A. G. Lyall, the acting Agent Governor General in Bājpūtāna, whom I met in Ajmer, had given the most distinct orders to the Jodhpur Vakil and Darbār that the bhāṇḍār was to be shown to me. For I have seldom met with a more obstinate and intractable set of men than the Merta Panch. They first tried to deny the possession of books, then they asked for several delays in order to await the return of certain aśaṇysi who had gone on a pilgrimage, and finally they flatly refused to show their treasures. Explanations, orders, entreaties by the officials of the town, offers of money, were equally fruitless. They surrendered only when the Jodhpur Minister sent an order that in within twenty-four hours they did not show their books, the Khotwāl was to undertake the task and to open the bhāṇḍār on the part of the Bāja. Thus I was kept waiting for nine days, and had finally the mortification to find that the library was not worth so much trouble. It contained about 500 well-kept and well-written manuscripts, which were neither distinguished by their age nor by their contents. The only interesting news I obtained was the name of the son of the famous Bāna在过去, who continued the Kādambarī after his father's death. He was called Bāna在过去a在过去a在过去. After copying the catalogues of the Merta bhāṇḍār I went straight back to Jaypur, and had again interviews with the Digambara pandits, from whom I collected further information and more books. Among my visitors was also the chief disciple of the present Bhāṭṭārka, who will, in all probability, succeed his master. It is rare that such people leave their māthas, and I fully appreciated the honour which he did me, though he somewhat diminished it by giving a false name.—Dr. Bühler in Bombay Administration Report, 1875-76.

Buddhism in Futu.

A correspondent of the North China Herald gives an interesting account of a visit to the island of Futu, off the China coast, which is entirely given up to Buddhism. No animals are allowed to be killed there, and neither fish nor animal food may be landed. Temples occupy the most beautiful spots, and everywhere shrines are built by the roadside, or Buddhas carved upon the face of the rocks. The government of the island is in the hands of the priests, and the rents from the land all go to the temples; in fact, though presents of tea, &c. are sent to Peking, the island is more like a dependency than an integral part of China. The few graves to be seen suggested to the visitor the practice of cremation; and not far from the largest temple, and near the beach, he found one of the furnaces, which consisted of a
small room in the hill-side, arched overhead, the only peculiarity about it, being an excavation in the rocky floor about the size of a small coffin, intended for the fuel, or to create a draught. The following is a brief description of the process, as given by a priest:—Three days after death, the body, seated cross-legged and enclosed in a box, is taken to the furnace. Fuel is placed round it, and after a suitable religious ceremony the torch is applied, and the whole pile is soon wrapped in flames. It requires several hours and 400 pounds of wood to complete the process. — *The Academy.*

**NOTES.**

Dr. A. Burnell has discovered a MS. of the long-sought *Prattidkhyana* of the Sūdrā Veda. It consists of about 280 śātras with a commentary, and is attributed to Śakatāyana; but, as it is, it is a relatively modern work, and much like the *Atharvā-pattidkhyana* (edited by Prof. Whitney) in style and conciseness. The copy he has is tolerably correct, and he hopes to print it shortly. He has also ascertained the existence of a *Brāhmaṇa*, as yet unknown, which belongs to the Jaiminīya Śākhā of the Sūdrā Veda, and expects to have a copy soon, and also authentic information respecting the chants of this Śākhā, which differ widely from those known already. What he has heard of the Jaiminīya chants makes him think that they are in reality far more simple, and perhaps older, than the others—e.g. of the Kauṭumika.—*The Academy.*

Some new Zend publications have been brought out by two young scholars, K. Geldner and W. Geiger, the first of whom is a pupil of Roth, the second of Spiegel. Geldner deals with the metrical parts of the *Zendavesta*, and proposes a great many ingenious corrections of corrupt passages, while Geiger confines himself to the Pehlevi version of the *Fruiddhi*. His conclusions show that this version is of no great value for the Zend text.

**BOOK NOTICES.**

Grand Duke Boris Fedorovich. Leaving this on the 8th December, Salankhomeny and his suite proceeded by Nijni Novgorod to Kazan and down the Volga to Astrakhan, which they reached on 27th May. The author's account of Russia—then separated by the Don from the Turkish Khanate of the Crimea—and of the court of the Grand Duke is full of curious information. In August they landed at Langheran, in the province of Guilan, where, from bad food and water, all fell ill. Robert Shirley met them there to conduct them, but on reaching Lanzan, two miles from Langheran, Salankhomeny died on the 25th October 1603. Tectander and George Agerastes then proceeded to carry out the mission, but the latter also died, of scarlatina, at Kasbin. Tectander found Shâh Abbas at Tabriz, which he had just taken from the Turks, and he gives an interesting account of that celebrated Sufawi ruler and his court. He accompanied the Persian army for some time during the campaign in Armenia, and then returned with a Persian ambassador through Circassia to Kois on the Caspian, and thence to Terek and Astrakhan, finding his way back to Moscow by the route he had come. There he met Henry of Logan, the Austrian ambassador, who left Moscow with him on the 24th August 1604, when Tectander's narrative closes. An appendix of 27 pages contains two letters of Salankhomeny's from Moscow, his address to the Grand Duke Boris, a letter from Boris to Rudolf, and an extract from a report by Henry of Logan.

The original work is very scarce, and M. Schefter has done excellent service in preparing this
French version of so interesting a volume, to which he has added valuable notes, and an introduction containing a brief but interesting account of the Shirleys, and a bibliography of European works on the reign of Abbas. The volume forms one of the excellence series of 18mo volumes of M. Leroux's Bibliothèque Orientale Élévatrice, and is illustrated by a curious coloured map of Eastern Europe at the commencement of the seventeenth century, and a facsimile of Sadeler's portrait of Husain A'l Beg, the Persian sent with Sir Anthony Shirley to the courts of Russia and Germany.

Gesta Romanorum, or Entertaining Moral Stories, translated from the Latin, with preliminary Observations and copious Notes, by the Rev. Charles Swan, late of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and revised and corrected by Wyndham Hooper, B.A., Clare College, Cambridge. (London: George Bell and Sons, 1877.)

The only fault which we can find with this cheap and carefully annotated translation of the Gesta is, that as might be expected in the case of a book published in England, no illustrations whatever are drawn from Sanskrit literature. The literatures of other Oriental countries are by no means neglected. But it is quite clear that for the learned and judicious corrector of Mr. Swan's translation Beney and Wilson and Weber have written in vain.

We proceed to mention some passages in which illustrations from Sanskrit writers might profitably have been introduced.

The first and most striking parallel that occurs to us is one between the 28th tale in Swan's Gesta and the story of Devasmitā in the 13th taranga of the Katha Satit Sarga. This was long ago pointed out by Wilson (Collected Works, vol. III. pp. 220ff.). "A Buddhist priestess has been asked by four young merchants to correct the wife of a friend named Devasmitā. The priestess pays her a visit, and gains her confidence. On the day following she pays her a second visit, and gives a bitch which was tied up at her door a piece of meat full of pepper-dust, which made tears trickle copiously from the animal's eyes. She then enters Devasmitā's room and begins to weep. On Devasmitā's asking her the reason of her sorrow she replies, 'My friend, look at this bitch weeping outside here. This creature recognized me to-day as having been its companion in a former birth, and began to weep, which made tears of pity flow from my eyes.' When Devasmitā heard that, and saw the bitch outside apparently weeping, she thought for a moment, 'What can be the meaning of this wonderful sight?' Then the ascetic said to her, 'My daughter, in a former birth I and that bitch were the two wives of a Brahman. And our husband frequently went about to other countries on em-
poison; and when she grew up she was considered so beautiful that the sight of her alone affected many with madness. The queen sent her to Alexander to espouse. He had no sooner beheld her than he became violently enamoured, and with much eagerness desired to possess her; but Aristotle, observing his weakness, said, "Do not touch her, for if you do you will certainly perish. She has been nurtured upon the most deleterious food, which I will prove to you immediately. Here is a malefactor who is already condemned to death. He shall be united to her, and you shall see the truth of what I advance. Accordingly the culprit was brought without delay to the girl, and scarcely had he touched her lips before his whole frame was impregnated with poison, and he expired." The editors of the Gesta illustrate this story copiously, but no parallel is adduced from Sanskrit literature. The notion is a very familiar one in Sanskrit literature, and readers of the Mudrd Rdkshana cannot fail to remember how the visha kanyd was employed against Chandragupta. On this occasion Aristotle's place was taken by Chānākyā. The king of Bānārās employs similar devices against the king of Vatsa in the Kāthā Sarit Sūgāra (taranga 19, 41. 81). Numerous illustrations might be quoted to show that the story is, as the commentators on the Gesta seem to suspect, of Indian origin.

In the 115th tale of the Gesta we read of an elephant that no one dared approach, but which was lulled to sleep by two chaste virgins. The same notion of elephants being peculiarly affected by the chastity of women is found in the 36th taranga of the Kāthā Sarit Sūgāra, where a chaste woman is able to raise up the white elephant Śvetaraśmi, that had fallen down apparently dead.

The 83rd tale in the Gesta Romanorum contains an incident found in the Panchatantra:—

"A board devastates a garden belonging to Trajan. It is wounded three times and then killed. When the cook was preparing it for the table, he reserved the heart for his own eating. This annoyed the emperor, and he sent to inquire after the heart. The cook declared that the board had no heart, and when called upon to justify this statement defended it in the following way:—"The board in the first instance entered the garden and committed much injury. I, seeing it, cut off his left ear. Now if he had possessed a heart he would have recollected the loss of so important a member. But he did not, for he entered a second time: therefore he had no heart. Besides, if he had had a heart, when I had cut off his right ear he would have meditated upon the matter, which he did not, for he came again and lost his tail. Moreover, having lost his ears and his tail, had he possessed a particle of heart he would have thought; but he did not think, for he entered a fourth time and was killed. For these several reasons I am confident he had no heart.' The emperor, satisfied with what he had heard, applauded the man's judgment."

This reminds us in the most forcible way of the second story in the 4th book of the Panchatantra. There a jackal persuades an ass to visit a sick lion; the lion wounds him, but the ass escapes. The cunning jackal persuades the ass to visit the lion a second time, when he is killed. The lion then goes to bathe, like a good Hindu lion, before making a meal off him. In the meanwhile the jackal devours the ears and the heart. When the lion takes him with making his food impure in this way, the jackal repeats that the ass had neither ears nor heart, otherwise he would never have run into danger after he had had one narrow escape from destruction. The same story is found in Babrius' fable 95. There the ass is represented by a deer, and the jackal by a fox. The fox devours the heart only, which makes M. Wagener remark that Babrius is plus consequent compared with the Indian fabulist. The fox's defence is most triumphant:—

"Οἰκος εἶχε παρως' φορεί, μὴ μάνθη ἄγει. Τὸ μαλλιέν καρδίν κοσμεῖν, ἄγει οὖν ἐκ δεινόροις λιότος ἦλθεν εἰς οἶκον;"

Possibly this story suggested to Shakespeare the lines

"Cæsar should be a beast without a heart
If he should stay at home to-day for fear."

An incident in the 15th tale, p. 46 of the present edition of the Gesta, reminds us of the story of Pāṇḍu in the Mahābhārata; and one, in the 5th tale, p. 91, of that of Śrīdatta in the Kāthā Sarit Sūgāra, taranga 10, slokas 140-150. Numerous other parallels would no doubt present themselves to those better versed than the writer of the present article can pretend to be in Sanskrit folklore. But we have said enough to show that the fashionable neglect of Sanskrit literature which prevails in England has detracted considerably from the value of this edition of the Gesta.

This collection of tales must always be interesting to Englishmen, as from it Shakespeare drew the plot of at least two of his plays.

The present edition contains much curious and valuable illustrative matter, though, if it had been revised by a scholar well read in Hindu folklore, it might have contained a good deal more.

C. H. T.
SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.C.S., M.R.A.S.

No. XXXV.

THIS and the following two inscriptions are the remaining three early Kadamba Sanskrit copper-plate grants, of which I have already made mention at p. 22 of the preceding volume. It appears that they were found in excavating the bed of a tank at Devagiri, in the Karajji Taluk of the Dhawad District. They were referred in the first instance to Mr. Panduranga Venkatadh Chintamanapetkar, Canarese Translator in the Educational Department, whose paper on them, after being submitted to Government, was made over to Mr. Burgess, as Archaeological Surveyor, and sent on to me to be recast for this journal. I found it necessary, however, to wait till I could obtain the originals themselves for inspection. In the meantime Mr. K. T. Thielig has published transcriptions &c., of the same plates in the Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. XII., pp. 300 et seqq. I have found his versions, as well as those of the Canarese Translator, useful to refer to in respect of a few doubtful points.

The present grant is on three plates, about 7"-5 long by 1"-8 broad. The ring connecting the plates is O'-2 thick, and is an oval.—2'4 by 1'-8. The seal, also, is oval.—1'-7 by 1'-4.

Transcription.

First Plate.

1 ŚrīŚaivasāṃdhy-aśāksa Tīrāravatē Śvāmi-Mahāśēna-mātri-gaṇa (ā) udhāraṇa mānavavāsya mānavya-sagātra

2 prati-kṛita svādhyāya charcāya (rceha) pāragasya aḍi-kāla rājaphi bimbānā aṣṭi-jan-aṁbānā

3 Kadambanāṁ dharma mahārājasya aśvamēla-yājinaṁ samar-ārjita vīpaḥ aṁvāravyasa

4 śamanta-rājavibhakta-ratnasu(sya) Nāgaj-ānākramya-dāy-anubhūtasya sarad-amaśana-

1 The Canarese Translator reads it as a horse or bullock. The head, which is the only part at all clear, seems to me more like that of a deer with short horns.

2 An asterisk, attached to a letter or mark of punctuation in square brackets, denotes that such letter or mark of punctuation is not in the original at all. An asterisk, attached to a mark of punctuation not in brackets, denotes that in the original a mark is used which it is not convenient to represent in the printing, and for which the ordinary mark of punctuation is substituted.

3 This word—aṅ, is close to the margin of the plate; the vowel is distinct, and parts of the other two letters are clear enough to be read in the original, though not enough to come out well in the facsimile. In No. XXXVI., i. 3, and No. XXXVII., 1. 1, Tīrāya-Vaijayanatih is not preceded by the honorific prefix aṅ. But the word can have no other application in the present case; and we have analogous instances in aṅ-śāmaya-Pulāñēkōryen, No. XX., i. 3, and No. XXI., i. 9, and in aṅ-śāmaya-Vaijayantin, xii., No. XXI., i. 12.

4 This passage is corrupt, and is difficult to deal with.

Mr. K. T. Thielig reads śamantavrājāvaśākratnasva sājikānam vādākhaṇḍhaṇya, and does not offer any explanation of it. But he reads two letters wrongly; for, the fourteenth is ṣa, not ṣi, and the sixteenth is kū, not kī. The Canarese Translator is altogether wide of the mark—nāgaj-ānākramya-dāy-anubhūtasya. From the context of the other genitive cases, I have no doubt that we must take the eleventh letter as, to be a mistake for sa. And the remaining letters form words intelligible by themselves, though not so as a whole, because there is no apparent reason why persons of Nāga descent should be referred to here. However, I see no other suitable way of explaining the passage. It is, indeed, just possible, as the eleventh letter may be either sa or a, that—i, the eye of rātanasa has been omitted altogether,—and, ii, it being by mistake for sa, the second word should be aṅgaṇāsā-ākrayasa, &c., i.e., a heritage, not to be arrived at by title-deeds, but possessed from time immemorial (see Monier Williams, s.v. aṅgaṇa); but this is probably going too far for an explanation, and I do not know whether aṅgaṇa is capable of being used in this technical sense, in the same way as aṅgame-
Second plate; first side.

[*] nabhasya-udita-sāśi-sadṛśia-aik-ātapatrasya dharmma-mahārājasya Śrī-Kriṣṇa-varma-maṇḍava

[*] tanayō Dē[va]*yavarna-yavaṃga-tha sva-puṇya-phal-ābhikāma-khaṇḍa triloka-bhūtā-hita-dēśa

[*] dharmma-pravartana-sya Arahaṭha bhagavataḥ chaityālayasya bhagavanśakr-ārchencha

mahiṁ-ārthaṁ

[*] yāpanīya[sa*]ūghēbhyāḥ Siddhākēdārē rija-mānāna dvādāśa nivarttanāṁ kshētrāṁ dattavān [ii*] Yō saya

Second plate; second side

[*] apahartā sa pańchama-mahāpataka-sa(saṁ)yuktā (ktō) || bhavati yō sy-ābhirakṣhitā sa puṇya-phalaṁ-āśuṅto [ii*]

[iv] Uktāṁ chaṁcha [ii*] P(a)hubhaṁ-ya(vya)sudhā bhukta rajaṁbhis-Sagar-ādibhi(bhiḥ)

ysya yasya yadā bhūthōḥā tasya tasyā

[iv] tadha(dā) phala(lam) || Ā(a)ddibhir-datdāṁ tribhbir-bha(bhu)ktāṁ sadbhise-cha paripālaṁ

etāṁ na nivarttanē pūrvva-rāja-kṛitiṁ cha [ii*]

[iv] Svam dātum su-mahach-chhakyaṁ duḥkhaṁ m-a[n]-ny-ārtha-pālanaṁ dānaṁ vā pālanaṁ

v-eti dānāṁ chhreyāṁ nupālanaṁ [m*] [ii*]

Third plate.

[iv] Sva-dattāṁ para-dattāṁ vā yō harēta vasundharāṁ śaśiṣṭhāṁ varsha-sahasraṁ narakō

pachyaṁ tu saṁ [ii*]

[iv] Śrī-Kriṣṇa-nriṇa-purūrṇa Kadamba-kula-kētunā raṇa-priyōṇa Dēvēṇa dattā bhūmīṁ

Triparvvatē [ii*]


Jaināya bhūr-iyaya [ii*]

[iv] Jayatā-Arhaṃ-trilok-ēṣaḥ savva(rvva)-bhūta-hitaṁ-karaṇa rāg-ādy-ari-haro nantō nanta-

jāna-ṛig-śarvaṁ [ii*] mitive times, and who are as fathers to their dependants; who celebrated horse-sacrifices; who acquired great wealth in battle; who was a very jewel among chieftains and excellent kings13; who enjoyed a heritage that was not to be attained by persons of Nāga descent10; and who possessed the sole umbrella (indicative of universal sovereignty), which was like (in the purity of its whiteness) to the moon when it has risen in the cloudless sky of autumn,—gave a field, (of the measure of) twelve nivartanās by the royal measure, at (the village of) Siddhākēdārā, to the sects of the Yāpanīyaṁ17, for the purposes of the glory of repairing anything

Translation.

At the glorious and victorious (city of) Tripuravaṇa, through a desire for the reward of his own meritorious act, the Yavarna Dēvavarna,—the beloved son of the pious Great King Śrī-Kriṣṇa varma,—who was consecrated by having meditated on the assemblage of the mothers of Svaṁ mā Mahāśeṇa; who was of the kindred of Mānava; who was thoroughly well versed in the system of private study and inquiry that he had adopted; who was the pious Great King of the Kadambaras, who (in their achievements and behaviour) are the counterparts of saintly kings" of pri-

5 A correction has to be made in the transliteration table at vol. VI., p. 136. The discursive mark of the letter used to represent the ś Jīvedālīya has dropped out in printing; it should be ś.

6 There is a mark below the line, which may, perhaps, be part of this letter, —, the rest being effaced; but the letter seems rather to have been omitted altogether.

7 sc. the city of the three hills.

8 This epithet, dharm-ārchara, is also intended to compare him with Dharmarṣa, sc. Yama, and also Yudhishthira, the king of justice.

9 Edjarasa, a person of the Kshatriya, or regal and military class, who has also acquired the status of a Rishi, or saint, by devoting himself to religious observances and austerities.

10 See note 4 to the transcription.

11 This word, yāpana, occurred in No. XXI., l. 9, and No. XXII., l. 17, in a way that led me to interpret it as meaning 'to be supported.' It now seems, however, to be the name of a sect, and the translations of those two passages should be altered accordingly. In the translation of No. XXI., instead of 'for the purpose of supporting the Kurchakas, who are naked religious mendicants,' read 'for the benefit of the Yāpanis, the Nirgrathas, and the Kūrchnas'; and, in the translation of No. XXII., instead of 'that ascetics should be supported during the four months of the rainy season; that the learned men, the chief of whom was Kumāradatta, should accord to justice enjoy all the material substance of that greatness;' read 'that the learned men, the chief of whom was Kumāradatta, who are ascetics of the Yāpanīya sect, should accord according to justice enjoy all the material
that may be broken and performing the worship of the temple of the holy Arhat, who points out that which is beneficial to the inhabitants of the three worlds, and who propagates religion.

He, who confesses this (grant), incurs the guilt of the five great sins; he, who preserves it, enjoys the reward of a meritorious act! And it has been said:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sāgara downwards; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the fruits of it! 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! It is very easy to bestow one's own property, (but) the preservation of the property of others is difficult; (if the question is) whether giving or preserving (is the more commendable act),—preservation is better than giving! He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, who confesses land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

Land was given at Tripārvata by Dēva, who was the son of the king Śrī Kṛiṣhṇa, and who was the glory of the family of the Kādambas, and who was fond of war. This land was given to the Jainas by Dēvavārama, the bravest of mankind, who desired his meritorious acts and virtues to be purified by tasting the happiness of the nectar of compassion.

Victorious is the Arhat, the lord of the three worlds, the worker of the welfare of all people, the destroyer of passion and other (mental) enemies, the eternal one, the lord who knows eternal knowledge!

No. XXXVI.

This grant is on three plates, about 5'2" long by 2'3" broad. The ring connecting the plates is about 0'3" thick, and is almost a circle 2'3" in diameter. The seal is oval,—1"5 by 0'9; whatever device or writing may have been on it is now illegible. The characters are small and neatly cut, and are for the most part very well preserved.

The plates record a grant by Mrīgēśavaravarāma, the son of Sāntīvaravārama, in the third year of his reign, which was the 'Pausha year'. This Mrīgēśavaravarāma is undoubtedly the same person as Mrīgēśa, the grandson of Kākūsthavarāma, who bestowed the grant recorded in No. XXI. of this Series.

Transcription.

First plate.

First side: 


Second plate; first side.


substance of that greatness during the four months of the rainy season.' Yāpantya, as the name of a seer, is not explained in Monier Williams' Dictionary. Mr. K. T. Telang suggests that it may mean 'those who are going away, i.e. mendicants who are going about and not stationary.' The Canarese Translator takes it as equivalent to Keshapanaka, 'a Jain mendicant, who wears no garments'; but this would only give it the same meaning as Nirgyantya, whereas, from the two terms being both used in No. XXI. l. 9, they must have distinct and separate meanings. 12 Bhaga-anusākaśa, here and in No. XXXVI. l. 10, and bhaga-kripa, in No. XXXVII. l. 24, seem to mean much the same as bhaga-sphāta-jīva-anudhāna of other inscriptions. 13 See the remarks at vol. VI., p. 229, and p. 345, note I. 14 This letter,—m,—seems to have been omitted in the original, and the place left blank in which it should have been written. 15 This letter,—m,—is followed in the original by the letter na. This last is superfluous and meaningless, and seems to have been partially erased after having been engraved. 16 The same remark as note 15 above. 17 The same remark as note 15 above. 18 The vocabul,—u,—is faintly discernible in the original, but does not come out well in the facsimile.
Second plate; second side.

mahim-ārttham grām-āpara-dig-vidhihā-sūm-ābhivyantarē rāja-māñcena chatvāriśasan-nivarttanaṁ kṛṣṇaḥ-bhūmi-

kshētraṁ chatavārī kshētra-nivarttanaṁ cha chaityālayasya bāhīḥ ēkaṁ nivarttanaṁ puppa-(shpa)-ārttham.

deva-kulasā-āṅganaṁ-cha ēkaṁ nivarttanaṁ-eva sarvva-parihāra-yuktaṁ dattavan

mahārājāḥ [[*]] Lōbhañ-adharmañ-māv-yā(yō) syābhhiartā sa paścena-mahāpātaka-
samyuktō bhavati

yā syābhhirakshitā sa tat-puṣya-phala-bhāg-bhavati [ ]] Utkañ-cha [ ]] Bahubhir-
vvasudhā bhuktā

Third plate.

rājabhīs=SaGa-rādibhiḥ yasya yasya yadā bhūmiḥ tasya tasya tadā phala[m] [ ]] Svadattaṁ para-(da)nam(tām) vā

yō harotā vasundharā(rām) shashtiṁ varaha-sahasrāṇi narakaḥ pachyate tu saḥ [ ]] Adharira-

dattaṁ tribhūr-bhuktān

sadbhiṁ-cha paripālitaṁ ātāni na nivarttantaṁ purvva-rāja-kṛitiṁ cha [ ]] Sva-dātun

su-mahāch-chhakyam duṣkhanaṁ-aryā-āṛthta-pālanaṁ dānaṁ vā pālanaṁ v-ēti dāanāḥ-chhreyo

nupālana[n] [ ]]]] [ ]]]

Parama-dhārmikēya Dānakīrti-bhōjakēna likhitā-eyam paṭṭikā [ ]] Iiti siddhir-astu [ ]]]]

Translation.

It is accomplished! Victorious is the Arhat, the lord of the three worlds, who delights in the welfare of all people, the destroyer of passion and other (mental) enemies, the eternal one, the lord who knows eternal knowledge!

Hail! At the victorious (city of) Vaijayanti, Srī-Mṛgēśavara-varma, who was the Great King of the Kadambras, who are consecrated by having mediated on the mothers of Svāmī-Mahāsēna, who are of the lineage of Mānava, who are the descendants of Hārti, who are of the sons of Aṅgiras, who have adopted the system of private study and inquiry, and who are as good fathers to the true religion; who acquired a great quantity of religious merit in many other (previous) births; who achieved brilliant and steadfast courage in battle; and who was the son of Srī-Sānti-varavarna, in the family of Kākṣtha, which has been continued by a succession of many men according to the nature of a pure lineage, and which has become the lamp of the world, and is great, and has risen higher and higher,—in the third year of his reign, in the Punaḥ year, on the tenth Lunar day in the dark fortnight of the month Kārṭtika, under the Uttarābhadra-

pad a constellation, at (the village of) the greater Paralūra, gave to the divine supreme Arhats, whose beautiful feet are rubbed by the tiara of the lord of the gods (who bows down to perform obeisance to them), for the purposes of the glory of sweeping out (the temple) and anointing (the idol with ghee) and performing worship and repairing anything that may be broken, a black-soil field, (of the measure of) forty nivartanas by the royal measure, within the boundaries of the western division of the village,—and a field (of the measure of) four nivartanas by the royal measure, within the boundaries of the western division of the village,—and a field (of the measure of) four nivartanas,—and (a field of the measure of) one nivartana outside the chaitya-hall, for the purpose of (decorating the idol with) flowers,—and the courtyard of the temple, (measuring) one nivartana,—entirely free from taxation.

He, who confiscates this (grant) through greed or impiety, inures the guilt of the five great sins: he, who preserves it, enjoys the reward of that same meritorious act! And it has been said:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sagaras downwards; (&e.)! He is tormented in hell for the duration of sixty thousand years, (&e.)! That (grant) which is bestowed with lobbies of water, (&e.)! It is very easy to bestow one's own property, (&e.)!

correctly, in the next line.

13 Vanavā; the modern Banawari.
14 Mahārājā has to be brought back to this place from 1.14, in order to govern the genitive case Kadambarān...
15 See note 19 to the transcription.
This charter has been written by the very pious Dāma kīrtti, the Bhūjakā. May there be success!

No. XXXVII.

This is another grant of Mrigēśa, or Mrigēśavarmā, as he is here called, on four plates, about 8½" long by 2½" broad. The ring, on which the plates are strung, is rather bent, but seems to be properly circular, about 2½" in diameter; it is 0½" thick. The scale is oval, — 1½ by 1½. The device on it is very indistinct, but seems to be a sitting or kneeling figure of a god or man, probably of Jinēndra. The characters are large and bold, and extremely well preserved.

The grant is dated in the fourth year of Mrigēśa's reign; but, as in the other Kadamba grants, there is no reference to any other era. The grant is also dated in the eighth fortnight of the rainy season. I have had occasion to remark on this at vol. VI., p. 28, and should have noted there the expression in No. XXII., l. 17, vārṇiḥkāte chaturdāsāma ṃ, 'during the four months of the rainy season.' A significant trace of the primitive division of the year into three seasons only is to be found in the sacrifices called chāturmāna, or 'four-monthly' sacrifices, performed on the full-moons of Pṛthigvīṇa (February-March), Āśādha (June-July), and Kārttika (October-November).

It is worthy of remark, in passing, that, whereas in No.XXXVI. Mrigēśa's third year is called a 'Pauṣha year,' and in No. XXI. his eighth year is called a 'Vaiśākha year' — no such term is applied in the present grant to his fourth year.

Transcription.

First plate.

[\[\] Siddham || Vijaya-Vaijayantyāṁ Svāmi-Mahāśēna-māтри-gaṇa-a(ि)uddha(h)āt-ā
\[\] bhiṣiktasya Mānavya-sagotryāya Hāritiya-pratryāya pratirikāta
\[\] charchēḥ-pāra[ga*] yām vīdūḍa-pratibimbānāṁ Kadambānāṁ dharma-mahāraja
\[\] sya Śrī-vijaya-sīva-Mrigēśavarmananāḥ vijay-ayur-ārōgya-āśvarya

Second plate; first side.

\[\] pravṛddhāna-karaṇaḥ sahyā(na)[a] sarāṁ sahitṛthah varśa-pakṣah ashtamaḥ titihī
\[\] paunāmāśī || Anaya-anupūryānā(ि)ka-janmāntar-ōpārijit-vipula-pa
\[\] nā-sankhā-sa-grha-viśuddha-pitri-mātri-rānasū pabhaya-lōka-priya-hita
\[\] kur-ānēka-āśār-aṭṭha-tatva-vijnāna-vīvēchcha(pha)na-viniśti-viśāl-ōdāra-mañā
\[\] hasty-āṣṭāraṇa-praharaṇa-ādiśūbhā vīyānudikṣābhā bhūmitiṣō yathā

Second plate; second side.

\[\] vats-kriyā śrāmaḥ daksāh daksihāḥ naya-vinaya-kuśalaḥ na(ि)k-ākha
\[\] v-ārśitā-pramāṇa-ādri(pha)-sataḥ udātta-buddhi-dhāraya-virya-tya-ga-sampaṇnāḥ
\[\] su-mahāti samara-sākātā svahā-bala-parakram-avāpa-viṣapa
\[\] l-āśivaṛyaḥ samaya-prajā-pālana-praṇāḥ svajana-ku* munda
\[\] vana-prabhāṇa-śānākaḥ dēva-dvija-guru-sāhilvajānībhyaḥ gō-bhū

Third plate; first side.

\[\] mi-hinaya-sayan-āchchhādan-ān-ādi(pha)-na(ि)ka-vidha-pradāna-nityaḥ vidvat-suhri
\[\] t-svajana-sāmānaḥ-ṛṣabha-vyayāmānaḥ mahāh-vibhavaḥ śa
\[\] rāja-ṛṣitā-anusārāḥ dharma-mahārajaḥ Kadambānāḥ Śrī-vijaya
\[\] śvā-Mrigēśavarmā Kālavaṅgā-grāmarāṅ tridhā vibhajya-dattavān [ || ]

[\[\] Atra pūrvvam-Achordh-pramaṇa-pravah-kāla-sthāna-nivāśībhyaḥ
\[\] bhagavata-Achordh-mahā-Jinendra-dēvatāḥ bhaḥ ēkō
\[\] dvitiyō Rāja-pratikā-sad-dharma-karaṇa-parasaṃyaḥ Śvetapata-mahāraja
\[\] maṇa-saṅgha-ṛṣabha-gaṇaḥ Śrī-gṛipto Nirgranthā-mahārāmanā-saṅgh-ā
\[\] pabhōgāya-ṛti [ || ] Atra dēva-bhāga-dhānya-dēva-pāja-balihara

\[\] Between the letters ṭa and ṭa there is the letter ṭa, partially engraved and erased as being out of place.
\[\] In the original ṭa was first engraved, and it was then altered into ṭa, by partial erasure of the ya and part of the ṭa, and by the addition of the vowel d.

\[\] The meaning is clear, but the construction is bad and should be either karaṇa-parasaṃya Svattapaṭa-mahārāmanā- saṅghaparasaṃya upabhāgāya, or karaṇa-prasaṃya Svattapaṭa- mahārāmanā-saṅgha-ṛṣabha-gaṇa.
Translation.

It is accomplished! At the victorious (city of) Vaijayanti, (it was) the lunar day of the full moon, the eighth fortnight of the rainy season, and the fourth year, productive of victory and long life and health and wealth, (of the reign) of the victorious and prosperous Śrī-Mṛigaśāvarṇa, who was consecrated by having meditated on the assemblage of the mothers of Svāmi-Mahāśeṇa; who was of the lineage of Mānavya; who was the descendant of Ģārīṭi; who was thoroughly well versed in the system of inquiry that he adopted; and who was the pious Great King of the Kadambas, who are the counterparts of gods.

The victorious and prosperous Śrī-Mṛigaśāvarṇa, the pious Great King of the Kadambas,—who had acquired great religious merit in many other births antecedent to this (date mentioned above); who was of a pure lineage on both the paternal and the maternal side; whose great and noble mind busied itself in learning and investigating the true meaning of the many sacred writings which effect that which is pleasant and that which is beneficial in both worlds; who had properly exercised himself in manly sports, comprising the riding on elephants and horses, and the use of weapons, and other things; who was clever; who was skillful; who was expert in the art of government and in propriety of conduct; who acquired great and steadfast courage in many fights; who was possessed of noble intellect and firmness and courage and liberality; who achieved great wealth by the strength and prowess of his own arm in great stress of war; who was devoted to properly protecting his subjects; who was a very moon to cause to blossom the lotuses which were his own relatives; who was constant in making gifts of cows and land and gold and couches and clothing and food and many other things to gods and the twice-born and spiritual preceptors and holy men; whose great wealth was being enjoyed equally by learned men and his friends and his own kindred; and who imitated the conduct of kings of primitive times,—divided the village of Kālavaṅga into three portions, and bestowed it. Among them, firstly, one share was for the holy Arhat and the great god Jīnendra, who inhabited the supreme and excellent place (called) 'the hall of the Arhat.' The second was for the enjoyment of the sect of eminent ascetics called Svētapata, which was intent on practising the true religion declared by the Arhat. The third was for the enjoyment of the sect of eminent ascetics called Nirgrantha.

He reaps the reward of that same (act of piety), who, on the understanding that it is for the enjoyment of the god, preserves this (grant) which has been duly acquired, (and applies it) for the use of the grain which is the portion of the god, and the worship of the god, and the oblation, and the charu, and the performer of the rites of the god, and the maintenance of the repair of whatever may be broken, and other objects; he, who may destroy it, incurs the guilt of the five great sins!

And it has been said:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sagara downwards; (&c.)!

(This charter has been) written by the General, Naravara.

32 Āsti, or abhūt, has to be supplied after pauruṣamāntrit in l. 6.
33 Svētapata, or Svēkāṁbara,—a sect of Jain ascetics who wear white clothes.
34 Nirgrantha,—a sect of Jain ascetics who wear no clothes.
35 Charu,—a preparation of rice, barley, and pulse, boiled with butter and milk, for presentation to a god.
WHERE WAS THE SOUTHERN CHARITRAPURA MENTIONED BY HIWEN THSANG?

BY A. C. BURNELL, Ph.D., M.C.S.

It is well known that Hiwen Thsang mentions two ports on the Coromandel coast both of which he calls Charitrapura, and from which, he informs us, the traffic with the farther East was conducted. The most northern of these was in the far north; the southern Charitrapura has been usually asserted to have been what is now called Negapatanam, but the reasons for this position appear to me to be without foundation, and the identification seems a mere guess. Hiwen Thsang describes this port as being in the north-east of the kingdom of Malakūṭa (as Staniša Julien rightly rendered the name), but this kingdom has not as yet been identified. I shall now show that a Tamil inscription of the 11th century A.D. helps to clear up the matter in a satisfactory way; but it is first necessary to take the excellent Chinese monk's account of the kingdom of Malakūṭa and its surroundings, for his statements in this respect afford substantial proof of the correctness of the new identification which I shall here propose.

He mentions, first of all, the kingdom of Drāviḍa, the capital of which, he says, is Kien-chi-pu-lo, which corresponds to Kānchipura or Conjeeveram. This is, therefore, the neighbourhood of the modern Madras, and corresponds to the territory of the Pallava kings, with whom Sir Walter Elliot first made us acquainted. Hiwen Thsang adds of himself: "En partant de ce pays, il fit environ trois mille li au sud, et arriva au royaume de Mo-lo-kia-ch’ā (Malakūṭa)."

He says (p. 122): "Au sud . . . . s’élèvent les monts Mo-la-yo (Malaya) . . . . . (p. 124) Lorsqu’on sort de Malakūṭa dans la direction du nord-est, sur le bord de la mer, on rencontre une ville (nommée Che-li-ta-lo—(Charitrapura); c’est la route des voyageurs qui vont dans le royaume de Seng-kia-lo (Sinhala—Ceylon), que baigne la mer du midi. Les habitants de ce pays rapportent que, lorsqu’on s’embarque pour le quitter, après avoir fait environ trois mille li au sud-est, on arrive au royaume de Seng-kia-lo (Sinhala—Ceylon).*

It appears that Hiwen Thsang returned to Kānchipura from Malakūṭa, and thence went to Koṇkaṇapura,* the modern Koṇkaṇa-hāli, in Maisur. It is thus evident that Madurā and the extreme south of India cannot be intended by Malakūṭa; and again, if this be assumed to be Madurā, and Charitrapura be assumed to be Negapatanam, it is difficult to understand the statement that Charitrapura was in the north-east of the kingdom.

No doubt the Pāṇḍya kings of Madurā for some time held in subjection what is now the Tanjor province, and what was once the best part of the Chola kingdom, but how could their northern limit be ever about Negapatanam? It must either have been north of the delta of the Kaveri, or have been south of the almost uninhabited country which separates the fertile parts of Tanjor from the fertile parts of Madurā. Again, Hiwen Thsang (even making great allowances for his necessarily defective geography) could hardly have said that the Malaya mountains are south of Malakūṭa if the last be Madurā: for if he had visited that place he would have seen them, and would necessarily have put them in the west. Orientals never err in directions, at all events.

Again, if we look at the text of Hiwen Thsang a little closely, it will be evident that in speaking of the kingdoms of the south of India he did not intend that they should be regarded as conterminous. His kingdoms—as the measurements he gives show—were composed of the deltas of rivers and similar fertile tracts; the large extent of barren and almost uninhabited land which then, as now, separated the fertile tracts was regarded by him as neutral land. Thus his Drāviḍa is the small Pallava kingdom composed of the fertile territory near Kānchiparam; the next kingdom would naturally be in the delta of the Kaverī and Kolerūn.

*This is the same description as is given by Hosi Li—ibid. I, pp. 123-4.

* Koṇkaṇapura (tom. III. p. 149), which Cunningham tries to identify with Ammapuri on the Tangabhadrā (Anc. Geog. pp. 303-3); Ferguson with the capital of the Koṅgū kingdom (Jour. R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VI. pp. 393, 396); and V. de St. Martin, with Banavali (Pellrīna Bouddhist, tom. III. p. 401).—Ed.
Hiwen Thsang gives his measurements of distance with a great show of accuracy in li, but the great difficulty is to ascertain what li he used, for the value of this measure has varied enormously in China at different periods. It is also unsafe to attach any great value to these distances given by him, as it is obvious that he could have had no means of accurately determining the distances he travelled, and that he must have used round terms.

Thus the only safe data to be derived from Hiwen Thsang’s journal as regards the position of this Charitra pura are:—(1) It was in the north-east corner of Malakkä; (2) Malakkä was the kingdom next on the south to the Dravida kingdom, of which the capital was Kâñchipuram. Other considerations render it very unlikely that Charitra pura is the modern Negapatam, but it is unnecessary to mention them here.

The new information that I am able to bring to bear on this question is derived from the great Tamiḻ inscription of Kuļottuṅga (Vira) Chōla which surrounds the shrine of the chief temple at Tanjor. Kuļottuṅga (who reigned from 1064 to 1113 A.D.) was a great benefactor to this temple, and the inscription records gifts and endowments made by him, as well as others, from about 1067 to the end of the century. Among the endowments by others than the king we find one by the community (Subhaigār) of Malakkutachūṭāmaipichathurvedimaṅgalam, which is said to be in the Avūkūrram of Nattavindavadanadu. The meaning of the name of the village is plain: the Brāhmaṇical settlement of Chaturvedimaṅgalam was ‘Malakkutachūṭāmaipi’ or an ornament of (the kingdom of) Malakkä, and indeed it comes nearly first in the list of endowments by private persons; it was in the subdivision (kūrram) of Avūr, which was, therefore, in Malakkä. Now Avūr is still a well-known place, and it is situated some five or six miles south-west of Kumbakonam. All the other places mentioned in this part of the inscription are also near Tanjor.

It follows, therefore, that Malakkä was the name of the kingdom comprised, roughly speaking, in the delta of the Kāveri; the name itself appears to be that of a former suburb of the actual Kumbakonam, which was probably then the capital; perhaps Suvāmaṅalai is the modern representative of it. If, then, we look to the north-east of the Kāveri delta, and recollect that Charitra pura is a mere epithet, there can be no difficulty in identifying Hiwen Thsang’s port with Kāveripaṭṭanam, the once famous port at the mouth of the Kāverī, and which is mentioned by Ptolemy (in the second century) as Chabera emporium.

Legends of its importance are still current, and it was the native place of a famous Tamiḻ poet—Paṭṭanattu Pilli. It seems to have finally ceased to be a place of importance in the fifteenth century, partly owing to the gradual silting up of the bed of the Kāverī; and nothing now remains but a few sandy mounds with fragments of brick strewed over them, and traces here and there of temples. The establishment of Negapatam by the Telugu chieftains of Tanjor as their chief port was probably a result of the decay of the original Paṭṭanam.

ARCHæOLOGICAL NOTES.

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

(Continued from p. 26.)

No. XVII.—Some Hindu Snake-notions.

An attempt is here made to bring together some notions and superstitions respecting snakes that I have met from time to time in India. It is not presumed to do more than touch the deep and difficult subject of the origin and meaning of the old Nāga worship, Nāga races, and Nāga sculptures and mythology. Works like Mr. Fergusson’s Tree and Serpent Worship, and treatises by great Orientalists, warn amateur intruders from such ground. I would only remark that the dread of the snake is as strong amongst peoples of all nations and colours as ever it was in the ages of fetish or totem worship. Amongst the civilized it is generally a sentiment of unreasoning horror at the sight or idea of any snake, whilst amongst the uncivilized,

* I owe this important information to my friend Mr. Groenerdtt.

religious awe and veneration are superadded. In all ages and degrees of culture, however, mere observation of a snake is sufficient, to a very considerable extent, to account for this. It is seldom, perhaps, that a snake is seen, especially by Europeans, when unsuspicuous and unalarmed. Notice of the neighbourhood of one is always the signal for immediate attack and pursuit. But whoever may have watched a serpent that perceived not that it was observed will know what a different feeling it excites to that aroused by any other creature, however ferocious. The presence of neither tiger, leopard, nor wild elephant calls up a like sort of apprehension. The fixed malicious intelligence of its eyes, so different from the eyes of other animals, the mystery of its motion, and the idea suggested of swift, unescapable deadly attack, all convey a peculiar thrill of alarm. There were three things that were too wonderful even for the wisest of kings, and one of them was “the way of a serpent upon a rock.” Weird and unearthly indeed it is, and the serpent-priests of Epidaurus and Asia Minor watched for it as they sang their adjuration, “Come! come! come! emerge from thy cavern! Swift one who runnest without feet, captor who taketh without hands! Sinuous as the rivers, colored as the sun, black with spots of gold like the sky sown with stars! Like the tendrils of the vine and the convolutions of the entrails! Unengendered! eater of earth! always young! good to men! Come! come! come! emerge from thy cavern!” It secret and silent habits and long endurance may have inspired its ancient renown for subtlety above all beasts. From its dwelling in caves and crevices, it knew all the secrets and treasures of the under-world, and often bore the choicest gems upon its forehead; and when men saw the “quick cross lightning” of the storm, or the silent wavering streamers of the evening sky, they believed that serpents were in the gods’ world too. Because the cunning of all creatures of the fields, woods, and waters was gathered together in the snake, any one who tasted its flesh or blood forthwith knew the speech of all fowls, and became wise in the ways of beast-kind. So it has always been that men have everywhere looked with fear or veneration upon the snake. The Hindus have notions of their own too. They say that snakes have twenty-four legs, which are invisible to the eye of men, possibly taking this idea from centipedes. For twenty-six days after birth, moreover, they have no poison, but on the twenty-seventh day they spread out their hoods to the sun and dance, and the rays striking upon the four upper fangs ripen and fill them with poison. Each of the four fangs has its own name,—Kāli, Kālasī, Yama n, and Yama thūta n,—all names of deadly meaning, and each inflicts its own peculiar sort of wound, and the poison from each has its own way of operation. The first-named fang leaves a mark like a cross, and a clearly visible exudate from the wound; the poison instilled (which in all cases remains stationary for a hundred seconds, except in the case of the bite from a young snake whose venom has just been animated by the sun on its twenty-seventh day, when death is instantaneous) rises in the skin. The second fang leaves a triangular wound, whence a yellow fluid issues, and the venom rises in the flesh. The fang Yama n makes a hook-shaped mark; blood comes from it, and the poison rises in the bones. The fourth fang inflicts a curved puncture, a whitish fluid exudes, and the poison goes up into the marrow. Sometimes a small sharp tooth grows with the four fangs; a wound from this, as also from the fourth fang, Yamathūta n, is always deadly. But it is consolatory to reflect that both are imaginary, and that only two poison-fangs can be found in the jaw of the worst-disposed snake. A bite is held to be fatal on any of these places,—the head, the lip, the chin, the breast, the navel, the palm of the hand, and the sole of the foot; fatal also if inflicted in a ruined house or uninhabited place, in a temple, cemetery, or dry tank, amongst reeds or bamboo, near a banyan or tamarind tree, by an idol-car or cross-ways; at morning, evening, or during sleep. Again, a wound is fatal if, after biting, the snake spreads its hood and dances, lies motionless, or chases the man: also if the wound bleeds and the limbs tremble, it will be fatal; or if the eyes sink and

1 When it is considered that the deaths from snake-bites officially reported, in 1869 in Malabar alone were of men 186, of cattle 625, and the total number of deaths of men in British India in the same year were 11,416; that such totals are concluded from very inadequate returns, and that it is more than probable the annual deaths from bites are not fewer than 20,000,—another great and obvious cause for the dread of serpents will be recognised.
the limbs swell, and the lips, nails, and palms grow dark, death will follow. Effects, too, depend upon the state of the snake; a bite from one laying her eggs causes the eyes of the sufferer to become red and inflamed; if the snake be a strong young female the left eye is lost; if a male, the right eye. A bite from a black snake makes the ears deaf.

There are some other notions respecting snake-bites, so fantastic as to be hardly worth setting down were they not a part of folk-lore. The Tamil people have eight cardinal points, named after eight deities: to wit, Indran (north-east), Varunan (east), Agni (south-east), Yamman (south), Katu (south-west), Sivan (west), Niruthi (north-west), Kuvran (north). Now if a messenger bringing intelligence of any person having been bitten comes from Indran, Varunan, Yamman, or Kuvran, the snake that bit was a male; if from Agni, Sivan, or Niruthi, it was a female; if from Katu, a man has not been bitten, but a beast. If a messenger from the east begins his announcement with broad A, one fang has entered; if with U three fangs; if with long A, two; if with E, all the four; and so on, with variations according to the point from which the message came. But from whatever point an announcement may come that begins with O it is not to be believed. More fantastic still, it is to be understood that no one breathes through both nostrils at the same moment, but alternately, using them in turn for an hour and a half each. Now if a person announcing a snake-bite comes first on the side of the breathing nostril, and then, whilst speaking, crosses over to the other side, the bitten person will have died; if contrariwise,—that is, if the messenger approaches on the side of the stopped nostril, and, after telling his tale, crosses to the breathing side, the bitten one will recover!

There is a great deal of serpent-worship in South Kanara, on the western coast; and on one of the highest mountains of the Ghâts, named Subramanya, there is one of the most famous serpent-temples in India. The locality is extremely wild and feverish, excessively so during the cold and dry seasons; nevertheless great numbers of pilgrims resort thither, especially during the December festival called Kukka Shastri, when a great cattle-fair is also held at the foot of the mountain. The temple has no architectural pretensions, being indeed mostly constructed of laterite, the sanctuary in the centre, containing the idol Sûbaraya, being of granite. It is square in form with an open cloister running round the four sides, and numbers of the 'coiling folk' reside in it in holes and crevices made for them. Numbers of persons who have made vows roll and wriggle round the temple serpent-fashion, and some will even roll up to it from the foot of the hill, a mile distant. They also take home with them some earth from the sacred serpent-holes. This earth is believed to cleanse from leprosy if rubbed on the parts affected, and to remove the stigma of barrenness from women if a little be daily put in the mouth. This serpentine body-rolling, called âgâ-pratdehinam, is practised also further south, where small snake-temples—in Tamil, Nâgakovil—are not unfrequent. I have seen one not far from the town of Madurâ, on the bank of the Vaigai river; the only images in it were large painted cobras with gaping red mouths; and there are men in Madurâ who for payment will perform any number of rollings round it as proxies for persons who have vowed them. These rollings are done very rapidly, with great fury and vociferation. I may also mention another remarkable serpent-shrine. Deep in the Travankor forests, on the bank of one of the many rivers flowing thence to the western sea, there is a small granite temple wonderfully sculptured, considering its situation; and in the bed of the river opposite there rises a tall rock called Pâm bû-pârâr ('Snake-rocks'), a glistening band, suggestive of a serpent's trail, winding round and round it from bottom to top in a very curious manner, apparently caused by micaeous veins in the rock. It is held extremely sacred, but I know not what ceremonies are practised there.

To return to South Kanara: a species of serpent-worship is in use there which I never heard of in the interior districts. The following particulars respecting it were obtained from a very intelligent native. Three afflictions are looked upon as due to the wrath of serpents for having killed a snake in a former life, namely leprosy, childlessness, and sore eyes. People so

* Subbaraya — serpent-lord; the image is said to be a shapeless block.
afflicted often perform costly ceremonies to remove the curse, which are superintended by the Mādhuva Brāhmaṇs, originally fishermen, and not acknowledged as Brāhmaṇs out of Kānara. There are two ceremonies in ordinary use. The first, generally performed by a childless man, is Sarpa Sampūrṇa, or 'the serpent's funeral.' The fifth, sixth, fifteenth, or thirtieth of the month is chosen, and the family priest called to preside. The childless or afflicted penitent bathes and dresses himself in silk or linen attire, a spot in the house is chosen and the priest sprinkles some consecrated rice about it, to drive away any lurking devil, and then he and the penitent sit side by side on two wooden stools, kneading rice or wheat flour into dough. He then makes the figure of a serpent, and with many muttered holy mantram is believed to animate the figure, and transform it for the time into a live serpent. Milk and sugar are then offered to it, and it is worshipped as a deity. After this other mantram are said, undoing the spell previously wrought, and taking away the life that was given. The serpent being dead, the penitent assumes the garb of mourning, and shaves off his beard and moustaches. He then carries the figure on his head to the bank of a river, where he reverentially places it upon a pile. The figure is then fenced round with chips of sandalwood and camphor, and melted butter poured over all. The pile is then lit with fire brought by the penitent from his own house with a vow that it shall be used only for burning the serpent-god. When burnt the ashes are thrown into the river. The penitent is considered unholy and must not be touched for three days. On the fourth day the funeral of the serpent-god ends with an entertainment to eight unmarried youths below the age of twenty; they are held to represent eight serpents, and are treated with the utmost respect. This curious symbolical ceremony evidently denotes penitence and amends for the supposed killing of one of the sacred creatures in a former life, and the temporary ascription of serpent-nature to the young men seems a trace of the very ancient and wide-

spread idea of the transformation of men into serpents, and serpents into men, which appears almost extinct in Lower India.

The second ceremony, called Nāgamaṇḍala, is resorted to when that first described has failed in producing the hoped-for results. The penitent gives a great feast to his castemen and unmarried youths, who are again supposed to personate serpents. In the evening-bruised rice is scattered over a spot previously selected, and the figure of a great serpent traced out in it. The figure is then worshipped, and a band of musicians summoned and well primed with toddy to sustain them in their work. They dress themselves in women's clothes and put on jewels, drumming and piping go on furiously, and the leader imitates the deity, reeling and writhing about frantically, and at times uttering words, which are devoutly attended to as though spoken by the deity; yet the musicians are low-caste people. The wild discordant music is often prolonged throughout the night. In the Government Annals of Indian Administration in 1867-68 there is the following notice:—

"The Manipuris are nominally Hindus, and their only priests are women called Naība, who are treated as oracles. The Rāja's peculiar god is a species of snake called Pakungha, from which the royal family claims descent. When it appears, it is coaxed on to a cushion by the priestess in attendance, who then performs certain ceremonies to please it."

Snake-worship does not appear to be distinctively an Aryan cult; the Brāhmaṇs, who doubtless found it flourishing, allowed and adopted it to a certain extent, but grudgingly.* Indications of this may be perceived in the facts that Brāhmaṇs avoid the sight of a snake, and hold meeting one to be the worst of omens, sufficient immediately to stop any undertaking. No Brāhmaṇ acts as a priest in any serpent rites, and there are no temples where the walls and pillars are so crowded with snake sculptures as the temples of the Jains in Southern India, over the deadly foes of the Brāhmaṇs. It is within and around Jain temples, too, that the 'snake-

---

* Other accounts of snake-worship in India will be found in the Ind. Ant. vol. I, p. 6, and vol. IV, pp. 89, 196-7, where it will be seen that in Kāthākā the idea of serpent transformation is still in full force. See, too, vol. II, p. 139, and vol. IV, pp. 5-6. To these must especially be added the very full and learned account of "Serpent-worship in Western India" given by Rāo Śāhil śivasalaka Nārāyaṇa Māpillā at pp. 169 et seqq. of vol. IX. of the Jour. Bo. Br.

R. As. Soc.; the ceremonies detailed above are recounted by him so minutely as to render my notice superfluous but for some local variations and particulars. See, too, Tree and Serpent Worship, 2nd ed. Appendix D.

* Even when depicted in connection with Brāhmaṇical gods as overshadowing or guarding Śiva, Nārāyaṇa, &c., it is in a subordinate capacity.
stones,' of which a typical collection will be seen delineated at page 5, vol. IV. of the *Ind. Ant.*, are most numerous. These stones, which mostly have an appearance of extreme antiquity, were thought by the late Mr. Boswell to be possibly a remnant of the earliest tribes who preceded the Skythian invaders, and the oldest representations of native art existing in the country (*Ind. Ant.* vol. I. pp. 150, 372). However this may be,—and probably investigation and evidence would fail to support the hypothesis,—there is yet something strange and mysterious about these serpent-stones. They mostly have an appearance of extreme antiquity, blurred, worn, and moulder by age, and though all castes regard them with some sort of awe or superstitions respect, none appear to claim them as specially pertaining to themselves. None will point at them, as it is believed the finger that so pointed would rot and drop from the hand. Women lay offerings of flowers before them and touch the sculptured heads with paint, believing they will be thereby blessed with children, but men very seldom appear to offer them any sort of adoration. They seem apart from existing systems, and, as it were, the fossils of an extinct generation. The enigmatical figure, in what Mr. Boswell called a Skythian cap and tunic, that so often accompanies the sculptured serpent, also appears to have nothing in common with Hindus.

It may be observed that in the neighbourhood of Hassan and Hālabīd, in Mysore, a frequent subject amongst the Jaina remains is the figure of a naked woman twined with a serpent encircling the right thigh. This is always accompanied by a smaller figure, clothed as for a cold climate, in a posture of adoration. I have more than once heard stories of snakes showing love for women, and in 1871 the following account appeared in the *Western Star*:

"A very extraordinary incident was lately reported to have occurred a few miles from Bêpur, in Malabar. A native female of very attractive appearance, whilst sweeping the yard of her house, heard a hissing noise behind her. Turning to see, she found to her terror a large cobra advancing towards her. Before she could fly or call for help, the snake darted at her and coiled round one of her legs, rising swiftly higher and higher till it brought its open hood in contact with her face, there moving it to and fro like a screen. In this pitiable and frightful position she had to remain for nearly two days, without being able to lie down or sleep. None but females could approach her to feel her with milk and plantains, when it is said, the cobra turned its head to one side, allowing her to nourish herself. But on any men coming near the cobra would hiss fearfully and tighten its hold round her body in such a manner as to make her feel breathless. Many conjurers came to relieve her, but none succeeded, till a Nair from the interior, by certain charms and spells, disentangled the poor woman from her venomous lover. The snake then crept back into the bushes whence it came, and the woman is now doing well. The above occurrence is now a general talk amongst the natives."

Such an occurrence, with whatever foundation, real or fancied, may throw some light upon the Jaina sculptures, as well as upon the stories current all over the world of serpent-husbands and serpent-wives, or deities assuming serpent-shape—"a dragon’s fiery form belied the god." Numberless kings and conquerors, besides Alexander, sprang from such ancestry, and the mythology and folk-lore on the subject are endless.

No. XVIII.—*Sepulchral Customs, existing and prehistoric.*

Mr. James Ferguson, in the Introductory Observations to his work *Rude Stone Monuments*, insists forcibly on the unprogressive character of savage tribes, even after long contact with the white man. They are everywhere dying out, and in all the civilized parts of Europe have long been exterminated by the progressive Aryan races, who have usurped their places. The stone implements they used, and the megalithic monuments they raised, remained, and are to-day objects of deep interest to their civilized successors, as the only clues to conjecturing their habits and history. As Mr. Ferguson remarks, it is infinitely more philosophical to reason from the known backwards; and if tribes should be discovered living in primeval wilderesses, where they may well have existed from unknown ages unchanged in habits, aloof from higher races, and if moreover amongst them monuments should be in use much resembling the vestiges of what must have been similar tribes in Europe, all such monuments and ceremonies and usages
connected with them must have a strong interest, as possibly throwing a faint light on the usages of prehistoric Europe. Elsewhere (p. 478) Mr. Ferguson has indicated the central plateau of India, especially the Nizâm’s dominions, as containing probably the solution of half the difficulties, ethnological or archaeological, that are now perplexing us; and it is on the north and east of that region, in the same ethnic area, that Colonel Dalton, in his *Ethnology of Bengal*, has described existing customs, which may easily have come down unchanged from stone-age periods. As his magnificent quarto, published by the Government of Bengal, is not generally accessible, a few extracts may be anthropologically and archaeologically interesting.

"On the death of a respectable Ho or Máná, a very substantial coffin is constructed and placed on fagots of firewood. The body, carefully washed and anointed with oil and turmeric, is reverently laid in the coffin, and all the clothes, ornaments, and agricultural implements that the deceased was in the habit of using are placed with it, and also any money that he had about him when he died. Then the lid of the coffin is put on, and fagots placed around and above it, and the whole is burnt. The cremation takes place in front of the deceased’s house. Next morning, water is thrown on the ashes, search made for bones, and a few of the larger fragments are carefully preserved, whilst the remainder, with the ashes, are buried. The selected bones are placed in a vessel of earthenware,—we may call it an urn,—and hung up in the apartment of the chief mourner,—generally the mother or widow,—that she may have them continually in view, and occasionally weep over them. Thus they remain till the very extensive arrangements necessary for their final disposal are effected. A large tombstone has to be procured, and it is sometimes so ponderous that the men of several villages are employed to move it; and some wealthy men, knowing that their successors may not have the same influence that they possess, select during their lifetime a suitable monument, and have it moved to a handy position to be used when they die. When required for use, it is brought to the family burial-place, which with the Hos is close to the houses, and near it a deep round hole is dug for the reception of the cinerary urn. When all is ready, a funeral party collect in front of the deceased’s house—three or four men with very deep-toned drums, and a group of about eight young girls. The chief mourner comes forth carrying the bones exposed on a decorated tray, and a procession is formed. The chief mourner, with the tray, leads; the girls form in two rows, those in front carry empty and partly broken pitchers and battered brass vessels; and the men with the drums bring up the rear. The procession advances with a very ghostly dancing movement, slow and solemn as a minute, in time to the beat of the deep-toned drums—not directly, but mysteriously gliding now right, now left, now marking time, all in the same mournful cadence—a sad march.

"The chief mourner carries the tray generally on her head, but at regular intervals she slowly lowers it, and, as she does so, the girls also gently lower and reverse the pitchers and brass vessels, and looking up for the moment with eyes full of tears, they seem to say, ‘Ah! see! they are empty.’"

In this manner the remains are taken to the house of every friend and relative of the deceased within a circle of a few miles, and to every house in the village; and, as the procession approaches each habitation in the weird-like manner described, the inmates all come out, and the tray having been placed on the ground at their door they kneel over it and mourn, shedding tears on the remains, as their last tribute of affection to their deceased friend. The bones are thus also conveyed to all his favourite haunts, to the fields he cultivated, to the grove he planted, to the tank he excavated, to the threshing-floor where he worked with his people, to the akhôra or dancing arena where he made merry with them, and each spot which is hallowed with reminiscences of the deceased. When this part of the ceremony is completed, the procession returns to the village, and, slowly circling round the great stone slab, gradually approaches its goal. At last it stops; a quantity of rice, cooked and uncooked, and other food, is now cast into the grave, and the charred fragments of bone, transferred from the tray to a new earthen vessel, placed over it. The hole is then filled up and covered with the large slab, which, however, does not rest on the ground, but on smaller stones, which raise it a little. One such slab over the grave of the wife of the head-man of the village of Pokuria measured 17 feet 2 inches in length, its greatest

8 The Hos and Mándás, branches of the great Koí family, inhabit Singbhûm and the hilly tracts bordering on Chûtía Nágó. 9 Compare accounts of Toda funerals—*Ind. Ant.*, vol. III. pp. 55 and 274.
width was 9 feet 2 inches, and thickness from ten inches to a foot. Its weight was estimated at about six tons. This slab was procured in the bed of a river about three miles off. It was brought on a wagon constructed for the purpose, from three to four hundred men having been engaged in its transit.

Now here was a stone of truly megalithic proportions, placed over a sepulchral urn, just in the same way as so frequently occurs in the British Islands, Northern and Southern Europe, Northern Africa, Western Asia, and Southern India. In all those regions, however, such monuments are ascribed to prehistoric peoples and periods of which nothing certain is known; but in the wilds of Central India we find them used to-day, with rites nothing inconsistent with what may have prevailed in megalithic periods, by tribes who may in all probability have changed but little since those times, with which these tribes, rites, and monuments may quite possibly display an unbroken thread of connection. Neither does it seem too strained an inference that the urn-covering megaliths in Britain may have been procured and placed in a manner, and with ceremonies, nearly resembling those we hear of prevailing to-day in the most primitive region of the oldest country of Asia.7

In addition to the slabs on the tomb, Colonel Dalton reports that “a megalithic monument is set up to the memory of the deceased in some conspicuous spot outside the village. The pillars vary in height from 5 or 6 to 15 feet, and apparently fragments of rock of the most fantastic shape are most favoured. Close to the station of Chaibasa, on the road to Keonghar, may be seen a group of cenotaphs of unusual size—one 11 feet 2 inches, another 13 feet, and a third 14 feet above the earth, and many others of smaller dimensions. The groups of such stones that have come under my observation in the Munda and Ho country are always in line. The circular arrangement so common elsewhere I have not seen.”

Colonel Dalton gives a sketch by Mr. Ball, of the Geological Survey of India, of a group of four such memorial stones at Pokuria, near Chaibasa. They are almost grotesque in appearance, the highest 8 feet 4 inches above ground; the first in the group is to the memory of Khundapater, the father of Paseng, the present muki (head-man) of Pokuria; the next two are to the memory of Kanchi and Samaria, young daughters of the muki, and the last in memory of his son. This practice of erecting memorial stones may throw some light on the origin of Menhirs and stone-worship: for it is easy to imagine how worship might come to be paid to the memorial stone of a famous man; and indeed one of the very wildest of these jungle tribes, the Kharrias, are described as “setting up in the immediate vicinity of their houses tall rough slabs of stone, and to these, as representing the deceased, they make daily oblations.”

Colonel Dalton also reports another prehistoric practice prevailing amongst the Aборs on the Dibong river, in the valley of the Brahmaputra, on the N.E. frontier of India, which European antiquaries will at once recognize as the contracted form of burial:—“The rugged rocky soil on which their villages are built has probably originated a unique custom of sepulture, by which very small graves are required. The dead are trussed up so that the chin rests on the knees, and are placed in the small chamber prepared for them, in a sitting posture.” Could the desire to save labour, to which Colonel Dalton ascribes this now existing custom, have had any weight in determining the contracted posture and small cists of prehistoric interments in Europe? It is noteworthy that the anti-Brahmanical sect known as Jangams, Vira Saivas, or Liigavants, also bury their dead in a sitting attitude. This is noticed by the Roman knight and traveller Pietro della Valle, who, when at the court of Venkatapa Nayik at Ikkere, writes, under date November 13th, 1623,—“Returning home I met a corpse going to be burned without the city, with drums sounding before it. It was carried sitting in a chair, whereunto it was tied that it might not fall, clothed in its ordinary attire, exactly as if it had been stone placed over it. Then all must bathe. The money that was placed in the mouth of the corpse, and saved from the ashes, is the fee of the musicians. The person who carried the bones to the grave has to undergo purification by incense and the sprinkling of water.”

7 Elsewhere Col. Dalton describes similar customs prevailing amongst the Orkons or Dhangars of Chotia Nagpur, Singbhum, and Sambalpore. After burning the dead, the fragments of bones are collected and placed in an urn. “The burial-ground is always near a river, stream, or tank. As the procession proceeds with music to this place, offerings of rice are continually thrown over the cinerary urn till it is deposited in the grave prepared for it, and a large flat

* Figured in Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 292, with account by Mr. Ball.
The seat was covered behind and on the sides with red and other colours. It was open only before, and there the dead person was to be seen. All dead persons are carried thus, as well as are buried (as the Lingavami, whom they also put into the earth sitting) as those that are burned." Pietro della Valle is the first European who mentions the Jangams. At Ikeri, he says, "I saw also certain Indian Friars, whom in their language they call Giangama, and perhaps are the same with the sages seen by me elsewhere; but they have wives, and go with their faces smeared with ashes, yet not naked, but clad in certain extravagant habits, and a kind of hood or cowl upon their heads of dyed linen of that colour which is generally used amongst them, namely, a reddish brick-colour, with many bracelets upon their arms and legs, filled with something within that makes a jangling as they walk. I saw many persons come to kiss their feet, and whilst such persons were kissing them, and, for more reverence, touching their feet with their foreheads, these Giangamas stood firm with a seeming severity, and without taking notice of it, as if they had been abstracted from the things of the world: just," he adds quaintly, "as our Friars use to do when any devout persons come out of reverence to kiss their habit, but with hypocrisy conformable to their superstitious religion." Whether the good knight meant to include both sorts of friars in 'their' does not seem clear. He also says that the king, Venkatapapa Nayeaka, wasa "Giangamo." So was the last Raja of Kurg, the Raja of Sudda, in Kanara, and the Raja of Punganur, near Chittur. In the days of Haidar Ali, Nanda Raja, ruler of Mysore, was a Lângavant, and the late Raja of Mysore is stated to have worn the liiga and also the Brâhmaâcal thread.

HISTORY OF THE KÂNPÂTÂS OF KACHH.

BY DALPATRÂM PRÂNJIVAN KHAKHAR, EDUCATIONAL INSPECTOR, KACHH.

The origin and history of the Kânphâtâs of this province is shrouded, like the origin and history of similar old orders of many countries, in fabulous accounts, specially invented to impose upon the credulity of the ignorant, with a view to inspire them with awe and reverence. However cautious the inventor of the legend may have been in placing the origin of these Kânphâtâs at a very remote period, and in ascribing to the founder of the sect the miraculous power of turning the sea between Kachh and Sindh into the present Râp, human imperfection has left its mark, to enable the present generation to fix the probable time of the origin of these, in this country at least. The history of the Kânphâtâs of Dhinodhar is traced to Dharmarnâtha, who is said to have been one of the twenty-two disciples of Machhandranâtha, or Masteyendranâtha, among whom was Gorakhnâtha, one of the most celebrated of the nine Nâths, or ascetics of ancient India, and about whose austerity, miracles, and resignation of the world almost every Hindu in India is well acquainted, on account of the interesting stories sung about him by the stray musician.

The genealogy of Machhendranâtha is given as under:—

1 Niranjan Nirakar. 5 Achetnâtha.
2 Adhika Somanâtha. 6 Âdinâtha.
3 Chet Somanâtha. 7 Machhendranâtha.
4 Omkâranâtha.

This Machhendrâ travelled through the world, and visited many holy places, and made a host of disciples. Among these was Gorkhanâtha, who surpassed his guru, or adopted father, in meritorious deeds. He is venerated throughout Hindustân, and there are many religious places where temples are dedicated to him. In Káthrôvâd there is a small temple called Gorak-Madhâ, where he is worshipped; but the chief place of his worship are in Gorakhapura near Haridwâr, in Nepal, and in the Panjab. He is the eponymous deity of the Gorkhâs, or people of Görkhâ, in Nepal.

He came to Kachh also, where there is a well near Dhâmâdâkâ, called after his name. He is said to be chiranjivi, i.e. 'ever-living.'

The word Kânphâtâ comes from kâm, 'the

History of Nepal, pp. 140-152, where a legend of Padma-pâpi-Âryâvalokiteśvara-Masteyendranâtha is given; Hodgson's Essays (Tribner's reprint), ii. p. 40—80.
ear,' and phāta, 'to slit,' thus signifying 'a person having his ears slit.' At what time and by whom the practice of slitting the ears was introduced is not known; but most of them declare that they do it after Śiva, whose followers as Yogīs they are.

Dhārmanātha is said to have come from Peshāvar to Kāthiāwār, and thence to Kachh, in search of a secluded place to perform tap or penance. He had with him a Śādhaka (or helping friend) named Sarannātha, and a disciple named Garībnātha. Another account gives the name of the latter only. He selected Ryāṅ, on the eastern bank of the river Rukhmāvati, about two miles north of the present town of Māṇḍavī, where, according to one account, there reigned a chief named Gadhesing, the father of the celebrated Vikrama of Ujjayainī, and according to another account one Rāmadeva, of the tribe of Chāvadā Rājputas. The former is an invention of the people, wherever old coins bearing the device resembling an ass are found; while the latter is more probable, as there appear to have been many small principalities of the Chāvadās about the time the ancestors of the present Jhādegjas entered the province as adventurers, and even subsequently. This is corroborated by the Bhāks, who are said to possess some rude poetical compositions on the subject.

Having selected an unbragious tree, as is the case with the people of his order, at some distance from the palace of the Chief, Dharmanātha made his Ḍhunī or fire, and began to perform his penance, at the same time ordering Garībnātha to go into the town with his jholi, or wallet, for alms; but the latter found the people so impious and hard-hearted as not to give him any countenance. There was only one woman, of the carpenter caste, who gave him a cake of bread. He had, therefore, recourse to fetching wood from the neighbouring forests and selling it in the town. From the proceeds of this he purchased corn and took it to the old woman, who prepared bread from it, and, adding to it a cake of her own, gave them to him without taking any remuneration. These he took to Dhundhālmall,

to which Dharmānātha had changed his name, and both partook of the frugal meal. They passed twelve years in this manner, Dharmānātha believing all the while in the charitable character of the people. After the penance was over, one day Garībnātha was asleep, covered, as usual, with a cloth, to hide an ulcer made by the constant lifting of bundles of wood. The wind blew off the cover, and Dharmānātha, who happened to see it, was mortified to learn, after much persistence, the cause of the ulcer, in which maggots had begun to appear. He was all wrath, and resolved to test personally the inhospitable and impious character of the people. He found that none but the old woman would give any charitable contribution. He determined to overthrow the whole town, and bury the people in the ruins. He advised the woman to leave the town, with all that she valued. Garībnātha remonstrated with him, as the loss of so many lives would bring upon him those very sins which he had tried to wash away by penance. Dharmānātha upheved his patta, or alms-shell, and pronounced the curse "Paṭṭan sab daṭṭan!"—"Be buried all the Paṭṭan cities!" when all the eighty-four Paṭṭans sank underground, with all the people and valuables except the woman. On the ruins is the present village of Choṭā Ryāṅ, repopulated in the time of the first Rāco, and given in charity to Chāran Bāgarimal, whose descendants enjoy it to this day. For about two miles brick foundations of buildings, jars, instruments, &c. have been discovered, and I myself have purchased some old copper and silver coins found in the fields. This same story is told of all the ruined cities in Kachh and Gujarāt; but the destruction may have been caused by some violent earthquake, and, as Paṭṭan was a seaport town, the people must have removed themselves to the present site of Māṇḍavī when they found that the sea had receded on account of the rising of the land.

Dharmānātha appears to have repented of his rash deed, and resolved to perform a second tap or penance. With this view he proceeded to a hill, which could not bear the weight of his sins, and was thence called Nenāu (नन्दी meaning 'weighed down'). Then he called jhert nārījara. It must be the fruit of a kind of palm.

The town of Māṇḍavī was founded by Rāco Khengīri through a Bhāktī named Topān on the 11th of the month of Māgha, Sāvatī 1886. Before this there were some fishermens huts on the site.
repaired to another hill, which broke down with his weight,—hence called Jhurgo (झुर्गो) = 'broke'). At last he came to a third hill, which could bear his weight provided he ascended it with his back turned towards it. He did so, and as the hill bore the weight of his sins he called it Dhinodhar (i.e. holder of दीनोधरा = dhurā, or 'patience'). He went to the highest peak and began to perform tap standing on his head, that rested on a conical ball of hard stone called Vajra Sopārī. He continued in this state for twelve years, during which time Garibnātha and a Chāran woman called Deva remained beside him, the latter supplying him with milk and ministering to his other wants. When the period of his penance was drawing to a close, the throne of Indra began to shake, and he was alarmed. He went to Bhagavān, who counselled him to devise means to stop his tap. Thereupon Bhagavān himself, the nine Nāṭhas, and the eighty-four Siddhas assembled together and alighted on the hill. They praised the austerity of his penance and besought him to rise, when he said that in whichever direction his eyes would open, that portion of the country would be burnt. Then Gorakhnātha, one of the nine Nāthas, after consulting the others, told him to open his eyes towards the sea on the north-east. Upon this he turned towards the sea and opened his eyes, when the sea was dried up and all the animals therein destroyed, leaving nothing else but the present Ṛṣi. When so many lives began to be destroyed, Dharmānātha declared he was losing the merit of his penance, whereupon Gorakhanātha asked him to turn his eyes towards his foot, but instead of doing so he turned them to the hill, which split into two valleys, leaving the part obstructed by the nose entire in the shape of the nose, by which name it is known at the present day.

Then Dharmanātha, with the Nāthas and Siddhas, descended. While doing so they proposed to have a treat of bhog (infusion of Cannabis indica), but no water was to be had about the hill, when one of them, Pīr Paṭhā (Gopīchand), brought out water by striking his kunārī or dagger into the side of the hill, and prepared the ‘green beverage.’ The hole was shown to me by my secerone, but the water does not come out till a stick is thrust into it. The stick, which is a rude branch of a tree, has a knob at the end, which brings out the water, of which there must be a reservoir the level of which must always remain a little below the hole. Those who ascend the hill can find water on their return only when they come to this place. The water is rather brackish, being impregnated with salts. They then came to another place, where all the Siddhas combined got water out miraculously, and called it the Siddh-Vīḍī (सिद्धवीडी), or ‘saints’ pool.’ It is said never to fail, and is held in great reverence; but when I visited it there was no water. My guide looked surprised, and ascribed this to its having been polluted by a low-caste person. The Pīr, he said, would come there and burn incense to the Dādā or Father Dharmānātha, who would refill it. Thence they came to the foot of the eastern side of the hill, which they selected as the spot for the present establishments. The Nāthas and Siddhas departed, and Dharmānātha made his dharā or fire, built the monastery and established the Order of the Kānphāṭās, and commenced that charitable distribution of food the refusal of which had caused the destruction of the Pāṭtāns. Then he went away, no one knows where. He is even said to be still living. Garihνātha, thinking that some share of the sin of destroying the Pāṭtāns must fall to his lot, determined to perform penance by standing for twelve years in Bhandi, 18 miles west of Bhuj, in a jungle, which is even at the present day very thick and mountainous. At this time the Jāts were powerful near the hill of Vārā. The children of the Jāt harassed the ascetic and disturbed his penance by pelting him with mango-stones. Being incensed, he went in search of some warrior tribe to expel these marauders, when, fortunately, the ancestors of the present Khādje had just entered the province and were trying to establish their authority. According to one account, Jām Rayadhān, the son of Lakhā Khāṭī, who was reigning in the small principality of Lakhār Vīrā, went to seek his blessing, when he encouraged him by his benediction to expel the Jāts out of the province, and in this the Jām was successful. This Rayadhān flourished between Sāyavat 1291 and 1271 (AD. 1175-1215), and there is a complect on the subject in the Kachchh language:—

मारवा ग्राम नापा भारतीय भाषा विभिन्न राजस्व के राज.
i.e. "Solemn Garibnath gave utterance through the mouth, and, expelling the treacherous Jata, gave dominion to Rāyadhan."

Another account places him in the time of Jām Hamirji, the father of the founder of Bhuji, who flourished in Śaṅvat 1598-1580 (≈ A.D. 1472-1534). At this time Hamirji was reigning at Lakhrū Virā, not far from Bhadil, and his brother Ajoji at Bārā, near Terā. The fame of Garībnātha had excited these pradakṣa chieftains to obtain from him some benediction to extend their dominions. Ajoji used to minister to the wants of the ascetic, and served him regularly. One day the latter, being pleased with his devotion, ordered him to bring a can of milk early in the morning for his benediction. This a langhā or musician of Hamirji’s happened to hear, and at once reported it to his master, who came to the ascetic early in the morning with the milk. The ascetic, taking him for Ajoji, accosted him as the ‘Lord of Kachh.’ Subsequently came Ajoji with the milk, when the deceit was discovered, but it was too late, as Garībnātha’s words could not be changed; but he said that Hamirji had practised deceit and he should have deceit in exchange, and his posterity would not be able to rule the province peaceably without the aid of his Bhāyāda. These have reference to the murder of Hamirji by Rāval Jām, and to the privilege of the Bhāyāda to sit in the Jhādaya Court. This latter tradition is generally believed, and is corroborated by many facts. Even at the present day the descendants of Ajoji, who enjoy the village of Khedoi, relate the deceit played by Hamirji. Hamirji began to reign at Lakhrū Virā in Śaṅvat 1523 (≈ A.D. 1472), and he could not have received benediction earlier than 1500. Therefore the time of the penance of Garībnātha being deducted, we come to Śaṅvat 1438 (≈ A.D. 1432), the time when the dhāvā and the present establishment at Dhunodhar were first instituted. After this Garībnātha is said to have buried himself alive in a standing posture up to the crown of his head at Bhadil, where is a small temple which was rebuilt recently. What they call his skull is daubed with red lead and ghū, and worshipped at the present day. The temple has no inscription on it. Considering that ascetics live long lives on account of their temperate habits, the time of the destruction of Rāyā could not be earlier than 1450. Dharmānātha, then, must have come to Kachh about Śaṅvat 1438, and not in Śaṅvat 790 as found from the Pir’s genealogy, but he went away after laying the foundation of the present Order. He himself belonged to the sect of Saṅtanathā, whose places of worship are in Nepal and in the Panjāb. After the penance he desired the Chāran Devāl to ask for a reward. She said she was childless; would he be gracious enough to bless her with a son? This he said was not in her lot; when she replied that his word as well as her devoted services were equally lost. On this he said himself would be born to her from a blister on the palm of her hand, but that she should never think of marrying him. He was afterwards born, and became the celebrated Rāval Pir, who is worshipped in a temple on the coast three miles east of Manḍavi.

Garībnātha obtained as a reward the villages of Bhadil, Thariūdo, Kotdā, &c., together with some impose on the neighbouring villages, from the Jhādaya, which his descendants enjoy at the present day. He had two disciples named Ornāṭha and Panthanāṭha. The former, becoming a Siddhā (defined), has a separate temple in the monastery of Dharmānātha; while the latter had a disciple named Bhikharinātha, who was highly revered by Rāo Khengāriji, who installed him as the first Pir in Śaṅvat 1545, on his agreeing to leave his wandering habits and to settle in one place. He also promised to give him a village, but both died soon after. He was succeeded by Frbhānāthā, who obtained the village of Rāyā, in Śaṅvat 1665, as a grant. The village has a temple built by Rāo Bhārmalji, in which I found the following inscription—

śaṅvat 1512 न रण वाकात तु १५ पीर भी
भिखारिनाथ पीर हुष्म शिरीष्यानां वेला पीर भी
शिल्पवानं बेला पीर परमाजन्यः ततो हरसेरानवतं पीर भाव
गाय आ भार भरत राजसी बेलान्ह भूत राजसी
भारताः पार भार भक्षणे गाय राजस्व भरतज
गुप्त भीमसेनचन्द्रं व भे पार भरसेज्जानीचं बेलान्ह
मिठामहं गाय तर्काम भूत गदेस्व भे सुधारे अग्नि
गाय करं तेजस गरीनाथयां भवानस्तरं पार राजसी
भीमसेनचन्द्रं भे दे. भार भरसेज्जानीचं बेलान्ह भे
राजसी भीमसेनचन्द्रं भे. आहेत भे भीमसेनचं बेलान्ह
भे राजसी भीमसेनचं भे.

He is said to have also peopled the village of Angio, which they enjoy at present. The present Pir, Hanjanāthā, the 25th in descent, was
installed in Saivat 1920 by His Highness the late Rāo Prāgmalji.

The hill of Dhinodhar is situated in the thickest jungle, and surrounded by a tract of country inhabited by pastoral tribes, who are generally very poor. At the foot are situated a number of buildings intended for the residence of the Pir and of disciples, who have always been assigned to them some duties. Among these buildings is a small rudely built and domed temple dedicated to Dharmānātha, on a raised platform facing the east. It is about seven feet square, and its walls are as many feet high. In the temple itself is a marbled image of Dharmānātha, three feet high, with the darāṇa or rings of the sect in the ears. There are, besides, small lingas of Śiva and images of gods, either of brass or stone. A lamp fed with ghī is said to have been first lighted by Dharmānātha, and to have been kept constantly burning ever since. A man is appointed to make the puja twice every day, in the morning and evening; who, after washing the images and offering rice, flowers, or leaves, burns incense mixed with ghī, and then waves the aarti or light amidst the sounds of bell, gong, and drum, and after prostrating himself several times he retires.

In another part is a large pandāl in which is the dhuni, kept constantly burning since it was first lighted by Dharmānātha. It is fed with large logs of wood, for which a man is specially kept. There are, besides, four very large cauldrons placed on hearths, each capable of cooking a khapāl of food. On ordinary days these are worshipped, but on Gokalasānti and Nava-rātri days, which are held sacred, more wood is thrown into the dhuni, and rice and lālpī (a dish of wheatflour sweetened with sugar) are cooked in these cauldrons, which never fail for the people who assemble on those days.

There are, besides, several temples as saṅgāls or tombs of the Pir, but without any inscription, in the monastery, which is enclosed with a high wall with turrets.

On the highest peak, which is 1263 feet, is the temple of Dharmānātha, on the spot where he is said to have done penance. It was built by Brahma Kachari Shri Sundarji Śivraj.

in Saivat 1877 (A.D. 1821), after the great earthquake. The materials used are limestone and mud, with a plaster of chunam. It faces the east. It is 6 feet high and 5¾ feet square, with a Muhammadan dome. The entrance is only 4½ feet high and 2 feet wide, and has no door. The wall is only a foot in thickness. In the temple is a triangular concave stone, in the cavity of which Dharmānātha is said to have rested his head at the time of the penance. It is daubed with red lead and ghī. Near it is a small stone fixed as a pālīgā. Outside the temple is the original dhuni, which is lighted for three days in the month of Bhadrapada, when the Pir resorts thither for the annual pujā, and people from the surrounding villages assemble to do homage. Those who cannot come or ascend the hill satisfy themselves by looking at the fire of the dhuni, which can be seen from villages several miles round. I saw that the temple was cracked in several places, and in a state of dilapidation; and on my questioning the Pir about repairing it, he said it was very difficult to get water there, on account of the difficulty of access. He said Sundarji, a very rich and great man, could do it, but he himself, though possessed of twelve villages, was unable to defray the expense of the repairs, unless copious rains were sent by the Dādā (‘Father’ Dharmānātha). The peak commands a beautiful view of the surrounding country up to the opposite shore of the Raś. It is composed of basalt, limestone, and sandstone.

Their tenets appear to be those of the Yoga-Sāstra, or the abstract devotion practised by the Yogis of the Nātha sect, and in which Dharmānātha and Garibnātha were well versed; but the Pir of Dhinodhar, except the first two or three, were ignorant of their tenets. They themselves, being generally converts from the shepherd tribes, are quite illiterate and ignorant, and know nothing but the name of the Dādā. They worship Śiva and follow the ritual of the Māth, whose stotra the Pir repeats on the 2nd of every month. They are celibates, and allow no woman to enter their precincts. I could find no works like those of the Nāthas of the north and the Dekhan.

Formerly Meghās or Dheals were admitted, and one of their Piras, Meghnātha, was of this caste. The Yogis are therefore regarded as very low, though the practice of adopting Meghās has long since been discontinued.

written by them. Their great aim appears originally to have been to feed suffering humanity, to whatever caste or creed the persons might belong, and for which they had obtained from the former Râos and others villages and lands. In this respect they resemble the order of St. Bernard in Europe, and are regular hospitaliers. But after obtaining the grants they gradually lost their character as disinterested Yogâs, and brought upon themselves, as it were, the very worldly cares they had renounced. They began to lend money at interest, perhaps originally with the object of relieving the distressed by the accommodation; but at present I found the Pîr involved in managing the estates, collecting revenues, litigating about boundary disputes, and collecting outstandings, which are quite incompatible with the doctrine of the Yoga. I noticed, however, one feature in the order of Dhinodhar which is wanting in all the others in Kachch. The Pîr is a chaste man, and enforces celibacy with strictness among his disciples, by prohibiting any female from entering the precincts of the monastery.

In the large hall of the residence recipients of charity are twice fed, the low castes and Muhammadans being served in the compound. The food consists of bâjri (millet) bread and khîchdi of bâjri and matâ (Phaseolus aconitifolius). I saw the Pîr himself serving ghûh with a ladle of a two-pice measure. Those who cannot partake of the cooked food receive it uncooked. Besides the members of the establishment, I saw about twenty-five persons from the surrounding villages, and stray travellers, answering to the call for dinner, which is loudly made twice a day by a man from an eminence. In times of drought and famine the number increases to three hundred. Besides the food, the Pîr, who always sits with a copper canister of opium, treats them to a few grains of it, according to their wants. I saw one paralytic, and another lame, who had sought shelter in the asylum.

The method of adopting disciples is very simple, as may be expected from their general ignorance. Persons of indolent habits, or afflicted with domestic calamities, generally become Yogâs at an advanced age, but parents unable to support their children give their young boys to the Pîr. Orphans also are received. Before giving him his name he is called Oghad, or novice, and his conduct is watched for eight months. His Gurû, or spiritual guide, makes him wear while a novice a black shed, or sacred thread of wool with Rudra knot, corresponding to the Yajnopavita of the Brâhmaṇ, round his neck, with a two-inch horn called Sringi-naḍâ, or bugle. Through this bugle he is made to say Oahâra, Upadeśa, and Adhâsa, which he has afterwards to repeat twice every day at dinner, before the god and the Gurû. In fact it is a form of salutation to the superior. If after the appointed period his conduct is found satisfactory, he is taken before the god Bhaïrava, where a brother slits the cartilage of the ears, in which circular plate-like rings of agate, glass, or horn, called darâna, are suspended. After the ears are cured by thrusting in a nimb stick, dressing with nimb oil, his head, beard, and moustaches are shaved, never to be worn again. The Gurû then whispers in his ear the Upadeśa mantra, or mystic instruction:—”Be wise, perform religious duties, and keep yourself prompt in the service of the Gurû.” Now he becomes a Yogi, and has a name terminating in Nâtha. He spends his life in repeating the name of the Dāda, serving his Gurû, and doing the duty assigned to him. The disciple is the adopted son of the Gurû, and he succeeds his father on his death. The Yogi is buried, and on the twelfth day after his death a feast is given and alms distributed by the son.

The Pîr cannot wear an anuparaakha, or coat, but he throws over his body a red shawl or brick-coloured scarf, has a turban of gold-bordered blue silk, with a shed, and a bâîsõta with a white diguji over the loins. He cannot put on leather shoes, but walks in chakkhi or wooden shoes. This dress is given to him by the Râo at the time of his accession to the Pirship. He also wears a number of gold ornaments of great value, but of rude old fashion. His darsiâna, or earrings, are covered with gold in which precious stones are set. He is highly respected by the people, and even by the Râo, who first pays a visit to his place (where the Pîr has the privilege of retaining his seat) before the latter comes to him. The dress of the others is simple, and dyed with ochre, but now it appears to be going out of fashion. There are about fifty Yogâs in Dhinodhar.

The head of the sect of Dhinodhar is called the Pîr, while the heads of the branches
are called Áyana. There are three such branches—the Áyana of Bāladdhī, which is next in importance to Dhīnoddhar, the Áyana of Arā, and the Áyana of Māthāl. The Pīr of Śivār Maṇḍapa, in Bhuj, is separate. The last place was built by Rāo Desalji the elder in Sāvat 1800, and given to a Yogi of Dhīnoddhar; while the others have received their villages from Dhīnoddhar on their separation. The Yogi of Dhīnoddhar was expelled the monastery of Śivār Maṇḍapa, which was given to charge of Shevānātha, a Yogi from Shrīngar, who was installed as Pīr and given a village. These also, like the Yogis of Dharmanātha, are of the Sāntanātha sect, but are Śkiṣias and worship the horse image of Naklank. They do not have intercourse with the Yogis of Dhīnoddhar, whom they consider low, but keep it with the Āṭṭīs. The annual income of Dhīnoddhar is about 50,000 köras. There is one monastery of Dharmanātha in Jodhpur, in Mārward, held in high honour by the Maharāja of that place. It was established through the influence of a Pīr from Bhuj who had been there.

The only other monastery of Kānpāṭhas in Kachch is that of Kanhāḍānātha of Manpharo. Their origin is from Kanhāḍānātha, who was residing in Kanhāḍa at with his dhāunta about Sāvat 900. About this time Moḍ and Manāi had come into Kachch, after killing their brother Unāḍ in Sindha. Moḍ had tried to build a fortress on the hill of Kanhāḍa, but it was thrown down by Kanhāḍānātha on his being asked to remove his dhūnā from that part of the foundation which crossed it. On the death of Moḍ his son Sād appeared the wrath of the Nātha, and built the fortress and called it Kanhāḍa, from the Yogi. He also built a large temple and dedicated it to him, which was destroyed by the great earthquake, and replaced by a small but beautiful temple. Kanhāḍānātha’s descendants used to tend herds of cattle wandering about the hills, which abound in grass. Generally their seaṇḍha was near a well called Manphario.

The present village of Manpharo was founded by Ude-Kanṭh. The land was given to him by Rāo Bhārmalji in Sāvat 1708-7 (A.D. 1649). When he was passing by their seaṇḍha, the Nātha invited him to dinner, and miraculously fed the whole army from a small dish. On this the Rāo installed him as a Pīr, and gave him the land about the well Manphario for the expense of the establishment.

The Pīr removed the monastery from Kanhāḍa at to this place, and began to feed travellers and other needy persons. The monks resemble in their peculiarities, manners, and customs those of Dhīnoddhar. They call each member a Kanhāḍa, instead of Nātha; they are selected from Rājpūts, Ahers, &c. They worship Kanhāḍa, and repeat his name with a rosary. They also worship Gāpēṣa, and are called Gāpēṣa uṇāṣi. They are sworn to celibacy, but their morality is depraved. Their chief temple is at Kanhāḍa, where one of the members worships Kanhāḍānātha’s image of marble, which sits cross-legged, twice a day. Once these Kānpāṭhas were very powerful in Kachch. Besides Kanhāḍa and Dhīnoddhar they had the monasteries of Kotesar, and Aje pāl in Ānjār, in their possession. They caught Āṭṭīs and other Sāddha coming on pilgrimage and forcibly slit their ears. But they were afterwards conquered by the Āṭṭīs from Junāgaḍh, about three hundred years ago, who took possession of their monasteries of Kotesar from Ringanapāṭha, and of Aje pāl from the Nāthas of the Rāval sect, which have remained in their hands ever since. Their influence declined from that time.

MISCELLANEA.

AN ADDITIONAL NOTE ON HASTAKAVAPRA—ASTAKAMPRON.

The letter of Major J. W. Watson regarding the identification of Hastakavapra, of Hastakavapra, with the modern Hāṭhāb, published in Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 314, imposes upon me the duty of saying a word on the subject. In fact, I ought to have apologized to Major Watson long ago for having omitted to mention that the identification both of Hastakavapra and of Kuṭkaṭa is not my property. I should have done so at once if I had not been convinced that my learned friend is fully aware that the omission of his name was due to no other cause than careless-

* A temporary residence made of rushes and leaves near watering-places.
In now performing this pratyschitta, I beg to add a few remarks which, I think, tend to strengthen Colonel Yule's important identification of Hastakavapra with Astakampron.

Major J. W. Watson has suggested in his note (l.c.) that Ḥatḥāb once must have been an important harbour, and have taken the place which Gundi-Koliak held during the Middle Ages. I am now able to confirm this statement, and to prove that when the place belonged to the kingdom of Valabhi, it certainly was more than a small village. Both in the inscription of Dhrusasena I and in that of Dharasena II, it is asserted that certain villages were situated hastakavaprdharyayda or hastavapadharyayda, and I have explained these compounds to mean 'in the territorial division of Hastakavapra.' I have now to add that the name occurs in a third inscription, the grant of Dharasena IV., an abstract of which has been published by Prof. Bhandarkar — Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 45. There we read, instead of Hastavaprdhary, Hastavapadhara, and it is stated that the village of Yodhāvakā was included in it. Now three unpublished Valabhi grants, which have been discovered at Aliṇā, in the Khedā Zillā, show the word Khelábhādra, and mention three different Pathakas which formed parts of the Khelábhādra. Pathaka is known from Valabhi and Chaulukya plates to have had the meaning of 'a small territorial division,' and its modern representative pathē, as Mr. W. F. Sinclair informs me, still sometimes occurs in the same sense. If an dhāra contained several pathakas, it is clear that it must be a larger territorial division, and corresponds to our modern sīlī. It follows further from the variatio — Hastavaprdhara, that the word dharavati was a synonym of dhāra, and that the compound in the two older grants may be translated 'in the zillā of Hastavapra.' This being once established, it follows also that if a zillā was named after Hastavaprapra the place must have been of some importance—that, probably, it was not a village, but a town. For territorial divisions are invariably named after the town at which the time when the name was given was the most important in it, and the seat of the local government.2

This result agrees very well with Major Watson's theory that Ḥatḥāb originally was a harbour which took the place of Gundi-Koliak. It further makes Colonel Yule's identification also with Astakampron more plausible. For, if Hastakavapra during the first centuries of our era was a really important town and a port, it is not astonishing to find that the Greek traders knew it.

The other point to which I wish to call attention is the etymology of the two forms of the town's name. Both are compounds the last part of which is coṣpra, which means 'an embankment, an earth-wall, the steep bank of a river,' &c. The first part, Hasta or Hastaka, must be a proper noun. For it is a rule in Sanskrit that common nouns which are used as proper names may receive the determinative affix ka. Thus, if āśva, 'a horse,' is used as a proper noun, it may be either āśva or āśvaka. As hastā is a common noun, meaning 'the hand,' and as in the compound both hasta and hastaka occur, it may be safely concluded that it is used as a proper noun. Possibly the whole may mean 'the embankment of Hastaka,' or 'the steep bank on the Hastaka,' according as Hastaka is taken as the name of a man, a river, or a hill. Further investigations regarding traditions or legends current at Ḥatḥāb will probably furnish certainty on this point. The Greek word Astakampron, I think, is not derived immediately from the Sanskrit name of the place, but from an intermediate Old Prākrit Hastakāmpa, which had been formed by the contraction of the syllables avā to d, and the insertion of a nasal, according to the habit of the Gujarāta. The loss of the initial h may be explained by the difficulty which Gujarātis have now, and probably had 1600 years ago, in pronouncing the spirants in its proper place.

The modern Ḥatḥāb, for which the lower castes, as Major Watson has informed me, use an older form, Ḥatḥāp, I take to be a corruption of the shorter Sanskrit name Hastakavapra.

G. Bühler.

MSS. OF THE MAHĀBHĀSHYĀ FROM KĀŚĪMIR.

We have already (vol. VI. pp. 224-224) given some interesting extracts from Dr. Bühler's Report of his Tour in search of Sanskrit MSS., and in vol. V. pp. 27-31 a general outline was given of the results; the following further extracts, however, will interest some of our readers —

"In the collection of grammatical MSS." says Dr. Bühler, "those belonging to Pāṇini's school take the precedence. Among the latter the Vyākaraṇaḥpaddhatī (two MSS.) bears the most
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ancient name. The Kaśmirian pandits are unanimous in declaring it to be a production of the author of the *Sawigrahā*. But Dr. Kielhorn, to whom I submitted the book immediately after its discovery, tells me that he cannot discover in it any proof of great antiquity, and that it contains only the well-known *Parīkhyāsūtra*. He thinks it not unlikely that the title has been given to it because some pandit believed the *Parīkhyāsūtra* to belong to Vyāsā. I must leave the question to the decision of those Sanskritists who make the *Vatkaranasūtra* their speciality."

Three incomplete Sārada paper MSS. (one of I. 1. 103—2. 63, another I. 4—VI. 1) represent the meagre result of a long and laborious inquiry regarding *Patanjali*’s *Makbhadāhaka*, a work which for the present is, as it were, the corner-stone for the history of Sanskrit grammar and literature. As the controversy regarding the genuineness of our present text of the *Makbhadāhaka* had been going long before my visit to Kaśmir, I was particularly anxious to obtain a trustworthy and complete Kaśmirian MS. of the work, in order to ascertain if Kaśmir possessed a redaction different from the Indian one. When I began my inquiries the pandits told me that the *Bhāṣya* was not studied in Kaśmir, and that they knew only of two complete MSS. of the work. One of these belonged to Panḍit Kesāvāmā, and the other to the sons of the late Panḍit Sāheb. With some trouble I got a sight of both these copies, and found that they were Devarāghari MSS., brought from India. Kesāvāmā’s copy had been imported into the Valley by a pandit of Bāralmā who had resided for some time in Banāras. His heirs had sold it for one hundred Kaśmir rupees (of ten annas each) to its present owner. After this transfer had been effected, Panḍit Sāhebāmā also had found it necessary to procure a copy, and had finally obtained one from the Panjāb. Both these copies are new—not older than fifty or sixty years. They contain Kaśyapa’s *Pratīṣṭha* also. As soon as the origin of these two MSS. had been determined, I told my friends that I neither desired to acquire them nor to have them copied, and that they must hunt for Bāhūrja or old Sārada paper MSS. They grumbled a good deal, and complained of my unreasonableness. But gradually they produced the three MSS. which now belong to the collection. Each of the three is certainly more than a hundred years old, and most probably copied from old Bāhūrja MSS. I sent them, immediately after I received them, to Dr. Kielhorn, for compara-

...sion with his Indian MSS. He informs me that they do not differ materially from the latter. I think that this fact is not without importance for the question regarding the genuineness of the text of the *Makbhadāhaka*, though it is desirable that it should be confirmed by the discovery and collation of an old Bāhūrja MS. Just when I left Kaśmir I heard that such a MS. had been found in the library of an ignorer Bāhūrja, who believed it to be a MS. of the *Kathāsaritarāgya*, and used it, as is frequently done with MSS. of that work, for purposes of divination. 6 Efforts have been made to obtain the book, but hitherto without success.

"In connection with the subject of the *Makbhadāhaka* I may also state that I have examined with particular care in all accessible MSS. of the *Rājatarangini* the verse I. 176, which refers to its introduction into Kaśmir. Most MSS. read *chandaricaryāntādbhāta labhāt dādītaṁ tadājananā pravartayitā prabhadāhakānā suvarcita vyākaraṇā dhātām*. But some, and among them Kesāvāmā’s *codes archetypus*, read *prānāt maṁ labhavīśasā tamanītā, &c.* I think that this is the original but corrupt reading of the MS., and that the vulgarites dādītaṁ ātman never can be purely conjectural. The Kaśmirians felt, and now feel, that the reading labhāt dādītaṁ never did readily give any sense. The attempt to restore the passage by writing dādītaṁ tamanītā is, in my opinion, not a happy one. I accept Dr. Kielhorn’s emendation, dādītāvādītā, as the most probable, both on account of the analogy of the passage in the *Vākyapadṛga* and on account of *Rājat. IV. 487*, where dādītāvādītā actually occurs. As to the translation of the word *dāvman* I think with Dr. Kielhorn that it means ‘the tradition’ or ‘the traditional interpretation’ of the dhātra. I have consulted the most learned grammarians in Banāras, Indor, and other parts of India on this point. All unanimously declare that *dāvman* must be taken in the sense for which Dr. Kielhorn contends, and some even go so far as to deny the possibility that *dāvman* can ever mean *grathā*. Though they are undoubtedly correct as far as the usage of the *Vaiṣyākaraṇa* is concerned, and *dāvman* is not used in the sense of a grammatical work, still their assertion goes too far. For the Jainas speak of their forty-five *dāvman* or sacred works, and the Sāiras recognize the authority of eighteen *dāvman*. In these two cases the word is certainly used as a synonym of *grathā*, and is frequently, by *lakṣyāh*, applied to designate MSS. As may be inferred from these remarks, I stand on the side of those who are..."
disposed, until the very strongest proofs to the
contrary are adduced; to consider the present text
of the Mahābhāṣya to be genuine.

"My search for copies of Kāiyaṭa's Pradīpa
were attended with still scantier results than the
inquiry regarding the Mahābhāṣya. One MS.
(No. 306) of 99 folios of 20 lines each contains
a very small portion of the Nāsadhikī. The
MS dates, I think, from the same time as the
pieces of the Bhāṣya. The Kaśmirians tell an
anecdote regarding Kāiyaṭa, which is perhaps
worth mentioning. Kāiyaṭa was, they say, an
inhabitant of one of the smaller towns of the
Valley,—according to some of Pāmpūr, according
to others of Yečgām. He lived in great poverty,
and entirely gave himself up to the study of
the Mahābhāṣya and of grammar. In this bhaṇṭa
he acquired so great a proficiency that last he
could explain the whole Bhāṣya to his pupils
without looking at a MS, and he understood
even those passages which Vararuci (2) had
marked by kuvālās (O) as unintelligible. Once a
foreign paṇḍit from Southern India, named
according to one authority Kṛishṇambhaṭa,
came into Kaśmir and went to see Kāiyaṭa at
his home. He found him sitting before his house
engaged in manual labour, and explaining at the
same time to his pupils the most difficult portions
of the Bhāṣya from memory. Amazed at the
paṇḍita's great learning and his abject condition,
the foreigner hastened to the king of Kaśmir and
obtained from him a dāsana granting to Kāiyaṭa
a village and an allowance of grain. But when he
brought the deed to the paṇḍita the latter
steadfastly refused to accept the gift, because he
considered it unlawful as coming from a king.
Later Kāiyaṭa left Kaśmir and wandered to
Bānāras. There he vanquished the paṇḍitas at
a sābha by his great learning, and composed the
Pradīpa at the request of the Sābhasapāti. According
to this story the Pradīpa was not written in
Kaśmir, and if the statement that Kāiyaṭa lived
at Pāmpūr is true it cannot be older than the
9th century. For that town was built by Padma
in the reign of Ajitapāḍa, 844-849 A.D. Dr.
Kielhorn has lately stated in his pamphlet on the
Mahābhāṣya that he does not think Kāiyaṭa an
old writer. I agree with him on this point, and do
not believe that he is older than the 13th century
A.D. The earliest Indian grammarian who quotes
him is, as far as I know, Sāyana-Mādhava. I
have heard it asserted by Indian paṇḍits that
Kāiyaṭa was a brother of Māmaṭa.

"The small fragment of Chandra's Grammar
(one leaf) is more curious than useful. As Chandra
was a Kaśmirian, or at least taught in Kaśmir, there
is no reason to doubt of its genuineness. Dr. Kiel-
born thinks that, to judge from the fragment, the
arrangement of Chandra's grammar must have
resembled that of the Kousolti, or, as Dr. Burnell
would say, that of the grammarians of the Aitra
school.

"The MS. of the Kántākeraṭṭi (No. 283)10 is a real
gem. It is the most correct and best-written
birch-bark MS. in the whole collection, and almost
without a lacuna. I collated a small portion of its
contents with Professor Bālaśastri's edition, and
found not inconsiderable differences. The read-
ings of the Kaśmirian MS. appeared to me the
better ones. It also gives the correct statement
regarding the author of the work. In the colo-
phons of the first four māhātya Jayatīya is
named as the author, and in those of the last
four Vāmana. Professor Bālaśastri told me that he
had found the same statement in one other MS.11
He considers the authors to have been mātakas
and men of small grammatical learning, who had
not penetrated to the deepest depth of the bhaṇṭa.
The Kaśmirians think that probably Jayatīya
is another name of the learned king Jayatīpa,
and that Vāmana is his minister, who is
mentioned by Kalhana. Be that as it may, the
Kántākeraṭṭi is not a modern work, and most probably
has been written by a Kaśmirian. The Govern-
ment MS. has been made over to Professor Bālaśastri
to be used for his edition of the Kántākeraṭṭi.
"The pieces of Jinendrabuddhi's Nyāsa (No. 284, adhy. I. 2-4; 285, adhy. IV.; and 286, adhy. VII.) have been transcribed from a dilapidated birch-bark volume belonging to P. Bal Kōl. Other portions of the work have been acquired in former years, in the Dekhan, in Ahmadābād, and in Bīkāner. But the Government collection does not yet contain copies of the VIth and VIIth adhyāyās. Jinendrabuddhi lived, according to the Kaśmirins, at Vaiśhānāvali-Husakapura. He was a Bhuddha ascetic, and is certainly not later than the 12th century, as the Nyāsa is quoted by Vopadeva."

"Among the smaller works explaining the appendices to Pāṇini's grammar, the Dhatūpratipāda, the śipitā-aryaya-śpata-paddhatikā, and the śpata-paddhatikā, Kaśmirins's treatises Abhijñayupratiṣṭhān, Abhijñavāśyupratiṣṭhān, and Kaśmirins's treatises Abhijñavāśyupratiṣṭhān, and the śpata-paddhatikā, are of some interest, as the date of this author is known. He is, according to the perfectly credible Kaśmirins tradition, the grammarian Kaśmirins, who instructed king Jayapiśa. The Lingavāyuksa, sarvottarabhadra (Nos. 310-11) shows as authors two well-known names—Śaṭnopāyin, the son of Dīpavāyin, and Harṣavardhana, the son of Śrīvadhan. The latter appears to have been a prince. I am, however, doubtful it is permissible to identify him with the patron of Bana and Hiwen Thang, as the latter's father is called Prabhākaraśvar-


We are very thankful for this valuable work.

In the nature of things Dr. Trumpp's translation cannot be perfect, as it is a first attempt to render a most difficult book. But it forms an excellent commencement of scientific investigation in a region in which we have hitherto had little else but"

"Conjectures, fancies, built on nothing firm."

In M. Renan's Report to the Société Asiatique special praise is bestowed on M. James Darmesteter's Ormuz et Ahriman, in which the Mazdean dualism is accounted for by a natural development, and not by a violent rupture between the two branches of the Aryans; on M. Bergaigne's thesis on Les dieux nouveaux de la religion véhélique, which is a complete repertory of Vedic ideas on the physical and moral world; on M. Guyard's Théorie nouvelle de la mésogére arabe; and the second part of M. de Vogüé's Syrie centrale, containing 400 inscriptions from Saph, the relation of the characters of the most puzzling of which to the Hymarīte, M. Renan fully expects will be cleared up within another year.

14. The Lingavāyuksa, sarvottarabhadra begins:—

March 17, 1878.

BOOK NOTICES.

}}}
The Adi Granth, or Granth Sahib as it is often reverentially called, has a twofold claim on attention. First of all, it is invaluable in a linguistic point of view. It is a perfect treasure-house of old Hindi words and forms: it thus gives great assistance in tracing the origin and progress of the modern vernaculars of Northern India. How these arose out of the ancient Prakrits is still a dark problem, but one on which the Granth throws considerable light. Secondly, it gives an authoritative statement of the teaching of the early Sikh gurus. Much has been written about Sikhism; but documentary proof has seldom accompanied assertion.

The Indian Government deserves praise for agreeing that the Granth should be translated; and it made an excellent selection when it appointed Dr. Trumpp to the performance of the task. Dr. Trumpp is not only a good Sanskritist, but has made a special study of Sindhi and the cognate dialects of Northern India. The labour which the rendering of the Granth involved was very great. Of the dialect in which it is composed—an old form of Panjâbī—there is neither grammar nor dictionary. The interpretation is very imperfectly known to the most learned Sikh gurus; while the Brahmans, whose acuteness and patience in research would have done excellent service, have never condescended to study so heretical a book. Dr. Trumpp left Germany and proceeded to India to obtain what help he could in his arduous task. He found three commentaries on the Granth which were of considerable use; but, on the whole, he worked, we may say, single-handed. He spent seven years in executing the translation.

We do not at present enter into any linguistic inquiries. The volume presents the Japji (more accurately, Japu-ju)—the first, and according to the Sikhs the holiest, portion of the Granth—in the original. Let us hope that some of the readers of the volume may overcome their repugnance to the Gurmukhi character, which looks so like a perverse metamorphosis of Devanâgarî, and work through these seven pages as a commencement in mastering the language.

In addition to a translation and sufficiently full annotations, Dr. Trumpp has given a short preface and five valuable introductory essays. Thus we have the Life of Bâbâ Nânak translated from the Janam Sakhî; which appears in two forms that are remarkably contrasted. We have next a sketch of the lives of the other Sikh gurus; then an outline of the Sikh religion; then a short essay on the composition of the Granth; and finally, a dissertation on the language and metres used in it.

Bâbâ Nânak was born A.D. 1469. He was not a man of education, nor possessed of any remarkable force of mind. He was simply a devout mystic. His teaching was chiefly drawn from the writings of the celebrated Kâbîr, who lived not very long before him. The sayings of Bâbâ Nânak, which were all preserved in verse, were collected along with those of other holy men by Guru Arjuna, Sikhism sustained an important change. His predecessors had been quietists, but he was a man of capacity, who affected the pomp of a great leader, and intermeddled with political affairs. The Sikhs gradually grew into a nation of warriors, inflamed with rancorous hostility to the professors of other creeds, especially the followers of Muhammad. The most remarkable of the later gurus was Govind Singh, who slighted the Granth as infusing a tame humility into the hearts of men. He produced a second Granth, called “The book of the tenth king (or reign),” which breathes throughout a fierce and warlike spirit. In several points Guru Govinda receded from the doctrines of the Adi Granth (the original Granth), and turned back towards Hinduism. This last of the great gurus died in 1708.

The Granth has been said to inculcate Monotheism. But this is a mistake, if the term monotheism is used in its ordinary sense. The teaching of the Granth is prevailingly pantheistic. It declares that God and the universe are not distinct; as “in a wave the foam and bubbles are not distinct from the water.” The notion that the universe is distinct from God arises from mâyâ.

According to Dr. Trumpp there are two forms of Pantheism in the work—a finer and a grosser. The grosser holds that the universe is an expansion of God. The finer considers the universe to be an emanation from God. But the Granth is self-contradictory, and occasionally (for instance, when it asserts the Supreme to be distinct from the universe, as the lotus is distinct from the lake it floats in) it is not properly pantheistic. The Supreme God is never—or scarcely ever—prayed to in the Granth. The subordinate gods are prayed to; and so is the guru. Indeed, the exaltation of the guru is one of the most characteristic features of the system. The saints also are to be greatly revered. The chief end which man is to desire is the cessation of individual existence; and the great means of attaining this longed-for goal is the repetition of the name of Hârî. But the right knowledge and utterance of this all-powerful name can be obtained only from the true guru.

1 There are some Hakas of Teg Bahadur's written in pure Hindi.

2 See a sketch of his life, Ind. Ant. vol. III. pp. 296-300.

3 It is written not in Panjâbī, but Hindī.
Caste is slighted rather than attacked.

It is a mistake to suppose that Bābā Nānak sought to blend the chief dogmas of Islam and Hinduism. The Sufism of the Persians is very similar to Vedantism; and the pantheism of the Gurmukh may be classed with either system. Dr. Trumpp is more than half disposed to think that Kabir was originally a Muslim (see note, p. 682). It is a vexed question, on which we pronounce no judgment. On the whole, however, the effect of Islam on the Sikh system has been considerable.

No reverence is paid to the holy books either of Hindus or Muhammadans. The Gurmukh is an all-sufficient teacher.

It will be seen, even from what has now been said, that the Gurmukh contains little or nothing that is really new. The readers of the poets—whether Hindi, Bangali, or Marathi—of the Vaisnav school will very seldom come on a sentiment in this book which is not familiar to them. Indeed, several of the poems of Nāma, or Nanu, who was one of the earliest Marathi poets, are embodied in the Gurmukh. This subject deserves the attention of Marathi scholars. In the mean time we assume that in the form in which they appear in Punjabi these can only be translations, and are not the original compositions of the tailor poet (an Oriental ‘Alton Locke,’ shall we say?) who lived at Panjabpur. Moreover, the influence of Kabir has been very great in the Maratha country, as well as in the Panjab and Northern India generally, so that the coincidences now referred to need excite no surprise.

Dr. Trumpp often speaks disparagingly of the Gurmukh. He says, “It is a very big volume, but incoherent and shallow in the extreme, and couched at the same time in dark and perplexing language in order to cover these defects.” (Preface, p. vii.) Again he says that “as regards its contents, it is perhaps the most shallow and empty book that exists, in proportion to its size.” (p. cxxii.) Certainly it cannot be rated high either as a philosophic or poetical production. Yet it has a value. These old gurus and devotees were feeling after God. There seems to us a clew to the religion of Bābā Nānak and several of his successors. We confess to a feeling of exceeding sadness as we read the outpourings of their hearts. They hungered for bread, and Hinduism gave them a stone. They needed union with a loving, conscious God in mind, heart, will; and Hinduism told them they must seek to be absorbed and lost in the immeasurable All.

It is difficult to read much of the Gurmukh at a sitting. Its repetitions are endless;—the same ideas and even illustrations recur perpetually. Bābā Nānak himself is one of the least attractive of the sages of whose sayings the book is made up, being in point of clearness and force decidedly inferior to Kābīr. We are much inclined to agree with him when he says in one place, “O Nānak, the telling of it is hard iron.” At least we have felt it oftentimes as difficult to hammer out a definite meaning from his words as to hammer out a piece of hard cold iron! But we shall let our readers judge. Take the commencement and conclusion of the Japu:

“Ox! The true name is the creator, the Spirit without fear, without enmity, having a timeless form, not produced from the womb.

By favour of the Guru!

“Japu.—At the beginning is the True One, at the beginning of the Yuga is the True One. The True One is, O Nānak, and the True One also will be.

1. “By meditation (and) meditation it (i.e. the knowledge of the True One) is not effected, though I meditate a hundred thousand times.

2. “By silence (and) silence is not effected, though I keep a continual absorption of mind. The hunger of the hungry does not cease, though I bind together the load of (all) the worlds.

3. “There may be acquired a thousand, a hundred thousand dexterities; not one goes with (at the time of death).

4. “How does one become a man of truth (knowing the True One)? how is the embalming of falsehood broken?

5. “He who walks in his (i.e. God’s) order and pleasure, O Nānak! (and) with (whom) it is (thus) written.”

68. “Continence is the workshop, patience the goldsmith. Understanding the anvil, the Veda the tool. Fear the bellows, the heat of austeritys the fire. The vessel is love; in this melt Amrita (nectar). Then the kabda is formed in the true mint. This is the work of those on whom his look and the destiny is (fiixed): O Nānak, the looker-on is happy by the sight.

“O Gokulak——Wind is the Guru, water the father, the great earth the mother. Day and night the two are female and male nurse; the whole world sports.

“Dharma-rāja rehearses the good and bad works in the presence (of God). By their own actions some are near and some are afar off (from God). By whom the name (of God) has been meditated upon, they are gone (to the other world), having cast off their labour.

“O Nānak, their faces are bright, and with them

* Dr. Trumpp (pp. cxxii, 93) affirms that he was a calico-printer; the Marathas called him a stiump.
The following two extracts will afford fair specimens of the general style of the Granth:

"O beloved, mother Hari, Hari! Having taken the wisdom of the Guru, say Hari!"

"O mind, if the touchstone be applied to the True One, if he be weighed by a full weight; his value is not obtained by any one, O heart! he is a priceless gem."

The nectar-speech of the Guru is sweet. Some rare disciple has tasted and seen it. In his heart there is light; he drinks the great juice (of Hari); at the true gate he makes himself heard." (p. 165.)


Professor Weber and Mr. Shankar P. Pandit, who have dared to reverse the decision of the late Horace Hayman Wilson, that the Mâlavikâgânâmitra is not the work of the great Kâlidâsa, the author of the Sakuntala, may claim M. Foucher as an ally. He gives forth no uncertain sound on this point:—"Sans mettre Mâlavikâ et Agnimitra sur la même ligne que Sakuntala, nous n'aurons pas de l'avoir de l'illard Wilson. D'accord avec M. A. Weber, l'auteur d'une élogieuse traduction allemande du drame si sévèrement jugé; d'accord aussi avec M. Shankar Pandit, l'éditeur du texte Sanskrit de Bombay, nous dirons que dans les pensées, et jusqu'à la manière de les exprimer, dans le dialogue et dans les stances tout présente avec le style de Sakuntala et d'Ouverture un air de famille si marqué qu'il est impossible de nier son influence même autorite."

We must confess that this profession of faith on the part of M. Foucher gives us considerable satisfaction. We have occasionally felt twinges of scepticism in discovering some of the expressions and thoughts, on which Mr. Shankar Pandit lays great stress as characteristic of Kâlidâsa's style, in Sanskrit dramas not ordinarily attributed to the author of the Sakuntala. The traditional belief is the more comforting doctrine, and it is pleasant to find it supported by such good critical authority.

The translation at present before us is evidently intended for the general reader, and therefore we shall not criticize the transliteration of the Sanskrit names. The spelling °Sakuntala° wears a somewhat unpleasing aspect to a British eye, but is, we suppose, justified by sound phonetic reasons in the Gallic land. °Tchandrika° is, no doubt, a choice of evils, but we should prefer the other alternative, however terrible it might be.

We feel, too, that our nationality is somewhat in our way in passing judgment upon the translation itself. It seems to us to be full of point and grace, but this is a question which none but Frenchmen are qualified to decide. It is as difficult for a Briton to discover Sanskritisms in French as to point out the objectionable Patavines in Livy. One thing, however, is certain—that it is a very faithful representation of the original. In one or two points we feel disposed to differ from M. Foucher. For instance, on page 54 we find the stage direction °Ivraut entre en simulant l'ivresse. This does not seem to us quite literal. We believe that there was no °simulation° in the case. M. Foucher seems to agree with us a little further on.

We find on the same page Ivraut s'avance aussi vite que le permet son état d'ivresse. In a note on the Intermezzo we find the Mandâkinî explained as °L'un des bras du Gange.° Mr. Shankar Pandit's view seems to us the true one:—"There is no doubt that the Mandâkinî of the present passage is a river of the Deccan. And further it is probable that it may here stand for the Narmadâ, in conformity with a practice, still very common all over India, of designating any sacred river by the most sacred river-name, as Gangâ, &c." He goes on to observe that one of the MSS. has used the Prákrit equivalent of Narmadâ.

This view harmonizes better with the other geographical notices in the play. But both of the passages we have quoted may be literary 'economies.'

It cannot be denied that, among Englishmen at any rate, there exists a belief that no Sanskrit literature will repay perusal. This is due to the fault of the Sanskritists themselves, who, as a general rule, show no judgment in selecting for translation works which possess literary merit and are of general interest. The three Sanskrit compositions which have been selected to form part of the Bibliothèque Orientale Edition are perhaps as favourable specimens of the Hindu muse as could be chosen. The first to appear, viz., the Stanzas of Brhatphāra, by M. Rgouaud, has already been reviewed in our columns.

The Mâlavikâgânâmitra, though the plot turns on a mere palace intrigue, is interesting as a picture of Indian manners at a time when Buddhism was still a favoured religion, and the Hindu genius possessed an etas which is now lost. It is written in a witty and animated style, and is one of the least tedious of Sanskrit dramas. The interest scarcely ever flags, except perhaps in the third act, where the foot-painting process is rather wearisome to a European reader.

M. Foucher has adopted the admirable expedient of enclosing those passages, which are metrical in the original, in inverted commas. This will enable his readers to form a better idea of the peculiar character of the Sanskrit drama. The notes are just what is required, without any unnecessary parade of learning. We believe that this attractive little volume will do much to interest the European public in Sanskrit literature.
T he subjoined grant of Dadda II. of Bharoch was discovered in 1875 by the Rev. Joseph Taylor, of Borudi, in the house of a Vânil at Úmētâ (Khedâ zikilâ). Mr. Taylor at first presented me with a paper impression of the plates, and later very kindly moved the owner (not without considerable trouble) to lend the original for a few days. During that time I had a half-size photograph taken, which, as the plates were in a very fair condition, came out very distinct and clear. It is from a copy of this photograph that the annexed photographograph has been prepared.

The measurements of the plates are 12 inches by 17½. The left-hand ring with the seal is still in its proper position. The latter appears to bear the same inscription as that of Dr. Burn's Khedâ plates, Šrîśravantadâdha. But the letters on the seal are so much corroded that it would be impossible to decipher them without the help of the earlier grants. Both the plates and the seal are very massive, and the former nearly free from verdigris. They have been well kept, and probably have been cleaned with tamarind juice. The letters are large and deeply incised, with the exception of the last line of Plate I. and of the beginning of the last line of Plate II. For in the latter the strokes intended to form the last syllables of the word maddhava run one into the other, and the name is not clearly distinguishable even on the photograph.

The grant itself closely resembles the Êdâo grant, likewise issued by Dadda II., which has been published by Professor Bhândârkar in the Jour. Be. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. X. pp. 19 seqq., as regards both the letters and the wording. As might be expected from the proximity of their dates—Sâka s. 400 and 417—they are both copies of the same model form. Professor Bhândârkar's remarks on the characters of the Êdâo plates are all applicable to the Umētâ grant also. I have only to add that in a few instances the elements of compound consonants are placed not vertically, the one below the other, but horizontally, side by side. Thus we find ŋ for ña. (Pl. I. 1. 14, Pl. II. 2. 15, 13.) Worthy of notice is also the occurrence of the virâma in the shape of a horizontal stroke placed below the vowelless consonant (Pl. I. 1. 1., Pl. II. 1. 13.)

The peculiar shape of the letters occurring in the signature of the king have been noticed in my article on the Kâvi plate of Jaya bhaṭâ, and I still adhere to the opinion that these letters represent the forms used in everyday life. I may add that, since the article on the Kâvi inscription was written, I have received news of a Jaina palm-leaf MS., preserved in the Sanghâvâna pâda Bhândâr at Aśīl vâd-Pâṭhâra, which dates from the end of the tenth century A.D., and shows the usual Jaina-Devanâgari forms. The lately published grant of the first Chânlukya king of Pâṭhâra, Mâlâraja I., which belongs to the same period, is written with the much more antique-looking Kâyaśtha Devanâgari character. This fact proves that in the tenth century, at least, the characters used for literary purposes differed from those employed for official documents. It consequently confirms the interpretation which, first, Prof. Dowson, and myself later, have put on the occurrence of two alphabets in the Gîrjârâ plates.

The sansâskâr furnishes no new information. It gives the well-known three kings of the Gîrjârâ dynasty—Dadda or Dadda I., Jayabhâta, surnamed Viśârâga, and Dadda II., surnamed Prâsvaṭârâga, whose names were first correctly given by Professor Bhândârkar. Little information regarding the events of their reigns can be gathered from the inscriptions of Dadda II. An allusion to the war with Vâlabhi, of which Jayabhâta speaks in the Kâvi grant, is, in my opinion, contained in the epithet paurânakârâḥ dhârayâtavânapâhâvîrśravâna kâśmīravânapârâdhapravâdhapraśvâdas-

1 Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 110.
2 The information comes from Padâit Nârâyaṇâsâkara of Surat, who spent more than six months at Pâṭhâra and carefully examined the palm-leaf MSS. preserved there.
3 The spelling is wrong in our grant than in the Êdâo âsma. A good many mistakes are due to carelessness on the part of the engraver. Others, e.g. ñamaya (Pl. I. 1. 3) for ñamaya, nisthrâs (ibid.) for nisthrâs, samâchâra (Pl. II. 1. 6) for samâchâra, belong probably to the writer of the original, whose ignorance of Sanskrit is also attested by such grammatical mistakes as grânâḥ - pratipadâtâ, bhûtabhuhârâta, &c.
4 I consider the latter merely a misspelling. Dadda corresponds to the modern D âdâ-j, and the first syllable ought therefore to have two consonants.
east of Bharoch. This statement, which is said to be supported also by the Revamdhavamugha, fully agrees with the information regarding Dadda's residence derived from the Illao and Umete plates. Both open with the phrase Ooh swasti vijayavasadeputi bhurkachhekharapradavadandakat. It cannot be doubtful that vadasakat must be read for nadasakat, which latter word is utterly meaningless. The document from which the copperamith who incised the inscription copied was probably written throughout in the current-hand characters which he has preserved in the signature, and in these the va had, without doubt, the form \( \alpha \), which appears in svahasto and vitavarga (Pl. II. l. 16) and on the Rathor grants. Thus he came to read and to write \( \alpha \) instead of \( \Delta \). But, independently of this consideration, the correction is made extremely probable by the occurrence of phrases like jayakandhevadri khudovediyasakat or bhadropadanakat on the Valabhi plates. The meaning of the corrected phrase can only be "Om. Hail! From the camp of victory which dwells, i.e. is fixed, before the gates of Bharoch." This fits the camp of the Nandi puri, outside the Jhadeshwar gate, exactly. It may therefore be considered certain that the seat of the Gutara government was located not in Bharoch itself, but close to its eastern gate. I may add that in many other cases the palaces of Hindu rajas lie just outside the gates of the chief towns of their dominions. A particularly striking instance of this kind is the residence of the Raja of Bikaner, which lies at a distance of several hundred yards, and entirely separate from the town, towards the north-west.

The date of the grant, Vasishtha Pauramasi or Suddha 16 of Saka samvat 400, teaches us nothing new, as we know from the Illao grant that Devangari, as well as from the Sarad and Jaina Devangari MSS. (1) That dasakat does not mean 'calculated to injure.' (2) That the analogies of numerous other grants, especially of all those issued by Valabhi and Gutara princes, requires that the place where the grant was issued should be named. With respect to my own translation, I have to state that I have been unable to find a lexicographical authority for the meaning, 'camp,' which I have assigned to vishakha. I base my interpretation chiefly on the fact that the word occupies exactly the place where other inscriptions have skandadhvra, 'camp.' Possibly vishakha may be a hibertro uncertainty technical word which possesses a meaning slightly different from skandadhvra. It may mean 'cantonment' or 'permanent camp.' The final decision of this question must be reserved for the future. It ought, however, to be noted that below naksap is used in the sense of 'to cause an army to pitch camp' (see Dev. Dict. s. v. kship + mi).
Dadda II. reigned at least until Śaka saṁvat 417. I have not the slightest doubt that the Śaka era meant here is, as Professor Bhāḍḍārakār has first shown, the era beginning in 789 A.D., and that the Umetā plate is just 1400 years old.

The grantee was a native of Kā ṣa ṭa kṣā ṭ bā or Kāṇoj, a Bha ṭ vi ṇa ṭ a, i.e. Rigvedī, Bhāṣṭa Mādhava, son of Bhāṣṭa Mahidhāna, who was conversant with all the four Vedas. The village of Nīgūḍa was granted to him for the purpose of defraying the expenses of an Agnīhotra and other sacrificial rites. It is a matter of great regret that, in spite of numerous inquiries made in Central and Northern Gujarāṭa, it has been hitherto impossible to identify the Bhukti and the villages mentioned in the grant. I suspect that they were situated in the Gaṅgāvīḍ districts. Of some importance is the name of the official Mā ḍhava bha ṭa, who wrote the grant, as the writer of the llāo grant was Revā, the son of Mā ḍhava. The occurrence of Mādhava's name on our plate is a strong proof in favour of its genuineness.

In conclusion I will repeat what I have already stated in a note to the article on Jāyabhāṭa's Kāvi plate, viz. that the Umetā śāsana possesses great interest, because it is the original according to which a Vāsla bha grant attributed to Dharasena II. has been manufactured. This forgery belongs to the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, and was first noticed by Dr. Bāhā Dāji. I have only once been able to get hold of it, for a few minutes. But the first glance satisfied me that it is almost an exact copy of the Umetā grant, in which nothing but the kings' names seemed to have been altered. The characters even are Gurjara, not Valabhi letters. As this forgery is probably ancient, it may assist in settling the initial date of the era of the Valabhi plates. For it may be presumed that the forger chose the name of a king whose times were not too far distant from those of the real donor.

Plate I.

[1] आ सति विजयशेषितम् महरक्षांहरारस्तकत् सकलगनपटविरागितर्गतः
[2] निकरकरावरूपाशिकृतमुद्मलपतिपाधिपतिनिदेशविनिष्ठासंगमः
[3] बगतिहर्षसंगमंत्रकलबोधभवनमातृकाणविविहारिश्रावङ्गम्
[4] वर्तजन्तिकृ च शर्ममलपरामृश्वान्त्यालिकोत्कारिकविरागितर्गतमुक्ति
[5] वस्तिहरिः दनान्दायुर्गामिनाविपुरूपकागामिनाविपुराणक्षेत्रीयातनु
[6] विनिशेतसहयोगसंयमः
[7] वनधरकुमिल्लाशरीरात्मकताल्पोषकपरमाणपत्रायात
[8] विद्वत्सदानकाशिकृतनिविदाञ्जनकरतामां विद्मलुपणमाक्षत्वसंहकलितमिनियमः
[9] महावर्गारुपिणीसुसूचनानन्दितनिबन्धकनात्मकमंतृपालिकसारसिद्ध
[10] लोकः
[11] न्तिविग्रह्यायुः
[12] स्तोत्रंकरुपिणीस्वरूपसदानन्दितनिबन्धकनात्मकमंतृपालिकसारसिद्ध
[13] योगारोगः
[14] श्रीरकुमिल्लाशरीरात्मकताल्पोषकपरमाणपत्रायात
[15] विनिशेतसहयोगसंयमः
[16] वनधरकुमिल्लाशरीरात्मकताल्पोषकपरमाणपत्रायात
[17] विनिशेतसहयोगसंयमः

* Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 110.
* L 1, read ओऽ दानकारः. The ओऽ used here is the current-hand letter: see remarks below. L 2, read ययुः. L 3, read मुखः. L 4, read नामः. L 5, read श्रवः. L 6, read मुखः. L 7, read पदः. L 8, read श्रवः. L 9, read फूलः. L 10, read श्रवः. L 11, read रावणः. L 12, read नामः. L 13, read नामः. L 14, read नामः. L 15, read नामः. L 16, read नामः. L 17, read नामः. L 18, read नामः. L 19, read नामः.
Plate II.

Translation.

Om. Hail! From the camp of victory fixed before the gates of Bharukachhav. There was the illustrious Dāda; the splendour of his fame brilliant like the water-lily that uncoils to the rays of the regent of the night when he issues forth from a dense bank of clouds, veiled the firmament. The might of his bright sword was always loudly proclaimed by its result, the morning-call of the wives of crowds of hostile chieftains who had gone forth to meet him in numerous battles and had been dental m. L. 7, read देत ;—तया. L. 8, read दश. श. L. 9, read दुधाप. instead of ल्र in प्रज्ञ and other words sign resembling द of दश occurs on these and on the ik. plates. Read श्रीमण्डल. L. 11, read राजसील. Doš दश in मामकास्त्र. L. 12, read साधित; आवेदनि. L. 14, देत; गोविष्ठ. L. 16, read माहस्य;—अधूरण: looks on the fascimile and on the photo. like mala श्रीतारामनास्य: श्रीमान्तानित.

13 L. 14, read श्रीमण्डल as dhyānakas and nityakaus are frequently mentioned together in other grants;—मामकास्त्र. L. 15 read मम; —नुपच. L. 16, read मामकास्त्र as dhyānakas. 15 L. 2, read श्रीमण्डल as dhyānakas. L. 3, read मांसायम. L. 4, read मामकास्त्र as dhyānakas. L. 5, read मामकास्त्र as dhyānakas. L. 6, read मामकास्त्र as dhyānakas. L. 7, read देत;—तया. L. 8, read दश. श. L. 9, read दुधाप. instead of ल्र in प्रज्ञ and other words sign resembling द of दश occurs on these and on the ik. plates. Read श्रीमण्डल. L. 11, read राजसील. Doš दश in मामकास्त्र. L. 12, read साधित; आवेदनि. L. 14, देत; गोविष्ठ. L. 16, read माहस्य;—अधूरण: looks on the fascimile and on the photo. like mala श्रीतारामनास्य: श्रीमान्तानित. This and the following sentences represent each one Bahuyukta compound. Professor Bhadurkar takes यात्र: prutāpa as a Dravendra compound, which is also possible.
अद्याध्ययनम्

अद्याध्ययनम्

अद्याध्ययनम्

अद्याध्ययनम्

अद्याध्ययनम्
slain; on his head glittered a diadem that shone with the regal rays of millions of diamonds, polished by his prostrations at the lotus-feet of gods, Brahma, and other venerable persons; his store of religious merits, the only friend in heaven, was always being increased in consequence of his liberally fulfilling the desire for wealth of the poor, of the helpless, of the sick, of the wayfarer, of beggars, and of the distressed; he proved his cleverness and polished manners in settling his love-queries with proud damsels through prostrations and sweet words; and he threw the dense darkness of the Kali age into the cage of his bright virtues.

His son was the illustrious Jayabhata, who showed the proud valour of a young lion, since by the strength of his sword (nistrinvisvikrama) he destroyed troops of hostile elephants mad with rut, just as the lion with fearless stride (nistrinvisvikrama) kills numbers of rutting elephants which attack him. He possessed in the highest degree the sporting qualities of the guardian elephants of the quarters of the horizon, because he made expeditions in the jungles growing on both the shores (of the gulf of Khasbay), just as the elephants roam in the forests growing both on the shores (of the western and eastern oceans), and because his bounty flowed constantly and without stint, just as the elephants constantly shed copious ichor (nirakhojaddhapirodhahaprekhta). He covered with the sandal-ointment (parvata) his body and the high bosom (sammanatapayodhara) of Fortune who resembles the sky with its high-rising clouds (sammanatapayodhara).

His offspring is the great king of kings the illustrious Dada, who has dispelled the intense darkness that had grown thick through the power of evil and had overspread the whole world,—who possesses an exceeding store of affection for his spiritual guide, and has illuminated the world of the living by his pure precepts,—who possesses true spiritual knowledge,—who has become the luminary of the extensive Gurjara dynasty, (and) who has obtained the five great titles.

(He) being in good health, addresses these commands to all governors of zillās, governors of tālhās, headmen of villages, officials and employés, great men, chief men, and others:—Be it known to you, that, for the increase of my parents' and of my own merit in the next world and fame, I have granted, with heartfelt devotion, confirming the gift by a libation of water, on the day of the full-moon of Vaisakha, in the year four-hundred of the Saka era, to Bhatta Madhava, the son of Bhatta Mahidhara, an inhabitant of Kanyaubija, who belongs to the Chaturvedi of that (town), and to the Vaisisthagotra in general, and studies the Bahvrijcha (śākhā of the Veda), for the performance of the Bali, Charu, Vaiśevada, Agnihatra, the five Mahāyānas, and similar rites, the village of Niguda, situated in the Kamayatadaśata Būkti, the boundaries of which are—

to the east the village of Phalabhavarda, to the west the village of Vihaṇa, to the north

18 Professor Bbndfarkar changes phala to okhala, I think, unnecessarily. His translation omits the word pramukhaṇgata. Prabhāttasyaṇapradhāna refers both to the fact that the widows of Dadda’s enemies naturally renewed their lamentations on re-awakening to a consciousness of their sorrows, and to the custom that the kings of ancient India used to be awakened by the hymns of their hands: compare, e.g., Viśvamitra's charita XI 73 et seq.

19 The diamond, I think, received an additional polish not by being rubbed against the feet of gods, &c., but by touching the ground during the king’s prostrations. Guru includes, besides preceptors, parents and other persons to whom reverence is due.

20 In my opinion nistrinvisvikrama is intended to convey a double meaning, though Prof. Bhbndfarkar renders one only. A merit would hardly allow to pass so splendid an opportunity for a pan. Vīrāsma, it referred to the lion, may either be translated by ‘stride or jump,’ or by ‘attack.’

21 Regarding this passage see also Ind. Ant. vol. V p. 111.

22 Professor Bbndfarkar’s translation omits the word aha, ‘body,’ which must refer to the king. The limits of this chain of puns are the following:—The king gained glory; according to the custom of the Kavis, glory is compared to every substance of white or brilliant colour. To the latter belongs also sandal-ointment. Sandal-ooint

23 This translation is tentative, and based on the analogy of the phrase parammahāśtya which appears on the Rādhor and later plates exactly in the position where the earlier ones have dhānaśantaramāttid. But I am not in a position to prove that sihāti is used elsewhere as a synonym of bhākti. Professor Bbndfarkar omits the compound from his translation.
the village of Dahithali. (The grant of) this village—which is not to be entered by any royal officials, and to be enjoyed by the grantees' sons, grandsons, and (remoter) descendants—defined by the (above-stated) boundaries, includes the . . . . . rents paid by outsiders, the income in grain and gold, and the right of forced labour, with the exception of former gifts to gods and Brahmans, is to be valid as long as moon, sun, sea, earth, rivers, and hills endure. Wherefore nobody is to cause hindrance to him who, by virtue of the rights conferred by this gift to a Brähman, cultivates (the land of this village), causes it to be cultivated, enjoys it, causes it to be enjoyed by others, or assigns it to others, and this has been written by the servant of the king Bhāṭṭa Mādhava, the son of the illustrious commander of the forces, Gilaka. This is my sign-manual, (that) of the illustrious Prasāntaraṅga, the son of the illustrious Vitarāga.

ADDITIONAL VALABHI GRANTS, Nos. IX.-XIV.

BY G. BÜHLER.

The first of the six new grants now published was made over to me by the Editor. The second, which was found in Sorath (Kāthāvād), I owe to the courtesy of Mr. Bau'd-tīra, Divān of H. H. the Navāb of Junāgadh. The remaining four have been procured from a Vāṇī in Alīnā (Kheḍā Zillā), through the good offices of Mr. Harivallabha, Assistant Deputy Educational Inspector, Kheḍā and Bharnch. It is stated that these plates had been lying in the Vāṇī's shop for some time, and that they were found either in Alīnā or in the neighbourhood.

NO. IX.—A GRANT OF GHASAENA.

The plates containing this new grant of Ghasaena measure 11.9 inches by 7.7. The rings and seal belonging to them are missing, and verdigris and carbonization have considerably injured them, especially the second.

The characters differ not inconsiderably from those of the other grants issued by Ghasaena. They are larger and bolder, and come nearest to the style adopted in the plates of Dhruvasena I.

It is a curious fact that, contrary to the custom observed in all other Valabhi plates, the place whence this grant was issued has not been marked, and that the word evasi has been left out.

The evikadali, too, differs from that given on other plates. The description of Guhasena is entirely new, and runs as follows:

"(After him, Dhruvasena rules,) the ardent devotee of Maheśvara, the illustrious Mahārāja, Guhasena, who has removed all aches by the power of his prostrations at that (Dhruvasena's) feet; who resembles Kṛishṇa, as he has defeated the armies of his enemies; who resembles the ocean, since he is replete with pure and valuable gems; who resembles the full moon, as he is lovely in the sight of all mankind."

The most puzzling point in this passage is that Ghasaena's own father, Dharpattā, is not mentioned at all, and that he is placed immediately after his uncle Dhruvasena I. This is so much the more curious as in the grants of Dhruvasena's son, Dharsena, Dharpattā is not only named, but receives the title Mahārāja, and is spoken of as if he had really ruled. It is perhaps premature to attempt a solution of this difficulty. But from the analogy of similar cases, e.g. that of the omission of Vallabharāja on some Chaulukya plates, I am inclined to conjecture that Dharpattā reigned for a very short time only, and that the writer for this reason did not think it worth while to insert his name. The date of the new grant—Sahvat 240, ērāvana śūdha—is of some interest, as it reduces the gap between Dhruvasena I. and Guhasena by six years.

The grantees was the community of Buddhist monks residing in the vihāra founded by Dhruvasena's sister's daughter Dudā in...
Valabhi. The monastery is mentioned in several other inscriptions.

The name of the village given has been lost.
The purpose is the usual one for which grants were given to Baudhadas, viz. repairs to the vihara, food, clothing, &c. for the monks, and materials for the worship of the Buddhas. In addition the ‘acquisition of books of the holy faith’ (saddharmaya pustakopakara . . .) (Pl. II. 1, 7) is mentioned.
The fact that the Valabhi monasteries possessed libraries is of some interest.

Transcript.
Plate I.

[1] और प्रसभपणामित्विक्षिता। 
[2] प्रतिपूर्णनिलयविनियमतां। 
[3] विषयक: प्रतियोगितानविनियमतां। 
[4] तथा प्रतीतिमययिनायविनियमतां। 
[5] चित्रकार्यान्विताः। 
[6] प्रतियोगितानविनियमतां। 
[7] चित्रकार्यान्विताः। 
[8] प्रतियोगितानविनियमतां। 
[9] चित्रकार्यान्विताः। 
[10] प्रतियोगितानविनियमतां। 

Plate II.

[1] इति नामायथा। 
[2] [कविते] पुण्य दुःखकारितविनियमताः। 
[3] प्रदर्शनान्विताः। 
[4] चरितं च चन्द्रुः। 
[5] नायित्राः। 
[6] प्रदर्शनान्विताः। 
[7] चित्रकार्यान्विताः। 

[10] [कविते] इति प्रदर्शनान्विताः।
This grant of Dharasena II. is written on two plates, each 12.5 inches by 8.5. The right-hand ring, which bears the seal with the usual device and inscription, is in its proper place. The characters resemble those of the grant of Dharasena, published below.

The plates are well preserved, and at present free from verdigris. But it is evident that they have been cleaned by the finder.

The execution is extremely bad and slovenly. No distinction is made between i and i, a often stands for u, a d standing before dh is not marked, and vaisarga, anumānika, and a are frequently left out or misplaced. Besides, there are other numerous mistakes in the spelling, and some little lacunae. In their incorrectness our plates resemble those of Śīlavatīya V. published in Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 16. The Sanskrit of the grant is not quite correct. The uncertainty in regard to the gender of many words, and the frequent substitution of as for sha, show that the writer was more accustomed to Prakrit than to Sanskrit.

The vasiśāvali teaches nothing new. But the date—Vaiśādha, badi 15 of Saṅvat 252—is historically interesting. For the last known grant of Dharasena's father, Guhasena, is dated Saṅvat 248, and the interval during which the death of the latter and the former's accession to the throne must have taken place is thus reduced to four years.

The objects granted are a field and a well in the village of Suryadāsa, and two more fields in the villages of Jotipadraha and Leśudaka.

As regards the geographical position of these villages, as well as those in the other grants now published, a separate article will be published later, when the results of inquiries in Kāṭhavād have been received.

The measurements of the fields are given in feet, pāda, just as in the grant of Dharasena IV., published in Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 16. The khaṭṭa-khaṭṭa-datuṭhitaka (Pl. II. 1. 7) is new and unintelligible to me.

The grantees are two Brāhmaṇs, Dūśa and Shashthi (Pl. II. 1. 9), belonging to the Sāpdilya gotra, and students of the Chhandogya-Kaṇṭhuma bākhā, i.e. of the Kaṇṭhuma school of the Sāmaveda, which at the present day is not unknown in Gujarāt. Shasṭi occurs as a Brāhmaṇical name in Kaśmirian works. Dūsa is not a Sanskrit word; possibly it may be a Desī nickname.

Two sets of officials are mentioned in the list (Pl. II. 1. 4), vartmapāla and pratīsaraṅka, who do not occur in the other grants. Vartmapāla means literally 'a protector of the road,' and probably denotes a watchman who is stationed on the road to prevent robberies. At present, too, the highroads in Kāṭhavād and Rājputānā are guarded by such men, whose huts are placed at intervals of two or three kos. Pratīsaraṅka means 'watchman' in general, and seems to be used here to designate the night watchmen attached to the villages.
Plate II.

[4] ताप, जल, त्रिवर्गविभाजन, ग्रामपंचायत, ग्रामपंচायत, ग्रामपंचायत, ग्रामपं�ायत, ग्रामपंचायत, ग्रामपंchai...
No. XI.—A Grant of Dharasena II.

The grant of Dharasena II. is written on two plates measuring 12½ inches by 6½. The only damage which the plates have sustained is the loss of the two rings which connected them. They were, however, covered with a thick layer of verdigris, which in some places withstood all attempts at removal, and makes a few letters doubtful.

The letters, which resemble those of the plates of Dhruvasena I. and of Guhasena's

\[\text{sadana of Sativat 240, are distinct and well incised. The number of clerical mistakes is not very great.}\]

The \text{vahidvai} is the usual one. It ought, however, to be noted that Dharasena II. receives in this grant also the epithet \text{nahasamana}, the great feudal chief.' One grant of Dharasena II. being dated Sativat 252, and one Sativat 269, the new date 270 does not add much to our knowledge of the length of the reign of the donor.
The grantee is a Rigvedi Brāhmaṇ of the Sārkarakhi gotra—Vishnu mitra, son of Mitra, who, a native of Anarta-pura, had settled in Kheṭakā (Pl. II. ll. 4-5).

The object granted is the village of Aśilā-palli, in the tālukā (pathaka) of Bāṇḍari-jidri, which belonged to the sīlā (śhārā) of Kheṭakā. The word śhārā, which is closely connected with the śhārā occurring in the śāsana of Dhrurvasena I, and Dharasena II. (of Saṁvat 269), and which appears also in a grant of Dharasena IV. (Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 45), is evidently a synonym of vishayā, 'sīlā', which here is added to it. Pathaka, its sub-division, has been met with in the grant of Dhruvasena II. (Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 13), and in the inscriptions of the Chaulukyas.14

The purpose for which the grant has been given is, as in the case of all Brāhmaṇical recipients, the performance of sacrifices.

The officers specified by name are the Dūta ka, the Sāmanta, or feudal chief Silā di ty a, and the Sandhivigrhakānd divirpati, i.e., Divāp and chief secretary, Kāndabha ta. Among the officials addressed by the king in the preamble to the grant occurs a new class, the Kāthebarika. I can only register the word, as I am unable to explain it.
Plate II.

[Text content not legible due to quality or format issues]
No. XII.—A Grant of Dharasena IV.

The plates on which this grant is written measure 14.5 inches by 11. The rings and the seal are missing. Otherwise the plates are well preserved. The letters resemble those of the grant published in Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 16, and are very clear and distinct. Very few clerical errors occur, but a considerable portion of the description of Harasena I. (Pl. I. ll. 20-23) is merely a repetition of a passage referring to Dharasena II. The error has been caused by the occurrence of the word सन्नातके in both places.

The vāhāvali offers nothing new. The two published grants of the supreme sovereign, great king of kings, supreme lord and emperor Dharasena IV. are dated Sāvat 326 and 328.18 I have seen two damaged plates, one preserved at Walā, and one now in the collection of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, which are dated Sāvat 322 and Sāvat 328. The date of our grant, Sāvat 330, is probably not far distant from the end of Dharasena’s reign. For an unpublished grant of his successor, Dhrurasena III., is dated Sāvat 332. The beginning of Dharasena’s reign is less certain, as only one grant of his predecessor, Dhrurasena II., dated 310, has been found.

The grantee is a Rigvedi Brahmā of the Sāvakrūṣki gotra, Nārāyaṇamitra, son of Kēśavamitra (Pl. II. ll. 15, 16), a native of Anartapura, who dwelt in the village of Kāsara. It is interesting to note that he receives the epithet Anartapura-Chaturvidya, ‘a Chaturvedi of Anartapura,’ which apparently shows his bheda, or the sub-division of the Brāhmaṇical community to which he belonged. On other plates we have before the word chaturvedya the word tat, i.e. tachchaturvedya.99 Our grant shows that in every case the tat refers to the name of the house of the Chaturvedi.

The object of the grant (Pl. II. l. 17) is the village of Desurakshitija, situated in the tālūka of Simhapatlika, and in the sīll of Khetaka. The purpose for which it is granted is the usual one. The two officers named are the dūtaka, the princess Bhumā (Pl. II. l. 25), and the divān and chief secretary, Skandabhata. The appearance of a female in an official capacity is rather startling. It is explicable only if we assume that she discharged the duties of her office vicariously.

The Skandabhata mentioned here is not the same as the minister of Guhasena and Dharasena II., as I have formerly conjectured.11 The proof that they are different persons lies partly in the impossibility that one man could hold office during ninety years, from Sāvat 240 to Sāvat 330, and in the fact that Silāditya I. had Skandabhata’s father, Chandrabhati, for his Divān in Sāvat 296.12

Transcript.

Plate I.

[1] ओ स्वति विज्ञानकार रहस्याराजकर – – वाकावाकाबā
Plate II.

3. Tapasrayā: Śikṣāntiśivānandān: Tapasrayā: Śikṣāntiśivānandān
[16] प्रिहिरभवनसामायिण्यातःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[17] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[18] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[19] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[20] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[21] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[22] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[23] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[24] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[25] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[26] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[27] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[28] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[29] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[30] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[31] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[32] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.

[33] नवम्प नवीषणाविन्दतःसाद्वादिशत्विक्तिपानामा परमांक्षेत्: महान्यः.
No. XIII.—The Grant of Kharagaha II.

The size of the plates is 15 to 15½ inches by 12. Both are broader at the end where the rings were fixed than at the other. The rings and the seal are missing. The plates are, on the whole, well preserved, a few spots only being defaced by verdigris. The letters resemble those of the published plates of Silāditya II. and Silāditya III. With the exception of the last lines of plate II., they are clearly incised and distinct. Clerical errors are numerous. The grant is dated from 'a camp of victory' situated at Pūliṇḍaka, or perhaps Aliṇḍaka.

Vasāvadvali offers nothing new. But the grant is important, as it is the first document issued by Kharagaha II. which has been found. Its date, Saṁvat 337, if taken together with that of the preceding grant of Dhara-

The grantee is (Pl. II. 14-15) a Rigvedi Brāhmaṇa of the Sārkardākha gotra.—Nārājaṇa, son of Keśa, a native of Anandapura, who settled in Khetaka. He is also called Anandapura cāturvidya, 'a Caturvedi of Anandapura.' This is of some interest, because, if this Anandapura is the same as Vadnagar (vulgo Barnagar), we have here the first notice of the famous Nāgarā Brāhmaṇa, the most distinguished and influential caste which Gujarāt contains.

The object granted is (Pl. II. 15-16) the village of Pangulapalli, situated in the district (bhūmi) called Ghrītalaya, and in the zillā of Śivabhāgapura.

The purpose for which the village is given is the usual one, viz. the performance of sacrifices.

The officials named in the grant are the dātaka, Pramātri Śrīna, and the Divā, Śrīmad Anahila, the son of Divān Śkaṇḍabhāta. The former appears to be a female, like the raṣjadihitri-bhūpā of Dharaṇasa's grant. But I do not know what to make of the epithet pramātri, which seems to be composed of pra + mātri, 'mother,' and not to be derived from pramā, 'to judge rightly.' Professor Bhāṇḍārkar (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. X. p. 71) gives the name of the Divā, which occurs again on the plates of Silāditya II. (Saṁvat 348), as Madhanahila. That would be a highly indecent name. In favour of my reading, Śrīmad Anahila, 'the illustrious Anahila' (instead of Śrī Madanahila), it may be urged that Anahila, or Anahila, is known to have been a Gujarāt name borne by the shepherd who showed Vanaṇāja the site of Anhalvāḍa-Pāṭhaṇ, and that it occurs among the Rajputs: see, e.g., Tod, Annals, vol. I. p. 708; Mad. ed. p. 607.

Transcript.

Plate I.


[88] Compare also above, p. 73, note 20.
[9] नासितिविद्धं उद्धतं विद्धिवं: [पादचारिव] तकमः नुमनः मण्डलमाहोभाष्मो वर्ममाहेश्वर: श्रीमुगे 

[10] देशत्रयसुस्तिनासनमुखस्वरूपमदिधिवर्धितं सम्भवतर्कारिणातः 

[11] तत्सीमविभाषनमयोऽविद्यायिनिः किरृकृतानामप्रतिविद्यायिनिः किरृकृतानामप्रतिविद्यायिनिः 

[12] हेः त्वायित्वनश्रीमरमोदि मिन्नामकोहि विक्रमादियिनिः किरृकृतानाममहृद्यिनिः किरृकृतानाममहृद्यिनिः 

[13] रमः श्रीमछलिवाच सत्यात्मकमकारणादुररूपेत: सम्भवत्रकथा विषयायिनिः किरृकृतानामप्रतिविद्यायिनिः 

[14] दनिजकदयेन बोधेवाध्यायमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[15] बृहस्पतिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[16] अपनिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[17] अपनिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[18] अपनिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[19] अपनिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[20] अपनिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[21] अपनिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

[22] अपनिविषयाय तस्यमहायावतसमध्यविश्वास्थितसंस्थापितं प्रभमायनकालः [क्रियान्वयनकालः] 

---

**Notes:**

20 L. 6, read चमोः। L. 7, read रंगेऽः, शुभेः। L. 8, read चंद्रः। L. 9, read वाचिकः। L. 10, read रामायानोऽः। L. 11, read विषयानीर्विश्र। संस्मरेः। तदेकः। L. 12, read भाषेः। कृतः, धोक्तः। श्रवसूः। L. 13, read शिशुपालः। L. 14, द्रष्टः।
Plate II.

[Plate II text here]
NO. XIV.—Grant of Śilāḍhita VI., surnamed Dhruvabhūta.

The plates are exceedingly massive, and measure each 15 inches by 13½. The rings and the seal which connected them are missing. The plates are not very well preserved. When I received them, they were covered with caked mud and verdigris, and not a single letter was readable. The cleaning cost, therefore, a great amount of labour and trouble. But notwithstanding this, a great part of the first plate and the upper portion of the second plate have remained, as a whole, illegible; single letters and words are recognizable, but the context could not be made out without the help of the publish-

ed grants. Fortunately the most important part of the inscription, the lower half of the second plate, is in a better condition, and can be read with tolerable certainty.

The letters on these plates closely resemble those of the grant of Śilāḍhita V. published in Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 16. But they are larger and incised with more care than those of the Luṇāvāḍa plates. They deserve a careful study on the part of those who are interested in the history of the Indian alphabets.

The text of the grant is not so full of clerical errors as that of the fifth Śilāḍhita. Still a considerable number of mistakes occur, and several lines have been left out. These lacunae corre-

ed grants.
spond exactly with those on the Lauśāvāda plates, and this agreement, as well as the recurrence of a number of phrases and corruptions, prove that both plates were copied from the same MSS. For our grant cannot be copied immediately from the earlier one, because it shows fewer mistakes.

The grant is dated from a camp of victory located at Ānandapura. The donor, Śilādīya VI, is the 19th king of the dynasty of Bhatārka who has become known. Contrary to the usage prevailing in other Valabhi grants, the description of this new ruler is given in poetry. It consists of four verses in the Vasantatilaka metre, which are preceded by the word paramānadhāvāraḥ, and followed by the usual titles and the name. The former word is, I think, merely due to a mistake of the Kānsār, who, in his impatience to have done, first skipped the whole description, and afterwards neglected to indicate that the word written by mistake is superfluous.

The translation of the passage referring to Śilādīya VI. (Pl. II. ii. 19-24) is as follows—

“His (the fifth Śilādīya’s) son is the ardent devotee of Mahēśvara, the supreme sovereign, the great king of kings and supreme lord, the illustrious Śilādīyadeva, who meditates on the feet of the supreme sovereign, the great king of kings and supreme lord, the illustrious Bappā. He is famous on account of his irresistible valour, he is the abode of Fortune; he strives to annihilate hell. He makes it his only purpose to save the earth; his fame shines pure as the full moon. He is made up of the qualities of the famous triad (of powers), he has conquered his enemies. He gives enjoyment to the poor, he always gives happiness. He is the abode of knowledge. All the guardians of the world praise him, the Vidyādharas serve him. He is famous on earth. He is resplendent with jewels, beautiful in person, a conglomeration of jewel-like qualities. He is endowed with lordliness, valour, and (other great) virtues; he is always engaged in conferring benefits on living beings. A real Janārdana, as it were, he humbles (ārdyayati) the pride of the wicked. He is exceedingly skilful in shaking again and again in battle troops of elephants. He is the abode of spiritual merit, all over the world his great prowess is celebrated in songs. The illustrious Dhrūbhaṭa conquers, he who is born in the line of the kings of kings and supreme lords, he who is supremely happy.”

There is only one statement in this long rigmarole which is of great importance, viz., that Śilādīya VI. was also called Dhrūbhaṭa. This word stands apparently for Dhrūvabhaṭa—literally the constant warrior. The first part of the compound has been contracted, because the pañcīṭ wanted a long syllable for his metre, and because Dhrū was, no doubt, at the time of the composition of this poetry, just as now, the vernacular Gujarati for Dhrūva.

Now this name Dhrūvabhaṭa resembles the form Tū-la-pō-pótus, which Hiwen Thangān gives as the name of the ruler of Valabhi whom he visited, more than any other royal name which has become known. As the transcription of Sanskrit Abhidharma by Chinese Opi-ta-mo, of bhādra by Py-ta-lo, and similar instances show, Tū-la-pō-pótus may stand just as well for Dhrūvabhaṭa as for Dhrūvapuṭu, the rendering which M. St.-Julien has adopted. Against this it may be urged that the Chinese translation of the word ‘Ch’ang-jui,’ ‘constamment intelligent,’ does not suit the compound Dhrūvabhaṭa. But this translation may have been caused by a mistake of Hiwen Thangān, who may either have mixed up the two words bhaṭa, ‘a warrior,’ and bhatta, ‘a pañcīṭ,’ or have been told the name incorrectly. For the frequent mistakes on the plates by which Bhatārka is changed to Bhatāśa, and Derabhāṭa to Derabhāṭa, show that the Valabhāns themselves were not very accurate in this respect.

If the identity of Hiwen Thangān’s contemporary and of Śilādīya VI. could be proved for certain, we should be able to fix, at least approximately, the initial date of the era in which the plates are dated. As our grant is dated 447, and Hiwen Thangān’s visit fell in the fifth decade of the seventh century A.D., the year 1 of the era of the plates must fall either shortly before or shortly after the year 290 A.D.

32 Compare, e.g., समभासित जयसुकभयात् Pl. I. I. 1.
33 Compare Kāṇeṣuadevi; 1st, XV. 32.
34 There is a fine precept which authorizes the distortion of words in order to avoid an offence against the

metre, and which deserves to become known. It is as follows—महानपि माधव च वर्षितभंगंम प्रायोऽत्र.
35 Mémones, II. 165.
I am at present inclined to believe that this view is the correct one. But, as the question is by no means simple, and as a number of other points have also to be considered, I do not wish to do more, for the present, than point out that the occurrence of the name Dhrúbhaṭa or Dhrúvabhāṣṭa on our grant requires the consideration of those who wish to settle the beginning of the era of the plates.

The date, Śaṃvata 447, Yēṣṭha, suddyā 5, or fifth day of the bright half of Yēṣṭha, 447, is given both in words and in cyphers, and is therefore indisputable. It settles definitively the question regarding the value of the Valabhī sign فعالي, and proves the correctness of Pañcit Bhagavānīś's and General Cunningham's explanation, who maintained that it stands for 'forty.' This date corroborates also my reading of the figures on the Lūnapāḍā plates issued by Śilāditya V as Śaṃvata 441.

The grantees are (Pl. II. ll. 25-26) Bhāṭṭa Ákhaṇḍālāmitra, son of Bhāṭṭa Viṣṇu, a Rigvedi of the Śārkardhādi gotra, a native of a famous Ánandapura, and a Chaturvedi of that town.36

The object granted is (Pl. II. ll. 26-27) the

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

1. village of Mahābhāṣṭa, situated in the tālukā (pathaka) of Uppaihāṭa (Upleṭa?) and in the zillā (ahāra) of Śrī Khetaka. The purpose for which the grant was made is the usual one.

The passage regarding the officials (Pl. II. ll. 36-37) is, unfortunately, not quite in order.

I think those mentioned are—
1. The dūṭaka: the grand chamberlain (mahā-pratihāra) the illustrious Dēṭaḥa.
2. The akṣhapatalika, or keeper of the records, Daftardār: Ḍājakula, the illustrious Siddhaṇāṭha, son of the illustrious Saṭvata.
3. The writer: Amītya, i.e. councillor Guha, son of Hem baṭa.

The name of the 'grand chamberlain' is a curious one, and I do not consider the reading to be certain.

The word akṣhapaṭalika does not occur on any of the known Valabhī grants, but it is common on those of the Chauulkyas of Anhilvād.37

The word Ḍājakula, which is placed before the name of the Daftardār, is a title which likewise occurs on the Chauulkya plates.38 It is probably the Sanskrit form of the modern Rāḍul or Rāval.

36 Regarding the Ánandapura Chaturvedis see above.
38 See loc. cit. p. 206.

Plate II.

[Plate II text here.]

---

[17] बक्शा सम्पोर्णादिनिमितो श्यामाचार्यानिविष्कारप्रकाशः।

[19] (तम) प्रणतानमुमात्पारिपक्वक्षितः।

[19] (ग्निवणानमुण्यिततरणनमूलज्ञताविपादविमुखः।

[19] दानुः परमभद्रायक्षमहाराजाधिराजप्रेमविद्वेदः।

[20] नक्षत्राधिकतप्रयतनः। श्रीसमुदरणामयः।

[21] निन्दमुखः। गुणधरः। नानावर्षः।

[22] गुणायतनः। ऐरियंकिमयः।

[22] युक्तः। सक्करजघाटपातकः।

[23] धिराधिपारः। धर्मशोभोऽधिवेदः।

[24] द्रैयं ऐरिकमुनिकस्वरः।

[25] महाभाषणक्षमचाराय।

[26] पवनविपुलायुप्रधर्मस्यक्षम्यकारकः।

[27] पपमहलालस्वरः।

[28] भ्रमणांदतीतः।

[29] ब्रह्मविलासभाष्यः।

[30] आंशितित्रियस्वरः।

[31] वर्जन्यस्वरः।
POLYANDRY IN THE PANJÀB.

SIR,—I have just read in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI. p. 315, Dr. Muir's paper "On the Question whether Polyandry ever existed in Northern India," and in response to the last sentence of his postscript the making known of a few facts I have gleaned may not be without interest.

Having occasion in 1872 to visit Ropar, a town in the Amţālā District at the point where the Sāvāna jī debouches from the hills, I was induced by hearing that a dāk of some kind was procurable at the Sirhind station of the Sind, Panjāb, and Delhi Railway to alight there, as the most convenient place for getting across the twenty miles between the railway and Ropar. No dāk of any kind was, however, procurable, and I was compelled to send for a common country-cart to pursue my journey in, and entered into conversation with the driver, a Panjābī Jaṭ, who was as good-humoured and communicative a man as the majority of his race. He let fall some remarks which induced me to question him on the subject of polyandry (of the existence of which I had not previously the faintest conception), and from his replies, as well as from subsequent inquiries, I have ascertained that there exists at this present time a system of polyandry among the Jaṭs. The same institution is not unknown among the Chamārs and other low castes at the foot of the hills and in the lower hills, and its existence in the higher hills is well known. My own inquiries have been in the Cīn-Sātālj districts of Ambāla, Ludhīnā, Fīrozpur, and Sīrā, and the Trans-Sātālj districts of Jālandār and Hoshiārpūr.

Whether the Jaṭs are Aryan or Turānian I do not know, but I have always remarked two distinct kinds of them—not, however, living apart from each other. One is the typical Sīkhs, tall and light-complexioned, with a purely Caucasian type of face, and often with an aquiline nose; the other is shorter and darker, and essentially Tatar in features. They are, so to speak, fused together, and the former type generally prevails, although the latter is very strong in particular families. The words of Prof. Weber, vol. VI. p. 317, describe exactly the differences between the Panjābī Jaṭ and Hindustānī Jaṭ. To such an extent does the former (in every respect the superior and manlier) carry his disregard of Brāhmanism that without the slightest compunction he cuts off *pīpal* branches (*Ficus religiosa*) to feed his camels—an act the Jaṭ would shrink from in horror as nothing less than sacrilege. My Panjābī camel-men have often been set upon and beaten for this act by the Hindustānī Jaṭs of the Dehli, Gurgon, and Rohtak districts.

When a Jaṭ is well-to-do he generally procures a wife for each of his sons, but if he is not rich enough to bear the expenses of many marriages he gets a wife for the eldest son only, and she is expected to, and as a rule does, accept her brothers-in-law as co-husbands. There is no attempt to conceal the fact, and it is even a common thing when women quarrel for one to say to the other, "You are one so careless of your duty as not to admit your husband's brothers to your embraces?" It is true that Brāhmanical influence prevents open cohabitation with an elder brother's wife, but no great pains are taken to conceal it. The custom of forcing a younger brother to take the elder brother's widow (to raise up seed to his brother) is well known. Many tribes practice it. I have even heard of the thing being done among poor Bānī ās Dehli.

C. S. KIRKPATRICK.

Dehli, 1st January 1878.
ANCIENT SUPERSTITIONS REGARDING "MEETING EYEBROWS."

Sir Henry Maine's article on South Slavonians and Rajputs has recalled to my mind a curious parallel between Hindu and Slavonic folklore.

In the 20th Lambak of the Katha Sotit Byagara a witch is mentioned who undertook to confer on her disciples the power of flying in the air, by means of the eating of human flesh (makhmdunsa). She is thus described:—"She was of repulsive appearance. Her eyebrows met, she had dull eyes, a depressed flat nose, large cheeks, widely parted lips, projecting teeth, a long neck, pendulous breasts, a large belly, and broad expanded feet."

The only point I desire to call attention to in this inventory of the lady's charms is the fact of her eyebrows meeting. For I find that Mr. Taylor, in his Primitive Culture, vol. II. p. 176, speaking of Slavonian superstitions says,—"A man whose eyebrows meet as if his soul were taking flight to enter some other body may be marked by this sign either as a werewolf or a vampire."

In both superstitions we find this notion, that meeting eyebrows are the outward sign of a predilection for human flesh.

C. H. T.

Calcutta, 15th Jan. 1878.

THE BLINDING OF SHAH MANSUR BY HIS REBELLIOUS SON.

Let not thy heart the World's vain goods pursue, For no one yet has found her promise true.

No stinging honey in her mart we buy, No thornless dates her garden will supply. If lamp she lights, as soon as it grows bright The wind extinquisheth the spreading light. Who careless doth his heart on her bestow, Behold, he cherishes a deadly foe: The warlike king, who made the earth his prey, His sabre dripping from the bloody fray, Who with one onset put a host to rout, Or broke a centre with a single shout; Who chiefs unjustly into prison threw, Beheading heroes when no crime they knew: Who made the lioness untimely bear In deserts when his name but sounded there; Who made Shirâs, Tabris, Irâk, obey— Succumbed at last on his appointed day: For one who his world-scanning eye made bright With stabbing awl destroyed that piercing sight

Bicknell's Selections from Hâdîr.

A Professorship of Zend has been founded at the Ecole des Hautes Études, Paris. It is the first chair established in Europe for the special study of the ancient language and literature of Persia. The first professor is M. James Darmesteter, the author of two works of great interest on the old Persian religion,—the first an essay on the mythology of the Avesta, entitled Haurvatât et Ameratat, published in 1875; and the second a volume, published last year, on the origin and history of the two principles, and styled Ormazd et Ahriman.


The first volume of Mr. Beames's work was reviewed at considerable length in the Indian Antiquary (vol. IV. p. 156). Our notice of the second volume shall be brief.

Mr. Beames speaks of the great and ever-growing pressure of work in Government offices, as "the machinery of Government becomes more complex." This compelled him to lay aside at one time all literary work for six months together. We have reason, then, to congratulate Mr. Beames and the public that the second volume issued from the press only two years and a half after the first. On the score of this pressure of official duty the author asks indulgence for "the disjointed and unfinished appearance of some parts of the work." Certainly there are marks of haste, and a want of artistic finish in the book; but we do not deem these to be unpardonable faults. On the other hand, the merits of Mr. Beames are great. They are such as these—extensive knowledge, great pains and patience in investigation, a quick and generally accurate perception. There are many statements in the book the truth of which we doubt, and some which we feel disposed to deny; but, take it all in all, the production is in a high degree creditable to the author.

The volume contains Book the Second, which comprises four chapters. The three first chapters discuss the Noun; the fourth the Pronoun.

In addition to the seven dialects which formally come under investigation, we have remarks on cognate forms of speech, such as Kasîrî, Nepâl, and the Gipsy language. Mr. Beames thus traverses a very extensive field, in which the report of a pioneer (which in truth he is) cannot reasonably be expected to be either perfectly accurate or exhaustive. But we are very thankful for the mass of information which he has supplied.

In some of his opinions Mr. Beames strongly dissent from the Pandits and even some European scholars. For example, Bangâll has been represented as the eldest daughter of Sanskrit, and as retaining the mother's character more fully than the younger sisters. But, says he, "it is in truth one of the youngest grand-daughters." Its phoneia and organic structure prove it to be "a very poor and rustic pataio" which of late has been deluged with resurrected Sanskrit words.
and forms. We submit the interesting question to those who have studied Bangâlî deeply; but meantime we hold with Mr. Beames, and with him also we reprobate the pedantry of reproducing dead Sanskrit forms in living Bangâlî speech.

The presence of Arabic and Persian words in the vernaculars of India has been to many a stumbling-block, and they have proposed to weed them out as interlopers—as invaders of recent date. Mr. Beames, however, justly reminds us that many of these words were naturalized very long ago. The influence of Arabic in India began with the conquest of Sindh in the early part of the 8th century; in the 11th the expedition of Mahmud of Ghazni extended the knowledge of Arabic (Mr. Beames should have added, 'and Persian') to all north-western India. The seven sister dialects had foreign elements thus woven into their structures from the very commencement; and often, even in sequestered rural places, the Arabic or Persian term is more familiar to the mass than any synonymous word of Indian origin.

Mr. Beames is much of a utilitarian. In the vast complications of classic grammar he has no complacency; he rejoices in the simplification which marks the modern dialects. English is "our own beautiful and practical language," which has "emancipated itself from awkward and cumbersome swaddling clothes." Thus, in regard to gender, he pities the 'stilted' Marâthî and Gujarâtî for having retained masculines, feminines, and neuters;—he thinks that Hindi, Panjabî, and Sindhi have done well in rejecting the neuter; and that Bangâlî and Oriya are to be congratulated on having no gender at all. We hardly know whether he prefers our English mode of designating natural (as distinguished from grammatical) gender to that which prevails in the languages which have retained the distinctive he dislikes. For instance, is it better to have horse for the masculine and mare for the feminine, than with the Marâthî to say ghôldâ, ghôldî? We cannot think so. Mr. Beames, it is plain, must immensely prefer the constancy with which the English article the does duty in all circumstances and connections; while he must pity the ever-shifting forms of its German representative—der, die, das, des, dem, den. What say the Germans to this? And will our friends in Western India rejudge his judgment when he ventures to speak of "the usual ill-luck of Marâthî"?

Mr. Beames in his first volume showed a good deal of 'a skipping spirit,' and refreshed himself and his readers with a very passable joke now and then. Hard official work, we fear, is taking the fun out of him; which is a pity on all accounts. In a discussion on the numerals (which, by the by, is one of the most interesting in the volume) he suddenly asks—"Had the Gipsies only learnt to count as far as six when they left India?" This, because above six the resemblance between the Gipsy and other Indian numerals nearly vanishes. Mr. Beames's question, if seriously put, is absurd, and as a joke the thing will hardly pass muster.

But we cannot let our closing remark be one of censure. We must heartily congratulate Mr. Beames on his having, on the whole, well sustained the position—and it was a high one—which he won for himself as an Orientalist by his former volume.

---

**History of Nepâl**, translated from the Parbatîya by Munshî Sâhâr Singh and Pandit Sâr Gujâr, with an introductory sketch of the country of Nepâl, by the editor, Daniel Wooton, M.A., M.D., late Residency Surgeon at Kâthmândâh. 8vo, pp. 324. (Cambridge University Press, 1870.)

Our information respecting Nepâl is still very defective, and, as Dr. Wright remarks, it is hardly possible to give it any degree of completeness "while our relations with it remain as they are at present," but for this very reason this work is all the more valuable. It is only to be regretted that the editor did not bestow more pains, while in the country, upon the revision of the Vânîshâni or Genealogical History of Nepâl, according to the Buddhist recension, which he here edited with only a few notes regarding the customs and places mentioned.

Dr. Wright's sketch of the valley of Nepâl surrounding the capital, about 20 miles in length by 15 in breadth, which is the only portion of the country open to the investigations of Europeans, occupies 75 pages, but, for want of a map, is not always very intelligible. Kâṭhâr mâ ngâ, the capital, known also by the names of Yinâsâ, Kântipur, and Kâthmândâh, is "said to have been founded by Râja Gunâkâmadava, in the Kaligat (sic, for Kalîyâga) year 8824 (A.D. 723)." It is built on no regular plan, and its shape is very irregular, but "is said by the natives to resemble the Khâra or sword of Dâvi." Its population is estimated by Dr. Wright at 30,000. "The better class of buildings is elaborately ornamented with plaster and paintings, and the houses in general possess large projecting wooden balconies, which are richly carved;" the temples "are several stories in height and profusely ornamented with carvings, painting, and gilding," but the carvings on many, and even on private houses, contain most obscene groups. The only reason assigned for which filthy custom is 'that such figures are supposed to protect the buildings from being struck by lightning' (pp. 9-10). The streets are narrow and the whole town is very dirty; in short "Kâthmândâh may be said
to be built on a dunghill in the midst of latrines”! (p. 12).

Pāṭan, the next city, about two miles S.E. of Kāṭhmāndū, was built by Rāja Bir Deva in the “Kaligat” year 3400 (A.D. 299), and is called by the names of Yellonedēsi and Lalita Pāṭan. Its population “is said to be 30,000” (p. 16). Bhaṭgāon, about nine miles E. from the capital, was founded by Rāja Anand Mall, A.D. 865, and was at first named Bhaktāpur, but was also known as Dharma Pāṭan and Khopodēsi; its population is also “estimated at about 30,000.”

The principal races of Nepāl are the Gorkhās or Gokhals, Newārs, Gurgyos, Lumbās, Kirātīs, Bhotiyās, and Lepchas. The Gorkhās is the dominant race, and derives its name, says Dr. Wright, “from the town of Gorkhā,” which is about 60 miles W.N.W. from Kāṭhmāndū, but this again is derived from the eponymous deity of the royal family, viz. Gorkhānātha. They conquered Nepāl in 1768. “The Lumbās and Kirātīs occupy the hilly country to the eastward of the valley,” and are famous as hunters. “They are both short, flat-faced people, powerfully built, and decidedly Mongolian in appearance” (p. 27). Like the Newārs and Bhotiyās, they are Buddhists. In very early times the chronicle relates that the Kirātīs came from the east and conquered the Ahir prince, establishing a dynasty which gave 29 princes to the throne, but was at last overthrown by the Somavānśī Rājpūts.

The second chapter of the introduction concludes with a very brief account of 22 of the principal jatās; the third gives some account of the occupations of the people, laws and punishments, trade and manufactures, agriculture, revenue, &c.; the fourth sketches briefly the history of the country during the past hundred years; and the last remarks on the political aspect of matters in Nepāl, and the petulious, avaricious, rude, and jealous character of the Gorkhās.

The ‘History’ is sadly deficient in details and dates. The valley, we are told, was formerly known as Nāg Hrad—“the tank of the serpent.” In the Tretāyuga, Vīśvabha Buddha came from a country called Aṇāpam to worship Swayambhū Buddha, and showed his discipes the place through which the waters of the Nāg Hrad should be made to run out. In later times the Rishi Nāg performed his devotions at the junction of the Bāgmati and Kāśvāti rivers, and ruled over the country, which derived its name from him. After this Mānjūrī came from Mahā-chin, and cut through the mountain and let the water run out with several Nāgas and other animals, but he per-

suaded Karkotak, king of the Nāgas, to remain, and pointed out to him a large tank (called Tandā) to live in; but afterwards Dāndārā dammed up the passage again, and Bhumī the Pāṇḍava came from Dolkha and amused himself in a stone boat upon the lake. Vishnu re-opened the passage, and a thousand years after, Rāja Śvayambhāra was made king. Vir Vikrama took service under him, and ultimately became king and “ruled a thousand years,” leaving the kingdom to his son Vikramādi. Later still Rāni Pingalā, the wife of Sudatta of Marwā, came and performed penances to Guhajēvī, but was taken back by her husband (pp. 104-5). These events, however, are all relegated to very early ages. Nā Nūrī installed a cowherd named Bhurkramā, as king, who founded a Gupta dynasty. We could have wished for a better chronology than Kirkpatrick’s, but that does not seem available; in fact the earlier dynasties have either been manufactured, or, which is quite as probable, and of which the case of the Simrua dynasty is an instance, two or more of them were contemporary, and none of them of any very great antiquity. The following are the lists of the dynasties with the dates derived by Mr. Prinsep from Kirkpatrick—and his names—where they differ from the Yonbdoesi:

1. Guptya Dynasty, 521 years.
   b.c. 3803 Bhūktamanagata, reigning 88 years (K. Burimahāgā, 18 years; Prinsep supposes about b.c. 844).
   3736 Jaya Gupta, his son, ruled 72 years.
   3722 Parama Gupta , 80
   3631 Bhimagupta 93 (Śrī Harsh 67)
   3564 Bhimagupta 100
   3526 Manigupta 37
   3489 Vīśvagupta 42
   3423 Yakshula Gupta 71 (Jaya-gupta II. overcame the Rājpūts near Janakpur about b.c. 700 ?)

2. The Ahir Dynasty from Hindustān.
   b.c. 3351 Mahārśī, Ahir (Bali Śrīha, descendant of Mahipī Gopāla).
   3302 Jayamati Śrīha.
   3281 Bhuvana Śrīha, overcome by Kirātīs from the east.

   b.c. 3240 Yalambara, 15 years, Yellang (Prinsep b.c. 646 ?).
   3150 Pavi (Daskham), in whose reign the Kalyug began, b.c. 3102.
   —— Skandhara.
   3113 Valamba (Ballāncha).
   3086 Hruiti (Kingi).

1 Thomas’s ed. of Prinsep’s Essays, vol. II. Useful Tables, pp. 268-71.
2 Prinsep by a clerical error has 3211 here.
3 The names in italics are wanting in Kirkpatrick.
B.C. 3040 Humati (Henanter).
2990 Jótédātī (Tusakhaj joined in the Mahābhārata).
2949 Gali (Srupast).
2910 Pushka (Parb).
2854 Suyarma (Jeyottāri).
2794 Farva (Panchem).
2723 Bunka (King-king-king).
2667 Swamanda.
2627 Sthunko (Thumutotemporary with Aśoka).

B.C. 260 F.
2558 Gighri (Jaigri).
2498 Nanė (Jenneo).
— Luk.
2365 Thōra.
2394 Thōkō (Thamu).
2211 Varmā.
2138 Guja (Gunjeh).
— Pushkara (Kashkūn).
2065 Keśū (Teahā).
2019 Sugal (Sungmā).
1950 Sansa (Jusha).
1887 Gunan (Gontho).
1813 Khimbu or Shimbu.
— Patluka attacked by the Somavāraśāpūts.
1739 Gasti (Galiyang subdued by the Somavāraśā).

4. Somavāraśa Dynasty.
B.C. 1658 Nimika or Nimisha (Nevesit, b.c. 175).
1608 Matāksha (Mataratīto).
1517 Kāka-varmā.
1441 Pasūpāsha-deva rebuilt the temple of Pasūpati k.y. 1234 (Pasūpushadeva).
1385 Bhāskara-varmā, a great conqueror.
5. Sāravāṇaśa Dynasty, ruling at Bāṅkēvaṇa.
B.C. 1311 Bhumī-varmā, a Khetri, crowned in k.y. 1359.
1270 Chandra-varmā.
1249 Chandra-varmā (Jaya-varmā).
1187 Varsha-varmā (Vrishā-varmā).
1130 Sārva-varmā.
1081 Pṛthvi-varmā.
1025 Jyeshṭha-varmā.
971 Harī-varmā (Kuvera-varmā).
901 Kuvera-varmā (Harī-varmā).
824 Sīddhi-varmā.
763 Haridatta-varmā built the temple of Nila-kāṭha Nārāyaṇa.
724 Vasudatta-varmā.
691 Paśi-varmā (Sripatri-varmā).

B.C. 688 Śivārīddhi-varmā.
611 Vasaṇa-varmā.
550 Sīva-varmā (Deva).
— Kruḍadeva-varmā.
493 Vṛkṣa-deva-varmā; Śankarāchārya visited Nepal.
436 Śankara-deva Rāja.
386 Dharma-deva (Brahmadeva).
335 Mān-deva.
297 Mahādeva.
247 Vasundēva-varmā II. crowned k.y. 2800.
190 Udyaḍēva-varmā.
143 Māṇadeva-varmā II.
98 Guṇakāmādeva-varmā (Sukam).
48 Śivadeva-varmā removed the capital to Deva Pātaṇ.
B.C. 6 Narēndradeva-varmā, brother of Śivadeva.
A.D. 27 Bāhmaṇadeva-varmā (displaced by the Ahirs).
43 Vishūdeva-varmā (Vishnu-gupta).
117 * Viśvādeva-varmā contemporary with Vikramāditya, gave his daughter in marriage to Ansu-varmā, a Thākuri or legitimate Rājput (Krishna-gupta).
6. The Thākuri Dynasty, capital Mādayulakha (p. 133).
A.D. 259 Anū-varmā (Anghu-varmā). Bibhuvarmā built an aqueduct on the left side of the road leading southward to Bāṅk-pokhri; in his time 3000 years k.y. had elapsed b.c. 101.
301 Kṛita-varmā.
319 Bāmārjuna-deva.
388 Nanda-deva. Sālīvāhana Saka introduced into Nepal.
299* Vīra-deva (Śiva-deva 371) founded Lalitpur.
— Chandrasētū-deva, the country suffered from invaders.
387 Narēndra-deva, 7 years (37 years).
424 Vara-deva, 8 years (Bala-deva, 17 years); moved his capital to Lalit-Pātaṇ; Gorakṣānātha came to Nepal; 12 years' drought; Maschchhindranatha came to Nepal k.y. 3623, a.d. 592.
441 Śankara-deva, 12 years.
453 Varudhamāṇa-deva, 13 years (Bhima Arjuna 16 years).
469 Balki-deva 13 years (Jaya-deva, 19 years).
488 Jaya-deva, 15 years (Srivala-deva, 16 years).
504 Bālārjuna-deva, 17 years (Kandara-deva, 27 years).
(807 Vikramā-deva, 12 years.)*

* These dates cannot both be correct; if we accept the second it would tally well enough with the next date under Gukkṣēna-deva k.y. 3854,—only that date is perhaps considerably too early.
BOOK NOTICES.

A.D. 810 Gunakaśāma-deva, 51 years; founded Kāntipur or Kāthmandū as his capital k.t. 3824, A.D. 723.
908 Bhūjā-deva, 8 years (Bhūjādevabhadra).
917 Lakshmi-kāma-deva, 22 years.
938 Jayakāma-deva, 80 years; he died without issue, and the Vaiśya Thākurs of Noakot; elected from among themselves.
955 Bhāskara-deva (Udaya-deva).
966 Balā-deva.
977 Padma-deva.
984 Nāgārjuna-deva.
987 Sankara-deva, expelled by The restored Rājput Dynasty.
A.D. 1004 Vāma-deva.
1006 Harsha-deva.
1022 Sadāśiva-deva; restored the Paśupati temple k.t. 3851, A.D. 750.
1050 Māna-deva ruled 10 years (Indra-deva 12 years).
1062 Narasiṣṭha-deva 22 years (Mān-deva 5 years.)
1067 Nanda-deva 21 years (Narendra-deva 6 years).
1073 Raudra-deva 7 years (80 years).
1153 Mitra-deva 21 years (Amrit-deva 3 years).—Ari-deva 22 years.
—Abhaya Mallā, introduced the now Samvat
A.D. 889 (1346) Jayā-deva Mallā 10 years.
1280 Ānanda Mallā, brother, 25 years; founded Bhāṣṭāgūn a.d. 865, where he ruled.
Kāṁṣakā Dynasty, capital—Bhāṣṭapura or Bāthpūndon.
1 Nāṅga-deva came from Kāṁṣakā, bringing Newānas from Nāṅgā, and defeated the Mallā rājas a.d. 889 ruled 50 years.
2 Ganga-deva 41 years.
3 Narasiṣṭha-deva 31 years; founded Chāpāgūn A.D. 991.
4 Śaṅkara-deva 39 years.
5 Rāmasiṣṭha-deva 53 years.*
6 Hari-deva removed to Kāṁtipur; invaded and slain by Makunda-sena, whose troops were destroyed by pestilence. Then the Vaiśya Thākurs of Noakot, established many petty chiefships and ruled 225 years.

Adīgāhā Dynasty.
A.D. 1324, Harasiṣṭha-deva of Simraungarh, 28 years.

fter this Kirkpatrick's lists differ greatly from these, and it is evident that previous to the time of Harasiṣṭha-deva, A.D. 1324, the chronology is in inextricable confusion; from that date Dr. Wright's book helps greatly to rectify our previous knowledge. This dynasty is doubtless placed three centuries too early by the Vaiśānvis, which apparently makes Gunakāma-deva of a previous list contemporaneous with Sadāśiva-deva of this one.
It will be observed that this Kāṁṣa Dynasty presents us with the same names in nearly the same order as they occur in the Samaungas or Simrau dynasty, viz. 1. Nāāyupa deva, who, according to Hodgson, founded
A.D. 1332 Mataliṣṭha-deva 15 years.
1367 Śaṅkara-deva 22 years.
1389 Sāmaṣṭiṣṭha-deva 15 years; a great earthquake in A.D. 1408 (1398?) destroyed the temple of Machchhindranathā, etc.

Restored Mallā Dynasty of Bhāthpūndon.
1 Jayabhadra Mallā 15 years, son-in-law of Sāmaṣṭiṣṭha-deva.
2 Nāga Mallā 15 years.
3 Jayajagat Mallā 11 years.
4 Nāgandra Mallā 10 years.
5 Ugra Mallā 15 years.
6 Aśoka Mallā 19 years.
7 1386 (? Sājaṣṭhita Mallā 43 years, a legislator.
8 1429 (7) Yaka or Jayakāthā Mallā 43 years, kingdom divided.
9 1472 (9) Rāya Mallā, eldest son of Gaka, 15 years.
10 Suvarna Mallā 15 years.
11 Pratila Mallā 15 years.
12 Viśa Mallā 15 years.
13 Trilokya Mallā 15 years.
14 Jagatjyoti Mallā 15 years.
15 Nārāyaṇa Mallā 21 years.
1643 Jagatprakāśa Mallā 21 years.
1674 Jitāmitra Mallā 21 years.
1695 Bhupatōndra Mallā 34 years.
1721 Banaṭj Mallā; Narbūpāla of Gorkha invaded Nepal 1729.

Mallā of Banāpā.
9 Rāya Mallā, second son of Yaka Mallā, 21 years.

Rājas of Kāṭhmāndū.
9 Ratna Mallā, youngest son of Yaka Mallā, 71 years.
10 Amara Mallā, 47 years.
11 Śrīya Mallā.
12 Nārāyaṇa Mallā.
13 Mahindrā Mallā; temple of Tūlījadevi built at Kāṭhmāndū a.d. 1549, and of Nārāyaṇa at Lalīt-Pātan 1566.
14 Sadāśiva Mallā, expelled.
15 Sivasiṣṭha Mallā, his brother; temple of Changu Nārāyaṇa repaired 1686, and that of Suyambhū 1594.
16 Lakṣamānārāyaṇa Mallā, became insane.

* The dates of the inscription Newār Sah. 542, the Kotsāhī-yajna 515, and Jayasthitī's death 509 (pp. 193, 197), are probably in error by 100 years. Prasag places the accession of Jayakāthā in Newār Sah. 371, or A.D. 1610, but this appears to be too late.
* Three dates are cited in this reign—S. 775, 783, 797 (pp. 191-2)—but the accuracy of them is questioned by Dr. Wright; they are in accordance, however, with what follows.
17 Pratāpa Malla a.d. 1630\textsuperscript{11}; abdicated for a time in favour of his son:—
\hline
a.d. 1663 Parthipendra Malla 1 year.
1667 Nripendra Malla 1 year.
1668 Mahipendra Malla 1 year.
1669 Chakravartendra Malla 1 day—died.
1689 Mahendra or Bhāpākendra Malla 5 years.
1694 Śrī Bhāskara Malla 8 years; a plague raged for two years.
1702 Jagajīa Malla, a distant relative.
1732 Jayaprabakāsa Malla a.d. 39 years; war with Prithvīnārāyaṇa, who took Kāntipur in 1768.
\hline
\textbf{Kings of Pāla.}
Harharasīiha Malla, son of Śivasīiha, No. 15 of Kāthmanḍu.
1654 Siddhi-narsiśiha Malla.
1667 Śrīvināśa Malla (Nirman Indra Malla).
1702 Yogaranendra Malla.
1706 \textsuperscript{12} Mahipatindra or Mahendra Śivasīha Malla of Kāthmanḍu.
1722 Jayayoga prakāśa Malla.
1729-31 Śrī Viśṇu Malla, grandson of Yogaranendra.
1742 Rājyā Prakāśa Malla.
--- Rājājīt Malla of Bāhagdūn 1 year and expelled.
--- Jayaprabakāśa Malla of Kāntipur 1 or 2 years and expelled.
1749-50 Viśṇujīt Malla, grandson of Viśṇu Malla, 4 years; murdered.
Dalmardan Śāh, a Gorkhāl of Noākōt, 4 years; expelled.
Tej Narasiśiha Malla, 3 years; expelled by Prithvīnārāyaṇa.
\hline
\textbf{Gorkhāl Rājās claiming descent from the Udāyapura family (p. 276).}
\textsuperscript{13}

\hline
1 Michā Khān ruled at Nuviākoṭ, 5 Vīchitra Khān.
2 Jayan Khān.
3 Śūrya Khān.
7 Kulmandan Śāh ruled over Kāski.
8 Yasōvām Śāh, Rāja of Lamjung.
\hline
a.d. 1659 Śrī Drabya Śāh, subdued Gorkha, Saka 1841, and reigned 11 years.
1670 Śrī Purandar Śāh, his son, 35 years.
1693 Śrī Chhatra Śāh, his son, 7 months.
1696 Śrī Rāma Śāh, his brother, 27 years.
1683 Śrī Dambar Śāh, his son, 9 years.
1642 Śrī Kriṣhṇa Śāh, son, 11 years.\textsuperscript{14}
1653 Śrī Rudra Śāh, son, 16 years (11 on p. 290).
1669 Śrī Prithvīpati Śāh, 47 years.
\hline
\textsuperscript{11} Dr. Wright gives a facsimile of the Mantra composed by him and inscribed on the temple of Jagannāth, dated a.d. 774, or a.d. 1633.
\textsuperscript{12} This date and that of his death, 1722, do not accord with the rule of Mahendra 1698-1694, but Kirkpatrick gives 1658, Nirman Indra Malla; 1659, Yogaranendra Malla.
\textsuperscript{13} Dr. Wright gives a facsimile of the Mantra composed by him and inscribed on the temple of Jagannāth, dated a.d. 774, or a.d. 1633.
\textsuperscript{14} Thus on p. 279, but 16 years on p. 290.
\textsuperscript{15} Trans. As. Soc. vol. II. p. 283.
THE WIVES OF MUHAMMAD.

WHEN the manner of Muhammed's relationships with persons of the gentler sex is subjected to investigation as a historical study, the topic naturally divides itself into several sections.

I. We may enumerate, in the first place, his lawfully-married wives.

1. The first of these was Khadīja, daughter of Khawailid. At the time of his marriage to this lady, in 595 A.D., Muhammed was in his twenty-fifth year, and Khadīja was a widow of forty. Before this marriage she had been twice a widow, her first husband having been Abū Hālah, and her second Ailq bin 'Abdāb: some of the Moslem historians reverse the order of these two names. By each of her former husbands Khadīja had borne two children,—a son and a daughter,—who had all of them died before her third marriage. By this marriage six children were born to Muhammed, the first and the last of whom were boys, and the remainder girls. There is a want of harmony in the statements of Muhammadan historians in regard to this point, some of them affirming that Muhammed had at least four sons by this marriage: the above-mentioned statement, however, is the one upon which there is a pretty general agreement, and according to that statement the names of the children, in the order of birth, are given thus:—the eldest, Qāsim; then, the girls, Zainab, Ruqayyāa, Fatimā, and Umma Qolthum; then, lastly, 'Abd-Manāf, who is called also 'Abdullāh, Tayib, and Tahir. The male children died in early childhood; the girls grew up, and at length married. When Muhammed was fifty years of age he lost Khadīja: she died at the age of sixty-five, in December 619, in the month of Ramzān, and was interred near Makkah. Her tomb, which is enclosed by a square wall, is still in existence, and is regularly visited by pilgrims to Makkah, especially on Friday morning.

Khadīja is known in Moslem legend under the title of 'the chief of women,' she having been the first of her sex (as she was, indeed, also the first human being) who avowed herself a believer in the mission of Muhammed. There is also a legend that Muhammed considered her one of the only four perfect women that ever lived,—the other three being Asia wife of Pharaoh, Mary the mother of Jesus and daughter of Imran, and his own daughter Fatima.

2. His second wife was Sauda, daughter of Zam'ah. Sauda was a widow at the time of her marriage to Muhammed, but she had been only once married. Her husband, Sakhr bin 'Umar, was her paternal cousin. Like Khadīja, Sauda was of Quraishite blood, but through a stock remote from that of Muhammed, and, with her husband, was among the earliest adherents of Islam: they were among those who, on account of the persecutions of the Muhammadans at Makkah, fled to Abyssinia as exiles. Sauda may therefore be regarded as having been more than ordinarily devoted to the cause of the new faith. There is some uncertainty about the question of Sauda's offspring by her first marriage: the best authorities, however, seem agreed that she had had but one child,—a son 'Abdūr-rāhīm, whose death is believed to have occurred before that of her husband. It is related that when her husband Sakhr lay ill on his dying bed, Sauda mentioned to him one morning a dream from which she had just awoken;—'the prophet of God' had approached her and placed his foot on her neck. Her husband replied, 'I am about to die; thou wilt soon be the wife of another.' Her marriage with Muhammed took place in February 620, within two months of the death of his first wife. For three or four years Sauda continued to be the only woman with whom he cohabited. There was no issue by this marriage; though it is said that motives of affection, rather than of worldly self-interest, dictated the union. However this may have been, the Moslem historians relate that when age began to advance upon Sauda, Muhammed was on the point of divorcing her. It seems a doubtful point whether the desire to divorce Sauda was occasioned by her advancing age, or by some uneasiness in Muhammed's mind as to her fidelity. It is a somewhat remarkable circumstance that it was only a year before this time—viz. at the conquest of Khaybar—that he assigned to Sauda her portion from the revenues of this victory. The desire to divorce her arose only nine years after the marriage. One legend relates that divorce was actually effected, and this through no misde-
meaour of hers, but solely on the plea that her time of life was now such as to preclude the hope of offspring. She, however, accosted him in the public street, and entreated that she might not be cast out of house and home in her old age, and begged her husband that, if such was his desire, he would bestow upon his favourite 'Āīshā her share of his company,—resorting to the society of his more youthful wife on Sauda's day. To this suggestion the prophet of God' magnanimously acceded; and, revoking the sentence of divorce, he permitted Sauda to continue henceforward to be nominally his wife. What may have been her age at the time of her being united in marriage to Muḥammad is a point that cannot be ascertained; she must, however, have been comparatively young, for she did not die till the end of the Khaļifāt of 'Umar, some ten years after the death of Muḥammad.

3. Muḥammad's third wife was 'Āīshā, usually written Ayešā, and less frequently Ašā. 'Āīshā was the daughter of 'Abdullāh b. Wāshā, better known as 'Abdullāh b. 'Abdul Qayyām, father of 'Abdul Bāqir, and son of the spinsters' father'.—a title which was bestowed upon him in allusion, apparently, to the fact that he was the father of the only spinster whom 'the prophet of God' had taken into his haram. It is not ascertainable at what period this name was given to the father of 'Āīshā; most probably it was not given till after the Hijāra, when the marriage to Muḥammad of such a large number of widows would give distinction to the circumstance of 'Āīshā being the only one among all his wives who had been married to him in her virginity,—a circumstance of which 'Āīshā never failed to boast. She was the most youthful of his wives, having been married to him at the age of six years, and Muḥammadan historians relate that 'the prophet of God' consummated his marriage with the child when she reached her ninth year (Arab. suḥbat, ijtima', zajj; Pers. hambistān). Some of the Muḥammadan authorities, however, make each of these events to have occurred one year later in her life,—thus substituting seven for six, and ten for nine. What may have been the impulse which led Muḥammad, then more than half a century old, to form this outré alliance, it is not easy to conjecture: thus much, however, may be said, that the immediate practical effect of it was to draw yet more closely the bond of friend-

ship which already existed between him and her father, Abū Bakr. Such things could not have been so revolting to the minds of the Arabs as they are to ours, for according to one authority we find that Muḥammad gave his own favourite daughter, Fāṭima, in marriage when she was but nine years of age; some, however, say that she was about fourteen at the time. Muslim traditionists are not agreed as to the precedence of the marriage with Sauda and with 'Āīshā: all of them are agreed in assigning these marriages to a period early in the same year—viz. 620 A.D. The truth seems to be that the alliance with 'Āīshā was contracted first in the order of time, and that the circumstance of the marriage with Sauda having been consummated prior to that with the child of Abū Bakr furnishes the only claim in Sauda's case to priority to her in a chronological list of the nature of the present one. The marriage with 'Āīshā would appear to have been suggested in the first instance by a desire on Muḥammad's part to attach to his own interests her father, who was somewhat younger than Muḥammad, and who, after her death, became the ecclesiastical and political chief of Islam, and first of the Khalīfāt. At the time of his marriage to 'Āīshā, Muḥammad had just turned fifty years of age, so that at the time of his death, at sixty-three, she was about nineteen. That he was influenced in this case by ordinary conjugal emotion can hardly be supposed: the disparity in the matter of age is very striking; and it is not susceptible that the charms of the poor child were so duly unfolded at the age of six as to have effected a conquest over the heart of one who had already known more than a quarter of a century of married life. There seems every ground for believing that this was merely a marrage de convenance,—an alliance mainly designed to secure, by the strongest ties available, the attachment of her father—a powerful and well-to-do citizen—to the then wavering and doubtful cause of Islam. With but few intermissions, 'Āīshā, though childless, maintained through the whole period of her married life the position of favourite wife; and the traditionists delight to relate how that it was on the floor of her house and in her arms that 'the prophet of God' breathed his last, and that her apartment in Madīna has been the one only resting-place of his remains. She lived to a tolerably
good age, for she survived Muhammad about forty-seven years, and did not die till the fifty-eighth year of the Hijra (= 680 A.D.), when she would be about sixty-seven years of age.

Partly on account of her having always been so great a favourite of her husband's, and partly on account of her having become after his death so great an authority for legends concerning him, 'A'ishah is known in Moslem literature as An-nabiyya, 'the prophetess,' and Ummu-l-Muslinin, 'mother of Muslims.'

4. His fourth marriage was with Hafsah, daughter of 'Umar, the immediate successor of Abū Bakr in the Khilafat. The name of this lady appears in various forms: thus, Hafsah, Hafsa, Haphsa, Haphza, Haphsah, Haphzah, &c. The marriage took place in the third year of the Hijra (i.e. in 624 A.D.), when Muhammad was in his fifty-fifth year, Hafsah being from eighteen to twenty years of age. This was her second marriage, her former husband, Khunais the Ethiopian (some name him Ja'ash the Egyptian), having died six or seven months before her marriage to Muhammad. Whatever may have been the real purpose of Muhammad in contracting this alliance, it had the effect of drawing into still closer friendship to himself her father, 'Umar. The course of this marriage was not unchequered; it was Hafsah who, on one of her own days, discovered 'the chief of the prophets' on her own bed with Mary the Coptic slave: she is, moreover, said to have been one of those two of Muhammad's lawfully-married wives whom he divorced,—the other, as we have seen, was Zainab. The occasion of her being divorced was his displeasure at her determination not to observe secrecy in relation to the circumstances of his amour with the Egyptian girl: afterwards, however, when 'the apostle of God' perceived the deep offence which the divorce had occasioned his friend 'Umar, the angel Gabriel was sent down with a special revocation of the sentence of divorce, the matter was made up, and the daughter of 'Umar was restored to favour. Hafsah died at Madina, at the age of sixty, about the forty-first year of the Hijra, and was childless in both of her marriages.

5. His fifth wife was Zainab daughter of Khuzayma. This alliance was contracted in the ninth month of the fourth year of the Hijra (Dec. 625 A.D.). At the time of her marriage to Muhammad, Zainab had already been thrice married; her first husband, Tufail bin Hārīth, divorced her; the second, 'Ubaida bin Hārīth, a paternal cousin of Muhammad's, was slain at the battle of Badr; and the third, 'Abū l-läh bin Ja'ash, was slain in the battle of Uḥud. The exact age of this lady at the time of her marriage to Muhammad does not appear to be known: she died soon after her marriage,—some say eight months after, and others say a year and a half,—and with the single exception of Kha'dīja was the only one of his wives who did not survive him. Zainab was childless in all her marriages.

She is said to have been one of the three whom Muhammad took in marriage at their own request. The beneficence of her disposition towards destitute converts won for her the epithet Ummu-l-Musālikin, 'Mother of the poor.' Some, however, record that this epithet was applied not to this Zainab, but to Zainab bint Ja'ash.

6. The sixth wife was a paternal cousin of his, Umm Salama, daughter of Abi Umaiyya. This alliance took place in the fourth year of the Hijra, in January 626 A.D., within one month of Muhammad's marriage with Zainab bint Khuzayma. At the time of her marriage to Muhammad she was twenty-eight years of age, and had been once a widow. Her husband, Abū Salama, died from a wound received at the battle of Uḥud,—death supervening some eight months after the infliction of the wound. She brought with her four children, the offspring of her late marriage, but she had no issue by her second. Umm Salama had been twice to Abyssinia with her husband, who had emigrated thither on account of the persecutions and hardships which, as adherents of Muhammad, they experienced at Makkah. Though not young at the time of her marriage to Muhammad, she still is said to have been very beautiful. She at first excused herself from complying with his proposal, partly on the ground of her maturity in point of age. Muhammad, however, removed her objections by urging that he too was well advanced in years, and that as for her children, they should be his care. Notwithstanding this, however, it is recorded by some of the traditionists that this lady was one of the three who were taken in marriage by Muhammad at their own request. This marriage of Umm Salama was consummated four months after the death of her husband, and within one month of Muhammad's marriage to his fifth wife.
his marriage in the present instance, he remained in her society for a period of three days; and his example in this particular was ever after followed by 'believers' when they added fresh inmates to their *haram*. From the circumstance that Muhammad was wont to have Umm Salama accompany him on the march and in his travels generally, it has been inferred that she was one of his special favourites. The exact period of her death is not known: it occurred, however, at some period between the fifty-ninth and sixty-first years of the Hajira, when she had reached the advanced age of eighty-four.

7. Muhammad's seventh wife was Zainab, the daughter of Jahsh. Zainab was a cousin of Muhammad's, being daughter of Amîna, who was a sister of Muhammad's father, 'Abdu'll-lah. Her former husband, Zaid bin Harith, was at one time a slave of Muhammad's, and, being afterwards freed by him, was adopted by him as his own child. Zainab was divorced from her husband in order that she might be united in marriage to 'the prophet of God.' This marriage was effected a few months after the former one with Umm Salama—viz. in June 626, in the fifth year of the Hajira, Muhammad being then fifty-five years of age. Zainab, in common with so many of his other wives, was childless, and died at the age of fifty-three. There are certain exceptional features in connexion with this marriage: in the first place, the four witnesses required by Islamic law in order to legalize the marriage were dispensed with. The reason was that when, in consequence of the displeasure generally felt in regard to the whole transaction, the difficulty of finding witnesses in this case arose, Muhammad declared that Gabriel had been sent down to him with a message from God,—"We have joined her in marriage unto thee." Thus was Zainab his *divinely-appointed* bride,—a circumstance on which she was wont, on occasion, to vaunt herself in the presence of her co-wives, saying that, whereas the other wives were given away by their relatives, she had been bestowed upon 'the prophet' by an express divine revelation and behest. Another exceptional feature is found in the extreme difficulty that exists in arriving at a harmonious statement of figures. According to one account, the divorce took place a year after her marriage with Zaid, and when she was only nine years of age, or as some say seven; according to another account Zainab was over thirty at the time of that event. Again, as to the time of her death, it is said by some that she survived till the fiftieth year of the Hajira; by others that she survived Muhammad only ten or eleven years, or till about the twentieth year of the Hajira. It seems most likely that she was thirty at the time of her divorce; and, her age being fifty-three at the time of her death, she would have survived Muhammad about seventeen years.

8. The eighth wife of Muhammad was Juwairiya, daughter of Banî-Harîth, chief of the tribe of the Banî-Mustaliq. Juwairiya was a widow at the time of her marriage to Muhammad,—her unfortunate husband, Zîhî-î-Shafrain, who was her paternal cousin, having just been put to death at the battle of the Banî-Mustaliq. On lots being cast for her as a trophy of war, she fell to the share of Thâbit bin Qais. She is said, however, to have been particularly beautiful; and it is related that 'the prophet of God,' overpowered by her beauty, purchased her from Thâbit for a sum of money, and without further delay consummated marriage with her. This event occurred in the fifth year of the Hajira, December 626 A.D.; and, as she died in the fifty-sixth year of the Hajira, at the age of sixty-eight, she would be about seventeen at the time of this marriage.

9. His ninth wife was a Jewess, Saffa, daughter of Hayy bin Aqîlub. Saffa is said to have been a beautiful damsel of seventeen or eighteen years at the time of her marriage to Muhammad. She had been twice married, and had been divorced by her first husband, Salâm bin Shikam. Her second husband, the Jewish chief Kinâm bin Râbi', was slain by the party of Muhammad in the battle of Khaibar. On returning from the battle 'the prophet of God' seated her, as his favourite trophy in the war, behind himself on his own camel, and covered her with his own mantle, in token of having made her his wife. The marriage took place immediately after the battle in which her husband had been slain,—that is, in the seventh year of the Hajira (= 628 A.D.). Saffa died childless in the fifty-second year of the Hajira, having survived Muhammad forty years: by that time she would be about sixty-three years of age.

10. Muhammad's tenth wife was Umm Habîba, daughter of Abî Sofân. At the
time of her marriage with Mu’ammad this lady was the widow of 'Ubaydullāh bin Ja‘lāsh, by whom she had become the mother of one child,—a girl. ‘Ubaydullāh was, in the first instance, a Muḥammadan; but, in consequence of the growing persecution of Muḥammad and his adherents in Makka before the Hajira, he removed to the Christian province of Abyssinia, where he gave up Islam and embraced the religion of the country, and at length died a Christian. This man was one of the ‘Four Inquirers,’ so called,—that is, persons who are said in Moslem legend to have been in a state of expectancy of a prophet just prior to the time when Mu’ammad announced his mission. ‘Ubaydullāh was a maternal cousin of Muḥammad’s,—his mother having been a daughter of ‘Abdullāh, Mu’ammad’s grandfather; he was also a brother of Zainab bint Ja‘lāsh, the divorced wife of Zaid. On hearing of his death, Muḥammad sent for his widow, and took her in marriage. This event took place at Madīnah in the seventh year of the Hajira, in the autumn of 628 A.D.—their ages being respectively fifty-six and thirty (or, as some say, thirty-five). This lady had no issue by the second marriage; she lived to see the good age of sixty-four, dying in the fortieth year of the Hajira (=832 A.D.)—thus surviving Muḥammad about thirty years, and dying during the Khilafat of her brother Mu‘āwiyah.

11. The lady who is generally believed to have been the last of his married wives was Maimūna, daughter of Hārith, and maternal aunt of Ibn ‘Abbas.1 This was the third marriage of Maimūna,—her former husbands having been Mas‘ūd bin ‘Umar, and the second Būrahām, from the first of whom, from some cause not now ascertainable, she had become separated. She was joined in marriage to Muḥammad in the seventh year of the Hajira (=629 A.D.),—his age and hers being respectively fifty-eight and twenty-six. This lady Maimūna, together with Umma Salama and Zainab bint Khuzayma, are the three who are said to have bestowed themselves, unsolicited and of their own will and request, upon the apostle of God to be his wives. Some of the authorities do not allow to Maimūna a place among his lawfully-married wives,—maintaining that in this instance there was no formal marriage. At the time of his marriage to her, Muḥammad had already in his haram eight wives, besides ladies of other descriptions: ‘Abdullāh and Zainab bint Khuzayma were the only two who had died. Maimūna lived just fifty-five years after the celebration of her third marriage, and was childless in all her marriages. Surviving, as she did, to the sixty-third year of the Hajira, and to the advanced age of eighty-one, Maimūna was thus not only the last of Muḥammad’s wives, but also the oldest, and the one who survived him the longest.

II. We come now, in the second place, to the case of those of Muḥammad’s womenfolk who do not fall under the above description of ‘lawfully-married’: these cases arrange themselves naturally under two heads:

1. Those ladies with whom he shared connubial rites, but to whom he was not formally married.

In most of these cases the revolting nature of the details must be our excuse for giving no more than the bare names. The women were some of them slaves of Muḥammad’s household, and others were captives taken by him among the spoils of war, and appropriated for himself; others, again, were given to him as presents by persons who desired his favour and good-will. The numbers in this list do not indicate the chronological order in which the women were introduced to his acquaintance,—that is a point which it seems impossible to settle with any degree of certainty.

(1) Khawla, daughter of Hakim.
(2) Riḥāna the Jewess.
(3) Salama, widow of Hamza.
(4) Um m-Rāfi‘.
(5) Rīzwa.
(6) Amīmā.
(7) Um m-Zāmir.
(8) Agīma.
(9) Um m-līman (also called Barkat).
(10) Um aīmā.
(11) Marīm Qabi‘ (Mary the Egyptian).
(12) Shi‘īn (sister of Mary the Copt).

The two last-named persons were slaves, the property of Māqūṣ, king of Egypt: they had been selected by him on account of their extreme beauty, for presentation to the prophet authorities with such exceptionally strange diversity that what we give below must be received with some reservation.

1 It is proper to observe in this place that facts, figures, and names regarding this person are stated by different Moslim
of God’ for his own private haram. Ultimately Muhammad decided to retain for himself Mary, the more beautiful of the two, and magnanimously bestowed her sister upon Hasān the Poet, one of his own generals.

2. Those ladies, not lawfully married to him, whom, after having taken, he, from a variety of causes, put away without their having shared with him connubial rites:

(1) Fātima, daughter of Zāhāk.
(2) Malaikā, daughter of Qa‘b.
(3) Lailīf, daughter of ‘Azīm.
(4) Ghuziā, daughter of Jābār (surnamed Umm Sharīk).
(5) Umm Hānī, daughter of Abū Tālib.
(6) A’smā, daughter of Nā‘mān.
(7) Anna, daughter of Zāzīd (of the tribe of Kunda).

It is important to observe, in regard to these lists, that no small uncertainty rests on the question as to the exact number of ladies who properly appertain to each description given in the headings. Thus, for example, as to the number of those who were formally married to him, some Moslem authorities maintain that they were not more than seven in number; others say eight; others nine; others eleven; others fourteen; others fifteen; others seventeen; others eighteen; others twenty-one; while some of them inform us that the prophet of God paid his addresses to as many as thirty ladies. As to this last number it is added that with seven out of the thirty no formal marriage took place; and that Muhammad consummated connubial rites with only twelve of the entire number. The variation in the statements of traditionists as to the number of ladies appertaining to each of the headings given above is partly owing, no doubt, to the indiscriminate mixing up of the names of the women who in the various ways above mentioned were associated with him. There is also a want of agreement among authorities as to the exact order in which the marriages took place: thus, some of them put Umm Salama fifth, Umm Habība sixth, Juwairiya seventh, Safia eighth, Zainab bint Jāsh ninth, Maimūna tenth, and Zainab bint Khuzaima eleventh. Three of the lawfully married wives of Muhammad are said to have been taken by him in marriage at their own request, and Zainab bint Khuzaima, Umm Salama, and Maimūna are named as the persons in question: but as to this point, again, there is the most bewildering diversity of statement. A woman thus ‘self-bestowed’ is technically termed in Arabic Whabīn-nāfe (Persian Na‘fūrkhāsh). Several of the ladies whose names come under the different heads of our second list also are termed na‘fūrakhāsh: for example, Khulāna bint Hakīm, Ghuziā bint Jābār, Lailīf bint ‘Azīm, Asma bint Na‘mān, etc. Further, though the names of some of these ladies imply maternity, it must not be supposed that any of them bore offspring to Muhammad: the circumstance shows rather that they had become mothers before they were introduced to him:

It is a remarkable fact that, notwithstanding the overflowing plenitude of his haram, no child was born to him after the death of his first wife,—with the single exception of Ibrāhīm, who was born of Mary the Egyptian, and who died at the age of fourteen or fifteen months. The former of the lists will show that there is no truth in the statement sometimes made, that most of the divorcees whom Muhammad took in marriage were women whose husbands were still alive; the only case of this nature was that of Zainab bint Jāsh. The details, however, of some of these instances—notably the instances of Safia and Juwairiya,—involuntarily recall the case of Uriah the Hīkite, with which the reader of the Old Testament history is familiar. Six only of Muhammad’s married wives were of his own tribe of the Qurāsh—viz. Khadija, Sād, ‘Āishah, Hafsa, Umm Salama, and Umm Habība,—and of the others, two were Jewesses. With the exception of ‘Āishah, there was not among his wives a single spinster;—they were all of them widows excepting Zainab bint Jāsh.

Moslems frequently attribute the tendency of Muhammad to marry widows to his magnanimous compassion for their forlorn condition: however this may have been, it is to be noted that the widows he married are described as young and beautiful. If magnanimous compassion had been his only sentiment towards them, a set of almshouses and guaranteed support would have fulfilled the dictates of such an emotion; and widows who were neither young nor beautiful would have been sharers of his bounty. The first three of Muhammad’s marriages took place prior to the Hajira,—that is, they took place at
Makka,—and the remainder at Madīna. What may have been the largest number of contemporary women (wives and others included) whom he may have had at any given period of his life after the death of Khadija, it is impossible to state with certainty. It is very worthy of note that the outbreak of Muḥammad’s mania for women occurred at a period of his life subsequent to his announcement of himself as the chosen favourite of God; and notably after the Hijra, when his pretensions were more distinctly avowed than during the comparative quietude of his married life in Makka during the lifetime of Khadija. The exact classification of the unfortunate little girl ‘Aīshā is a matter which must be left to the judgment of the reader: making all due allowance for differences said to be occasioned by the climate of southern Arabia, to describe her as a spinster could hardly, without legal quibbling, be deemed an exact application of the terms of our mother-tongue,—it surely is not an application of the term which would commend itself to persons of ordinary sense of propriety. How to describe the case of Zainab bint Jaḥish is, again, a problem which we must leave to the good sense of our readers. The former of our lists reveals the circumstance that Muḥammad observed no rule as to any relativity between the ages of his wives and himself, nor as to any consanguinity that may have previously existed between himself and them, nor as to the elapsing of any specific period of time either between his marriages, or between the decease of a woman’s former husband and her union with himself. It has sometimes been maintained that, on grounds supplied by the Qur’an itself, some of the names mentioned in our first list belong properly to the second; thus, the Qur’an lays down the rule that a period of not less than four months must be the minimum of widowhood. Now, this rule, as we have seen, was ignored by Muḥammad in the case of both Juwairiya and Safiyya. Some are even disposed to include in this same category Zainab bint Jaḥish. However this may be, his marriage with Zainab was a clear infringement of at least one other law of the Qur’an, inasmuch as in this case the requisition that every marriage, to be considered lawful, must be witnessed by four witnesses, two on each side, was dispensed with. The question of the order in which Muḥammad’s children were respectively born to him is still one of the unsettled points of Muslim history: the order we have given is the one generally received by learned Muḥammadans.

There were certain hardships connected with the case of Muḥammad’s womenfolk which could hardly escape the notice of the most cursory reader. In the first place, it was not lawful for any woman who had ever been united to him to become united afterwards to any other. This is expressly taught in the Qur’an: none, therefore, of his widows ever re-married; nor, with but one exception, did any of those whom he divorced, however brief may have been the period of their connexion with him, or however innocent they may have been as to the immediate occasion of separation. This it was, in part, that made divorce from him seem so cruel a measure to them, as we see in the case of Sanda and others. The exception we refer to appears to be the case of ‘Aali bint ‘Azīm. The reason was that all those women whom Muḥammad took to himself were thereafter called ‘Umāmahātul-mūminīn, ‘Mothers of the faithful’: the interpretation of the epithet is given in the Qur’an.

—Mothers were to “regard the prophet’s wives as they would regard their own mothers.” Another thing that made it hard for the unfortunate women was that Muḥammad claimed the special privilege of unlimited licence,—he was authorized by Heaven to summon to himself any woman he chose. It is laid down in the Qur’an, as one of his distinguishing privileges, that he was at liberty to appropriate to himself—by force, if force were necessary—any member of the gentler sex whom he might take a fancy to, and this irrespective of her own inclinations. Should he, moreover, become enamoured of any female whatsoever who chanced to be an inmate of his establishment,—whether she were there in the capacity of servant or of slave,—he was even at liberty to dispense with the formality of lawful marriage. This same privilege of his extended in all particulars to other women besides those who were inmates of his own domestic establishment. There was but one qualification in connexion with this privilege of his, and that was that no woman was to be permitted to become his until she had first acknowledged herself a believer in the divinity of his mission. He had also the express permission of God to relieve himself at any mo-
ment of the presence of any one of his women-folk, and of the burden of her support; but should any of them cease to be desirous of continuing their relationship to him, they, in like manner, were at liberty to follow their own wishes—always bearing in mind, of course, that the law of the new religion rendered further conjugal alliance criminal. Without intending any rudeness to the memory of the ladies, it is but natural to suppose that it was, no doubt, this circumstance that gave so much poignancy to their grief at the prospect of being separated from him, and which made them willing (as in the case of Sauda) to themselves propose the abdication of their conjugal claims provided they might be permitted to continue inmates of his haram. Though the rule laid down in the Qor'an for his followers was that the number of their wives was not to exceed four, yet there was no limit to the number allowed in his own case: the only passage in which there is so much as a hint on the subject of limitation in his case, was not ‘revealed’ till a short time before his death, at a time when the history of his relations with the occupants of his haram was at an end, and as an old worn-out man, exhausted and enfeebled by physical ailments, he might be supposed to have attained satiety. Special divine permission was, he assured us, granted to him (“and,” as he expresses it, “to none besides”) in all these particulars, as also that he was at liberty, if he were so inclined, to receive in any capacity whatever any person who might offer herself to him for the purpose of cohabitation.—a privilege of which, as we have seen in the case of the uafabakshis, he did not hesitate to avail himself. Among the spoils of the conquest Muhammad almost invariably secured in his share of the plunder the most beautiful of the captive damsels, and on his triumphant entry into Mad'in with the trophies of war the inmates of his establishment were wont to peer from their privacy to catch a glimpse of their new rival.

It will not be surprising to learn that the above lists contain what many will hold to be inaccuracies. Some of the dates we know to be disputed. There are but few points in history that are more disheartening to the student than the bewildering diversity of statement which we find in Muslim records regarding the subject of Muhammad’s domestic relationships. The case presents a very fair sample of the difficulty in which Muhammadan authorities have bowered all subjects relating to their religion and its founder. It is only regarding the barest outlines of Muhammad’s life that there is even the semblance of agreement among them; the moment the student inquires into details he perceives how loose and unsatisfactory the whole fabric is. Honest inquiry for historical fact is baffled at every turning—and this through the inability of Muhammad’s biographers to agree among themselves. Seeing that his own admirers differ so widely concerning even mere matters of fact, the impartial investigator must labour to do his best in a judgment of charity, and must give up much as hopelessly involved in contradiction. If it is difficult to arrive at anything like certainty regarding the wives-proper of Muhammad, it is still more difficult to do so in regard to those women whose intended marriage with him was broken off at various stages before consummation. To the narratives of all such cases a certain degree of doubt attaches, for the relatives of such women would naturally seek to suppress the tradition of such abortive negotiations, as not creditable to them; there seems, in fact, every reason for doubting the details of such cases as mentioned in tradition. Muslim tradition abounds in legends concerning these women, and dwells with delight upon Muhammad’s relations with them. When we state that very few indeed of those legends reflect upon him other than what ordinary men would call disgrace, notwithstanding that they were written by his own admirers and adherents, we state what is merely a cold, unvarnished fact. We shall not undertake the recital of such legends, for in so doing we should surely awaken in the minds of his followers emotions of irritation; for, however paradoxical it may seem, a calm and unbiased inspection of Muhammad’s deeds, and a careful analysis of his personal character, are processes which no Muslim can endure without being irritated almost to the point of frenzy. We therefore purposely repress all those inquiries and reflections which evolve themselves out of a study of the above lists, and content ourselves with placing on record the cold facts, which no duly-informed Muhammadan will call in question. The whole subject of Muhammad’s relations to his women-folk is so beset with contradiction, that any
man who is possessed of a due regard for matter-of-fact accuracy must feel the extreme delicacy of the position. No account of these ladies has ever yet been prepared which has met with the good fortune of universal approval; and the result is the same whether the account be prepared by a Moslim or by a non-Moslim.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bn. C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 38.)

No. XXXVIII.

In the Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. I., pp. 1 to 7, a copy is given of a long stone-tablet inscription at the temple of Śaṅkha-bāstī at Lakshmēswar, the chief town of an outlying Talukā of the same name of the Mūrāj State near the south-east corner of the Dharwād District. I obtained also a tracing of the inscription by means of a local schoolmaster, and, by comparing this with the MS. copy, have succeeded in making a sufficiently accurate version of the text to edit it. My version may be capable of improvement here and there by personal examination of the original stone. But there are very few doubtful passages involving matters of importance.

The tablet is about 5' 2'' high by 2' 3'' broad, and contains 82 lines of writing in neatly formed Old Canarese characters of the tenth century A.D. I have no information as to whether there are any emblems at the top of the stone. It includes three separate inscriptions.

First Part.—Lines 1 to 51 contain an inscription of the Gaṅga or Koṅgu dynasty, which has already been introduced to our notice by Mr. Rice in the Merkāra copper-plates at Vol. I., pp. 360 et seqq., the Nāgamaṅgala copper-plates at Vol. II., pp. 155 et seqq., and the two sets of Mallōhāli copper-plates at Vol. V., pp. 133 et seqq.

The grants recorded in it were made by Mārasimha-dēva-Satya-vākya-Koṅgaṇīvarmā, also called Gaṅga-Kandarpā, when the Śaka year 890 (A.D. 968-9) had expired, and while the Viḥava saṅvatara was current, to a Jain priest named Jayadēva. According to the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronology, the Viḥava saṅvatara was Śaka 890, and Śaka 891 was the Śukla saṅvatara. The grants were of some lands at the city of Puligere, or 'the city of the tank of the tiger'; which, I presume, must be taken as the ancient name of Lakshmēswar. They were made for the benefit of a Jain temple, which, being called 'the shrine of Jīnānāra of king Gaṅga-Kandarpā', seems to have been founded or restored by Mārasimha-dēva himself.

The genealogy is given thus—

Mādhava-Koṅganāvarmā
(or Mādhava I).

Mādhava II.

Harivarmā, Mārasimha,
Mārasimha-dēva-Satya-vākya-
Koṅganāvarmā,
or Gaṅga-Kandarpā.

As regards the spelling of the subsidiary title or family-name of these kings,—in l. 5 there is no Anuśāvara, either in the tracing or in the MS. copy, and the vowel of the second syllable is a in both, and it reads 'Koṅgaṇīvarmā'. But in l. 23 the Anuśāvara is very distinctly legible in the tracing and is also given in the MS. copy, and the vowel of the second syllable is a in both, and it reads 'Koṅgaṇīvarmā'. In the four sets of copper-plates the vowel of the second syllable is always a, except in the Nāgamaṅgala plates, III. b, l. 7, where, unless there is a fault in the facsimile, it is u. In the Merkāra plates, I., l. 4, and II. a, l. 5, the guttural nasal a is used, not the Anuśāvara, and it reads 'Koṅgaṇī'. The same is the case in the Nāgamaṅgala plates,—I., l. 3, where Mr. Rice transliterates 'Koṅgaṇī' in error for 'Koṅgaṇi', and III. b, l. 7, 'Koṅgaṇī' or 'Koṅgaṇi', as the case may be. And the same is the case in the Mallōhāli plates,—in the first set, I.a, l. 3, II.a, l. 4, and III. a, l. 1,—and in the second set, I., l. 4, and III. b, l. 7, though in IV. a, l. 5, the Anuśāvara is used. In the Nāgamaṅgala plates, II. a,
I. 6, and III. a. 1. 4, there is no Anuvārā or guttural nasal, and it reads ‘Kogaṇi.’ Undoubtedly, either the Anuvārā, or the guttural nasal, is required before the g, and, when it does not occur, it is omitted through carelessness. Accordingly, I have entered it as a correction in I. 5 of my transcription. As to the vowel of the second syllable, a or u, it is possibly liable to variation, as is the case in so many Dravidian words; and in one instance, referred to more particularly below, it occurs as i.

Down to the end of the description of Harivarmanā, the present inscription follows very closely the wording of the copper-plates, except that the first king is not mentioned in the plates by his name of ‘Mādhava.’ And there can be no doubt that the first three kings are the same persons who stand first in the genealogy of the plates. Māraśimha, the younger brother of Harivarmanā, is not mentioned in the plates, the direct succession being continued by the son of Harivarmanā.

Now, however, the ever-recurring question of discrepancy of dates crops up again; and in this instance the discrepancy is a very wide one indeed. The Mallôhali plates are not dated in any era save that of the reigning king. But the Merkara plates purport to record a grant of the time of the great-grandson of Harivarmanā in the year 588, which is taken by Mr. R. G. Bhandarkar to be the Śaka year 588. And the Nāgamaṅgala plates purport to record a grant by the eleventh or twelfth in succession to Harivarmanā, in the Śaka year 698. And, in his paper On the Inscriptions of Southern India, of which an abstract is given at p. 39 of the Report of the Second International Congress of Orientalists, Prof. Eggeling refers to a copper-plate grant, in the Elliot facsimile collection, of Arivarmanā, the Harivarmanā of the Merkara, Nāgamaṅgala, and Mallôhali plates, and of the present inscription—dated Śaka 169. Whereas, we here find Harivarmanā’s younger brother making a grant in the Śaka year 890 or 891. And the date, in I. 24, is expressed in words, not in figures, and the words recording it are very distinctly legible in the tracing, though they are omitted in the MS. copy.

I am not prepared at present to suggest any explanation of this discrepancy. But, if the present inscription were a forgery, made in Śaka 890 or 891, the forgers of it would certainly have given it a much earlier date, and would probably have endeavoured to imitate the more ancient characters. In my opinion, the date of the present inscription is more probable than the date of the Merkara plates, if it is to be referred to the Śaka era, than the date of the Nāgamaṅgala plates, which is expressly said to be in the Śaka era.

And we have to notice here three Gaṅga or Kōṅgu stone-tablet inscriptions from the Kīggaṅgad forest, published by Mr. Kittel at Vol. VI., pp. 99 et seqq. They are inscriptions of Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmanā, or ‘Koṅguṇivarmanā,’ as the name is spelt in one of them, No. I. The same name, Satyavākya, is given to the king who stands twenty-sixth in the list made out from the chronicle called Koṅgudēśa-charitra and published at Vol. L., p. 361. And Māraśimhadēva, again, is called Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmanā in l. 23 of my present inscription. Now, satyavākya, ‘of truthful speech,’ is a title, rather than a proper name. And it does not necessarily follow that Māraśimhadēva is the same person as the Satyavākya of the Kīggaṅgad inscriptions, or of the traditional, and possibly rather inaccurate, list of the Koṅgudēśa-charitra. At the same time, I consider that he is to be identified with the Satyavākya of one of the Kīggaṅgad inscriptions. I have seen the photographs of the originals, from which facsimile plates have been prepared; and I consider that they are not to be allotted all to the reign of one and the same Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmanā. One of them, Mr. Kittel’s No. III., at p. 103, is entirely undated. In another, No. II., at p. 102, the date runs:—Sa(śa)kā-nri-p(a)t(a)d(ta)-kāla-saṁvatavarṇaṇaḥ=entyu-nār-ombînayogy avarshaḥ=pravartit-eṣō, i.e. “while the eight hundred and ninth year, of the years of the era which had expired of the Śaka kings, was current”; and it is further stated to be the eighteenth year of the reign of Satyavākya. This Satyavākya, therefore, commenced to reign in Śaka 791; and it follows that he cannot be the Māraśimhadēva-Satyavākya-Koṅguṇivarmanā of my present inscription now published. These two inscriptions, Mr. Kittel’s Nos. II. and III., are to be grouped together, the characters of both of them being of the same square and upright type and of the same age. The date of the remaining Kīggaṅgad-
nād inscription, Mr. Kittel's No. I., at p. 102a, is unfortunately somewhat hard to decipher in the photograph, though it would seem to be legible enough on the original stone. So much of it as can be read at first sight runs:—

Sā(i)a-ka-nrīpa-kā-ṛita-sunītavatara-sa(i)a-taṅgag-

iti...t. anyesa Īśvara-sunītavatara pravarâtite. The vowel attached to the ī of īśāṅgal, the Anusvara, if any, and the following letter, are indistinct, and the second t of īta in ītanye is effaced. Mr. Kittel proposes to complete the passage by reading either ombhattaneya, 'ninth', or ombhathaneya, 'eightieth'; it is not quite clear which,—and submits Śaka seven hundred and eighty as the translation. But there is nothing, either in the text, or in his proposed completion of it, to justify 'seven' being taken as the number of the hundreds; and, as he himself points out, the date, even if interpreted thus, does not harmonize with the date of his No. II., as it should if they are both inscriptions of one and the same Śatyavākya. That supposition, however, is not to be made, and the dates are not to be expected to harmonize in that way. For the characters of this inscription are of a very different standard from those of his Nos. II. and III., being of a round type with a very decided slant to the right, and they belong to a more developed stage of the alphabet. As to the uncertain letters, of which the photograph shows only indistinct traces, we must of necessity read either īśāṅgal-ombhathaneya, 'ninth hundred', or īśāṅgal-hathaneya, 'tenth hundred'. It is not likely that the last expression was used; we should rather have the ordinal form of omu śāstra, 'one thousand', if that were the date to be given. And, as a matter of fact, the indistinct consonant appears to me, as to Mr. Kittel, to be undoubtedly bh. Accordingly, I read the entire passage as:—Sā(i)a-ka-

nṛīpa-kā-ṛita-sunītavatara-sa(i)a-taṅgag-ombhat-

[?]anyesa Īśvara-sunītavatara pravarâtite, i.e. "the Īśvara sūntavatara, which was the ninth of the centuries which had expired of the era of the Śaka kings, being current."—sc. "the Śaka year 900, the Īśvara sūntavatara, being current." And, by the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronology, Śaka 899 was the Īśvara sūntavatara, which is close enough for the purpose. The date of this inscription being thus so near that of the inscription now published by me, I look upon this Satyavākya-Kongi(n)īvarāna as in all probability identical with the Māraviḥadeva-Satyavākya-Konguvinvarāna of my inscriptions.

Second Part.—LINES 51 to 61 contain an inscription of the Śendra family.

It commences with the mention of a Chālukya king named Rānaprākramāṅka, and his son Ereya. Neither of these names has as yet been met with in the genealogy of either the Western or the Eastern Chālukyas. But Rānaprākramāṅka is perhaps intended for Rānarāga, the son of Jayasimhaī, and the father of Pulikēśī I. Jayasimhaī, the first of the family in the Dekkan, is occasionally referred to. But I know of only four inscriptions in which the genealogy in a connected form is carried back beyond Pulikēśī I.;—1, the Aihole stone-tablet at Vol. V., pp. 67 et seqg. 2, the forged or copied copper-plate grant of Pulikēśī I. in the British Museum;—3, the Yēwār stone-tablet, of which a copy is given at Vol. I., pp. 258 et seqg., of the Elliot MS. Collection;—and 4, a copper-plate grant of Jayasimha-Jagadēkamalladeva from Miraj, dated Śaka 946, the Raktakshi sāvatara, published by Mr. Wadher in the Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. II., p. 380, and Vol. III., p. 258 et seqg.;—and we may take it that the information of most people on the subject was only traditional and rather hasty.

It then mentions a certain king Satyārāya. But there is nothing to show which of the several Western Chālukya kings who bore that title is intended.

It then mentions, as the contemporary of Satyārāya, king Durgāsakti,—the son of Kundāsakti, who was the son of Vijayāsakti,—of the race of the Śendra kings, who belonged to the lineage of the Bhujagendra, i.e. the Nāga family.

And it records a grant of land at Puligere, by Durgāsakti, to the Chāitya shrine of the god called Saṅkha-Jinendra.

The inscription is not dated. It is probably one of early date, repeated here for the sake of confirmation or of preservation. I find the Śendrakas referred to in one of my early Kadamba copper-plate grants, No. XXVI. of this series, i. 10, at Vol. VI., p. 32, and in l. 3 of a stone-tablet inscription at Balagānare of
Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya, No. 98 of Major Dixon's Collection.

Third Part.—The rest of the tablet, 1. 61 to the end, contains an inscription of the Western Chalukya Vikramāditya II. It is dated in the second year of his reign, when the Śaka year 656 (A.D. 734-5) had expired, and must consequently have been copied here from a previous stone-tablet or copper-plate, for the sake of confirmation or of preservation. It is issued from his victorious camp at Raktapura, a city which I cannot identify.

It records that the Śaṅkhatirtha-

vanasi of the city of Pulikara,—the Puligere of the preceding two inscriptions,—and the temple called 'the white Jindlaya', were embellished and repaired, and that certain land was given for maintaining the worship of Jina.

In its genealogical portion, it agrees with the Western Chalukya inscriptions published by me, Nos. XXVII. to XXXI. of this series, in Vol. V., and it carries the genealogy two steps further, in the persons of Vinayāditya and Vikramāditya II, the son and grandson of Vinayāditya.

Transcription.

\[\text{[
\text{\[1\] Šrīmat-parama-gaunbhā-sāyādiv-āmogha-lānchhāna-m jīyā(yāt)-trālīkāyā-nāthasya sāsan

\text{\[2\] Jīna-sāsanā || Svasti Jītaṁ bhagavatā gata-ghana-gagan-ābhēna Padmanā

\text{\[3\] bhēna || \[\text{[2] Šrīmā-Jānāvē(vī)-jīnyā-kul-ānāya-vaḥ-sāhāna-bhasharāḥ sva-khadg-aik

\text{\[4\] praḥāra-

\text{\[5\] kaṇḍita-mahā-śiśās-nābha-laba-baḷa-parākramo
dārān-āri-gaṇa-viddarā-opalabha-

\text{\[6\] bra(vra)ṣa-vibhūṣaṇa-vibhūṣaṇā Kāṇḍa(ṇa)ya-sagōtṛa sīraṁ Ko(kom)gaṇivarma-

dharmamahāraj-

\text{\[7\] j-ādhirāja-paramēvara-Śrī-Mādhava-prathama-nāmadhyāya || Tat-putraṁ pitur-anvagata-

guṇayuktō

\text{\[8\] vidyā-viṇaya-viḥita-vṛttah samyak-prajā-pālana-mātr-ādīgata-rājya-prayōjanā
dividkat-kavi-

\text{\[9\] kash-opala-bhūta(tō) niti-sāstrasya vaktri-prayōktri-kusālō dattaka-sūtra-vṛttīṁ praśānta

\text{\[10\] sīraṁ-Mādhava-mahā-

\text{\[11\] rāj-ādhirāja || Tat-putraḥ pitṛ-paī(pi) tāmaha-guṇa-yuktā(ktō) nēka-chā(cha) turidanta-

\text{\[12\] yuddh-āvāṣa-chatur-udadhi-saṁj-āsvāḍita-yā-

\text{\[13\] āḥ śrīmad-Dhārivarma-mahārāj-ādhirāja || Api cha || Vṛtta || Āśeṣ-jagad-gabana-

\text{\[14\] rakshaṇa-rāj-sūṁha kasmā-maṅgu-ābja-

\text{\[15\] vana-maṅgana-rājasaṅsā || Śrī-Māraśrutaḥ iti bṛuhita-bāhu-kṛitṛa-taśy-anūjaḥ Kriṣ-

\text{\[16\] yuga-kahitīpāḷa-kī-

\text{\[17\] rtiḥ || Ādēśād-dēva Chōl-āntaka-dharaṇipatēr Gagāṇa-chūḍāmanās-tvāṁ vēgaṁ abhīṣiti

\text{\[18\] yuddhān tājya gaja-turagā-vṛtta-sānma-

\text{\[19\] ha-darpanā Gaṁgām-uttṛyā gantuṁ para-balam-śauṇaśa kalpay-śty-āpa dūtaṁ vṛjīnaṁ

\text{\[20\] Gūrījāraṇām paṁtar-akṛiti tathā yatra

\text{\[21\] jaiṣṭra-prayāṇā || Pād-āṁbhōruha-bhrīṅga-bhrīṣṭa-bharāṇa-vṛttrapā-chintāmaṇī
durāśas-agraha-vihāv-kṛiṣita-rūpa-kṣēma-

\text{\[22\] maṇī || Māṇḍākīyā Jīnevā-snapana-vidhī-paya-syanda-sahāpātyāẏa Kārīḥyāds-chaṅdo-

\text{\[23\] vairi-prahata-gaja-mada-svēta-nirvattitāyāḥ

\text{\[24\] sāmbhāde Śrī-nikēt-aṅgāna-bhuvī bhavatō Gaṁgā-Kāṇḍarpā-bhūpa-vṛttrapāḥ
dig-vadhuṁ

\text{\[25\] vidhu-vijayy yaśo ṛhar-ā-chaṇḍrā-tārām

\text{\[26\] Api cha || Vṛtta || Nirvāḍ-dōja(jīva)ja-bōda-pōta-balas-siddhānta-ratnakaraṁ
tāhrit

\text{\[27\] oṭpulta-yānapātra-balas-saṁsāra-maṇiKarān

\text{\[28\] uttīrṇaṁ-samudrāpa-bhakti-viṁsaṁ-vuvāydy āhuddhānaḥ budhā-bāśd-Dēvasag-āgaṁrāṇa-

guṇa-nidhir-Dēvaṇḍa-bāhāṭarakaṁ || Ubbāma-

\text{\[29\] The correct reading should probably be 'bhūṣpasya'

\text{\[30\] ātēṇ.}

\text{\[31\] See note 2 to Inscription No. XXXV., p. 83.

\text{\[32\] See para. 6 of the introductory remarks.}
yāvya dagdhaḥ bhavyo
[31] ratna-trayau śāraśi yaccharaṇa-dvayaṃ cha || Mahātasya tasya mahāt玉石 maṃhatāt śrāṇa-
maṇya cha prathama-śīyaṣṭayā Jayā
[32] ḍvārā paśūdita iti prathitaṃ prathamakūśa-mahīma-dvaryaṃ || Api ca || Gadāya || Tasmā 
sa bhuvan-aikā-maṅgala-Jīneṣvara-nītya-bhāhīya
[33] ka-ratna-kalāśaḥ sa tu Satyavākyā-Koṅguṇivarman-adhamunahārāj-ādhiraṇa-paraṃsāvara-
Śrī-Māraśinaḥdēva-prathama-nāmadheyā Śaṅga-
[34] Kandarpṇaḥ || Śaka-nṛpa-kālā-ātāya-saṅvatsara-āśeṣav-aṃvata navatya-uttaraḥaḥ pravartita-
māṇo Vibhaḥ-saṅvatsarā Śaṅkhavasati-Tīrthāvasati-maṇḍala-māṇya
nagarāt-pūrvayasāṃ diśā taṣa-vaṭṭitaṃ dattē sma ||[*] Tasyā-simā
yugalā-ṛ-dakshina
[37] syāmā diśā Belkanūr-graṇa-śaṣchima-sūnāṇah-pāvaḍa-diśā Kāli-tatāka-purō-varttinaś-śilā 
śarasas-samṛṣṭa-dik-kā(ko)ṇṭe ḍhasti-prastaraṭ-paśchimāyāṃ
[38] diśā vata-tatāka-purō-niloka-nimna-ōttara-dig-varttinaḥ kriṣṇa-paśāṇād-uttarasyāṃ diśān
Nāgapura-graṇa-maṅgā-taṅkhaṇiṣyāṇaṃ-dīśa
sūryāni diśā Kṛṣṇa-saraṇa uttara-jala-pra
[40] vāha-nirggaṃad-uttarasyāṃ diśā Nilīkāra-tatāκ-āgūḥ-pravāhād-uttarasyāṃ-aśāyam-eka 
nivartitaṃ-āntarē vāyavyaṃ-dik-kōṇa-vartti
[41] ṝ̣ka-ta-śaṣchama-paśvā-varttinaś-śamyaḥ || pūrva-vat-mukhāṇa-gatya-ekkṛṣṇa-ārū 
paśāṇāḥ-Nāgapura-graṇa-śaṣchima-gatva-śrīva-pūrva-vartty
[42] dig-mukhāṇa gatvy-ōttara-diśāṇ prati nivrittita-paśchima-diśāyām-eka-nivartitaṃ-āntarē pūrva 
ōttara-diśā kriṣṇa-paśāṇād-dakshinaśyāṃ-āśā 
[45] ā-vṛttitē simā saṃmānayētē tad-yathā || Dēṣa-graṇa-kūṭa-κṣethrā-vāyavyaṃ(ya)vyayēm 
kakubhi tri-śam-kanti-kārī-ṭapalād-vāyavyaṃ(ya)vyayēṃ-a 
varttino viśā la-śam-kanti-kārī-jaṭāḥ-paśchimāyām
āśāyām kanti-kārī-gulma-Saṅkhīgraṇa-maṅgagad-dakshīṇa-
Kinnarā-paśāṇād-dakshīṇaśyāṃ-diśāyām-Anidekā 
[50] ra-kṣhērāt-paśchima-sūnā prāk-prakāśita-bhā-bhām kṣhērā-vāyavyaṃ diśā 
tri-śam-kāṇa-bhāṅa simā samāgatā || Evah paśchima
[51] dig-varttini chatvāriṇaḥ-chhaṭṭaṃ nivartaṇāni || Saṅkhāva-vasātaḥ-Vasāva-dīśa nivartanamātramāḥ pūhpā-vātāḥ-paśchima-diśā cha nivartaṇā-dvāya-dvayaṃ (d?) pūhpā-vātāḥ || Tasya chaitya 
[52] layasya pūra-pramāṇam-ākhyayātē [*] Pūrvvathā Bālabēvara-paśchima-prakāraḥ pāvaka-
diśā Charaṃakāra-dvēva-griha-samaṇaṃ || Tat-paśchimataḥ ||
[53] Vārī-vāraṇa-simāni kirtī vādakaṇhaśyāṃ-dīśā pūhpā-vāt-Āḥ(?) ga(?a) jha-chaityā-pūra-pra(a) 
Śrī-Mukkara-vasātaḥ paśchimāyaṃ diśā gopūra-paryayantāt paśchima-dig-vartti-dē

[*] For some reason or other the words saṭṭhavasā, vṛṣṭaka are omitted in the MS copy, a blank space being left as if they were illegible or doubtful, and Prabhāva-saṅvatsarā is read instead of Vābhāva-saṅvatsarā. But is the tracing every letter of the whole passage is perfectly clear and is indubitably just as transcribed by me.
[*] This syllable, -ṛ-, is superfluous.

dīa Chandrikāmukikā-dvē-grīhāt=pūravataḥ Mukkara-vasṭaitun

[47] praviṣṭh-kriyā Rāyarachamalla-vasati(m) (ii)-dakshiṇa-prākāraḥ tataḥ pūravataḥ Sīrī-Viṣaya-

vasati-dakshiṇa-prākāraḥ i(ajj)ānāya di-

[48] Śi Karmatarēvara-dvē-grīhaḥ tad-dakshiṇaḥ pūrvv-ākāra Bālābēvara-vaschīma-sīma

[47] Tasya sīma praviṣṭh-kriyā (ii) ya(ñ)ā[47] Parava-saraśaḥ pūrva-diś Tāpaś-grāma-pathād-

uttarato pūrpa-vātasa-vasitvam-emākam | Gaṅga-Permāḍi-chaitiyā-

[48] laya-pūrpa-vātād-uttarato nivarttanam-ēkaṃ nāga-vallī-vaṇam | Īvaṇam Gaṅga-Kandarpa-

bhūpāla-Jīnendramandira-dvē-bhūga-nimittam nivarttanam-za-satya-traya-mātra-kaśē

[47] train pūrpa-vātasa-trayaṃ urvīśa-dēsa-grāma-kūt-akāra-viśiṣṭi-prabhṛiti-bādhā-pariharaṁ maṇḍ-

harm=īdām | Ślōka || Bahubhīr=vasudhā dattā rājaḥbhīṣ=Sagar-ā

[49] dibhiḥ yaṣya yaṣya yadā bhūmīs-tasya tārā tadā paḥaṇam || Mad-vāṣa-ja(ñ)ā para-

mahiśati-varaṇa-ja vā pāpād-apāta-maṇasaḥ bhūvi bhāvābhūpiḥ yē pāyasa-

[47] nti mama dharmarni-iapuḥ samastāṃ tēbhāṃ mayā virāchītī-ūjairī-ēha mūrdhau

Jayatī-atiśaya Jinaṃ-bhābhura sara-vanditaḥ śīrmanā Jina-patis-sujītērē-ā

[48] dē kartā day-ōdayaḥ || Dehabhīsari[48] || Chālukya-pritiyavallabha-kula-tilakāṇu bhavahau

aitēsau Raṇaṇa-prarākramāṅka mahārājō bhavat-taṅ-

[49] ja-tanayaḥ rājita-nayō vivardhīti-sāvīravasāḥ chatus samudrānta-sāna-turā-mail-amadā-

sonā samuḥau Eṛēya-nāmaddēya śīrmanā[48]

[48] Api cha || Śaśaśaśaṃ samudr-āntāṃ vasudhāṁ vasudh-ādvimpe || Satyāraya-mahārājō rāja-

satya-samavīte || Bhujageśad-ānaya Sūndravāla-satvāvatā

[50] anēka-n toe-sattamēshv=aitēsau ta-kulā-gagana-chaundramāḥ bahu-samara-vijaya-labhā-

patāk-avabhaśita-dig-andarā-valaṣya Vijayaśaktinām nṛpitarū-bhau


satva-gon-dpapanaṃ sāmanta-Śrī(ṇ)jna-mauli-māl-avalaḥ-cha sahaṇā Kuṇḍaṣe

[48] kīrr=ṇāma rāj-ābhāth-tasya prīya-tanayaḥ || Advītiya-purushakārā-sāmpūnnaḥ || dharman-

ārthaka-kāma-pradhaṇṇāḥ anēka-rāja-vijaya-vraṇa-patākāṛ-āgrahau


pūj-ārthaḥ puny-ābhivṛddhīyē cha || Puligere-nām-nagarasya-ottara-pārśvē paṃcchāsan-

nivarttana-parīma


pāvaka-diśa Jyēśhālalūgro-bhūmiḥ daksināti pātikā-kṣhirāṇaḥ nairīrīyayā diśa Daṇī(ṇ)ān

[48] diśa(ā)-śreṇṭhi-bhūmiḥ paschimātāḥ Rāmēsvara-kṣhirāṇa vāyaḥyān Hōsēsvara-kṣhirāṇa

uttaratā Śindēśvara-kṣhirāṇa (ajj)ānāya diśa Bhaṭṭārī-kṣhirāṇa | tad-dakshiṇaḥ pūrvv-ōkta-Kinnar

[49] ri-kṣhirām dēva-śvāmaḥ lōkōkha lōkaṇā maḥāna maḥāna uchya ṣaḥ || vishebhēkānaḥ


[49] t-ānṇavam dakshiṇ-ômata-đaṇḍhr-āgṛ-ôrīrāṇa-bhuvanaḥ vaṇuḥ || Śrīmataḥ saṃkal-

bhuvana saṃstyaśaṇāmā Māṇaya-sagōṭrāṇaḥ Hārītī-puṭrāṇaḥ saṃkā-

[49] ka-māṭribhīḥ saṃ-kāṭhibh-ābhivarddhiṭhāṇāṃ Kārttikēyā pariśraktasā-prāpta-kalīṣa-

parāśāpaṇāṃ bhagavan-Nārāyana-prāsadā Samadāśa-vaiṭhe Lāṇ

[49] chchā (chhā)-ĕkṣaṇa-vāśrīḥ śēṣā mahābhūjiṭāṁ Chālukyaṇāṃ kuḷāṇa-ṣaṭākṣaṁkarṣāṃ

śāvemēduḥ-avabhrīṭābhiṇa-sāṇa pavītrāṣa kṛita-gātrayā Śrī-Poliṣčāvallabha mahārāja

[49] jaṣya priya-sūnuḥ Śrī Kirttivarmanpravīthavallabha-mahārāja-jaṣya śatya-ātmanaya Satyārāya-

śī pravīthavallabha mahārāja-ādhibhāja-paramē


* These letters are unintelligible. The MS. copy reads chchā śvaṣṭi, of which the first word is equally unintelli-

* From here down to priya-sūnuḥ (marā), inclusive, in l. 67, is omitted altogether in the MS. copy.
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[83] hasa-rasa-rasikāḥ paraṇāmkhikīta-satru-māndjasas-sakula-pāramāsivaryya-vyakti-hētu-pāli dhvaj-ādy-ujya(jiva)la-rājya-chihin Vījayādī-

[84] tya-Satyaśraya-śrī-prīthvivallabha-mahārāj-ādhirāja(ja) [[ ]] Tat[-]priya-sūnuḥ pratidina-pravardhamāna-yā(yau)van(o) nayasa ripu-māndjā-ākraṇī-rajy-ābhyadayaḥ(yasya)

[85] kastōrī-kśora-vikram-aika-rasō(sasya) Vikramāditya-Satyaśraya-śrī-prīthvivallabha-mahārāj-ādhirājya-paramēśvara-bhāṭrakasya vījaya-skandhārāvē Raktapuram-adhirasa-

[86] ti shat-pauchchāsād-uttara-shat-chhatēsah Śaka-varshēsah-sattēna pravardhamāna-vījaya-rājya-sānvatsarā dvitiyā vartamānē Māgha-paunypamāsyaṃ Mālaṃsuṃgh-ānya-

[87] ya-Dēragna-ōdihah(tāya) parama-tapa(pal)ṣūtra-mūrtī-śīlā(āka-Rāmādevād Śīrāyya')

[88] śīhīyō(shīyā) vijita-vipaksha-vādi-Jayēvā-paṇḍit-āntēvāi(sinē) samputeṣa-aikāvya-

[89] dītv-ādi-Śrī-Vijayādvē-paṇḍit-āchāryyē Jina-puṣābhhiṣh-āryah Bāhuruki-śrēhhi-

[90] vījñāpanēna Pulikara-nagarasam Śamkha-Tīrchha-vastērē-samputēnā-māṇjītum

[91] tasya dhavala-Jīnalayasah jirṇ-ōdhahnaṃ krītē vahyanā-sphuto-nāva-sāñkāra-bali-

[92] nimyām dāna-ārād-ādi-pravarttām ārthahā nagārā uttarasahā māṇi gavyātī-pramām

[93] ya-vyavasthitam Karppati-tātākād-dakṣāśayāṃ dīṣi rājā-māṇēna sat-ārdha-nivarttana

[94] pramaṇā-ksētraṅ sārvvā-bādh-ārīharāṁ dattāṁ [[ ]] Tasya simā samākhyāyatā [[ ]] Pūrva-dīṣi tat-saṃhita-Kinnara-pañcāṅ-ga-dakṣāśayāṃ asayāmām dhavala-pāśhāna-parāv-

[95] samyāyām | paschimāsahāṃ dīṣi svētā-pāṇhād-ēka-śaktī uttarasahāṃ


[97] va-vṣvaḥ visham-uchyata visham-ēkāminā hānti dēva-vṣvaḥ putra-paṭukānaṃ [[ ]] Svāmī dattāṁ para-dattām vā yō

[98] harēta vasuvihārān sahaṭti-varsha-saḥsraṇāḥ viśṭhāyām jāyatē kṛmiḥ ||

[99] Prathytatām Jīna-sāsanaṃ ||

Translation.

First Part, Lines 1 to 51. May the scripture of the lord of the three worlds,—the scripture of Jīna, which has for its efficacious characteristic the glorious and supreme and profound science of the assertion of possibilities,—be victorious!

Hail! Victory has been achieved by the holy one, Paḍmānabhaḥ,18 who resembles (in the colour of his body) the sky when the clouds have left it!

A sun to irradiate the clear sky which is the glorious family of Jānava12; possessed of (a reputation for) strength and prowess acquired by clearing asunder a great pillar of stone by a single stroke of his sword; decorated with ornaments which were the wounds sustained in massacring the forces of his pitiless enemies; belonging to the lineage of the Kāvya-nās14; (such was) the glorious Koṅgapiyarāmā, the pious Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord, whose first name was Śrī-Mādhava.

His son (was) the glorious Mādhava, the Great King, the supreme king,—who was possessed of virtuous qualities that imitated (those of) his father; whose conduct was regulated by knowledge and modesty; who attained the objects of sovereignty only by properly governing his subjects; who was a very touchstone for (testing) the gold which was learned men and poets; who was skilled among those who

---

10 The MS. copy reads Rāmadēś-dhāryādyāḥ(sic) Jina-

11 The MS. copy reads Rāmadēś-dhāryādyāḥ(sic) Jina-

12 The name of an Arhat,—also of Vāsudeva.

13 Vīrāṇastra.

14 The descendants of Kauśa, who was the son of Bhūra and belonged to the family of Ághiras.
pronounce and those who apply the science of polity; and who was the promulgator of a treatise on the law of adoption.

His son (was) the glorious Hariyāmā, the Great King, the supreme king,—who was possessed of the virtuous qualities of his father and his father's father; and whose fame was flavoured with the waters of the four oceans, (the sovereignty of) which he had acquired in many battles (in which use was made) of elephants.15

Moreover:—His younger brother was Śrī Māraśimha,—who was a very lion of a king in guarding the thicket which was the world; who was a very royal swan (of a king) in adorning the lotus-pool which was the circle of the earth; the fame of whose (strength of) arm was great; and who had a reputation (equal to that) of a king of the Kṛṣṇa age. At his victorious journeying forth, the lord of the Gūrjaras received a rough16 command from messengers:—"O Sir! at the order of the king"17 who destroyed the Chūlas, the chief of the Gaṅgas comes quickly against thee; cease to fight with the unequalled force of (thy) enemy, which possesses the pride of the array and accoutrements of elephants and horses, and prepare to depart across the (river) Gaṅga." A very philosopher's stone in supporting his servants, who were as bees at the lotuses which were his feet; a very amulet of protection against the hostile kings, who were disquieted by the apprehension of fear; a very pearl to make lustrous the virtuous qualities that were the ornaments of the throats of learned men; divine; performing achievements that were worthy to be praised by good people;—(such was he), the chief of the Gaṅgas.

When he was staying in the courtyard of the habitation of the goddess of fortune, at the confluence of the Māndakini18, which was produced by the trickling of the water (used) in the rite of ablution of Jīnendrā, and of the Kaliṇī, which was made to cease to be white by the rut of the wounded elephants of his fierce enemies,—the fame of the king Gaṅga-Kandarpā, which surpassed the moon (in the purity of its lustre), spread abroad as a necklace for the women which are the distant regions, so as to last as long as the moon and stars might endure.

And again:—There was the venerable Dēvendra, the receptacle of virtuous qualities, the leader of the sect called Dēvagāna,—who traversed the ocean of the Śiddhānta by the strength of his boat which was his knowledge that shines in deciding controversies, and the ocean of worldly existence by the strength of the boat which was the excellent result of his good behaviour; and whose name was worthy to be praised by learned people, who bowed down to his devotion when it was declared.

His sole disciple was Ekaḍēva, a very god among ascetics, preciously brave in destroying the demon of unbridled lust; (every) worthy person bears his ratnārāyaṇa19 in his heart, and takes his feet upon his head.

The wise man Jayadeva, who possessed the wealth of the scriptures, which are extolled, was celebrated by being the first disciple of him, who was honoured by honourable ones, and who was the foremost of great people.

And again:—Eight centuries of years and ninety (years) having expired in the era of the Śaka kings, while the Vihaṇa saharatara was current,—he, Gaṅga-Kandarpā,—who was a very jewelled pitcher wherewith to perpetually besprinkle Jīnendrā, who is the most auspicious (god) in the world; (who was called) Satyavākya-Koṅguvantā, the pious Great King, the supreme king, the supreme lord; and who had the first name of Śrī-Māraśimhadeva,—gave to him a plot of ground, to the east of the city of Puligere, for the purposes of the charity and the worship and the enjoyment of the god of the shrine of Jīnendrā of Gaṅga-Kandarpā, which is the ornament of the circuit of the temples called Śāṅkhavasati and Tirhavasati.

The boundaries of it are described, as follows:—On the east of the lake of Kumārī, there are two stones at the distance of one māvatara. On the south of them, there is the western boundary of the village of Bejkanūr. On the south-east of that, there is the 'lake of

15 Chaturdanta, 'having four tusks,' is an epithet of Aṅkīta, the elephant of Indra, but seems here to mean elephants in general.
16 Aṛitī, 'clumsy, uncooth.'
17 Probably Hariyāmā.
the stones,' in front of the (tank called) Kāśi
tāṭaka. At the north-west corner of that, there
is the littering-place for elephants. On the
west of that, there is a dark-blue stone, on
the north of the depression in the ground
which is close in front of the 'tank of the
sacred fig-tree.' On the north of that, there
is the road to the village of Nāgāpura.
On the south of that, there is the field of
the house of Maṅgaṁrātāṇḍa. On the
north-east of that, there is a slightly blue-
black stone. Again on the west of that, there
is the north outlet for water of the tank of
Krīṣhṇa. On the north of that, there is the
stream that joins the tank of Nilikāra. On
the north of that, there is a Śamī tree, beside
a red stone which is in the north-west quarter
at the distance of one nivartana. Coming to
the east from that, and going to the east on the
north side of the road to the village of Nāgā-
pura from the (above-) mentioned red stone,
and turning towards the north, on the west,
at the distance of one nivartana, there is a
dark-blue stone in the north-east quarter.
On the south of that, there is a slightly blue-black
stone in a clump of Śamī trees and Kantārī
trees. On the west of that, the boundary joins at
the two stones first mentioned and specified.
Having included six nivartanas (of land) lying
in front of the lake of Krīṣhṇa, one hundred
and sixty nivartanas were excellently laid out
(and thus given).

The boundaries are recorded, as follows, of a
plot of ground on the west of that same city:—
On the north-west of the (field called) Deśa-
gramakūṭakṣhetra, there is a red stone
near three Śamī trees. On the north-west of
that, there is one Śamī tree. On the east of
that, at the distance of one danda, there is a
red stone. On the south-east of that, there is
a large clump of Śamī trees and Kantārī
trees. On the south of that, there are the
southern outlet of water of the 'tank of the
merchant' and the road of Vallabharājā.
On the east of these, there is a clump of Kan-
tārī trees, and the road to the village of
Savasī. On the south of these, there is a
clump of Śamī trees and Kantārī tree.
On the north-west of the north of this, there is the
land of Jyēṣṭhabalīṅga. On the
south-west of this, there is a dark-blue stone.

On the east of this, there is the road of Val-
labharājā. On the west of this, there is the
'stone of the Kinnara,' in the large
stream that flows to the north. On the south
of this, there is the field of Andhakāra.
On the west of this, there is the (field called)
Deśa-gramakūṭakṣhetra, which has
been already specified. On the north-west of
this, the boundary joins at the red stone near
the three Śamī trees. Thus (there were given)
one hundred and forty nivartanas in the west-
ern quarter.

On the east of the Śaṅkhavāsati, (there
was given) a flower-garden measuring one
nivartana; and on the west, a flower-garden
measuring two nivartanas.

The measure of the city of that same Chaitya
hall is declared:—On the east, the west wall of
the enclosure of (the temple of the god) Bālaba-
ēśvara. On the south-east, the boundary of
the temple of the god Charmaṅka. On
the west of that, on the south of the boundary
of the enclosure of the harlots, there is the (temple
called) Śrī-Mukkaraṇavaśati, in front of
the flower-garden and the city of the Chaitya
of Aṅgaja (?). On the west of this, there is the
back of the temple of (the goddess)
Marudēvi, including two temples lying in
the west quarter, as far as the ornamental
gateway. On the north of that, there is the
temple of (the goddess) Chandrikāmbikā.
On the east of that, having entered the (temple
called) Mukkaraṇavaśati, there is the south
wall of the enclosure of the (temple called)
Rāyarāchamallavāsati. On the east of
that, there is the south wall of the (temple
called) Śrī-Vijayavaśati. On the north-
est, there is the temple of (the god) Karmatēś-
vara. On the south of that, there is the pre-
viously mentioned west boundary of (the temple
of the god) Bālābēśvara.

On the west of the city of the god, there was
given a field measuring one nivartana and
including two flower-gardens. The boundaries
of it are specified:—One nivartana of flower-
garden, on the east of the Parava lake, and
on the north of the road to the village of
Tapasi; (and) a betel-nut plantation of one
nivartana, on the north of the flower-garden of
the Chaitya hall of Gaṅga-Permāḍī.

Thus (there were given), for the enjoyment of

20 Lit. 'a staff'; = 4 hastas, or cubits; = 90 finger-breadths.
21 Or 'of the god of the workers in leather.'
the god of the temple of Jinendra of king Gaunga-Kandarpa, a field of the measure of three hundred nivarantan, three flower-gardens, free from the hereditary perquisites of the king and the country and the villages, and forced labour, and other dues. This is pleasing!

Land has been given by many kings, commencing with Sagara; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefits of it. Those future kings, whether born in my lineage or in the lineage of other kings, who, with minds free from sin, preserve this my act of piety in its integrity, to them I join my hands on my forehead (in respectful salutation).

Second Part.—L. 51-61.

Victorious is Jina-pati, who is resplendent with (attendant) Jinas, possessed of superhuman powers; who is praised by the gods; who is the maker of the first creation; and who displays tenderness...

Many ornaments of the family of the Cha-lukyas, who are the favourites of the world, having passed away, there was the Great King Raapararakramana.

The son of that king was the glorious Ereyya, who was possessed of brilliant statesmanship; whose dominion was increased; and whose array of horses and elephants and troops of foot-soldiers was at the margins of the four oceans.

Moreover:—While the Great King Satyasraya, the lord of the earth, possessed of brilliant truth, was ruling this earth, which is bounded by the ocean;—

Many most excellent kings having passed away in the race of the Sundra kings, who are of the lineage of the Bhujagendras, there was the king Vijayasaakti, who was the moon of the sky which was the sky, and who irradiated the circuit of the regions with the banners that he had obtained by victory in many battles.

His son was the king Kundasaakti, who was as lustrous as the rays of the (newly) risen morning sun; who was endowed with the qualities of bravery and steadfastness and courage; and whose feet were touched by the garlands on the tiaras of the crowd of chieftains (who bowed down before him).

His dear son was he who was possessed of unequalled manliness; who abounded in religion and wealth and pleasure; and whose fame was heightened by capturing the banners of heroes through victory in many wars.

By him, named Durgasakti, a field of the measure of fifty nivarantan, on the north side of the city of Puligere, was given for the purposes of the perpetual worship of the Chaitya of Saunaka-Jinendra, and in order to increase his religious merit.

The boundaries of it are declared:—On the east, (the field called) Kinnarikshetra; on the south-east, the land of Jyeshthalinga; on the south, (the field called) Gahtik-kshetra; on the south-west, the land of the merchant Danisha; on the west, the field of Ramesvara; on the north-west, the field of Hobesvara; on the north, the field of Sindesvara; on the north-east, the field of Bhastari. On the east of that, (there is) the previously mentioned (field called) Kinnarikshetra.

The property of a god (is called) poison by mankind; poison is not called poison: poison kills a single person; the property of a god, (if consecrated, kills) sons and sons' sons!

Third Part.—L. 61-82.

Hail! Victorious is the boar-like form that was manifested of Vishnu, which agitated the ocean, and which had the earth resting on the tip of its uplifted right-hand task!

The dear son of the Great King Sri-Poikelkivallabhna,—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 Mavaya, which is praised over the whole earth; who are the descendants of Hari; who have been nourished by seven mothers, who are the seven mothers of mankind; who have attained an uninterrupted continuity of prosperity through the protection of Kartikeya; and who have all kings made subject to them by the (mere) sight of the banner of the Boar, which they attained through the favour of the holy Narayana,—
(was) Sri-Kirtivarman, the favourite of the world, the Great King.

His son was Satyasraya, the favourite
of the world, the Great King, the supreme
ing, the supreme lord.

His dear son was Vikramādiṭṭya-
Satyaśraya, the favourite of the world, the
Great King, the supreme king, the supreme
lord,—who, (like Indra), clef open with the
thunderbolt which was his prowess the over-
weening precipitation of the Pāṇḍya and
Chōja and Kērala and Kādamba and
other kings, (which was like the lofty sum-
mits of mountains); and whose feet were kissed
by the diadem of the lord of Kāñchī, who
always bowed down before him.

His dear son was Vinayaditya-Satya-
śraya, the favourite of the world, the Great
King, the supreme king, the most venerable,—who was possessed of the
banner of the sword-edge and all the other
tokens of supreme dominion, acquired by
crushing the lord of all the region of the north.

His dear son was Viṣṇuadiṭṭy-Satya-
śraya, the favourite of the world, the Great
King, the supreme king,—who was flavoured
with the quality of impetuousity; who drove back
the bands of his enemies; and who possessed
the banner of the sword-edge and all the other
brilliant tokens of sovereignty which indicate
supreme dominion.

While the victorious camp of his dear son,
Vikramādiṭṭya-Satyaśraya, the favourite
of the world, the Great King, the supreme
king, the venerable one,—
whose manhood was increasing day by day;
who enlarged his dominions by invading the
territories of his foes; and the chief flavour of
whose heroism was (like the scent) of musk and
of the Kisthāra plant,—was located at (the city
of) Raktapura,—six hundred and fifty-six of the Śaka years having expired, the second
year of his increasing and victorious reign being
current, on the day of the full-moon of (the month)
Māgha,—having embellished the (temple
called) Saṅkhathirathaś or of the city of
Pulikara, and having repaired the white
Jindalaya (which was an outbuilding) of it,—at
the request of the merchant Bāhubali, (which
was made) for the purpose of increasing the
worship of Jīna, a field of the measure of half
a hundred microtanças by the royal measure, laid
out by the measure of a gaṇyāṭī to the north
of the city and to the south of the (tank called)
Karpataṭakā, was given to Śri Vijaya-
Ṇapāḍitāḥṣāhṛya,—who belonged to the (sect called) Dēvagana of the lineage of the Mūlasaṁgha; who was the disciple of Rāmacēvāchārya, who performed
the most austere penances, and was a very incarnation
of holy learning and was free from sorrow;
who was the house-pupil of Jīnavāpa-
ṇḍita, who overcome those that opposed
him in argument; and who had attained single-
ness of speech and other (qualities),—for the
purpose of repairing breakages and of making
new embellishments and of providing the oblation, and in order to maintain a hall of
almsgiving, &c. The boundaries of it are declared:—On the east, some Saṁś trees
beside a white stone on the south of the ‘stone of the
Kīnara’ already spoken of. On the west,
a Saṁś tree near a white stone. On the
north, the boundary comes back to the ‘stone of the
Kīnara’, already spoken of, from a red
stone on the east of the tank already referred to, (which is reached) from a slightly blue-black
stone.

It is very easy to give one's own property;
the preservation of (the grant of) another is
difficult; (if the question is) whether giving or
preserving (is the more meritorious act),
preservation is better than giving! They say that
poison is not poison; the property of a god is
called poison: poison kills a single person; the
property of a god, (if confiscated, kills) sons
and sons' sons! He is born as a worm in
ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years,
who confiscates land that has been given,
whether by himself or by another!

May the scripture of Jīna become famous!

No. XXXIX.

At Vol. I., p. 22, of the Elliot MS. Collection
there is given a copy of a stone-tablet inscription
of the Western Chaḷukya Viṣṇuaditya, also from the Saṅkha-basti temple at Lakshmeśvar.
I sent for a tracing of this also, with
the following results.

The tablet is about 5' 3" high by 2' 1" broad,
and contains 87 lines of writing, more or less
perfect, in Old Canarese characters of the tenth

Pāḷi; the word has various meanings, of which 'the
sharp edge of a sword' seems most suitable in such a
passage as this.

Gaṇyāṭī, or gaṇyāṭi,—a measure of length = 2000
dandas or 1 ārābh, or 4000 dandas or 2 ārābr.

Aptadakshin, 'a pupil who dwells near or in the house
of his teacher.'
century A.D. The average number of letters in the line is about fifty-four. I have no information as to whether there are any emblems at the top of the stone. The tracing is not so good as the preceding one, and only a portion of the entire inscription has been copied, and that imperfectly, in the MS. Collection. I am, therefore, unable to edit this tablet, but can give the general contents of it; which must suffice until the original can be examined by some one competent to read it, when the greater part of it can be satisfactorily deciphered. The tablet includes four separate inscriptions, which, from their varying dates and the age of the characters, must have been copied here from previous stone-tablets or copper-plates, for the sake of confirmation or of preservation.

First Part.—There are fragments of twenty lines, and seven lines, 21 to 27, perfect but very indifferently traced, of which I can only make out that it is an early Western Chalukya inscription of one of the Satyārāyas, other than the first of that name. The name of the individual king, the date, and the details of the grant, are effaced somewhere between l. 14 and l. 20.

Second Part.—Commencing with l. 28 and ending in l. 53 is the Western Chalukya inscription copied in the MS. Collection. It is well preserved, and the whole of it could be edited from the original stone. It carries the genealogy from Polikēśivallabha, i.e., Pulikēśal, down to Vijayāditya-Satyārāya, and records that in the thirty-fourth year of his reign, “six centuries and fifty-one of the Śaka years” having expired, on the full-moon of the month Phālguna, while his victorious camp was at the city of Raktapura, he gave the village of Kardama, on the south of the town of Pulikara, to his father’s priest Udayadēvapandita, also called Nisvādyapandita, who was the house-pupil of Sripāyapāda and belonged to the Īlagaṇa sect of the Mālasaṅgha lineage, for the benefit of the temple of Śāṅkha-Jinendra at the city of Pulikara. The date is in ll. 42-4, and reads:—Eka-paṃchāśād-uttara-sat-chhatāhku Śaka-var-

Third Part.—Commencing in l. 53, and ending with l. 68, is another Gaṅga or Kōṇgu inscription of king Gaṅga-Kandarpa. Here, again, though the tracing is very indifferently, the original is evidently very well preserved. Like the first part of the preceding inscription, No. XXXVIII., it is dated in the Vihāra samhāra, “eight centuries of years, in the era of the Saka kings, and ninety (years), having expired.” It records a grant of land at the city of Puligere to the same person as in the first part of No. XXXVIII., Jayadeva, on account of the temple of Śāṅkha-Jinendra. The date is in ll. 62-3, and reads:—Śaka-nṛjapā-kā-tītasaṃhāra-kātāh-kāh-ashāh samvatsarasāh pravartitāmāh Vihāra-samhāra. The month, the lunar day, and the day of the week, are not given. Undoubtedly it is a grant of the same king who is called Mārasimhadeva in the first part of No. XXXVIII.

Fourth Part.—Commencing with l. 69 is another Western Chalukya inscription. Here, again, the tracing, though very indifferently, shows that lines 69 to 82 are well preserved; below that, there are marks to indicate five lines of which the characters are too faint to be traced. It carries the genealogy from Polikēśivallabha down to Vinayāditya-Satyārāya, and records a grant made by him to some Āchārya of the Dēvagāna sect of the Mulasaṅgha lineage, on the full-moon of the month Māgha, in the fifth or the seventh year of his reign, “six centuries and eight of the Saka years having expired,” while his victorious camp was at the city of Raktapura. The date is in ll. 77-8, and reads:—Astottarā-sat-chhatāhku Śaka-varāhāśāh-āttāhku pravartitah ādhikāraṃ-vijayā-rāja-purānchama-(t vaptama)-samhāra Śrī-Rakta-puram-adhivasati viyā-pandhāvā Śāṅkha-mādē paunpamadēyāna. Here, again, the day of the week is not given.
NOTE ON THE CUSTOM OF MAHĀPRASĀD IN THE SAMBALPUR DISTRICT, CENTRAL PROVINCES.

BY CAPTAIN W. SAURIN BROOKE, B.S.C., F.R.G.S., BILASPUR, CENTRAL PROVINCES.

Mahāprasād denotes a boon or favour of the highest degree, and as such conferred by a deity. Prasād is equivalent to anything given by a god, or by a Gāru, and carries with it a blessing. It further signifies the food presented to a god and afterwards distributed to the worshippers. It also denotes the offerings when an idol is consulted. The prefix Mahā ('great') is used to mark especially the prasād of Jagannāth ('the Lord of the Universe'), to whom the great temple at Puri, in Orissa, is consecrated. The food cooked within the holy precincts at Puri, presented to the idol and sold to pilgrims, is familiarly known, not only in Orissa, but throughout India, as Mahāprasād, or 'the great offering.' Hunter's Orissa gives a graphic account of this holy food, and mentions the large profits which accrue from its sale.

The general belief among Hindus is that the holiness and purity of the deity is imparted to the food which has been eaten, or 'amelt,' as the expression runs, by Jagannāth, and that by partaking of the Mahāprasād the human soul is sanctified, and becomes in a measure impregnated with the divine essence. This being the conception, it follows that this holy food is much revered; its possession is tantamount to the spiritual and personal presence of the deity; neither putrefaction nor impurities can defile it or alter its virtue. All castes and races of men are alike welcome to the advantages which its use confers. In theory, at least, the purest Brāhmaṇ would not disdain to eat it from the hand of a Chāma. The estimation in which the holy food is held, and the equality of all men which it asserts, present some curious marks of similarity to the highest of all rites in the Christian churches. It is well known that in an area of about five square miles surrounding the temple of Jagannāth at Puri all distinctions of caste are in abeyance within the holy limits. According to one of the Purāṇas, men of all nationalities, castes, and creeds may unreservedly eat together of the food which has first been offered to the god. In practice a more exclusive system has grown up. The innovation is said to be of recent introduction, and certain races and castes are now recognized as not entitled to the equality which in the case of all othert the presence of Jagannāth demands.

It is far from easy to determine how so unique a phase of Hinduism grew up. By some it is set down as a relic of the Buddhism which once prevailed throughout Orissa. Further research would probably show that some ground exists for this explanation. By others, the more cynical view is entertained that it arose from a device of the Brāhmaṇs to widen the field from which worshippers are drawn, and with increase of numbers to swell their gains. Be the origin what it may, the loosening, under religious sanction, of the customary rules of Hindu life was probably in its inception based, and is even now maintained, on a noble assertion of the equality of man before God. The wide popularity of the worship of Jagannāth can perhaps only be accounted for by the existence of a deep-rooted feeling of this kind. The sale of the sacred food forms no mean addition to the gains of the temple servants. Pilgrims from all parts of India purchase and carry it to their homes, where it is consumed, or distributed as a much-prized gift to relatives or friends, and even sold. An oath on the Mahāprasād is considered to be more than ordinarily binding, and seems to be known and common throughout India. This form of sanction is often adopted when a mixed body of men band themselves together with the object of effecting some common purpose. The universally binding character of the oath on the Mahāprasād is thus recognized, it not being believed that a Hindu when so pledged can by any mental reservation evade his self-imposed obligations.

In Orissa, including Sambalpur and the Garjat states, the sacredness of an engagement entered into on the Mahāprasād has given rise to a curious and, from some points of view, a graceful custom. This consists in two persons becoming what is popularly known as mahāprasād one to the other. The tie is one of a close and indissoluble brotherhood. The con-

1 Reprinted from a Supplement to the Central Provinces Gazette.—En.
tracting parties consider themselves, and are thought by others, to have formed an offensive and defensive alliance. The essence of the bond is that in evil report or good report, for weal or woe, the newly created brothers are to stand by each other, and seek each other's welfare. According to the theory, loss or injury should be accepted, rather than by any action to affect adversely the interests of the brother by the sacred food. The basis of the friendship is unequivocally a religious one. Anything done to aid or help forward the aims of the 'brother' is regarded in the light of homage to Jagannáth. Like most things in India, from Fairs to Thagi, the people have, to their own satisfaction, managed to combine the service of 'God and mammon.' Friendships analogous in their features, such as those that derive their sanction from the holy water of the Ganges, the Tulsi leaf, and other sacred objects, are found elsewhere in India; but for the most part they are rather the amusement and interest of women than the business of men, and nowhere do such ties appear to have developed into an institution embracing in its effects both private relations and public affairs. Although I would be the last to urge that an unselfish longing for true friendship, strengthened by a tie held peculiarly sacred, may not often be the motive that impels to the union, its aspects as exhibited to outsiders are strictly utilitarian. There seems now none of the chivalrous spirit which still lights up the Rākshibandhan custom of Rājputaná. There the gift of the bracelet makes the recipient first and most important—the champion of the donor's honour and fair name, and the giver, in the highest sense, a sister. However pure the idea out of which the maháprasad brotherhood grew, the tie is not unfrequently debased to unworthy purposes. An avowedly selfish object in entering into the contract is now the rule rather than the exception. Once formed, the union is supposed to be unseverable, and should be maintained by the interchange of amenities from time to time between the 'brothers.' In practice, however, where some specific purpose was the end sought, this accomplished, the tie is commonly allowed to sink into abeyance.

I have not been able to ascertain that the custom prevails elsewhere in India, except in Lower Bengal, where it is said to occur, though rarely. In Sambalpur it is so common and so widely spread as to engage attention from an administrative point of view. On taking charge of the district, the recurrence of the word maháprasad in official documents struck me. I was warned that one person could not be trusted in relation to some one else, because he was his maháprasad. In cases before the courts the evidence of witnesses is almost daily objected to and discredited, on the score that they are maháprasad of the persons in whose favour they are depositing. The most experienced native officials have assured me that the uncorroborated testimony of a known maháprasad must at least be looked on with suspicion. Unfortunately no individual is restricted in the number of his maháprasad; men of wealth or influence have many, and, as might be expected, native Government officials, from their position, are eagerly desired. Rumour also says that the tie is bought and sold. Instances are known of the connexion being established on the eve of a trial, to secure the neutralization of hostile evidence. Practically, then, in the daily life of the people the custom has almost come to assume the character of a business arrangement. Some warrant for this may be found in the well-known couplet—

"Sura nára muni kí yahi ríti
Svartha lage káren sáva príti,"

which, freely translated, might run—

"Gods, men and sages to this assent.
That all love and friendship for private ends is meant."

In addition to purposes less excusable, the tie is often utilized for more legitimate ends, such as to make up a long-standing quarrel, or to borrow money. In the latter case the lender feels that a loan to the maháprasad has a security which an ordinary transaction would not offer. When means are available, such an application is seldom refused.

The development of the maháprasad tie as visible in Sambalpur is far from healthy, and unquestionably, in many points of view, has a pernicious effect on the habits of the people. It adds to the difficulties of the courts by contributing another to the many under-currents, the force and strength of which are difficult to stem or to gauge. The indigenous native officials seem peculiarly imbued with a lust for this sacred friendship; and it may be questioned if
TRADITIONAL ACCOUNT OF KALIDĀSA.

BY THE LATE RĀVAJI VĀSÜDEVA TULLU, M.A., LL.B.

What little can be gleaned from popular or traditional accounts of Kalidāsa cannot fail to interest, however inaccurate or scanty the sources of our information. For this reason, I give the following traditional account:

Kalidāsa was born a Brāhman, and was left an orphan by the sudden death of both his parents, when he was scarcely six months old. In this helpless condition, he was seen by a cowherd, who brought him up as a member of his family till he was eighteen years of age. The natural beauty and delicate make of his person, distinguished him from the rest of the family, as one presumably born of superior lineage. But having had no education he was little better than the illiterate class of people among whom he was brought up.
Now the king of the country had a daughter who was the most beautiful and accomplished lady of the age. Having arrived at years of discretion, she would accept no one as her husband who was not versed in all the arts and sciences. Such a man could not be found. And several kings and princes that came to ask her hand had to return disappointed, much against the will of her father, who had proposed them one after another for her choice. Thus the king got tired, and resorted to his minister for advice. The minister said, "Your highness's daughter is impetuous and self-willed; as she has already refused so many persons, who have been proposed for her, I feel sure she is destined to be married to an idiot. If your highness permits, I will practice my art and find out a person who would suit her." The king consented, and the minister while sitting upon his terrace, saw a beautiful man in a cowherd's attire, returning home from the woods with his cows. He beckoned to him, and the man accordingly went to him. The minister was glad to see that he had lighted on the object of his search, and next day reported the event to the king, who was glad to hear it. It was afterwards communicated to the princess that a learned Brähman had come from Banaras to court her, and that he had numerous pupils and followers equally learned with himself. With her permission, the new Brähman, the minister's protégé, was brought to the palace richly dressed with a number of pupils and followers. These last were examined by the paññitas of the court, and were found to be invincible in their arguments. Thus the princess was deceived, and fixed her choice upon the handsome youth, who was quite illiterate. The marriage was accordingly solemnized, but, not long after, the princess discovered her mistake. Then with a sword she threatened to kill him, if he did not reveal to her the truth. This was soon told, and the bridegroom felt ashamed of his total ignorance and utter inequality with the accomplished princess. The princess was a favourite devotee of the goddess Kālī, and at her advice he proceeded to the temple of that deity, worshipped her with devotion, and ultimately promised to make an offer.

The goddess Kālī took pity on the worshipper and his bride, and marked upon his tongue the letters बनरजसागर, which endowed him with a ready wit in speaking and versifying. Hereafter the young Brähman became known to the world as Kālidāsa, or 'the devotee of Kālī,' and his original name became lost.

Kālidāsa, with his new gift of learning, returned to the princess, who was almost in raptures at seeing her husband thus endowed. Kālidāsa also felt conscious of the great change in himself, and ascribed it all to the princess, to whom he felt very grateful for her advice, and even threats. Henceforth he regarded her as his mother and preceptor, and vowed to treat her as such. The princess grew wrath at this, and cursed him by saying, "Thou shalt meet thy death at the hands of a woman." Henceforth Kālidāsa led a single life, although it is said, he spent a great deal of his time in the company of courtesans and persons of low degree. It was here he enjoyed those pleasures he so vividly describes in his poems, and more especially in his Ritu Sañhāra and Śrīvārītilaka.

With reference to the 199th verse in the first book of the Panchatantra (Calcutta edition), it is said that Bhavabhuti, who led an ascetic life, passing by the house of a courtesan, happened to say the first half—

मूलि नित्यस्ति वाचि गविभं धि हसनहलेज लक्ष्यम्,

Kālidāsa, who was just then inside, very wittily completed the verse, saying—

अनत्य नित्यस्ति वाचि गविभं धि हसनहलेज लक्ष्यम्

With reference to verse 17 of the Śrīvārītilaka the following is a traditional account:—

Once upon a time it happened that king Bhoja uttered the line:—

अनत्य नित्यस्ति वाचि गविभं धि हसनहलेज लक्ष्यम्

and asked if any of his paññitas could complete the verse. None in the court could do it, as Kālidāsa had for some reason concealed himself in the house of his mistress, and was absent from court. A large reward was offered to any one who should complete it. Kālidāsa by Tirtha, given in Ind. Ant. vol. IV. pp. 163, 104, and conf. p. 368; also vol. I. p. 245; vol. III. pp. 24, 81; vol. IV. p. 84.—En.

Footnotes:
1. Vasant, the daughter of Bhimāśakila, king of Vrānak, Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 103.—En.
2. Vararuchi—ut sup.
3. This is substantially the same account as is transmitted.
heard this, but, not choosing to discover himself in public, merely wrote on a wall the other half—

Bhavabhuti—वह द्वितीय किरण रचयन्तिरोच्चारणम्
अमी कुलप्रेमीत्रा नान्देकुलशास्त्रमः
तवे नानुपदितारम्याय मातारम्यायम्
निष्ठा मुद् रसमिन्यायिन्यायम् कथितं कृतम्।
Daśān—कौय्य वाचन कामस्वरूपमुक्त्वर्मस्रावासमाती
पायोरिधिन्यकल्यानरस्मास कैत्वेदी।
रंगे नुपुस्रमुयस्वाशस: परमेष्ठिन्यायी

Kālidāsa was a great traveller, as appears from his correct knowledge of places as described in his poem of the Megha-śuta. Once it happened that Kālidāsa, Bhavabhuti, and Daśān travelled together on a pilgrimage to Śrī-Raṅgāpur, near Trichināppalli, to see the shrine of Śrī Raṅgānāthā, or Vishṇu lying on Śeṣa. Each of them composed in honour of the deity a verse characteristic of his own peculiar style:

Kālidāsa—रंगी पाटलमणिकरण चामुंखिलिपिमुनरौः
अभिज्ञै शैविकतीर्थनितिवर्त्तमारयोः पार्श्व च वेदान्तप्रसन्नवर्तियोः कर्त्तवणमभृतयः
सुंदर काव्येः श्लोकांकुलकाल्यावि नित्रातित्वाथोः खोबीः वाः

Bhavabhuti—वसो वीरे विशेष रचयन्तिरोच्चारणम्
नान्य कुलप्रेमीत्रा नान्देकुलशास्त्रमः
तवे नानुपदितारम्याय समर्पितमयायम्
निष्ठा मुद् रसमिन्यायिन्यायम् कथितं कृतम्।
Daśān—कौय्य वाचन कामस्वरूपमुक्त्वर्मस्रावासमाती
पायोरिधिन्यकल्यानरस्मास कैत्वेदी।
रंगे नुपुस्रमुयस्वाशस: परमेष्ठिन्यायी

On another occasion, a learned pāṇḍit named Damārka, came to the court of the king, and challenged the pāṇḍits to complete a verse, the first line of which was—

अन्तेशमन्तिविव: पायोरिधिन्यकल्यानरस्मास कैत्वेदी।
None could do it but Kālidāsa, who added the following lines:

अंशकुपये दुविं नित्रातित्वाथोः नित्रातित्वाथोः का वर
कौय्यवाचनकल्यानरस्मास कैत्वेदी।

Such is the account of Kālidāsa handed down by गुरुपरिषाद, i.e., by a line of preceptors to pupils, and generally current in Mārsur (Mysore). I am indebted for it to Paṇḍit Rāmānūjāchārya, Śaṅskṛt Teacher in the Indor High School, who had it from his preceptor, the late Sājīyāchārya, the well-known rhetorician of Mysore.

According to Father Francis de Sousa, S.J. (Oriente Conquistado, tom. II, p. 29), Father Estevoa (Stephens, or Stevens) was a native of London, and according to the Rev. Theodore Hauser, S.J. (Bombay Catholic Examiner, No. 43, 1875), Father Estevoa was born in Wiltshire. His father, Thomas Stevens, was a London merchant, and sent him for his studies to New College, Oxford. In the year 1675 he was in the noviciate of the Society of Jesus at St. Andrew's in Rome, where he spent four years; during the two last he was most probably engaged in the study of philosophy. F. Estevoa was sent to Goa, which he reached in the daythic 1679. "Thomas Stephens," says the Rev. Philip Anderson (History of the Settlement of the English in Western India, pp. 6, 7), "is the first Englishman of whom we are sure that he visited the western shores of India. When there he was only known as a Jesuit, but he had been originally educated at New College, Oxford. On the 4th April 1579 he sailed from Lisbon, and the following October reached Goa, where he lived many years. A letter which he wrote to his father, a London merchant, soon after his arrival, is printed in Hakluyt's Collection of Voyages. It contains not only a particular and interesting description of his perilous navigation round the Cape, but many sagacious remarks are made in quite a mercantile spirit on the state of Portuguese trade, of which he evidently desires that his countrymen should obtain a share. The reader is surprised to find a Roman ecclesiastic entering with such eagerness and penetration into commercial affairs. Probably Stephens' advice were the strongest inducements which London merchants had been offered to embark in Indian speculations, and certainly they began from this period to fit out expeditions for the East.

"The narrative of his travels," says Dr. Pope (Text-Book of Indian History, p. 244), "is excited

immense interest in England." Mill (History of India; vol. i. p. 12) says that Stephens wrote an account of his voyage, which was read with avidity, and contributed to swell the general current of enterprise which now ranso vehemently towards India (Harris's Voyages, vol. i. p. 273). Murray (British India, vol. i. p. 151) states that Stevens sent home a most favourable report of the fertility of the region in which Goa was placed, the opportunities it afforded for trade, and the liberty with which the port was opened to vessels of every nation. Father Estevaõ is the only Jesuit who ever worked in the missions of India before the suppression of the Society. He represented his nation worthily, as well by his zeal as by his learning and obliging manners.

According to Anderson (p. 7), (Francis) Pyrard de Laval, who was a prisoner at Goa in 1608, states that Stephens was then rector of a college (of Rachol) in Salsette—by which he probably means the province of that name in the Goanese territory. The English Jesuit was a kind-hearted and true friend in need to several of his countrymen, who within the space of a few years found their way to India." (Histoire Générale des Voyages, par C. A. Walckenaer—Hakluyt's Voyages.) Two English travellers, John Newbery and Ralph Fitch, were intimately acquainted with F. Stephens and received many favours from him during their stay at Goa. Their letters are dated 20th and 25th January 1584. John Hugh van Linschoten (born 1553 and died 1633), a Dutch traveller, who was a page to the Archbishop of Goa, D. F. Vicente de Fonseca, and came out with his Grace in 1583, praises very much the kindness of F. Stephens. Amongst the missionaries of those days he was one of the most distinguished, and a chief means of converting the island of Salsette, near Goa. His thorough knowledge of the Konkani language, joined to a great zeal for the salvation of souls, fitted him best for the mission of Salsette, which was considered the most difficult the Society had up to that time undertaken in any part of the world. Father Stephens must have been still young when he reached Goa, and apparently a scholastic only. He spent forty years on the mission of Goa, as Mulbauer remarks (Geschichte der Indischen Missionen, referring to the History of the Society by Orlandini). Father Stephens died in the year 1619, probably at Rachol, and must have reached a good age; "for it," says Father Hauser, "we suppose him to have been at least twenty-five years of age when he came to India, he was about sixty-five or about seventy years when he died." The following works were published by this English Jesuit:

1. Arte da Língua Canarim: Art of the Kanares (i.e. Konkani) Language, by Father Thomas Estevaõ. Printed in the College of St. Ignatius at Rachol, in Goa, in 1640, with additions by Father Diego Ribeiro, S.J., and four other Priests of the same Society. Only two copies of the original edition are known to exist.

2. Doutrina Christã em Lingua Brahman Canarim (i.e. Konkani), ordenada a maneira de dialogo para ensinar os meninos. Rachol, Svo. Christian Doctrine in Brahman-Konkan Language, arranged in dialogues to teach children. Svo, Rachol. This Catechism is a translation of that of Father Marcos Jorge, commonly known under the name of its improver, Father Master Ignacio Martins.

3. Discurso sobre a Viãda de Jesus Cristo nosso Salvador ao Mundo, dividido em dois Tratados, pelo Padre Thomas Estevaõ, Igles. da Companhia de Jesus: Discourse on the Coming of Jesus Christ our Saviour into the World, divided into two treatises, by Father Thomas Estevaõ, of the Society of Jesus, an Englishman. This famous book of religious instruction is a selection from the Bible. It is entitled a Purdã, and is an abridgment of the books, accompanied by explanatory remarks and a good account of the mysteries of the incarnation, passion, and resurrection: of our Saviour. Father Thomas Estevaõ wrote his work in 1614. It was afterwards revised, in 1647, by Father Fr. Gaspar of St. Miguel, of the Order of St. Francis of Assisi. The work was printed in 1626, 1649, and 1654. In Kanara there are only a few manuscripts, of 1000 pages in folio, and it is understood by those who know the Marathi or higher dialect of the Konkani language, in which it is written. The work was dedicated to D. Fr. Christovaõ de Sa e Lisboa, Archbishop of Goa and Primate of the East, on the 29th April 1616. All the three editions of this excellent work were approved by the ecclesiastical authorities at Goa. Father Francisco Vieira, Provincial of the Society of Jesus at Goa, approved it on the 22nd June 1615. It is divided into two treatises or purdãs, the first of which contains licenses, dedication, introduction, and 36 cantos. The second treatise, divided into four parts, contains 59 cantos. The whole of the work has 11,018 strophes, 4296 of which belong to the first purdã, and 6722 to the second. Father Pascoal Gomes de Faria, Priest of the Order and Habit of St. Peter, a native of Bathim, in the parish of N. Sra. de Guadalupe, of the island of Goa, added in the year 1722 two hundred and thirty-seven strophes to cantos 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51 of the second treatise (see Ensaio Historico da Língua Concâni, pp. 119-120, por Senhor J. H. da Cunha Rivara).
THE HISARLIK RELICS—THE SVASTIKA.¹

As the relative antiquity of the objects found at Hisarlik by Dr. Schliemann, and now exhibited at South Kensington, is under discussion, allow me to point out what is the origin and date, as I believe, of the Greek archaic cross, which so frequently occurs in the pottery found at Hisarlik, and its distinction from the Buddhist Svastika or Aryan symbol, so called, with which Dr. Schliemann appears to connect it. The Greek archaic cross appears to me to be evidently derived from the punch-mark on early Greek coins. The punch-mark was originally composed of four small squares, the centre assuming the form of a cross, but in the stamping of the coin the squares went a little on one side, and made the punch-mark take the shape of the archaic cross. In this manner it is found on the coins of Chalcedon and Cyzicus, and on early coins of Syracuse; the archaic cross appears in a more definite form. This form was thence adopted as an ornamental device on early Greek pottery, as we see it on that of Athens, Samos, Cyprus, and Hisarlik.

The Buddhist Svastika is a monogram. According to General Cunningham, it is composed of two Pali characters, and, or su, which is the Pali form of the Sanskrit Svasti, which means 'it is well.' It is a symbol of resignation among the Buddhists. The svastika is almost invariably, according to Mr. Beal, the reverse of the Greek archaic cross, thus ॥

The dates of the two crosses are also very different. The Greek archaic cross is found on Greek coins and pottery of the seventh century B.C., while the Buddhist symbol, the Svastika, cannot be earlier than the sixth century B.C., as Buddha died about 540 B.C.

At page 103 of Dr. Schliemann's work on Troy, he gives Burnouf's explanation of the origin of the Svastika. There is every reason to doubt his explanation; the very meaning he assigns to it, 'it is well,' shows that General Cunningham is correct in deriving it from the two Pali characters su, ti, 'it is well,' and that it is a Buddhist symbol of a date not earlier than the sixth century B.C.

At p. 102 Dr. Schliemann tells us that the Rev. W. Brown Keer assured him that he had seen the Svastika innumerable times in the most ancient Hindu temples, and especially in those of Jains. According to Mr. Ferguson, the mean date of the earliest Buddhist monuments is 250 B.C., while the date of the oldest known Hindu monument cannot be carried further back than the sixth or seventh century of our era, and the oldest Jaina monument may be of the tenth century. Mr. B. Keer's assurance is, therefore, of no value with regard to the antiquity of the Svastika in India.

HÖDER M. WESTROP.

BOOK NOTICES.

1. L'Islamisme d'après le Coran, l'enseignement doctrinal et la pratique. Par Garcia de Tasse. Membre de l'Institut. Prof. de l'école spéciale des langues Orientales vivantes. 3me ed. 8vo, 412 pp. (Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie, 1874.)


The first of these works is by a well-known veteran in Oriental scholarship, and contains four short treatises. The first, on the doctrines and duties of the Musulman religion, is preceded by a collection of the texts from the Bible which the Musulman doctors regard as having reference to Muhammad and his mission. Their interpretations are of course forced in the extreme; thus, the "twelve princes" in Gen. xvii. 20 they make the "twelve imams!" "their brethren" in Deut. xviii. 18, the descendants of Ishmael the brother of Isaac; "Paran" in Deut. xxxiii. 2 and Habak. iii. 3, being the generic name of the mountains-round Makka, they hold that the revelation of the Kôru is referred to, and that the Gospel was given from 'Mount Seir'; in Isaiah xxix. 6, 7, they make the man in the chariot drawn by asses to be Christ, him drawn by camels Muhammad; in John xiv.
16 and xv. 26, they change παράληπτος into περιμελένος and apply it to Muhammad, as they make him also 'the last' who 'shall be first' in Matt. xx. 9, 10, 16. The other texts referred to him are—Isaiah xili. 1, 7, &c.; lixi. 1, 6, &c.; Dana. vi. 13, 14; John xxi. 7, 13, &c.; and Rev. vi. 4.

The teaching and duties are presented in a series of quotations from the Korân, classified under various heads, such as God, Angels, Inspired Books, The Gospel, the Korân, Jesus Christ, Muhammad, The worship of one God, Social Duties, Infidels, Unbelievers, Purgatory, Hell, Paradise, Prayers, &c. &c. It is evident that in such an arbitrary arrangement there is a danger of representing the religion under an aspect which is not strictly a correct one; it is apt to bring into strong prominence, for example, the ethical teaching of scattered and incidental precepts, while, unless the classification were far more comprehensive than M. de Tassy has attempted to make it, many ethically important features, such as the position of woman, slavery, the discipline of the heart and will, private virtues, &c., may be left out. Yet this treatment has its uses, as it brings together all that is said in the Korân on each of a number of important topics, from which we can at once judge of the character of its teaching respecting each individually, and, as the arrangement is pretty exhaustive of the contents of the book, we see at once the areas that it leaves entirely blank.

The second treatise is a translation of the Turkish Risâli-i Berkevi, a religious catechism written in the sixteenth century, treating chiefly of dogma and morality, but mixed with minute details on abductions and rules respecting prayers. The third section is a Sunni Euchology, translated from the Hidayat-ul Islâm, which is known in India both in an Arabic and a Persian version, and contains most of the prayers in use, the Suras from the Korân employed in prayer, the Fatihas, and special prayers used in the pilgrimages to Makka and Medina. The fourth and last division of the volume is a memoir on the special features of the Muhammadan religion in India, drawn from Hindustânî works, and gives a pretty full account of the feasts and principal saints of the Indian Musulmân. M. de Tassy has given us an interesting, instructive, and valuable addition to the literature of the subject, though, like most books written by those who know Muhammadanism only from its literature, the author, by dwelling principally on its better features, gives a more favourable view of it than it really deserves.

The small volume by Mr. Stobart is an excellent handbook, at once popular in its style and ac-
SEAL OF THE EASTERN CHALUKYA GRANT OF AMMARAJA II. WITHOUT DATE.
HINDU AND JAINA REMAINS IN BIJAPUR AND THE NEIGHBOURHOOD.

BY W. F. SINCLAIR, Bo. C.S.

It must serve for excuse for the extreme roughness of the following notes that they are derived from such observations as could be made in the scanty leisure of a Famine Officer. Apology would seem almost as much required for meddling at all with a region which has already been in such hands as those of Colonel Meadows Taylor, Messrs. Ferguson, Fleet, and Saükara Pandiit, but the fact is that the attention of the two former gentlemen has been chiefly attracted by the magnificent works of the Adil Shâhî kings, while the two latter have been busied rather with inscriptions than with architecture. I hope, therefore, that I may be able at least to indicate the materials for a new and interesting chapter in the architectural history of the Deccan.

It seems certain, from the number and variety of the remains, that the site or neighbourhood of modern Bijapur was occupied, before the Muhammadan invasion, by a group of temples of considerable size and beauty; and that one, at least, was of high antiquity will be proved, I think, by the description of the first fragment which I have to notice. This is the shaft of a column lying outside the east gate of the citadel, nearly opposite the old Kotwâl Chauri. It is 3 feet square throughout, and 14 feet long, besides a basal tenon of 9 inches. Of this great mass 11 feet 10 inches and the tenon are in one block. Just above the moulding this is so finely united to another length of 2 feet 3 inches that the point of a hunting-knife can hardly be got into the joint; and in fact the shaft has hitherto enjoyed the reputation of a monolith.

The moulding, as will be seen from the accompanying sketch, is of a fastened pattern common to the caves of Bâddâmi and the Durga Dewal, at Aihole, only sixty-five miles away. The square massiveness of the pillar agrees with this indication; and, so far as one is justified in assigning a date to a solitary fragment, I must conclude that this pillar belonged to a building nearly contemporary with the Durga Dewal—that is, certainly not later than the 7th century. It may be added that the upper end is finished with an ornamental bevel showing the distinctive double flexure of the Dravidian cornice; from which it is permissible to conjecture that this form may have been used in the building, or at least that it was known to the artist as a structural device. There is also in this end a deep and wide square mortice-hole, showing that the pillar was meant to support some ponderous stone superstructure. Had it been, as has been imagined, a mere pillar of illumination (dipmâla), or a lâj supporting a single figure, I should have expected a narrower hole; but at any rate I know of no lâj, dipmâla, or Jaina shrine-pillar having the square and massive form of this shaft, nor do I believe that any Indian architect would have used so unsuitable a form for that purpose.

Close to this pillar stands a slightly ornamented base, generally supposed to belong to it. In proportions it is indeed suitable, being 38 inches square and 44 deep to as far as I could excavate,—probably, from the proportions, 8 or 10 more below this. Examination, however, shows on its upper surface the mark, not of such a shaft as I have described, but of an octagonal drum of 13½ inches to the side; which, after some search, I found built into a guard-house platform belonging to the inner gate of the citadel, about fifty yards off, and which, I am tolerably certain, belongs to a Chalukya building of the 11th or 12th century, which I shall have occasion to notice further on. It is indeed, not only possible, but probable, that the building, of which the great prostrate shaft is now the sole remnant, served as a quarry to the Chalukya architects; but, if so, they completely re-wrought the materials.

Their successors, however,—the earliest Musulmân invaders,—were less industrious, and erected in the citadel of Bijapur three buildings composed as far as possible of the fragments of Hindu temples. The first of these is a small colonnade, probably meant for a guard-house, or shelter for witnesses, petitioners, and other loiterers about the citadel. It requires no further individual notice, but must be understood as included in the scope of remarks touching these appropriated materials as a whole.

The second was certainly the corps de garde of the main gate of the citadel. It consists of two or three arcaded chambers and verandas, in some of which fragments of ancient Hindu
pillars support arches, while others are utilized in the trabeate Hindu style. The former method suggests what might have happened here, had it not been for the importation of a purely arcuate masonry style by the Western A d i l S h á h i dynasty and their foreign followers. Similar adaptations occur at one or two other places in the district, notably at D h ó l k h e r, on the Bhima; but the general question can be more fittingly discussed at the close of this article. This guard-house contains no less than four inscriptions in the Hallo Kānadi, or old Kanarese character, all incised on the superstructures of columns.  "The oldest inhabitant" assured me that all four had been copied for Sir Bartle Frere. Two of them are mentioned in the Architectural Committee's account of Bijāpur (p. 65)—one as recording that M u l a D e v a r a C h á l u k y a made a grant to a temple of Nārāsīhā in Śālivāhana Śāk 1114 (a.d. 1192), and one to the same purport of "Śaṅkarapā Daṇḍa Nāyaka, minister to Nārāyaṇa Yadava," Ś. S. 1162 (a.d. 1240). I am not myself sufficiently learned in Kanarese (had even the terrible exigencies of the public service at the time of my stay in Bijāpur allowed the time) to attempt a translation on my own account, but I believe that they have attracted the attention of Messrs. Fleet and Śaṅkara Pāndurang Pandit, and a photograph of part of one (all I could get done) was taken. The octagonal drum of a great pillar, mentioned above as belonging to a base still standing outside this gate, is built into a platform of this corps de garde, on the north side of the entrance.

The third building is that known now as 'the Jain temple,' lying between the inner citadel and the remains just described. The epitaph has probably been derived from the local habit of referring all ancient buildings to 'the Jainas,' of whom, I may here remark, I found no trace whatever in the city of Bijāpur, though their remains are not uncommon in the neighbourhood. I did at one time imagine that a stone now standing outside the Juma Masjid might have been the capital of a Jain columnar shrine, but was subsequently obliged to admit that it must have been part of a fountain still existing within the mosque. The building now referred to has been unfortunate in its historians; for the compilers of the official volume on Bijāpur photographed it from two different points of view, and described it as two separate buildings, vis. as a Hindu Agrahāra and as a Muṣalān mosque (pp. 65-66). The latter is the correct designation. It consists of a rectangular courtyard, flanked right and left by blank walls, faced by a pillared façade, and having at the rear or western side a pillared wall with mihrāb, or azimuth niche, and minbar, or pulpit. There are fragmentary inscriptions in the Persian, Nāgari, and Kanarese characters. The Government Reporters mention the second only (or condense the whole, for they are not explicit), as expressing that in Śālivāhana Śāk 1242 Mālīk Kārim u'd in Kān built the mosque,—Revaya, carpenter of Salhaadage (probably Salotgi, tālukā Indi), being the architect. In the Persian inscription I made out the name of the Mālik in the Persian, but read it, with such assistance as I could get, "Kārim-u'd-daulah Khān." The point is not important; and I hope that the inscriptions, which are very rough, will ere-long receive the attention of a more competent and less harrassed interpreter. The hall has a trabeate stone roof covered with concrete, and a covered skylight bearing exactly the same relation to the large central compartments of Chalukya temples as the dome of a typical mosque at Ahmadābād does to the central domed compartment of a great Jain porch. How any one could ever have taken it for anght but a mosque,—even desecrated, ruined, and encumbered with vegetation as it is,—passes my comprehension. Besides these three buildings there are fragments of Hindu sculpture lying all about the city and citadel; the most notable are some broken pillars (one apparently part of a lát or diypmālā) lying in a corner of the Ashar Muḥārak palace, where now is the shrine of 'the Prophet's beard.' There is a fragment of a frieze or pediment—course of elephants—built into the revetment of the inner citadel ditch; and two small stone elephants, similar to those shown in Mr. Fergusson's plate of the Temples at Somnāthpur (Indian and Eastern Architecture, p. 394), still survive, though mutilated. One was, in July last, lying opposite the door of Karim-u'd-din's mosque. The other has been set up in a modern temple of D a t t ā t r e (the Hindu Triad), between the inner and outer ditches of the citadel, where it occupies a position similar to that of the bull Nandi in Śāiva temples.

In the whole body of remains the traces of
three distinct large buildings can be made out. The first was that of the 7th century, or thereabouts, of which nothing is now left to us but the one great shaft already described. The second was—if the inscriptions read by the Government Reporters were identical, as I suppose, with two of my four—a temple of Narasimha, the Man-Lion incarnation of Vishnu, built probably in the 12th century, of the same dark basalt as its predecessor—very likely on its site and of its remains. It was certainly Chalukya in style, adorned with courses of figures, windows of stone tracery in geometrical and foliage patterns (I found none into which figures had been introduced), and standing on a plinth about two feet high, with small free-standing elephants at the corners. In short, the best idea of it can be obtained from the woodcut already quoted in Mr. Ferguson's work, or from the volume by the Architectural Committee of Western India upon Dharwad and Muisur, where the Chalukya style has now its best representatives. It may be added that the mixture of Saiva and Vaishnava emblems throughout the fragments of this temple (sometimes together on one column) shows a very different feeling between these two Hindu sects to that now existing in the same country, though the total absence of Jaina emblems in such a large collection of remains would lead us to infer that the entente cordiale did not extend to this religion; and, finally, that the work of decorating the temple was probably still in progress when the Musulman invasion broke upon the country.

The third traceable building was a temple built of what is called on the spot red sandstone, though apparently belonging rather to the schists. It seems to have been of the same style and age as the temple of Narasimha, but its inferior material has suffered much more from time than the hard basalt of the latter; and the indications are in this case more scanty. Fortunately the surviving remnants include the members of a gateway high enough to admit an elephant (now utilized for its original purpose in the citadel), and the lintel of a shrine door on which Gajasapati is still to be recognized. There is, therefore, no doubt that it was a Saiva temple.

These three buildings—if one may form a conjecture from the concentration of their relics—stood, two of them, as friendly contend-
ing still visible to any worshipper who might happen to look upwards from within.

One may, I think, recognize in these two buildings the work of different, though contemporary, influences and architects. It is probable that while Revaýa the mistri was doing his best with Hindu ideas and Hindu materials to build such a mosque as might entitle him to his fee of “twelve chaukars of arable land rent-free for ever,” and the Sayyid or Manlana of the garrison was overlooking him with an iconoclastic eye, some Persian or Turkish royal engineer was at work on the fortifications close by, utilizing what materials he could, with as great a contempt for everything but economy and defence as could be produced in the 19th century by the training of Woolwich and Chatham. Our hypothetical Persian was familiar with the arch; he had very likely seen old Roman buildings in which arches were, or seemed to be, supported on pillars; so, when he ran short of stolen goods,—i.e., great slabs and complete pillars suitable to the trabeate style of his Hindu masons,—he utilized the smaller stones at hand, in accordance with the lessons of his youth, but, to the last, economized labour by supporting his arches on the stumps of Hindu columns, in some cases turning them upside down rather than go to the trouble of cutting a new capital.

We have here the incunabula of a distinct style of civil and ecclesiastical architecture, which would, if left to itself, have grown up much as that of Ahmádábád did, from a similar origin. This, however, was put a stop to by the flood of foreign influence which accompanied the Adil Sháhí dynasty which succeeded Karîmu’d-dírin and his like as provincial governors, and eventually made of Bijâpur the metropolis of a great kingdom, and the centre of a great architectural school, essentially Western in its love for the dome and pointed arch. Considering how far they excelled all the rest of the world in their chosen style, and the distinct inferiority of the local architecture to that of Gujârat for the purpose of great buildings, we need not spend more than a passing regret upon the death in its cradle of the nascent Chaîukya-Saracenic style.

It did not, however, die without to some extent influencing what we now know as the Bijâpur style of architecture. In the windows of many Adîl Shâhí buildings the simple forms of Chaîukya tracery are reproduced with good effect; and the beautiful Ibrahim Rozâ, built by a king who did not die till 1636, owes much of its charm to the employment of Hindu pillars, brackets, and flat ceilings, modified indeed by the use of cement and concrete, both practically unknown to the indigenous race of architects. The Musulmân of Bijâpur, moreover, used one architectural device which was due to the influence of their predecessors, and deserves a very distinct description. They found, as everywhere in India, the horizontal or bracketed arch. They brought with them, as everywhere else in India, the radiated or true arch, so well known to the Western world; and they used the former occasionally, the latter in a style which has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. But they alone, I think, ever combined these two forms of construction—not only in a single arch, but in a single stone. This was effected by using in their abutments, above the spring of the arch, long stones, with short elbows turned downward in the form and angle necessary for voussoirs (as shown in the diagram Fig. 2). It is obvious that an arch built in this manner contains the elements and merits of both systems, and avails itself of every element of stability which can be found in cut stone. It could not, of course, be practically applied throughout such an arch as that of the Gagan Mahâl, 83 feet in span, but in the lower part of even such arches, and throughout those of less dimensions, it is as ingenious and efficient a structural device as can well be conceived, and has probably much to say to the wonderful vitality of the monuments of Bijâpur,—for hardly any other word is applicable to the way in which these have survived every form of ill use, from Moghul bombardment to Marâthâ pillage, which, with a thoroughness characteristic of that predatory race, extended even to building materials.

I have already said that the immediate neighbourhood of the city of Bijâpur is barren of Hindu and Jaina remains—for the reason, pro-

1. Ibrahim Adîl Shâh II, said to have been nicknamed by his Musulmân subjects Jâgâd Ovâr, in derision of his tolerance for the Hindus. A converse modern case is that of the famous Sikh Râjâ Sher Singh Atâšriwâla, who

when supposed by his followers (during the first siege of Multân) to favour the English and Pathân interest, was contemptuously styled “Baş Sheikh Singh.”
bably, that they were used up by the conquering race. In the course, however, of a few months’ service in the country to the north-east, now forming the talukas of Indi and Sindagi, I have come across many of both religions. Temples still stand at Horti, on the Solapur road, and at Namgal-Khurd, six miles east of this, which cannot date from an earlier period than the thirteenth century, and would well repay the examination of any one who may have the luck to visit them in times of leisure. There are probably others as complete as these, and as old, which I did not come across; and in almost every village there are numerous fragments, often utilized in buildings of the composite character already noticed. One of the most remarkable of these is the temple of Khandoaba at Hipargi, 24 miles east of Bijapur. The cloisters of this building surround a court cut into the side of a low hill; and some of them back up into the hill itself in a way which reminds one of the caves of Elur. This impression is heightened by the square and massive trabeate style of these cloisters themselves, though upon examination they show plain signs of having been built long after Mughal influence had become dominant; while they are faced by a set of arches which would not be out of place in any Saracenic courtyard in Bijapur. In the centre is the temple itself, a modern building of no beauty or pretensions, but eccentric in that, though it appears to be raised upon a stone plinth two feet high, the floor of the shrine and porch is on a level with that of the court, and the approach is by a path cut down to this level through the stone work of the plinth. Opposite this a stone horse, caparisoned but unmounted, occupies the pavilion which in a Saiva temple would belong to the bull Nandi. Above the whole, and without the enclosure, though practically belonging to the temple, stands a dippada, or illumination-tower, unique in these parts, and worthy of description in detail. The builder had evidently in his eye the construction of the four great minars which flank the tomb of king Mahmud at Bijapur, and he composed his tower of pierced stories closely resembling theirs. But, as a Hindu, he did not care to use true arches for his openings, which are accordingly spanned by single stones cut into a pointed arch—a common form throughout India in the 17th century, to which this building probably belongs. As his object, moreover, was not to relieve a huge square building with an almost semi-globular dome, but to bear up into the night air a column of light, he did not hold to the perpendicular form of king Mahmud’s towers, but tapered his away by diminishing the diameter of each successive story; and finally he departed still further in detail from his model by adorning his exterior, not only with the carved stone brackets needed for his lamps, but with the supplementary sculpture, which was almost as necessary to support the effect of these when viewed by daylight. Although all of this is coarse in execution, and some of it obscene in design, the general effect by daylight is exceedingly good, and would be more so were the building complete. Its legend says that the builder was a Raja of Sattara, that it had originally seven stories, besides the plinth and final story (agreeing with the form of the minars of Mahmud’s tomb, which have seven stories, a dome and plinth; further, that when the uppermost lamps were lit, their radiance lit up the tomb of king Mahmud, whose ghost and successors were so much disgusted at this incidence of idolatrous ‘light on the subject’ that they forced the architect of Hipargi to truncate his tower till it was shut out from Bijapur by the intervening hills of Sivanagi. A small pillar about two miles off upon the Deur road is pointed out as being the amputated top of the tower, but upon examination turned out to be of a different style, material, and probably generation.

I could get no historical evidence whatever to corroborate or contradict this tradition. The period which it points to—i.e. the end of the 16th or the first half of the 17th century—is likely enough from the internal evidence; and though no chief could have been called ‘Raja of Sattara’ till long after the kings of Bijapur had lost the power to pull down any one’s tower, the ancestor of that family, Shaha Bhosale, was a feudatory of the Bijapur state at that very time, and may possibly be the person alluded to. At any rate, truncated by Moallem bigotry, and defaced in later days by modern Hindu vulgarity, the tower still dominates, not unpleasantly, the group of trees and temples in the hollow at its foot (for Khandoaba has several divine neighbours), and on the other side it
presents a resting point to the eye wearied with the dismal monotony of the ugly brown plains of Kallâgi.

The lower part of a smaller temple in the same village (which I used as a relief kitchen), with its plinth and well, seem to be pre-Muham-
madan in style; and at Sûndagi, 12 miles off, there survives a complete Chalukya temple of Khandobâ, apparently of about the 13th century, but absolutely buried in whitewash, and surrounded by a bad modern wall. It has, however, an amusing gallery of sculptured figures,—
gods, Rishis, and later saints, besides a whole row of lingas in a side chapel, and is altogether worth a visit.

At Almeia, near the Bhûmâ, 12 miles north of Sûndagi, a very fine temple—probably of the 11th century—was destroyed by some old Nawâb to build the embankment of a tank, which was repaired this year as a famine work. The mischief done was past remedy, but I did save one fine figure of the Cobra-king, armed with sword and shield, and set it upon, not in, the dam; which is, besides, surmounted by an ugly and ruinous little temple, said to have been built by a European officer. This gentleman, it is said, being encamped under the tamarind trees of the old embankment, thought it right to insult the image of the goddess Lakshmi, who was stuck up under another tree near the tents. She, being wroth, punished him vicari-
ously by sending cholera upon the villagers, and refused to be appeased till he had granted a sum sufficient to erect her present bane. The hero of this legend is still alive, but, as neither the temple nor the tale (if true) says much for his taste, it is not necessary to name him here.

I have already (Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 230) referred to the erection of small dolmens by the Shepherd caste of these parts, and have since seen two a little larger—that is, about three feet cube. One of these exists near the village of Hanatgi, 12 miles east of Bîjâpur; and the other just outside the Fateh Darwâjâ, or Victory Gate, of the city itself. Both are of the same pattern, having one back, two side, and a top stone, the fourth side remaining open, and being flanked by two small upright stones; and both now serve the purpose of shrines for Grâma devatâs—in all likelihood deified ancestors, "rude forefathers of the hamlet," whose remains may lie below, or perhaps were burnt there or thereabouts; but not even a tradi-
tion could I pick up about either.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL NOTES.

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

(Continued from p. 47.)

No. XIX.—Passing through Fire."

Treading on fire and leaping through flames, either in honour of a deity or in fulfilment of a vow, seem to be among the most ancient and universal of superstitious customs. They exist in every part of the Madras Presidency, and doubtless elsewhere in India. Excellent accounts of the custom have been given in the Indian Antiquity by Mr. Stokes, vol. II. p. 190, and by Captain Mackenzie, vol. III. pp. 6-8, and are of special value, one as containing the evidence given in a judicial inquiry respecting the cus-
tom by parties concerned, the other as a detail-
ed description by an eye-witness of a very full ceremional of the kind at Bangalore. Both occurred in 1873. In 1854 the Madras Gov-
ernment called for a report from every zillâ as to the prevalence of the custom, and whether it appeared to be attended with such an amount of hurt or danger as to warrant measures being taken for its discouragement and suppression. From the replies received, it appeared that fire-
treading was known in every district, but only locally observed in most, and not general in more than two or three. It was reported to be falling into disuse, practised only by the lower orders, and its performance to be unattended by danger or instances of injury sufficient to call for interference by Government, who thereupon ordered that it would be enough for European officials to use their influence in discouraging the custom, and endeavouring to obtain the assistance of the more educated classes of the native community in the same object.

When not done in discharge of vows made in time of sickness or disaster, the fire-walking seemed to be performed (generally in March or June) in most places in honour of Virabhadra,
the portentous flame-clad progeny of Siva, who is especially feared as presiding over family discord and misfortune, or else of Dharmaraja, the elder Pandava, to whom there are five hundred temples in South Arkat alone, and with whom and Draupadi the ceremony has some particular association. 1 In Ganjam and Muisir it is performed in honour of a village goddess, and everywhere seems connected with aboriginal rites and Siva-worship, Brahma always disowning it. Messrs. Stokes and Mackenzie have described how it is carried out, and the reports to Government speak of the fire-pit as a narrow trench, sometimes twenty yards long and half a foot deep, filled with small sticks and twigs, usually tamarind, which are kindled and kept burning till they have sunk into a mass of glowing embers. Along this the devotees, often fifty or sixty in succession, walk, run, or leap, barefooted; and not unfrequently the precaution is taken of forming a puddle of water at each end of the trench, for the devotees to start from and leap into. Such a trench I have seen the day after a fire-treading had been performed in it, and one of the actors went along it with a hop, skip, and jump, to show how it was done. Sometimes, to make the rite more imposing and meritorious, devotees will pierce their eyelids, tongues, the fleshy part of their arms, &c. with long slender nails having a lighted wick attached to each end, and so accoutred tread the fiery path. This seems repulsive, but there is no real danger in the ceremony, as the reports to Government were obliged to admit; and Captain Mackenzie in his account observes that there "never was, nor could be, the slightest danger to life." Nor would there be ordinarily. In the case reported by Mr. Stokes, a sickly boy fell in the pit and received burns from which he died: the accident and result were owing to his condition; and, when it appears from Mr. Stokes's paper that the practice is now prohibited in Madras, the antiquity will be inclined to regret interference with primeval customs not essentially more dangerous than hunting or racing. Amongst similar exhibitions it may be mentioned that in the demon-worship so prevalent on the western coast, when celebrations are held in honour of Chânumdâ, a much-dreaded female divinity (vide Ind. Ant. vol. II. p. 169), the dancer, who represents and is supposed to be possessed by her, dances and rolls upon a pile of burning embers without any injury, as is asserted. In the Nilgiri Hills, too, there is a sect of outcaste Brahmans denominated Jumpers (Haraveer), from a rite in which they used to leap over a fire. Though claiming to be Saiva Brahmans, wearing the thread and abstaining from meat, they really have no caste, but live and marry amongst the Badagas, and work as coolies.

When official inquiries were made into the fire-treading practices in Madras, surprise was evidently felt that they should turn out to be so harmless. The minds of many probably reverted to passages in the Old Testament (e.g. Leviticus xviii. 21; 2 Kings xxiii. 10) where children are spoken of as being passed through fire to Molech, which have been generally regarded as denoting cruel sacrifices of living children,—an idea Milton has gone far to confirm by his well-known lines:

"Molech, horrid king, besmear'd with blood
Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears,
Though, for the noise of drums and timbrels loud,
Their children's cries unheard, that pass'd through fire
To his grim idol."

Commentators have usually adopted the same view, and drawn frightful pictures of a huge brazen idol in whose arms, heated glowing hot, children were placed and cruelly consumed. It is most probable, however, that the rite was as harmless as the Indian fire-treading, or as when children were "passed through fire" by their mothers, almost in our own days, on St. John's Eve in our own islands, and still in Brittany. The Rabbinical commentators have strongly repudiated the common interpretation, and insisted that in all the Scripture passages on the subject there is no word used signifying 'to burn' or 'destroy,' but 'to pass' and 'to offer,' and they ask whether, when so wise and beneficent a king as Solomon is spoken of as permitting his 'strange wives' worship of Molech, it can be believed he would have sanctioned the murder of little children. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus, in Upper Syria, and then passing through it, slowly or quickly according to their zeal, and often carrying their children in their arms.—Tom. 1. p. 153.

1 A century ago Sommer (Voyage aux Indes Orientales, Paris, 1763) described the Indians walking on fire in honour of Dharmaraja and his wife Draupadi,—first following their images carried in procession three times round a fire,
who wrote in the 4th century, took the same view, and there is an interesting passage in his commentary on the Old Testament, where, in his 47th query on 2 Kings iii., as to how the expression "Ahaz made his son to pass through fire" is to be understood, he observes—"Josephus says that Ahaz offered one of his sons as a burnt-offering; but I think this is an error that has come down to our own times. I have myself seen in certain cities that once in a year fires were lit in the streets, and people leaped and bounded over them,—not boys only, but men also; and infants were carried through the flame by their mothers. It appeared to me to be an expiatory and purifying rite, and I think that this was the sin of Ahaz." Such, probably, were the Molech rites; they were condemned by the Old Testament writers as idolatrous, not as destructive, and the observances described by Theodoret were forbidden to Christians at the 6th Council of Constantinople, in A.D. 580, as superstitious follies merely.

The result of the Madras inquiries was to show that fire-walking was almost as much practised by Muhammadans as by Hindus. Indeed, in one district (Karnúl) it was only known at the Muharram; and fire-dances were reported to be regularly observed at that festival in 120 villages in Nellúr; in that district, also, Muhammadan Fakirs were said to walk and roll on fire at two places in the month Madhūn, in honour of a Pror or saint named Bundar Sháh Madur. Herklotz, in his Qasmo-o-Islam, when describing the Muharram, says that the fire-pits then used are called alwaú (`bonfires'), and are dug annually on the same spot. Fires are kindled in them in the evening, and, "of those who have vowed, some leap into the still burning embers and out again, others leap through the flame, and some scatter about handfuls of fire." He gives, however, no account of the origin and meaning of the custom. Muhammadans are unable to explain it, and the more educated amongst them regard it with aversion, as they do many of the Muharram extravagancies. It has hence been surmised by many that such wild ceremonies may have been imitated from Hindu observances, as intimated by Mr. Sinclair in his Notes on the Muharram (Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 79). It may indeed be so, but I know not whether it would be too hazardous to refer this leaping into

and over fires to a survival of Arabian and Syrian idolatrous ceremonies, such as are described by Theodoret, older than the Prophet! Indian Muhammadans partake largely of Arab descent, and it is no more surprising that strict Musulmans should, though doubtless unconsciously, keep up customs of idolatrous origin, than that Christians should, up to our own times, have maintained the pagan festivities of Beltane and St. John's and St. Peter's Eves. Indeed, the coincidence is remarkable and striking. How long old customs linger, and how hard they die, is exemplified in a curious passage of Captain Frederick Burnaby's amusing book On Horseback through Asia Minor, vol. II. p. 201:—"I have often wondered whether something connected with the old fire-worshippers' superstition has a lurking-place in the minds of the Persians and Kurds. Day after day, and at the same hour, I have seen the entire inhabitants of a village turn out and gaze intently upon the great orb of light slowly sinking on the distant horizon. I have questioned them about this subject. They indignantly repudiate the idea of any act of worship to the sun: they say they do so because it is their habit, and because their fathers and ancestors did the same thing before them." Again, in close connection with the subject of this note, and showing how the origin of ancient observances may be forgotten, Ovid expressly mentions leaping through flames as amongst the rites of the Palília (Fasti, lib. iv. 781), and then, proceeding to explain the meaning, acknowledges that the multitude of reasons popularly assigned makes it doubtful, and adds some which only show that, even in his time, the signification of the rite was really unknown. Some instances of analogous customs may be here recounted. The late Professor H. H. Wilson, in his "Essay on the Festivals of the Hindus" (Works, vol. I.), when describing the wild revelries of the Holi, as observed in Hindustán Proper in the month Phalgun, or March, says of the bonfires then lit in all the towns and villages,—"When the flames break forth, the spectators crowd round to warm themselves, an act that is supposed to avert ill-luck for the rest of the year. They engage also in some rough gambols, trying to push each other nearer to the fire than is agreeable or safe, and as the blaze declines jump over it and toss about the burning

---

1 The Muharram existed as a feast before Muhammad, who enjoined ten additional customs during it.
The following are selected from many instances of ancient customs in the British Isles. Sir John Sinclair, in the Statistical Account of Scotland, published in 1794, states, from the report of the minister of Loudoun, in Ayrshire, that "the custom still remains amongst the herds and young people to kindle fires on the high grounds in honour of Beltane" (vol. III. p. 105); and, again, the minister of Callander, in Perthshire, relates that on "Beltein day" (old May-day) the people kindled a fire and toasted a cake, which was divided into as many parts as there were people present, and one part blackened with charcoal; the bits were then put into a cap and drawn blindfold, and he who drew the black bit was considered devoted to Baal, and obliged to leap three times through the flame (vol. XI. p. 620).

In the Gentleman's Magazine for February 1795, an eye-witness relates that on the 21st June 1782 he saw, from the top of the house in which he was staying in Ireland, the fires burning at midnight on every eminence for a radius of thirty miles all around, and that the people danced round the fires, and made their sons and daughters, together with their cattle, pass through them—reckoning this to ensure good fortune during the succeeding year. The dancing round and leaping over fires probably did not survive long into the present century, but the kindling the Midsummer fires is hardly yet extinct. I remember, a few years ago, a notice of them having been seen in some of the Scottish Isles; and in 1833 there was a riot in Cork on account of some of the soldiers quartered there refusing to subscribe to the Beltane bonfires.

There is not a county in England, from Northumberland to Cornwall, in which there was not some trace of the custom existing in the last century; and in Wales, Devonshire, and Cornwall it lingered to within living memory, if indeed it be yet wholly extinct. In Brittany it is still in force; there the peasantry still vigorously dance round and leap over the St. John's fires, and two years ago a fine painting by the eminent artist Jules Breton was exhibited in London, entitled La Saint Jean, vividly portraying the scene from life. One of the old navi-

3 "In the month Muharram the first rain fell, Adam and Eve descended on earth, and species were propagated."—Herhoto.

4 The sanctity of fire-treading would also be heightened by its being used as a solemn ordeal. In Antiquarian Researches, vol. I. p. 269, there is a paper on ordeals communicated by Warren Hastings containing this passage:

"For the fire ordeal an excavation, 9 hands long, 2 spans broad, and 1 span deep, is made in the ground, and filled with a fire of poplar wood; into this the person accused must walk barefooted, and if his feet be unharmed they hold him blameless; if burned, guilty." In medieval Europe accused persons walked barefoot over heated ploughshares placed in a line at unequal distances.
Rājmahāli Words.

By R. B. Swaynton, Late M.C.S.

In Dr. Hunter's Comparative Dictionary of the Languages of India and High Asia nearly two hundred words have been selected for comparison in more than a hundred and forty languages and dialects—one word to a luxurious page. Twenty of these dialects are bracketed together as belonging to Central India, but including the Chentau and Yerukala of the south; and there are seventeen under the Southern India division, including Tamīl, Ma-layālam, and Karṇāṭaka, ancient and modern, Todrā and Toḍa. Malabar, as a dialect distinguishable from Tamīl and Malayālam has been included by mistake; neither has Siēhalese any relationship to any South-Indian language. The Keikadi dialect, wherever it may come from, has three words out of four the same as one or another South-Indian language.

The blue book entitled Specimens of Languages of India, published in 1874 under the authority of the Government of Bengal, has about a hundred and fifty words, and under the division appropriated to 'Central Provinces languages' twenty-two names of dialects or of selected centres. Unfortunately none of these correspond in name with any of Dr. Hunter's list under the heading Central India, though some classified as belonging to Western Bengal are to be found in Dr. Hunter's list. The words in the Bengal book have been better selected than those in Dr. Hunter's, and the sentence illustrations are to be found only in the former; but, as Dr. Hunter's book was printed six years earlier, it would have been better if the same words had been adhered to in the later volume.

The dialect of the Rājmahāli hills appears in both vocabularies, and as it has been always stated to be connected with the Drāvidian languages, though so widely separated by distance, it may be interesting to see to what extent this is borne out by vocabulary comparison.

Among the numerals, only the name for 'one' in Rājmahāli—'ort, ondung, kieong'—will bear comparison with the Tamīl onra and the Kana-reso ondu; all the other numerals are Hindi. The pronouns in Rājmahāli, as they are given by Dr. Hunter's informants and in the Bengal collection, are put down below for comparison with those of the South-Indian languages to which they bear any resemblance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Rājmahāli (Bengal Book)</th>
<th>Hindi</th>
<th>Rājm. (Hunter)’</th>
<th>South-Indian (Tamil)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ayn</td>
<td>Main, ham</td>
<td>En</td>
<td>Mān or yān, Kanarese (anc.) nā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>Aym</td>
<td>Ham, hamani</td>
<td>Nam, om</td>
<td>Nam, nangal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thou</td>
<td>Nin</td>
<td>Tu, tou</td>
<td>Nin</td>
<td>Ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>Nin</td>
<td>Tum</td>
<td>Åth</td>
<td>Nir, nangal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He</td>
<td>Åh</td>
<td>Wuh</td>
<td>Åsabar</td>
<td>Avan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>Ahaber</td>
<td>We, ohney</td>
<td>Ongki</td>
<td>Avargal, avar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of me</td>
<td>Aynyk</td>
<td>Mera</td>
<td>Emki, nāmki</td>
<td>Ennudeiya, Telugu Na-yokka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of us</td>
<td>Emsubki</td>
<td>Hamāra, ham-sobinkaer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nammudeiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of thee</td>
<td>Ningkid</td>
<td>Tera</td>
<td>Nimki</td>
<td>Unnudeiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of you</td>
<td>Ningkid</td>
<td>Tohāni</td>
<td>Ummudeiya</td>
<td>Ummudeiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of him</td>
<td>Ahikid</td>
<td>Uska</td>
<td>Avanudeiya</td>
<td>Avanudeiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of them</td>
<td>Ahikid</td>
<td>Unka</td>
<td>Avaragaludeiya</td>
<td>Ennathu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine</td>
<td>Aynyk</td>
<td>Hamāra</td>
<td>Ongki</td>
<td>Nammathu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our</td>
<td>Emsohki</td>
<td>Hamāra</td>
<td>Åsa-beriki</td>
<td>Unathu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thine</td>
<td>Ningkid</td>
<td>Tera</td>
<td>Ningki</td>
<td>Ummathu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your</td>
<td>Ningkid</td>
<td>Tumāra</td>
<td>Nīnoki</td>
<td>Avanathu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His</td>
<td>Ahikid</td>
<td>Uska</td>
<td>Åhiki</td>
<td>Avaragluthu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their</td>
<td>Ahikid</td>
<td>Unka</td>
<td>Åsa-beriki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from the different modes of spelling in the two Rājmahāli lists, there is an interchange of h for s, or s for h. The word 'they' has been taken down for Dr. Hunter asabār, and for the other list ahabār. The sort of lisp which I am informed a Bhil uses in trying to say the Hindustani word hādir may have appeared to one hearer an s, and to another an ā. The words
For 'I,' 'thou,' and 'they' are most like the corresponding words in the Dravidian languages, but it may be observed that 'thou' in Chinese also is əi. The mode of the addition of the postpositions is as in Hindi as Tamil or Telugu.

After the pronouns, I have gone through all the words in Dr. Hunter's lists, with the results in the small catalogue below.

### List of similar words from Dr. Hunter's Dictionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Rājmahāli</th>
<th>South-Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Meche</td>
<td>Tamāl anc. Misei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much</td>
<td>Ina</td>
<td>Telugu Ėnta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near</td>
<td>Atgi</td>
<td>Malayālam Āṭukko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mallā</td>
<td>Tam. Ailla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>Ule</td>
<td>Tam. Īḷḷē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooth</td>
<td>Pāl</td>
<td>Tam. Pal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow</td>
<td>Oi</td>
<td>Tel. Āu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>Kāne</td>
<td>Tel. Kannu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear</td>
<td>Khetway</td>
<td>Tam. Kāṭhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Tam, Min, Śaṅskṛit Mīna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Aya</td>
<td>Tam. Ayi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth</td>
<td>Toro</td>
<td>Tel. Nōru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come</td>
<td>Bara</td>
<td>Mal. Vāru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree</td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Tōḍa Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Āha</td>
<td>Kannarese Appa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time had not arrived when Dr. Hunter wrote, as he remarks in his preface, to render it safe to make a table of non-Āryan phonetic changes, but from the instances of changes and substitution of letters given I do not see how Telugu nōru, 'a mouth,' becomes toro, or vice versa. Min, the word for 'a fish,' is Śaṅskṛit; 'father' is a dissyllable, with a b, a p, and an a in it in many languages.

The next list has been taken out of all the words in the Bengal vocabularies, with two sentences from Rājmahāli, Tōḍa, and Tamil. The residuum of similar words is very small.

### Tāmil Malayālam Telugu Kannarese Tōḍa Badaga Rājmahāli (Bengal Book.) Rājmahāli (Hunter.)

| Hand | Kāi | Kei | Kei | Kei | Kei | Kei | Tetu | Sesu | Kal |
| Foot | Adi, pāḍam Kāl | Pāḍamu | Adi or Pāḍa Kāl | Kāl | Kālu | Kodu | Kal | |
| Nose | Mōkku | Mōkka | Mūkku | Mōgu | Mitûf | Muku, mugu Muiēd | | |
| Eye | Kān | Čiṭṭu | Kanna | Kāṇu | Kāṇu | Kāṇu | Kāṇe | |
| Mouth | Tāt̪ | Tāṭ | Nōru | Nāḍi | Nāḍi | Bāi | Bāi | Tōr | Soro |
| Tooth | Pāla | Pālla | Palī | Hallu | Hallu | Hallu | Hallu | Pal | |
| Ear | Kāḍu | Chēni | Chēvi | Kivi | Kivi | Kivi | Kivi | Kāḍu | Kāḍu |
| Hair | Māyir | Rōmam | Venṭr̪ukal Kōḍal | Mīr | Mīr | Kōḍal, meir | Kāḍal, Tāli | Khetway |
| Head | Thalai | Tala | Tala | Tale | Tale | Tale | Māndē | Māndē | Kāku |
| Tongue | Nakū | Nāva | Nālukā | Nālīgo | Nālīgo | Nālange | Nālange | Tarṭay |

1 The Brāhūls of Kalat speak a language different from the Baluchi of other tribes in Makrān, and which is called Kardl or Kardgāli.—Ed.
POLYANDRY IN THE HIMÁLAYAS.

By Dr. C. R. Stulfnagel, Lahor.

If immorality of the worst description existed in juxtaposition with the most brilliant civilization of the Greeks, it will create surprise in no one to hear that chastity, as we understand the term, is a virtue scarcely known among the Mongolians who inhabit the northern confines of India. It is true, little is known of the Tibetans, very little indeed; and this is to be regretted, for they seem an intelligent people—capable, no doubt, of good and great things if brought under the continual influence of a higher life. But the little that is known of their state of morals does not prepossess us in their favour. When Marco Polo, in the twelfth century, reached that country, it had been recently ravaged by Manku Khan; the grandson of the great, Mangu Khan; but though his knowledge was limited,—for he does not pretend to have travelled over the 30,000 square miles of Tibet,—he still had his attention attracted to the extraordinary immorality prevalent all over the country, so much so that he observes that no man of that country would, on any consideration, take to wife a girl who was a maid. Colonel Yule adds to that passage a learned note pointing out that similar corrupt practices are ascribed to many nations; Martini says they prevailed in Yunnan; Garnier makes a similar observation respecting Sishan; Pallas mentions that young women among the Mongols are esteemed in proportion to the number of their love affairs; Japanese ideas of morality are not very different, and the most recent traveller in Eastern Tibet, Mr. Cooper, makes a similar observation about the people he came across.

What has been said of the immorality of the Mongolians holds good in some respects of their neighbours the Pathans, inhabiting the Himalaya mountains. Whether of Mongolian, Tatar, or of mixed Mongolian and Aryan descent, these highlanders have extremely loose ideas concerning morality generally, and matrimony especially. Obligated by their life of seclusion to adhere to the principle of absolute conservatism, it is by no means strange that their customs should still be primitive—as they may be called with a euphemistic license. But their primitiveness is not the primitiveness of innocence. "The Abode of Snow" might lead one to expect, from a partial inspection of its fertile mountain slopes, flowing rivulets, irrigated

papers in Ind. Ant. vol. VI. pp. 311, 315; and Mr. Kirkpatrick's letter, vol. VII. p. 86.

valleys, and wooded glens, that the people who live among them would excel the natives of the plains in body as well as mind. And though, generally speaking, natural fearlessness, frankness, hardiness, and a superior physique may be conceded to them, they are certainly far behind the people of the plains in intelligence, shrewdness, quickness of intellect, and in that virtue which ought to exist in the relation between the sexes. Although I have never found an instance of hereditary cretinism, still there is an extraordinary heaviness about the brains of a Pahari which makes him in many respects a totally unworthy opponent to a native of the plains when it comes to an encounter of wits. A Banyā coming from the plains has little difficulty, even without necessarily resorting to dishonesty, in enriching himself at the expense of the improvidently stupid hill-people. How far intellectual obtuseness is connected with moral unconsciousness is a question of some nicety, but the difficulty lies in striking the balance, as, after all, innumerable instances for and against such a proposition can be brought forward. However the case may be, the filth, the objectionable customs, the mental and moral obliquity of these hill tribes, attracted early the attention of Christian persons, with a view to establishing missionary centres, so as to bring them gradually to a better and nobler life. Thus Dārjiling was made a mission station in 1840, Ālmora in 1850, Sabāthu was taken up by the American Presbyterians in 1837, Chambā by the Established Church of Scotland in 1863, Kāngrā by the Church Missionary Society in 1854, and the Moravians established in Kyelang a station in 1855. But perhaps the most important seat of missionary enterprise is Kotgadh, situated on the extreme northern frontier of the British territory, on the highroad from the plains past Simlā to Tatary.

The deplorable state of morality obtaining among the people of the Kotgadh valley thirty-five years ago is graphically described in the Rev. W. Robson's mission report published in 1873; and, being an authentic record, it may with advantage be here reproduced:

"The hill states prior to the British conquest had for many years been subject to all the miseries of ruthless rapine and tyranny, both under the Gurkha rule and under the government of their own native chieftains. The prevalent superstition betrays the most extreme ignorance. No ceremony is undertaken without duly offering a propitiatory sacrifice to some devata. Human sacrifices in former times were not unfrequently immolated at the shrines of their temples, but it is believed that, since British sway has been established, these impious barbarities are no longer practised. Every accident or misfortune, however trifling, is connected with the evil agency of the genii loci, who are very numerous, having peculiar functions attributed to each; for example, some are believed to preside over the crops, and some to exercise an influence over the heart of man, some over the summits of mountains, sources of rivers, forests, &c., and large flocks of goats are carefully kept in most villages for sacrificial purposes.

"The sale of females, for the worst purposes of slavery, though carried on with secrecy and caution, is continued in various parts of the hill territory; and a frightful evil, which will be noticed below, may in a great measure be traced to this pernicious system. It is a notorious fact that for ages past the zanānas of the rich natives of the plains have been supplied with females from the hill regions; which, together with the cruel custom of female infanticide, has caused a disproportionate between the two sexes, and given rise to the monstrous evil of polyandry, a practice which obtains throughout the country. Where females are so scarce, and where they are almost sure of commanding a price, it is not difficult to trace the motive for the perpetuation of such a crime as that of female infanticide. It seems improbable that the same feelings of jealous honour and false respect for family, which actuate the mind of the high-caste Rājput in India, can in any way influence the people of the hills, whose habits and practices are at total variance with their ideas.

"The very marriages of the people are strongly tainted with slavery, for no man can obtain a wife without paying a sum of money to her father. If she be turned out without a cause assigned, the purchase-money is retained until another marriage is contracted, when the first purchaser receives back his purchase-money. Thus the females in no respect appear to be above the condition of slaves, being considered as much an article of property as any other commodity. We could adduce other facts to show that vice added to ignorance goes hand in hand in reducing this class of human beings to the lowest level of existence."

A little further on, the report states that—

"Since the influence of the English government, based largely upon Christian morality, has been brought to bear upon these tracts, the disgusting custom of polyandry has disappeared. Not a single instance can be now adduced (in Kotgadh of course) of many men having one wife, although increase of wealth has resulted in many persons acquiring by right of purchase more than one wife, because women, who all take their share in field work, are very valuable in these agricultural districts, where manual labour is an important consideration. But the British territory once
passed, especially towards the east, polyandry will still be found in Kanawar. The cause assigned is, however, not poverty, but a desire to keep the common patrimony from being distributed among a number of brothers. The result is that the whole family is enabled to live in comparative comfort."

Any one who has attempted to obtain original information from people who suspect evil intentions in every action or question of a European stranger will understand how difficult it is to verify statements, not to speak of collecting facts only conjectured. But, taking the observation of former travellers as a fact respecting the low state of morality among the hill people, it would be strange indeed to learn that they had become in course of a generation convinced of their pernicious practices, and had turned over a new leaf. And so it actually is. Though slavery is now abolished, the marketable value of a wife still exists. Moral perception is now no acuter than formerly; for it is nothing extraordinary to hear that two men disgusted with their wives have agreed to interchange them, hoping that a new arrangement in their domestic affairs would conduco to greater peace and comfort. But far worse, and a vice unknown to the Hindus of the plains, is the marriage within the prohibited degrees of relationship. Not that this practice is indeed very common, but its existence at all without being visited by the severest social penalties is a sign that domestic ties are not considered of a very sacred character.

In a thoroughly conservative country like India, habits do not change per saltum, nor can much be effected in a decade; even half a century will produce no perceptible change in the more remote corners of the Himalaya. As regards polyandry, a glance at Fraser's "Journal of a Tour through part of the snow range of the Himala Mountains" will give the reader a fair idea of its present condition. Speaking of the hill people it is stated—"Their custom of marriage and the general system with respect to their women are very extraordinary. It is usual all over the country for the future husband to purchase his wife from her parents, and the sum thus paid varies with the rank of the purchaser. The customary charge to a common peasant or zamindar is from ten to twenty rupees. The difficulty of raising this sum, and the alleged expense of maintaining women, may in part account for, if it cannot excuse, a most disgusting usage, which is universal over the country. Three or four or more brothers marry one wife who is the wife of all; they are unable to raise the requisite sum individually, and thus club their shares, and buy this one common spouse."

This account was printed in 1829. It is not surprising that when Fraser heard of this very revolting custom in the course of his travels he was further attracted, and made inquiries into the cause of the origin and continuance of so remarkable an inconsistency with all Hindu manners. He therefore relates that his informers, who were, on the whole, sensible and intelligent men, "unanimously admitted the universality of the custom, that it was usual to purchase wives, and that the zamindars were too poor to be able to give from ten to twenty rupees for a woman, and therefore contributed their quota, and each enjoyed his share of the purchase. They often explained the modes usually adopted to prevent quarrelsome interference, and described everything as already detailed; but when I came to put questions relative to the disposal of the surplus of females they could give me no satisfactory answers whatever."

Supposing the above account to be correct—and there is little reason to doubt it—we have two things that require confirmation before the statement can be accepted as applicable after a lapse of more than fifty years—the universality of polyandry, and its causes. Fraser seems to think that the custom of having a community of wives would not exist but for the poverty of the hill people. But in that case it would have disappeared long since, or, if not, it could not possibly exist side by side with polygamy; whereas the fact is that instances have come to my notice of these two practices existing in one and the same family. Poor the hill people undoubtedly are, but there are few who are destitute. Ever since the English government was firmly established in the Punjab, the inhabitants of the plains as well as the hills have benefited by the gradual rise of the price of labour or of agricultural produce. If, therefore, any man finds that there are too many mouths to feed in his household, one or more of the grown male members must leave for a time their home and obtain work in the larger farms of a prosperous neighbour, or else go in quest of service in one of the numerous hill sanitariums. This, however, he abhors. He is constitutionally lazy, improvident, dirty, and immoral. If a crop is plentiful he will wastefully consume the whole outturn, instead of laying by a store for a possible bad season. He will not move twenty miles, as a rule, to earn a livelihood, and he does not cultivate more ground than is absolutely necessary to maintain himself and his family. Moreover, besides ploughing the fields and sowing the seed, he leaves the field work to be performed by the women—the weeding, the reaping, the threshing, the garnering. The household duties, of course, fall upon the women.
If, then, the Paññi is poor, it is chiefly his own fault, and the promiscuous and complicated connections he enters into cannot fairly be charged to his poverty. On the contrary, most of the cases of polyandry in the villages of the Kogadh district, in Bassahir and Kulu, are found among the well-to-do people; it is the poor who prefer polygamy, on account of the value of the women as household drudges.

Nothing, perhaps, will give a more vivid insight into the state of polyandry than one or two cases as they have actually occurred. In Pomei, near Kogadh, there are two brothers, the elder of whom, Jhar, got properly married to his wife. Being of the Kanai caste, the ceremony was performed in the usual manner by a Brahmman. But as these two brothers had a house and fields in common, it was privately arranged that the woman should also be the wife of the younger. The fruit of such a union does not generally give rise to disputes; the first-born child is always considered that of the eldest brother, the second that of the next. Legally, I believe, the children all belong to the eldest. No European would probably have become aware of the case at Pomei, but for a violent quarrel which obliged Jhar to leave his wife to his younger brother, and seek for employment in the house of the missionary at Kogadh.

In another village, Mongau, not far from Pomei, there are three brothers in a family of high caste, the eldest of whom, Prima by name, married a woman who became afterwards the wife of the second, Gangi. The third brother, on the other hand,—Ratti,—has a separate wife.

The most complicated case of polyandry that has come to my notice is that at Kilka, in Kanawar, about a hundred miles from Kogadh. Ram Charn, the mukhiya or head-man of the village, had three brothers,—Khati Ram, Basant Ram, and another,—and these four brothers had only one wife in common. Her eldest son, Premasuk, was in 1870 about five-and-twenty years old, and her youngest seven or eight. These two, besides a girl called Sundari Dase, were the acknowledged children of Ram Charn, the mukhiya. Khati Ram had no children, but Basant Ram, the third brother, had first a girl, Amar Dase, aged eighteen, and two boys about fourteen and eleven. All six children acknowledged Ram Charn as head of the family. When Premasukh, the eldest son, who officiated as mukhiya in the absence of his father, was married, it was well understood that his wife would become the wife of all the brothers as they grew up, including the child then in his infancy. I hear that Premasukh lately married a second wife, as he had no family by the first. Again, the girl Amar Dase, daughter of Basant Ram, was not married until she was eighteen, because her father could not find any family which contained a sufficient number of brothers to make it worth his while to part with her. Eventually, however, she was married to an only son who was wealthy.

These three instances of polyandry are culled from a large number I made a note of, and it is hoped they will afford a general insight into the working of the system. But, with all due consideration to the high authority of Mr. Fraser, it is contended that polyandry, as it now exists in the Himalayas, is owing rather to the avarice and the brutish insensibility to, and absence of, general morality than to the poverty of the people. When several brothers agree to have a wife in common, it will be found that, though individually rich enough to keep a wife, there is some property they have, and which they do not wish to divide.

Fields, grazing-lands, or a forest, or all together, produce sufficient to keep a combined family in respectability, but if divided and again subdivided each part would at last be too small to support two or three people. Polyandry is thus in reality nothing more than a mere custom of community of wives among brothers who have a community of other goods.

Next, I must modify another statement in The Journal of a Tour quoted above. The practice of polyandry, so far as I have been able to learn, is not universal,—it cannot scarcely be called very common; and, considering what was said by the committee of the Kogadh Mission in 1841, there are visible signs, though small, that the custom is falling into disuse. If diligently searched, single cases of polyandry will be found in the Kogadh pargana, in Kulu, in the territory of the Raja of Komarsen and Kaneti, and in Bassahir, and this not confined to any special caste, but among Brahmans, Rajputs, and Kanaits without distinction. Though common enough in Kanawar at the present day, it exists side by side with polygamy and monogamy. In one house there may be three brothers with one wife; in the next three brothers with four wives, all alike in common; in the next house there may be a man with three wives to himself; in the next a man with only one wife.
MISCELLANEA.

THE FIREARMS OF THE HINDUS.

Many were the weapons of war in use amongst the Æryans, even so early as the Vedic period, such as the pāsa, sela, bagra, chakra, dhanu, &c.; and many more were invented in the ages of the Rāmdyana and the Mahabhārata. The classification of these weapons, according to the Agni Purāṇa, is four-fold:—(1) Yantra-Muktā, (2) Pani Muktā, (3) Muktā-Mukta, and (4) A Mukta.

Besides these weapons, there is mentioned another called the Agni Astra (firearm), but no description of it has been found in any Sanskrit work. The Sātāgāni, Professor Wilson supposes it to be a firearm; but he gives no description of it. The Hindus had also another kind of weapon, called the Māhā-Yantra. It would thus seem that instruments like the cannon and the gun were early in use amongst them.

We shall describe the Agni Astra as given in the Śūkra-Niti, a work said to have been written by the sage Śūkra-Achārya; and we find mention of it in the Agni Purāṇa and in the Muktā Rākṣasa. From the description we have here of the Nālīka-Yantra and gunpowder, we are led to believe that these were in use amongst the Hindus at an early date.

Nālīka Yantra.

The Nālīka is of two sizes—the larger and the smaller. It is about five spans in length, slightly bent in the middle and bored towards the bottom.

It should have, moreover, two notches, one at the top and the other at the bottom, for securing the aim, and an ear near the bore, and the flint for striking fire inserted near it. It is set in a wooden frame which elongates into a thin blade upwards, and has a hole in it of the width of the middle finger. It has further a ramrod for boring and settling down the powder.

This is the smaller Nālīka. It should be used by infantry and cavalry. It is as thick as it is long, and thus capable of taking a long aim.

If this Nālīka is thick and has no wooden frame attached to it, it is called the Brīhaspati-Nālīka.

It is sometimes so big that it requires to be drawn by a cart. It graces war and secures victory.

Gunpowder.

The material used is:

- Ānanda-bhūta (a kind of saltpetre), sulphur, charcoal of Akanda (Calotropis gigantea) (soaked in the milk of Euphorbia nervalis, and dried and then burned in closed pottery). All these ingredients should be reduced to powder and then mixed together in due proportions, and used as gunpowder in the Nālīka.

Round and made of iron and fired with smaller bullets, or it is solid. It is used in the Brīhaspati-Nālīka. For the smaller, one small bullet of lead or other metal should be made. The Nala should be made of iron or of like metal, and kept constantly clean. This instrument is for infantry and cavalry.

The manner of firing the Nālīka with bullets is as follows:—First clean the Nālīka well, then pour in powder and shot, and stuff the bore with a little gunpowder. Thus loaded and fired, it is sure to do execution.

The bullet flies with the velocity of an arrow from a bow.

Besides the materials mentioned above for preparing gunpowder, many other ingredients were also known to adepts in the art, and used in different proportions for the same purpose:—

Śūkra-Niti, Section 4.

The ēlokas, quoted here from the Śūkra-Niti, do not seem mere modern interpolations; but we stop here for want of sufficient corroborative evidence.

Berkampore, Bengal.

Rām Dās Sen.
ANTIOQUITY OF INSURANCE IN INDIA.¹

Str,-I think “Cantab” has hardly evidence for saying that “the practice of insurance was common in India for many centuries before the Christian era.” The text out of the ordinances of Manu, in the translation accredited by Jones, is—“Having ascertained the rates of purchase and sale, the length of the way, the expenses of food and of condiments, the charges of securing the goods carried, and the neat profits of trade, let the king oblige traders to pay taxes.” One would think that if the king or his minister had got ‘the neat profits’ he would not trouble himself with the details; but, says the next verse, “As the leech, the sucking calf, and the bee take their natural food by little and little, thus must a king draw from his dominions an annual revenue.”

I do not think we know enough of the state of mercantile law and custom in the days of these kings to assert that anything like a modern system of insuring goods was in vogue. Manu is very general; some of his dicta are like that decree of king Ashuvaras that “All the wives shall give to their husbands honour, both great and small.” Just before the order for taxing the merchants, he says—“In every large town or city let him appoint one superintendent of all affairs, elevated in rank, formidable in power, distinguished as a planet among stars.”

There is one other order very similar to that cited first, establishing what indeed has descended to very modern time, called mostly a sirak:—“Let the king establish rules for the sale and purchase of all marketable things, having duly considered whenever they come and whither they must be sent; how long they have been kept; what may be gained by them, and what has been expended on them.”

In the translations of other ordinary authorities on Hindu law there is no trace of a system of insurance of goods, though much about deposit and bailment; and in practice in modern times, apart from an occasional copying of English practices, there is no such thing as insurance, and there are no insurance companies.

The word Yoga-Kshemam is in every-day use among Brahmanas for ‘welfare,’—a compliment expression,—but the dictionary also gives insurance as a meaning.

R. B. SWINTON,
late Madras C.S.

HYPOSTHAL TEMPLES.

There appears to be a considerable resemblance between the remarkable hyposthal temple lately described by Sir Walter Elliot (Ind. Ant. vol. VII. p. 19), and the Trimurti Kovil at the foot of the Anaimalai Hills in Kombatur, noticed at page 35, vol. III. The Orissa temple is evidently much larger and more important, but the other one, so much further to the south, is situated in a locality of old doubtless equally wild, and even now sequestered and remote. The circle of images with faces turned inward—an arrangement I have never seen elsewhere—corresponds with “the open circular temple or enclosure of plain cut-stone” in Orissa, and, to the best of my remembrance, the images were backed by a low wall not reaching to their shoulders—an approach to an hyposthal structure. The principal figure in the Orissa temple “appeared to have three faces,” and the figure indistinctly graven upon the great boulder overlooking the Kombatur circle indicated three figures, doubtful whether united, but the place is called Trimurti Kovil or Temple. It had all the look of extreme antiquity, was regarded with awe by the natives, who generally disliked approaching it, and seemed something quite apart from the ordinary temples and sacred resorts of these days. It was much to be wished that the locality could be visited and accurately described; it is but a morning’s ride from the talaik Kasba town of Udumalapâta.

M. J. W.

METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE MAHÂBHÂRATA.

BY J. MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., &C.

How Women ought to gain, and keep, their Husbands' affections.

A free translation of parts of the Mahabharata.

Book iii., verses 14649-14721.

[Of the two ladies who figure in the following dialogue, the first is Satyabhâma, the wife of the renowned Krishna, the ally of the Pândava princes; while the second is Draupadi (as she is most commonly called by her patronymic, as the daughter of Drupads, although her proper name was Krîshnâ), the wife of the five Pândava princes, Yudhishthira and his brothers. Here we have a case of polyandry, which the Mahabharata, in accommodation to later ideas, explains as originating in accidental and miraculous causes, although the custom is allowed, by some of the personages who appear in the poem, to have been one immemorially practised. Some indications of its (at least) occasional occurrence in the Panjâb in ancient times are found in two passages adduced in two papers communicated by me to the Indian Antiquary (vol. VI. pp. 256ff., 315).] It is

¹ From the Times.
² See also M. Williams’ Indian Epic Poetry, pp. 96ff.
worthy of remark, that Satyabhāma is represented in the passage before us as seeking to bring her husband, Krishna, under subjection by some of the philtres which she supposed Draupadi to have found effectual with the Pāṇḍavas, although Krishna was, either at the time when this section of the Mahābhārata was composed, or somewhat later, regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu, or of Brahma (the supreme Spirit), and (unless his deification was a later event, or unless his higher was not supposed always to permeate his human nature), might have been supposed, by his divine omniscience, to be incapable of deception by the wiles of his wife. I may add that, at the time when the dialogue is related to have occurred, the Pāṇḍavas were living in the forests, in pursuance of an engagement to exile themselves from their kingdom for a certain period. (See Professor Monier-Williams' Indian Epic Poetry, pp. 23 and 103.) The passage before us may doubtless be held to prove that in ancient days the women of India were in the habit of employing philtres of various kinds to gain or keep their husbands' affections. In other respects, and irrespectively of the dutiful, though exaggerated, sentiments which the second speaker expresses, it may possess some interest as a picture of ancient Indian manners.

Two ladies fair, of high estate, Long parted, now again had met. The one herself could justly pride On being noble Krishna's bride; The other ruled five princess' hearts With loving sway, by honest arts. Rejoiced each other now to see, They laughed and chatted, full of glee. In thought o'er all the past they ranged, And ancient memories interchanged. When this at length had found an end, The former thus addressed her friend —

Satyabhāma.

"How is it, dearest Krishnā, say, That thou thy husbands so canst sway,— Those godlike princes, youthful, bold, Strong-limbed, and proud, and uncontrolled,— Who ever watch thy looks, to find What thoughts are passing in thy mind, And ne'er against thy rule rebel? Reveal, I pray, thy potent spell. By what devices, what finesse, Canst thou their proud self-will repress, And make them all thy power confess? Where lies thy strength? What philtres rare Avail to gain thine end? declare. Do rites, oblations, prayers, conduce To work thy will, or lost abstrusè? Or is thy grand success the fruit Of any drug, or herb, or root?"

What art is thine, which fame ensures, And full connubial bliss secures? For I, too, seek to rule my lord: Thy methods tell; thy help afford."

These words when noble Krishnā heard, She spake with grief and sorrow stirred:—

Krishnā (Draupadī).

"Such questions vain befit not thee, A dame esteemed so sage to be. For all but heartless wives eschew Those wicked arts thou hast in view. Could any female merit praise For acts so shameful, schemes so base? Whene'er a hapless husband knows His foolish wife is one of those Who ply their lords with drugs and charms, His soul is racked by dire alarms, As any one is ill at ease Who in his house a serpent sees, How can he lead a happy life Who lives in dread of such a wife? How many men whose wives thus sin,— Who seek by drugs their lords to win, To fell diseases fall a prey, Grow dropseed, leprous, pine away In sad and premature decay! Such madness couldst thou dare to share? For thine own lord such ills prepare? No wife has e'er, by drugs or charms, Won back a husband to her arms. Now, calmly hear how I proceed, Avoiding every tortuous deed, I seek to win my husbands' hearts By none but open, honest arts. And so their willing hearts I rule: I ne'er cajole them, or befoul. Nor e'er on charms or drugs depend, Their independent wills to bend. From anger, pride, and passion free, I serve my lords most zealously, Without parade of fondness, still, Submissive, I their wish fulfill. By fitting gestures, gentle speech, And mien, and acts, my goal I reach. Those lords, whose glance alone could kill, I please with all my might and skill. Though they are never harsh or rude, But always kind, and mild, and good, I act as if constrained by awe, And treat their slightest hint as law. No other object draws my love, On earth beneath, or heaven above. No handsome, wealthy, jewelled youth, No god, could shake my plighted troth. For no delight or joy I care, Unless my lords the pleasure share.\n\n
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both European and native, have testified their approbation of it. Its object is chiefly social and religious. "There are thousands of Brâhmaṇa," the editor remarks, "who know the whole of the Rigveda by heart, and can repeat it in Sanskrit, Pada, Gaṭa, Ghaṭa, and Krama, without making any mistakes [these are different methods of learning the Veda, by either reciting each word separately, or by repeating the words in various complicated ways]; there are probably not more than a dozen who have ever attempted to understand what the Veda contains. There are quite as many who can repeat the Yajus and also the Sāma Veda, though Atharva-Veda are very few, at least in the Bombay Presidency."

Prof. Max Müller, in a paper on "The Veda and its Influence in India," taking this publication as his text, speaks of it thus: "The translation now offered to the natives in Sanskrit, Marâṭhi, and English is chiefly intended to show what the Veda really contains, and especially to prove that those texts which are supposed to authorize modern rites and beliefs among the people do not authorize them. To this object the greater part of the notes are devoted. Thus the verse i. 6. 3, Ketum kriyavan aketone is repeated in a ceremony now performed to avert the ill-will of the imaginary planet Ketu. An ignorant priest, who only knew how to repeat the verse, at once connected the ketum of the verse with the planet Ketu, and accordingly taught that all the Purânas tell about Ketu was authorized by the Veda. A note of the translator fully explains this, and shows the simplicity of the religious conceptions of the Vedic Rishis as compared with those of their modern interpreters.

"We are told that, if the authority of the Veda is regarded as invulnerably sacred, the belief that it is impossible for any human being not inspired, like the old Rishis, to interpret the Veda, is almost as invincibly firm. Hence the editor has adopted the following plan. He gives first the Sanhitâ text of the Rig-Veda with the Pada text, because the Vaidik Brâhmaṇa regard the Sanhitâ text alone as quite incomplete. He then gives a translation based as much as possible on the recognized commentary of Sâyaṇa. He does not, however, follow Sâyaṇa slavishly, but if he finds that the explanation of a word which that infallible commentator gives in one passage is impossible, he takes, whenever he can do so, another explanation of the same word given by the same writer in some other passage, thus shielding his departure from Sâyaṇa by the authority of Sâyaṇa himself. This rendering of the Veda into Sanskrit is chiefly intended for the old Sâstric, who despise all vernacular speech, and who would be repelled still more by English. The Marâṭhi translation will find its way to the educated classes among the natives; the English is intended for that small but important class of Indian society which has adopted the language of the ruler as the lingua franca of the day. It is to be hoped that this important work may be continued, though it will probably take at least ten years to finish it."

---

The Life of Jenghiz Khan. Translated from the Chinese.

This little volume on the Life of the great Tatar conqueror Jenghiz Khan supplies, from Chinese sources, a record of his early life and of his victorious career in China, which are treated but cursorily in the Persian and Mongol historians, who concern themselves principally with his more western conquests. "It has been translated from the Yuen She, or 'The History of the Yuen dynasty,' by Sung Leen; the Yuen she buy peen, or 'The History of the Yuen Dynasty classified and arranged,' by Shaou Yuen-ping; and the She sei, or 'The Woof of History,' by Chin Yun-Seih. Each of these works contains facts and details, which do not appear in the other two," and the translator has judiciously woven the three narratives into one connected history. But, to make the account of the conquests of Jenghiz more complete, he has preceded it by an introduction of about twenty-five pages, giving a sketch of the campaigns in Western Asia and Eastern Europe, drawn principally from the third chapter of Howorth's excellent History of the Mongols.

The translated narrative extends over 105 pages, and is a thoroughly readable chapter of a history that, with the exception of a few incidents, may doubtless be accepted as authentic and tolerably accurate in its details of the life of the man "whose armies were victorious from the China Sea to the banks of the Dnieper." It was the march of his Mongols that displaced the Ottoman Turks from their original home in Northern Asia, and thus "led to their invasion of Bithynia under Othman, and ultimately to their advance into Europe under Amurath the First."

The Chinese materials for these annals have been already drawn upon by continental scholars such as Pauthier, Hyacinthe, D'Obsson, Erdmann, Gaubil, Schott, Kavalevsky, and others, but this is their first appearance in an English dress. We hail the volume as an evidence of a growing interest in Oriental research, and hope Professor Douglas will be encouraged to undertake other versions.

---

1 The Academy, Nov. 18, 1876, p. 501.
THE THREE NEW EDICTS OF AŚOKA.

SECOND NOTICE.
BY G. BÜHLER.

(See Ind. Ant. vol. VI. pp. 142ff.)

MY translation and analysis of General A. Cunningham's new Aśoka edicts, published in vol. VI. pp. 149ff of the Indian Antiquary, have called forth two reviews in the London Academy, one by Mr. Rhys Davids, and one by Professor R. Pischel, in which my explanations of several important words have been found fault with, and the correctness of the historical inferences drawn from the inscriptions has been disputed. Mr. Rhys Davids has also devoted a couple of pages to the new edicts in an appendix to his work "On the coins and measures of Ceylon" (Numismata Orientalia, Part VI. pp. 57-60). As the latter work contains an analysis of the statements regarding Buddhist chronology, given in the Dhārapamāsa and Mahāvamsa, as well as a very ingenious attempt to fix the date of the Nirvāṇa somewhere about 410 B.C., the author very naturally felt it necessary to deal with the somewhat inconvenient three edicts, which, if the interpretation given by me were right, would make his deductions valueless. The importance of the questions connected with the new inscriptions, and the consciousness that in my first notice some important points have been either entirely omitted, or rather touched than fully discussed, induce me to reply to the strictures passed on my article.

For the sake of ready reference I reprint the texts of the Sahasrām and Rūpāṇth edicts.

Sahasrām.

Devāṇāṁ piye hevaṁ aḥāḥ: satiśekāṇi aṭhitāḥ jayāni savachalāni, aṁ upāsake sumi, na cha bāḍhaṁ palakanite. Saviśchahale sādhike, aṁ [sumi bāḍhaṁ pala-kunā] t[e].


Se etāye athāye iyaṁ sāvane: Khudakā cha udālā cha palakamaścita, aṁtā pi chaṁ janaścita; chilāthītecha cha palakame hotu. Iyaṁ cha aṁtha vaṭhisaiti, vipulaṁ pi cha vaṭhisaiti, diyaṁdiyatiyam avadhīhidāya diyaṁdiyatiyam vaṭhisaiti.

Iyaṁ cha savane vīvuthena; duvo saṇānālaścita vīvuthaṁ ti (ṣu ṣ phra) 256.

Ima cha athāṁ pavatesu ikiḥpayaṁ thāya; [yata] vā athiḥ hete silāsthāṁbhā tata pi ikiḥpayaṁ thayi.

Rūpāṇth.

Devāṇāṁ piye hevaṁ aḥāḥ: satiśekāṇi aḍhitāṁ vā[sē], ya sumi pākā sa[va] ki, no cha bāḍhi pakate.

Satiśke chu chhavachhare, ya sumi haka suṅgha-papite, bāḍhi cha pakate. Yā iṁyā kālāya jambudipīsai amisā devāhuśu, te dānī masā kātā.

Pakamasi hi esa phale, no cha esa mahatatā-pāpotave. Khudakānē hi kapi parunamēnēa sākiyam pipule pi svage āroḍhavē.

Etiya athāya cha sāvane kaṭe: Khudakā cha udālā cha pakamaścita, atā pi cha janaścita; iyaṁ pakāre cha kiti? chiraḥhitikēcyā. Iya hi ṣe vādhi vaṭhisitī, vipula cha vaṭhisitī, apaladhiyēnēa diyaṁdiyatiyam vaṭhisitī.

Iya cha aṁtha pavatīṣu lekhāpeta vēlata hadha cha; aṁthi silāsthābhā sīlāsthābhāśi lēkhāpeta vayata.

Etinā cha vayajanaṁ vāvatakata paka aḥāle, savara-vivase tavāyati. Vūtēna sāvane kaṭe; (ṣu ṣ phra) 256 satavīrāsa ta.

---

1 The Academy, July 14, 1877, p. 37.
2 18th Aug. 11, 1877, p. 143.
3 Corrections and vr. II. 20.

Sahasrām.

Savachalē—sēmisē;—devāḥ—cha janaścita—sāvane. Mr. Rhys Davids in addition reads sapaṇnaḥdātātā, a correction regarding which I am still as doubtful as when I wrote my first article.—Num. Or. VI. p. 57, note 1.

---

Mr. Rhys Davids suggests for [sa]mādhi, su-ko, I think unnecessarily. His correction vyuṇṭena, is also unnecessary as the inscriptions show three instr. in end. The real reading of the inscription is ināṣ, not koṇa as he supposes.—Num. Or. VI. p. 57, note 2.
In my analysis of these edicts I stated—
Firstly, that the author must be a king, because he uses the ancient royal title, Devānāpiya, which speaks of his greatness, and asserts that he caused a change of religion throughout India, and incised his edicts on rocks and pillars.

Secondly, that this king probably belonged to the third century B.C., and to the Maurya dynasty, on account of the title, which we know to have been a Maurya title, and on account of the alphabet employed in writing the inscription.

Thirdly, that he must have been a Buddhist, because the Mauryas were patrons of that sect, and because we have no evidence that the Jainas, the only other known sect which the terms employed in the inscriptions would fit, were patronized by a Maurya.

Fourthly, that as the author of the inscription was a Buddhist, the author of the sermon which the inscription quotes, the Vīvutha or Vuytha, must be Śākya muni Buddha, and that vīvutha must mean the Departed, or he who has passed away, on account of the phrase dwe sapānādivēsāt vīvuthā (Sah. 6, 7), and that the word probably corresponded to Sanskrit vīraśita.

Fifthly, that if the Vīvutha was Buddha, the era used must be that of the Nirvāṇa, and that the explanation of sataviśādā by śātri viśādāt, from the departure, i.e. the death, of the teacher, which I regarded as probable, confirmed this view.

Sixthly, that as the inscription belonged to a Buddhist and Maurya king, no one but Aśoka could be the author, as no other Maurya had ruled as long as thirty-four years, or been for so long a time a Buddhist; and

Seventhly, that the statements of the Mahāvihāra, if correctly interpreted, showed that Asoka had been a Buddhist for about thirty-four years, and might have been alive during the greater part of the year 257 after the Nirvāṇa.

In his first review (Academy, July 14th, 1877) of my article, Mr. Rhys Davids demurred to one point only, viz. to the explanation of the word vīsādā by ‘death,’ preferring to render it, ‘in accordance with classical usage,’ by ‘abandoning his home’ or ‘becoming an ascetic,’ and assumed that the erasure was not that of Buddha’s Nirvāṇa, but that of the Great Renunciation.

He farther stated that even if my interpretation were correct, and the era used were that of the Nirvāṇa, the inscription would only prove that the Buddhists believed the Nirvāṇa to have taken place 257 years before the 34th of Aśoka’s conversion, and not that it actually did take place at that time. He finally suggested that the opening sentence of the edicts might mean that the gods of Jambudvīpa, who had hitherto held aloof from men (i.e. the Buddhistic deities), had been caused to mingle with them.*

Next, Professor Pischel, in a note on the inscription (Academy, Aug. 11, 1877) objected to my view that the edicts belonged to Aśoka. He declared my explanations of vīvutha, vuytha, and sata to be inadmissible. The former two words he identified with the Sanskrit vīvutha, the past part. pass. of vīvūc, ‘to depart,’ and translated them by ‘he who has departed from life.’ Sata he declared to be the Sanskrit sattva, ‘life,’ and explained the phrase sataviśādāt by śātri viśādāt, ‘since his departure from life.’ He further contended that, as neither of these terms nor any other word was clearly of Buddhistic origin, nothing remained to connect the inscriptions with Aśoka. He therefore took them to be Jaina, and expressed his conviction that the Vīvutha must be Māhāvīra, for which view he adduced a phrase, ‘from the departure,’ occurring in Stevenson’s Kalpaśūtra, p. 95. He finally ascribed the inscriptions to Aśoka’s grandson Sampradi, whom, as I had stated, the Jainas represent to have been a patron of theirs.

Finally, Mr. Rhys Davids, in the appendix to the Numismata Orientalia, Pt. VI, pp. 57-60, once more reviews the whole question. Influenced by Professor Pischel’s criticism, he no longer confidently attributes the edicts to Aśoka, but thinks that my arguments for that view are not sufficient. He repeats Professor Pischel’s assertion that the terms employed in the edict may be Jain as well as Buddhist; he also points out that Devānāpiya, the Jaina form of Devanāpiya, is used by the latter as a polite form of address to inferiors and women. Hence he thinks that my strongest argument for the identity of the author of the edicts with Aśoka, drawn from the fact that he was the only Devānāpiya who in the third century of the Buddhist

* As I shall not recur to this remark, I may as well state that the explanation of māra, by māra, seems to me very improbable.
era was a zealous Buddhist, and reigned more than thirty-four years, falls to the ground. He, however, does not go so far as to absolutely reject the authorship of Asoka; but he would, in case that were proved, adhere to his former explanations of visāda by abhinabhamana, or 'turning ascetic,' and take visvatha-vyūtha for an equivalent of evashita-vyutha, and in the sense of pravrajita. He combats Prof. Pischel's explanation of satapivāsā, and he also gives Professor Jacobi's authentic text of the passage from the Jaina Kalpasūtra to which Professor Pischel had referred, and shows that it affords no countenance to the identification of the Viewtha with Māhāvīra or, to call him by his correct name, Nirgranthā Jñātiputra. The result at which Mr. Rhys Davids arrives is that the inscriptions afford no assistance for determining the date of the Nirvāṇa, that they may be either Jaina or Buddhist, and that everything connected with them is exceedingly uncertain and doubtful.

These reviews contain the following points which require consideration:—(1) whether the inscriptions really contain nothing that connects them with Asoka, and shows them to be Buddhist; (2) the etymology of the terms Visvatha-Vyūtha and Sata; (3) the explanation of the word vivasa by abhinabhamana, 'the Great Renunciation.' To the discussion of these points I shall have to add an inquiry regarding Mr. Rhys Davids's adjustment of the date of the Nirvāṇa. For it is evident that if his deductions from the texts of the Dīpancāsa and of the Mahāvīnāsa are correct, and the Nirvāṇa has to be placed about 410 B.C., the Ceylonese date for Asoka's coronation, 219 A.D., with which, according to my interpretation, the date of the inscriptions agrees, must necessarily be wrong. I shall also have to consider his remark that in the most favourable case the new edicts prove only the belief prevailing in Asoka's time regarding the date of the Nirvāṇa, not the actual date itself; and to add a few further facts bearing on the interpretation of the edicts, which I omitted in my first notice.

As regards the first point, I regret that I cannot agree either with the method employed by my critics in their discussion of the authorship of the edicts, nor with their results. In my opinion, the question if the terms saṅgha, upāsaka, ādikula, visvatha-vyūtha, sata, Devinda, and piye are exclusively Buddhist, or if they have been used by Jainas, Brahmins or other sects also, as well as the etymology of visvatha-vyūtha and sata, affect the chief problem very little. I have myself stated that some of these words were used by two sects, and I have no doubt that all of them were current in the fourth and third centuries B.C. among the adherents of various sects. In some cases actual proof for this belief can be furnished. I have given two possible etymologies for visvatha, and nine for sata, and I now regret that I did not add two more for the former word, as my doing so might have made it clearer how little I relied on them. The chief problem—the question who was the author of the new edicts—has to be solved in an entirely different manner, viz. by a careful comparison of the old Aśoka edicts, and of the other known Prakrit inscriptions with the new edicts. If that comparison is duly made, I think it will be found that there is a good deal to connect the new inscriptions with Aśoka, and that their authorship is not even doubtful. If my critics, in answer to this defence, charged me with having neglected to state my case clearly, and to put forward in a prominent manner all the points which prove Aśoka to be the author of the three edicts, I should feel obliged to plead guilty. But I should urge in extenuation that I trusted to their knowledge of the old Aśoka edicts, which would enable them to recognize at once the family likeness existing between the old and new sets, and to supply my omissions. I must also confess that the decided opinion of General Cunningham, who, long before the inscriptions came into my hands, the Jainas, the grandson of Aśoka, and that the first author of certain date who gives the history of his conversion to Jainism by Suhastī and of his benefactions is Hemachandra, the contemporary of Kambrapāla (1173 A.D.). Hemachandra's account is purely legendary and unhistorical. The tradition that Sampaḍī was a protector of the Jainas is, however, old. Sampaḍī may be merely another name of Dāsaratha, who appears in his stead in the Brahmanical rājālist, or he may be a distinct person. But the information regarding him is too vague to afford a basis for any historical speculations.
recognized their origin, as well as the agreement of other eminent epigraphists with his and my conclusions, influenced the manner in which I put the case. I can now only express my regret that I have not been explicit enough, and arrange the decisive arguments in the proper manner. The case may be stated as follows:—

We possess a large number of inscriptions which, according to the consentium communis of all competent scholars, belong to the Maurya Asoka. These inscriptions are written in the peculiar characters which are usually called Pali or Lāt, and which I prefer to style Maurya. These inscriptions, further, are written in a number of Prakrit dialects, which differ from all those known from other sources, and which vary according to the provinces where they are found. They are distinguished by a very peculiar style, and by their moralizing, sermonizing contents. In the latter respect they are unique, utterly different from the inscriptions of all other Indian princes. They are further incised both on rocks and pillars, in slightly varying recensions. Their author calls himself usually Devānām Piye Piyadasī, and in some cases simply Devānām Piye.

If we now turn to the new edicts, we find that they closely resemble the old ones in every one of the details mentioned. The new edicts, too, are written in the Maurya characters; they, too, show different dialects, according to the districts where they were incised. Their vocabulary is, with the exception of two or three words, identical with that of the old edicts. The grammar of the Sāhasrām edict perfectly agrees with that of Asoka's Magadhan edicts. The Rūpānath edict, which comes from the Central Provinces, agrees in some particulars more with the Saurāshṭra inscriptions of Girnār, and is in other respects independent, though it comes nearer to the Asoka forms than to any other. As regards the style, we find the well-known formulas and turns: "The beloved of the gods speaketh thus", "This manner of acting should be what of long duration", and so forth. The contents, too, agree so far with those of the old pillar or rock inscriptions that they are a sermon,—not historical matter, such as we are accustomed to find in other inscriptions. The new edicts, just like the old ones, further give variations of one and the same text, and contain the explicit statement that they too were incised on rocks and pillars. Finally, their author, too, calls himself Devānām Piye.

Where we have so many points of agreement between two sets of inscriptions, the obvious inference is that both proceed from the same author. The only way to bar this conclusion would be to show that the facts on which it is based are susceptible of some other explanation. My critics have not done much in this respect. Professor Pischel is entirely silent regarding the close resemblance of the new edicts to the old ones. Mr. Rhys Davids occupies himself only with the title Devānām Piye, which he thinks may have been used by Jaina kings and others also. In support of the latter assertion he addsuce the Jaina-Prakrit term Devānāppiya, which in the Agamas of the Jaina sect is frequently used as a polite form of address. I, too, believe that Devānām piye was not a title peculiar to Buddhist kings, but one common to the Mauryas and their contemporaries, whether they were Buddhists or not. Originally, it seems to me, it must have been invented by Brahmanas, because Buddhists or Jainas would hardly care much whether they were the beloved of the gods, i.e., of beings to whom they paid but little reverence, and whom they considered perishable like themselves.

That, however, is not very important. Taken by itself the title does not prove much. It merely shows that the author was a king of the fourth or third century B.C. But it is of

1 See now Corp. Inschr. Ind. vol. I. pp. 20 et seq., which were printed before my article was written.

2 Though I thus agree with Mr. Rhys Davids in his chief statement, I regret that I cannot see the force of the argument employed by him. I am unable to understand what the Jaina address Devānāppiya, which, as far as my observation goes, is invariably used by superiors speaking to inferiors,—e.g., by Yatis speaking to their pupils or to Śrāvakas, by husbands to their wives, &c.—is to prove with respect to the self-given title of great kings. It seems to me that the royal title, the Jaina mode of address, and the Brahmanical use of Devānām piye to denote "an idiot," are caused by three entirely different currents of thought, and that a derivation of the one from the other is very improbable. Devānām piye means, etymologically, "dear to the gods." The early Indian kings, who elsewhere are declared to be incarnations of deities, called themselves "dear to the gods" in order to indicate their divine right. The early Jainas employed it as a form of polite, or rather humane address, recommending thereby the person spoken to to the protection of the gods,—"you who may be dear to the gods." Compare the use of apuraham, "you who may live long." The later Brahmanas, finally, called idiots by this name, because such persons were considered to stand in the particular keeping of the gods.
great value if taken as a link in the long chain of circumstantial evidence which connects the inscriptions with Aśoka. The same remarks apply to the alphabet used. Other kings besides Aśoka did use it, and its occurrence in the new edicts shows only, like the title Devānāpiye, the period to which the inscriptions belong. It may also be contended that other kings besides Aśoka used some of the words and the grammatical forms occurring in the two edicts. We have some evidence to this effect in the Khandgiri and the Dāsaratthā inscriptions, and the supposition is not more than reasonable. But with respect to the peculiar turn of expression and the style of the inscriptions, the same reasoning does not hold good. The style of a man reveals, as is generally allowed, his individuality as much as his handwriting or his general deportment. If, therefore, particular resemblances in this respect are observable between two sets of compositions, something more definite than a vague assertion that others too may have employed phrases like Devānā piye hevāni dhā, vipula svagā saktiye ārādhane or iya pakāre kiti chirahātikē sidā, is required in order to preclude the obvious inference to be drawn from their occurrence in both. In like manner, there is only one way to account for the fact that both sets of edicts contain sermons preached by a ruler of “all the Indias” to his subjects, and that both give original texts, different redactions of which were placarded, so to say, in different places and dialects on “rocks and pillars” for the enlightenment of the multitude. We have many hundreds of Indian inscriptions, issued by hundreds of different kings, but there is not one document which resembles Aśoka’s edicts in this respect, and there is not one king who tried to convert his subjects to a particular creed, and to keep them in the paths of virtue and morality by means of officia officiellia. Here, too, the individuality of the author reveals itself, and, as long as it is not shown that others besides Aśoka actually adopted the same plan, the resemblance of the two sets of edicts in this respect admits only of one explanation, viz. that they belong to the same author. If, now, the other points mentioned above, the identity of the alphabet, of the vocabulary and grammar, and of the author’s title, are taken into account, it is, I think, not too much to say that the edicts not only contain something connecting them with Aśoka, but that they furnish as strong proof as circumstantial evidence can afford that they actually proceeded from the great Maurya Buddhist.

As regards the question whether the edicts contain any Buddhist terms, I will point out one word, which my critics have overlooked, viz. ahāle (R. 5). I have translated this by ‘thought,’ relying on the explanation of ahāra given in Childers’ Pali Dictionary. I do not think that the passage can be taken otherwise than I have done, and the silence of my critics seems to indicate that they agree with me. But if that is so, then ahāle is a specially Buddhist word, which in this sense has been traced neither in Brahmanical nor in Jain books. The matter is, however, of small importance. For, as the inscriptions belong to Aśoka, all the doubtful terms must be Buddhist. Upāsaka and sāvana must mean a lay Buddhist, sanāga must denote the community of Buddhist ascetics, and the Vīvutha or Vṛtytha, whatever the etymology of the words may be, must be Śākyamuni-Gautama.

In turning to the consideration of Professor Pischel’s criticisms on my explanation of these two terms, I must premise that I fully agree with his assertion that Sanskrit vṛtytha and vṛtytha phonetically correspond to vīvutha and vṛtytha. I may add that this phonetic correspondence was known to me from Childers’ Pali Dictionary when I wrote my first article, as well as the phonetic identity of Sanskrit vṛtytha (vi+u+t+sth+a+u) with the same two terms of the edicts, and that several scholars had pointed it out to me before Professor Pischel’s letter appeared. But I must demur to Prof. Pischel’s statement that, on account of this phonetic identity, my explanation is “quite untenable.” For, considering the fact that Prakrit words are corruptions, which may have originated in many ways, and that all Prakritis, but especially those used in the inscriptions, frequently show a want of fixedness both as to orthography and grammar, phonetic identity is neither the only nor even the chief point to look to in the interpretation of doubtful words. In attempting to explain Vīvutha and Vṛtytha, the correct method is to begin, not with the etymology, but with the sentence due...
The parallel passage of the Khandgiri inscription, tattho viṇṇhe vasa, viṇṇha is used, not as an appellative noun, but as a verbal form, and cannot mean anything but ‘passed, gone.’ This is a translation, with which neither Professor Pischel nor Mr. Rhys Davids finds fault. The next question is whether the same meaning answers in the case of Viṇṇha. There can be no doubt that it does. For Buddha may fitly be called ‘the Departed,’ or ‘he who has passed away.’ since at his death he obtained freedom from future births by entering Nirvāṇa, whatever notion the early Buddhists may have connected with this term. This is the way in which I arrive at the meaning ‘by the Departed’ for Viṇṇha, which of course must also be that of Viṇṭha. I do not rely on any etymology, as Professor Pischel thinks. As the meaning of the term is thus fixed by the aid of parallel passages, the etymology has only a secondary importance, though, of course, it must be looked to. Now the Sanskrit vyuñātha or vyuṣṭha, no doubt, phonetically corresponds to viṇṭha-vyūṭha. This etymology might also suit the noun viṇṭha, but it does not fit the participle viṇṭha, in the Sahasāram date. For deśa vaiṣṭhaśakāsātike kate vyuṣṭhāle or vyuṣṭha is a phrase inadmissible in Sanskrit, where viṇṭha is not used for ‘to elapse,’ and vyuṣṭha—a derivative of vās ‘to shine,’—means ‘having broken or begun.’ Nor has it been shown that the verb acquired this meaning in any of the Prakrits. It is therefore necessary to look for some other etymology, and the verb the past participle of which comes nearest to the two forms, is the Sanskrit viṃḍit. In the Prakrits of the dramas viṃḍa usually makes viṇṭha, and in Pali viṇṭha, viṭṭha, or viṭṭha. The compound verb viṃḍha means in Sanskrit ‘to turn round, roll away, to pass,’ and the meaning of its past participle exactly corresponds to the sense which viṇṭha has in the Sahasāram date, and in the passage of the Khandgiri inscription. This etymology also fits the noun Viṇṭha-Vyūṭha perfectly. For, though Sākyamuni is now here called viṇṭha or viṇṭha, still the neuter viṃḍha, according to Chidlers’ Dictionary, means ‘absence of vās or transmigration, Nirvāṇa.’ Hence the masculine viṃḍha or viṇṭha, whether taken as past part. of viṃḍha, or as a compound formed of the particle vi and the noun vūṭha, is a suitable name for Sākyamuni, and it may be reasonably expected that a more complete investigation of the Baudhā Agamas will show its actual occurrence. But whether this expectation is fulfilled or not, the existence of the neuter affords a powerful support to the proposed etymology. The phonetic difficulty which the latter presents, viz. the irregular appearance of an aspirated tha i.e. tha, instead of unaspirated ta (tta), appears less important in consequence of the following considerations. Firstly, in the various Prakrit dialects aspirated letters do frequently appear for the corresponding unaspirated ones. Secondly, there are several cases where this change is observable in past part. pass. Thus we find in Jaina-Prakrit pāṇḍha for prāṛṣa, uṣṇa for uṭṭa, and sanāṇtha for sanāṛṣa (Müller, Jaina Prakrit, p. 26). Further, in modern Gujarātī there is a whole series of verbs which form their past participles in ḍha, ḍhā, ḍhau : e.g. khā-vaṇa, khāḍha, pā-vaṇa, pāḍha, de-vaṇa, ḍīḍha. The last example is most to the point, as ḍīḍha stands for an ancient Prakrit form ḍīṭha, which, though hitherto not traced, can be inferred from Kāśmīrī dyuta genitive diṭ-is, and also, from the corresponding Śindhi form. Thirdly, it must not be forgotten that in all Prakrits the letters r and r̥ cause aspiration, though the dialects of Aśoka’s edicts do not usually show this influence, like the Pali and the dialects employed in the dramas and poetry. The r̥ or r which stood in the original of viṃḍha may therefore also have contributed to the development of the aspirate. Finally, the derivation of the two forms from viṃḍha has this advantage, that it will fit vyātha, which may be read, and has been read by General Cunningham, instead of vyuṣṭha. For we have in Jaina-Prakrit viṃḍha for viṃḍha. I have adopted the reading vyuṣṭha in the transcript of the text, because a little stroke seems to protrude under the vy, but the reading is not beyond doubt. I do not think that it can be settled definitively without a fresh and very careful examination of the stone. It may remain doubtful even after that has been done, as the group of letters occasionally as a proper name. Now santāni : sanitā — viṃḍha : viṃḍha.
seems to be damaged. In concluding this discussion I will repeat that I do not consider the etymology proposed very important for my chief point, and will add that I consider it is a pis aller. I should prefer one where the phonetic correspondence with the Sanskrit would be exact, if it were suitable in other respects. If it could be shown, for instance, that *vivas* had the meaning of 'to elapse,' I should be ready to accept the derivation from that verb. Without that proof I feel unable to rely entirely on the phonetic laws; because, as stated above, the Prakrit dialects, and especially those of Aśoka's inscriptions, are deficient in that fixedness of orthography and grammar which is required in order to give to phonetic correspondence a paramount importance.

Professor Pischel's rendering of the last word of the Rūpāth edict, *sathiviviḍā*, I am likewise unable to agree to, though I should think that *sata* does phonetically correspond to *sattva*, and ought to be added to my list of possible Sanskrit equivalents. The sense requires that the first part of the compound should contain the designation of the person whose *viveka* or departure is referred to. *Sattiviviḍā* would mean 'since the departure of life,' *prāṇaśya apagamā*, not 'since his departure from life,' as Professor Pischel renders it. The numerals together with this compound form one sentence, and are not connected with the preceding *vyathend śādane katā*. Hence the *his* does not readily suggest itself. If, however, it is considered too unsafe to interpret *sata* by *śatī*, it may be taken as an equivalent of *śaṅka* or *sat*, which both suit Buddha very well, and which, according to the analogy of *pakato* for *pakṛtāh*, and *yāvata* (*kata*) for *yadanta*, would exactly correspond to *sata*. I, for my part, however, adhere to the explanation by *śatī*, which, as Pali *atta* for *asta* shows, *might* become *satta* or *sata*.

I, now, come to the meaning of the word *viveka*, which Mr. Rhys Davids, appealing to classical usage, takes as an equivalent of *abhinnikkhāmaṇa*, 'the departure from home,' 'the renunciation of domestic life.' I am unable to understand on what classical usage he bases his interpretation. I have never found the verb *vivas* or any of its derivatives used as a synonym for *pravraj*, nor has Mr. Rhys Davids brought forward any passages supporting his notion of the classical usage of *vivas*. As far as I know, *vivas* has only one technical meaning, viz. 'to go into exile,' and its causative *vivāsay* accordingly means 'to banish.' If Mr. Rhys Davids is unable to bring forward passages which show that our dictionaries are defective, and that *vivas* means also 'to renounce domestic life, to turn ascetic,' his appeal to classical usage is useless. Classical usage supports neither his nor my rendering. But analogous transitions of meaning in the case of other verbs may be brought forward in support of both translations. Some Sanskrit verbs which mean 'to depart, to go forth,' acquire the secondary signification 'to renounce domestic life, and some develop the meaning 'to die.' To the first class belong *pravraj* and *nīkkham*, 'to go forth,' as well as *abhinīkkham*, literally 'to go forth towards.'

The second change is much more common. We have firstly *pra*-i., 'to go forth,' which is one of the commonest terms for 'to die.' There is secondly *gam*, which, like the compound *vīgam*, means 'to die,' while *aṃgam* means 'to die after a person,' and *sahāgam* 'to die with somebody.' *Prasthā*, too, and its derivative *prasthāna* are used for 'to die' and for 'death.' *Pravas* also appears to have developed the same secondary meaning (though I find no passages quoted for it), as *pravānand*, a derivative of its causal, is stated to mean 'killing.' This list might be enlarged, but the examples quoted are sufficient to show that Sanskrit, like all other languages, uses words meaning 'to depart' for 'to die.'

I may add, however, that even in the present day it is usual among Pandits, when speaking of the decease of Gurus or parents, to use the tenderer and more reverential expressions, *svar-vaśed abhītā, kalāṇā gataḥ, or pravṛttih parā lokān gataḥ* instead of the more matter-of-fact *mṛtaḥ.* If we now return to the phrase sātiviviḍā, both Mr. Rhys Davids and myself agree that the first part of the compound denotes a person,—either Śikyamuni or somebody else. The second part cannot, therefore, have its etymological and primary meaning 'departure, or starting.' It must have been used in a secondary sense. Now, as has just been shown, on purely philological grounds two explanations are possible. *Viveka* may either mean 'the renunciation of domestic life' or 'death.' Which, then, is the one to be adopted? I answer the latter, because we know that both Bandhas and Jainas began their era with the death of their found-
ers. If Mr. Rhys Davids wishes to make his explanation probable, he will have to show that the Bandhas, or at least some other Indian sect, reckoned also from the Great Renunciation of their founders. The same objection must be made to his explanation of Vivātha-Vyāsthā. Supposing it were proved that these two terms corresponded to vyāsthā-vyāsthā, they could only be rendered by 'the Departed,' or 'he who is dead.' These remarks will suffice to show that neither Professor Pischel's objections, which are quite worthy of his reputation as a grammarian, nor Mr. Rhys Davids' new rendering of vivāsa, can exactly be called unanswerable, or be said to render my explanation of the edicts untenable.

I now turn to the consideration of Mr. Rhys Davids' date of the Nirvāṇa, which, if correct, would entirely destroy the remarkable agreement between the edicts as interpreted by myself and the statements of the Ceylonese chronicles. This agreement is visible especially in two points:—

1stly, in the length of membership of the Buddhist sect assigned to Aśoka both by the edicts and by the chronicles; and

2ndly, in the fact that the year 257 A.B., which I have taken to be the date of the edicts,11 apparently was, according to the statements of the Mahāvamsa, the last year of Aśoka's life.

The force of the former point has been acknowledged by Mr. Rhys Davids, who declares (Num. Or. VI. p. 59) the fact that while the Devānāṁ Piyē of the new inscriptions speaks of his having been an upadeśaka for thirty-three years and a half, and that we know of no king of the third century A.B. but Aśoka who reigned more than 34 years,—to be my strongest argument for the identification of the two. I have already stated that the strongest argument for the identification of our Devānāṁ Piyē with Aśoka lies in the family likeness of the old and the new edicts. But, as we have a case of circumstantial evidence only, it is no doubt indispensable that the results gained by interpretation should agree with the facts known from other sources. I do not consider this agreement, therefore, as a matter of small importance. It is, on the contrary, as essential as the arguments given above. In order to show the full importance of the fact mentioned in the edicts, that Devānāṁ Piyē, a ruler of the whole of Jambudvipa, was a member of an heretical sect for more than thirty-three years, I will point out that according to the Buddhistic chronicles the only kings in the first three centuries A.B. who reigned longer than thirty-three years were Bimbisāra and Aśoka, and that according to the Purāṇas no Maurya king except Aśoka occupied the throne for so long a period.

The second point, the very remarkable fact that, while the inscriptions are dated in the year 257 A.B., the statements of the Ceylonese chronicles permit us to infer that Aśoka was alive during a portion of the year 257, has not been noticed at all by Mr. Rhys Davids. The reason for this omission probably is his distrust of the date, 219 A.B., which the Dīpavaliṇī and the Mahāvamsa give for Aśoka's coronation. According to Mr. Rhys Davids, this is an invention of the southern Buddhists, or rather a mistake caused by an erroneous addition of certain figures in their list of Tīrāmas. The real distance between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's accession to the throne is, according to his calculation, not upwards of 218 years, but 150 years only. If Mr. Rhys Davids were right, and the genuine tradition of the southern church showed the shorter period only, the agreement between the edicts and the chronicles would certainly be of no importance for my view. It would, on the contrary, tend to prove that my explanation must be wrong. For the latter can only hold good if the date 219 A.B. for Aśoka's coronation either is really genuine, or at least is derived from a calculation made during the reign of Aśoka and before the incision of the three edicts. It must be wrong if the coronation date had been settled later in Ceylon and were based on a mistake. Under these circumstances I am compelled to examine closely Mr. Rhys Davids' chapter on the Ceylonese date of Buddha (Num. Or. VI. paras. 82-124), and to institute an inquiry as to whether his objections to the date 219 A.B. for Aśoka are really valid.

11 I must add that the date of the inscriptions may be 256 A.B., if we assume that the figure refers to the current year. In my first article I referred it to the number of completed years in accordance with Prinsep's dictionary.
Mr. Rhys Davids begins his essay by giving a few facts which make the early use of the now prevalent Ceylonese era of the Nirvâna, and the general acceptance of its initial date 543 B.C., somewhat doubtful. He shows that even modern inscriptions in Ceylon are not always dated in the era of Buddha, while the oldest known in which that era occurs, belongs to the twelfth century, and that the Chinese pilgrim Fa Hian, who visited Ceylon in 412 A.D., speaks of a Ceylonese proclamation or sermon in which the Nirvâna was mentioned as falling 1497 years earlier. Adverting, then, to the fact that the elements of the calculation for the date of the Nirvâna are contained in the Dipavamsa and in the Mahavamsa, he further points out that its beginning in 543 B.C. depends on three periods, viz. the period from Dutthagamini, 161 B.C., down to the present time; the period from the coronation of Devānāpiya Tissa, 236 B.C., to Dutthagamini, 161 B.C.; and the period from the Nirvana to Devānāpiya Tissa,—the total of the three (236 + 146 + 161) being 543. Accepting the period which begins with Dutthagamini as correct, he proceeds to an examination of the other two. Travelling over off-trdden ground, he shows, with the help of the Greek notices of Chandragupta and of Aṣoka's inscriptions, that an error of more than sixty years exists in the Ceylonese chronology of the oldest period of 236 years, as the latter places Chandragupta's accession in 301 B.C., and Aṣoka's in 325 B.C. Next, turning to the second period of 146 years, he finds that the great number of years assigned to Mutasiva and his nine sons likewise indicates the existence of a serious error,—a point which other scholars, too, have noticed,—and that the statements of the chronicles regarding Mahinda and Sanghamittā show Devānāpiya Tissa's reign to have been doubled. Mahinda and Sanghamittā were ordained in the sixth year of Aṣoka, when they were respectively twenty and eighteen years old, they came to Ceylon 12½ years afterwards, and died there, at the ages of sixty and fifty-nine, in the eighth and ninth years after Tissa. Hence it may be concluded that Mahinda lived in Ceylon 27½ years, eight of which were subsequent to Tissa. The reign of the latter must therefore have lasted twenty, not forty years as stated in the chronicles. Mr. Rhys Davids remarks that Turnour and his Pandits, who are apparently supported by a passage of the Dipavamsa, have got over the difficulty with Mahinda by explaining the figures 60 and 59 to refer to Mahinda's and his sister's spiritual ages, but that under this supposition, too, there is a discrepancy of two years, as the correct number for Sanghamittā would be 61 (13 + 40 + 9). Mr. Rhys Davids next expresses a doubt regarding the correctness of the period of 218 years stated to have elapsed between the Nirvana and Aṣoka's coronation, because the number of kings and of patriarchs or chiefs of the Buddhist church placed between the two events is too small for the length of the period. Taking first into consideration the list of the Magadha kings, who fill the space between Buddha and Aṣoka, he admits that it involves no absurdities. But it appears suspicious to him, because a number of kings are said to have murdered their fathers, and because the years assigned to some are multiples of 4 and 8, and finally because the Purānas have a shorter list. The list of the kings of Ceylon between 1 and 236 a.d., which he takes up next, clearly shows traces of an undue lengthening of the reigns, as only five kings are named, the last of whom, Mutasiva, must have reached the respectable age of 147 years. After this, Mr. Rhys Davids passes to the list of the Theras or Buddhist patriarchs from 1 to 285 a.d. He extracts the data regarding them from the Dipavamsa, and, reducing all the years given there according to the reigns of the Ceylonese and Magadha kings to years of the Buddha era, he arranges them in tabular form as below:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Date of Upanisad, A.D.</th>
<th>Age at Upanisad of successor</th>
<th>Length of Membership</th>
<th>Age at Death</th>
<th>Date of Death, A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upali</td>
<td>44 Bef. B.</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasa</td>
<td>14 A.D.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonak</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siggav</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissa</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahinda</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table, as Mr. Rhys Davids points out, abounds in absurdities, as it places the birth and the ordination of most Theras too close together, and in the case of Sonaksa the latter event before the former. He, however, thinks that the absurdities may be removed by taking the statements, which are merely based on the Therdwaka by themselves, and by separating them entirely from those of the first two and the last columns, which depend on the Edjawals of Ceylon and Magadhā. After doing this he finds that the figures no longer involve any absurdity, and that by deducting the difference between the ages of the four Theras beginning with Dāsaka at the ordination of their pupils (col. 2) and their ages at their death (col. 5) from the number of years during which they were members of the church (col. 4) the length of time may be found during which each was head of the church. If to the total of these figures the sixteen years are added which elapsed between Buddha's death and the ordination of the second Thera, Dāsaka (col. 2), as well as the eighteen years which lie between the sixth, Mahinda, and Aśoka's council, the interval between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's council is not 236, but 168 years. As the council took place after Aśoka had ruled eighteen years, the coronation falls in 150 B.C.

These calculations are embodied in a second table, which, for clearness' sake, I reprint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age when he performed the Upasamupada of his successor</th>
<th>Age when he died</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upāli</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāsaka</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonaksa</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siggava</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissa</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dāsaka admitted to full membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The second council was in the twelfth year of Mahinda's full membership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date A.B. of Aśoka's council</td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date A.B. of Aśoka's coronation</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It thus appears that in reality the Dipavānasā, in its Therdwaka portion, allows for 168 years only as having elapsed between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka's council. At the same time the same work places the council explicitly in 236 B.C., and Aśoka's coronation in 218 (?). B.C. The question now arises whether the shorter or the longer period is the more credible one. Mr. Rhys Davids declares himself in favour of the former, because the number of the Theras (five) is not sufficient to fill a period of 236 years; because, further, the number of the Ceylonese kings is also too small for more than two hundred years; and because, finally, the Brahmanical lists of the kings of Magadhā which place the Siyānaga before Bāṭiya and his descendants, likewise speak in favour of the shorter interval. Mr. Rhys Davids further shows that the Buddhists possessed a number of ancient works which probably contained the Therdwaka, and that the latter have therefore a claim to be considered historical. He, also, points out that according to the Ceylonese chronicles the Siyānaga reigned just 68 years, and that if they are placed before Bāṭiya and Bimbisāra and their descendants the number of years of the Magadhā kings down to Aśoka will be exactly 150, and thus fully agree with the sum of years gained by the adjustment of the Therdwaka. An explanation may be offered for the insertion of the longer period also. For as the sum of the figures in column 3 of the second table makes 217, it becomes not improbable that Buddhist chronologists, in calculating the distance of Aśoka from the Nirvāṇa, by mistake added up the periods during which each Thera was upasamupanna, instead of those during which he was sole teacher of the Vinaya, or head of the church.

On first reading Mr. Rhys Davids' deductions, it is impossible to avoid being fascinated by his eloquent and ingenious pleading, to which my abstract does but scant justice. Still one cannot help feeling a certain distrust against so very startling results, and the discovery that the an-
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is the correct interpretation of the seemingly inconsistent statements of the chronicles. We shall see, further on, that the latter, when speaking of the ages of Theras or Upasampanna Sāthihe, always refer to the period after the upasampadda, or, to adopt Mr. Rhys Davids' appropriate term, to the spiritual ages just as references to the ages of anointed kings refer to the time after their abhiseka.

If we now turn to the chief portions of Mr. Rhys Davids' calculations, it becomes impossible to accept without a re-examination the statements contained in his first table, though they agree with Mr. Turnour's analysis of the Dīpavamsa. As it has been found that the seeming contradictions in the case of Sāthihe disappeared, as soon as the chronicles were correctly interpreted, the question arises whether a reconsideration of the text of the Dīpavamsa would not clear away the stupendous absurdities contained in the table which gives the data regarding the Theras. But even supposing the first table to be correct, a consideration of Mr. Rhys Davids' second table raises numerous difficulties. One cannot help asking how he gets the sixteen years between Buddha and Dāsaka without the help of the Rājāvali, which he considers to be unworthy of reliance; or how, if he gets them from that source, he can reconcile that with his promise to rely on the Theras alone. One must further ask why he adds the sixteen years in col. 5 of table II., and not in col. 3, where they are evidently also required. If he had added the sixteen years in col. 3, the total would become 283, and it would have appeared at once that the chroniclers could not have made the mistake imputed to them. (pars. 115, 116). Finally, on comparing the two tables a serious discrepancy is observable between the figures given for Dāsaka's age at Sāthihe's upasampadda in col. 3 of the first, and col. 1 of the second table. In the former place it is stated to be 40, and in the second 45, and no explanation is offered. Similar vacillations occur, too, in the date of Aśoka's coronation, which sometimes is stated to have occurred after the completion of the 218 years of the Nirvāṇa era (i.e. in 219 a.e.), and

Aśoka had ruled ten years—

According to the Dīpavamsa, when Utiya had completed eight years; see below.

12 Compare also Dīp. VII. 27, where it is stated that Mahinda was four years of age (i.e. spiritual age) when

sometimes in 218 A.D.," and that the latter incorrect statement is used in order to convict the chroniclers of an inaccuracy (pars. 114).

These and other doubts which it would be too long to enumerate induced me to ask Dr. Oldenberg, who is preparing an edition of the Dipavamsa, for the loan of his text, and to examine the work once more. A cursory inspection showed to me that Mr. Rhys Davids’ first table does not accurately represent the statements of the Dipavamsa, but, besides a number of minor inaccuracies, contains three important mistakes. The heading of col. 4 ought to be "Chiefship of the Vineya (vinayatthāsa or pāmokhata)?", the heading of col. 5 should be "Spiritual Age at Death, i.e. Age reckoning from the upasampadā ordination," and hence the figures put against the names of the first five Theras in col. 1 ought to be removed. I found that the Dipavamsa left not the slightest doubt on the necessity of these alterations, and that, if it is interpreted rightly, its history of the Theras contains no absurdities. The text, though less corrupt in the Theravāda than in other portions, nevertheless shows a few mistakes in the figures which can be easily corrected. In order to enable the reader to judge if my interpretation is correct, I give the text of the chief passage, Bhānavīra V. 76-106, in full, together with a translation. The text is Dr. Oldenberg’s, with whose permission it is published. The translation is my own.

nibbuto lokānāthaṁ vassaṁ sasamsa aññam ahā | saṃsāṭṭhi tadā hoti vassaṁ Upāli paññāya | 76 17
Aṭṭhasatatuchavisaṁ Vijayasaṅga sasamsa aññam ahā | Dāsako upasampannu Upālitheraṁ vassāti | 77
chatūlās eva vassaṁ Dāsako nāma paññāya | Nāgādāse dasavasa Pakaḷjākassa vassissati | 78 18
upasampannuo Sonako theru Dāsakathesamantaṁ chatūlāsassa dhiro theru Sonakasaṁvaya | 79 19
Kāḷāsokasaṁ dasavasa Tambaḷapuḷi antarvāva vassaṁ ekāsas sah bhava | Siggavo upasampannu Sonakatherasantika | 80
Chandrag&ttaṁ dve vassa chatutattic̣hi Siggavo tadā | aṭṭhapaññāsa vassaṁ Pakaḷjākassa rājino | 16

The first date occurs, e.g. paras. 84, 86, and the second 114 (twice).
18 Dr. Oldenberg, very judiciously, has not attempted a restoration of the original work, but merely of the codes or archetypus, from which the existing modern MSS. have been prepared. He has collected a good many various readings, from which I have selected a few particularly important ones.
19 Second half probably corrupt, perhaps sammattih
Susunāgo dasavassam rajassi kāresi issaro | aṭṭha-
vassase Susunāgami Dāsako parinibbuta | 98 | 88
Susunāgass’ acharayena honti te dasa bhātaro |
sabbe bāvissavassam rajam kāresu vasi danto |
imesan chiṭṭhe vassānam Sonako parinibbuto |
99 |
Chandragutta rajam kāresi vassāni chatutisati |
taṃmīn chuddassavassamhi Siggavo parinibbuto |
100 |
Buddhārasas yo putto Asokadhanno mahāyaso |
vassāni sattattissan pi rajjan kāresi khattiyo | 101 | 89
Asokass’ chhavīstivasse Mogaliputta sarvāhayo |
sāsanai jotayitvāsa nibbuto Ayusankhayo | 102 | 89
chatutisattavassamhi thevo Upālapi | siddhh-
vihārīkani thera Dāsakam nāma pāndita | vin-
ayaṭṭhāne ṣhapetvāna nibbuto so mahāyano | 103 |
Dāsako Sonakam thera viṇṇapālama saṃpadhā |
katvā vinayapāmokkhan chutassāthīmhi |
104 |
Sonako chahabhiñnāno Siggavan ariyatrānā | vi-
nayaṭṭhāne ṣhapetvāna chhāsatāthīmhi pari nibb-
uto | 105 | 90
Siggavo āgaṃsama puino Mogaliputta cha dārakam |
katvā vinayapāmokkhan nibbuto so chha-
sattati | 106 |
Tissā Mogaliputta so Mahinda saddhiḥvārīkani |
katvā vinayapāmokkhan chāsattissamhi |
107 | 91

Translation.

76. Sixteen years had elapsed after the pro-
tector of the world (Buddha) had entered Nirvāṇa, |
then the learned Uṇāli had just completed |
sixty years. 86

77. Then twenty-four years of Ajātaśatrus (reign) |
and sixteen of Vijaya’s had elapsed, (and then) Dāsakam |
received the upa-

78. The learned Dāsakam had completed, just |
fourty years, when Nāgaḍāsa (had reigned) ten |
years, and twenty (years of) Pāṇḍurāja’s (reign |
that had passed);

79. (Then) Thera Sonako received the upa-

80. When Kāḷāṣoka had completed ten |
years, and the eleventh year of the interregnum 
in Ceylon was (the current one), (then) Siggava |
received the upa-

81. Two years of Chandragupta’s (reign |

had passed), then Siggava (had completed) sixty-

four years, (and) fifty-eight years of Pakunḍaka’s (reign had elapsed). Then Tissa-Mog-

82. When Dharmāśoka had (reigned) six |
years, (then) Mogaliputta had completed |
sixty-six years, (and) forty-eight years of king |
Mutasiva had passed. (Then) Mahinda |
received the upa-sampaddi ordination from Thera Siggava. 31

83. And Upāli learned the Vinaya from | Bu-

84. Dāsaka, the Thera, instructed Sonako |
in the Vinaya, (and he), having mastered it, |
repeated it before his teacher.

85. Sonako, endowed with intelligence and |
aquainted with the law and the Vinaya, taught |
Siggava the whole Vinaya, sentence by sentence.

86. Siggava and Chandavajja (seems) |
the pupils of Sonako. The Thera taught both |
his pupils the Vinaya.

87. And Tissa-Mogaliputta, having |
learned the Vinaya from Chandavajja, was |
emancipated by the destruction of the substrata |
(i.e. became an Arhat).

88. Mogaliputta, the teacher, taught |
Mahinda, his pupil, the whole Vinaya, the |
whole, entire doctrine of the Thera.

89. After the Sambuddha had entered Nirvāṇa, |
Thera Upāli, endowed with great lustre, taught |
the whole Vinaya during thirty years.

90. Having appointed his pupil, Thera Dā-
saka, to the office of (Chief of the) Vinaya, |
that high-souled man entered Nirvāṇa.

91. Dāsaka made his pupil, Thera Sonako, |
in his turn, Chief of the Vinaya, and died in |
his sixty-fourth year.

92. Sonako, possessed of the six supernatu-
ral faculties, appointed Siggava, of honour-
able descent, to the office of (Chief of) the Vinaya, |
and died in (his) sixty-sixth year.

93. Siggava, possessed of (true) knowledge, |
made Mogaliputta, the youth, Chief of the |
Vinaya, and died after (completing) seventy-six 
years.

94. And Tissa-Mogaliputta made his |
pupil Mahinda Chief of the Vinaya, and died in |
his sixty-eighth year.

84 The construction is apparently a mixture of the loc.
and gen. absol., and occurs frequently.
85 Upasampaddi, i.e. second or full ordination.
86 Regarding these dates more will be said below.
87 Pakunḍaka is another name of Pandukabhaya.
88 The years are to be counted from the upasampaddi: 
see below, v. 93.
89 v.i in his 36th year.
95. And Upāli seventy-four, and Dāsaka sixty-four, Thera Sōnaka sixty-six, but Sīggaṇa seventy-six, Moggaliputta eighty (that is, the number of years elapsed between the upasampadā ordination of each (Thera and his death).

96. The learned Upāli is chief of the Vinaya for all time. Thera Dāsaka held that office sixty (years), and Sōnaka forty-four, Sīggaṇa fifty-five, and he who is called Moggaliputta sixty-eight.

97. The Kshatriya Udaya reigned sixteen years; when Udaya had (completed) six years, Thera Upāli died.

98. Sīṣunāga, the lord, reigned ten (?) years; when Sīṣunāga had (completed) eight years, Dāsaka died.34

99. After Sīṣunāga’s death came those ten brothers; according to hereditary custom, they reigned all (together) for twenty-two years. In the sixth year of their reign Sōnaka died.

100. Chandragupta reigned twenty-four years; when he had (completed) fourteen years Sīggaṇa died.

101. Pāmaṇas Dhammāsoka, the son of Bindusāra, of royal race, reigned thirty-seven years.

102. When Aśoka had (completed) twenty-six years, he who is called Moggaliputta died of old age, after having exalted the Faith.

103. The learned Thera Upāli, the great chief of the school, died in his seventy-fourth year, after appointing the learned Thera Dāsaka, his pupil, to the office of (Chief of the) Vinaya.

104. Dāsaka, in his turn, made his pupil, Thera Sōnaka, Chief of the Vinaya, and died in (his) sixty-fourth year.

105. Sōnaka, endowed with the seven supernatural qualities, appointed Sīggaṇa, of honourable descent, to the office of (Chief of the) Vinaya, and died in (his) sixty-sixth year.

106. Sīggaṇa, possessed of (true) knowledge made young Moggaliputta Chief of the Vinaya, and died, having (completed) seventy-six years.

107. Tissa-Moggaliputta made his pupil, Mahinda, Chief of the Vinaya, and died in (his) eighty-sixth year.35

This passage contains:—1. The dates of the upasampadā of each of the five Theras, from Dāsaka to Aśoka’s son Mahinda, according to the chronology of Magadha and of Ceylon, together with the spiritual age of the teacher who performed the ordination—vv. 76-82.

2. A statement of the teachers under whom each of the six Theras studied the Vinaya—vv. 83-88.

3. A statement regarding the persons who appointed each to the office of Chief of the Vinaya, or head of the church—vv. 89-94.

4. A statement of the number of years which elapsed between the upasampadā ordination and the death of each, i.e., the length of the life of each while full member of the Sāṅgha—v. 95.

5. A statement of the number of years during which Dāsaka, Sōnaka, Sīggaṇa, and Tissa were Chiefs of the Vinaya, or heads of the church, which must be completed as far as Upāli is concerned from v. 89-96.

6. The dates of the Māgadha kings in whose reign the five Theras died, together with the year of the death—vv. 97-102.

7. A repetition of the information given above under 3 and 4.

Two other passages of the Dīpavaṃsa (IV. 27-46 and V. 69-79) give the same details,—the first regarding Upāli, Dāsaka, Sōnaka, Sīggaṇa, and Chandavajja; and the second regarding the last two teachers and Tissa-Moggaliputta. These two passages mostly agree with each other, but in certain particulars and show some variations, which it will be necessary to quote. Firstly (IV. 31), it is said that Buddhā himself appointed Upāli to be Chief of the Vinaya:—saṅghamajjhie visokkade Buddhā Upālīpaṭṭhitaṃaggio vinayaṃaddokkhe Upāli mayha śāsanaṃ |31|

Secondly, it is stated (IV. 41) that Dāsaka’s spiritual age was forty-five years, instead of forty, when he ordained Sōnaka. Thirdly, the date of the ordination of Sīggaṇa is specified more exactly as having taken place ten years and half a month (according to the varia lectio of bad MS., ‘and eight months’) after Kāliṣo-kā’s coronation:—

chattārika vaseso tho theru Sonakasavavaya | Kāliṣo-kāsu dasa-vameso addhamasān chā sesake |35

A corrupt verse adds the statement that at that time eleven years and six months of Pākunḍaka—Pundukabhaya’s interregnum had elapsed,—

34 v. l, in his eightieth year.
35 v. l. addhamasān chā sesake.
The information regarding the career of Aśoka’s son, Mahinda, finally, is completed in the following passages:— (1) VI. 20, where his birth is stated to have taken place after 204 years of the Nirvāṇa,

dev vassissatā konti chatuvassani paro uttari satamaraṃhi so juto Mahindo Aṣokaravo | 20 |

(2) VII. 21–24, where it is said that Mahinda became an ascetic when he was full twenty years old, and when Aśoka had reigned six years (after his coronation); that Mahinda received the upasampadā ordination at the same time; and that Moggaliṇuṭṭa was fifty-four years old when Aśoka’s coronation took place, and sixty-six (? ) when Aśoka had reigned six years. The last verse is, however, corrupt, and must be corrected as proposed below:

paripuṇnatātisseva Mahindo Aṣokaravo |

Sūryabhūtā ca jātīya vassani aṭṭhārasanā bhavo | 21 |

chāvasamahi Aṣokassāmā ubho pabhajītu paṇa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name.</th>
<th>Date of Upasampadā</th>
<th>Spiritual Age at Pupil’s Upasampadā</th>
<th>Date of Death.</th>
<th>Length of Chiefship of Venaya.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Upāli ..........</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60 years [D. IV. 27, V. 76].</td>
<td>74th year [D. V. 103].</td>
<td>30 years [D. IV. 34, V. 89].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dāsaka ..........</td>
<td>Ajṭaṇāstra 24 = Vijaya, 16 = 16 A.B. [D. IV. 26, 27; V. 76, 77.]</td>
<td>40 years [D. V. 76].</td>
<td>64th year [D. V. 91; 104; IV. 43].</td>
<td>50 yrs [D. V. 96].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Siggava ..........</td>
<td>Kālaśoka 10, or 10 + ½ month = Interregnum, 11 or 11 + 6 mos. = 100 A.B. [D. IV. 44, 45; V. 80.]</td>
<td>64 years [D. V. 69, 81].</td>
<td>75 years [D. V. 93, 106].</td>
<td>55 yrs [D. V. 96].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31 Dr. Oldenberg’s very probable emendation is, choro dra Pakunda. 32 The genitive stands for the locative, as above. 33 v. 1, and the correct one, theravāda.
The first glance at this table shows that the figures given are intended to form a chain, each link of which is closely connected with some of the others. The connexion is established in this wise, that the difference between the dates of each teacher and his pupil’s upasampadā gives the age of the former at the latter ceremony; that, further, the difference between the date of the upasampadā and of the death gives the length of the spiritual life; and that finally the difference between the dates of the teacher and the pupil’s death gives the length of the latter’s chiefship of the Vinaya. But the most cursory inspection also shows that some of the figures given are corrupt and do not answer.

In the case of Upāli the date of the upasampadā is not given, but may be calculated by deducting the length of time during which he was Chief of the Vinaya after Buddha’s death from his spiritual age: 74 — 30 = 44. His spiritual age at the upasampadā of Sona ka, sixty years (col. 4), is given, and the correctness of the statement can be controlled by the dates for his own and his pupil’s upasampadā, the difference between which—44 B.C. and 16 A.D.—must, and does give exactly 60. The length of his spiritual life, which is once given as full seventy-four years and as the seventy-fourth year, i.e., seventy-three plus an indefinite number of months, can be tested by the figure given for his spiritual age at Sona ka’s upasampadā and the difference between the date of the latter and the date of Upāli’s death, which together amount to 60 + 14 = 74. The discrepancy between the two statements which mention both the seventy-fourth year and seventy-four years, may be got over by assuming that he died in his seventy-fourth year, but that his death took place towards the end of the year. As the author of the Dipoṣa’s near throughout uses round figures, he found it more practical to substitute in his calculation seventy-four full instead of seventy-three full years. This explanation applies also to the spiritual ages of Dāsaka, Sona ka, and Tissa. In the case of Siggava seventy-six complete years (chhatattai) are given everywhere. Hence it may be concluded that his death occurred either exactly at the end of the seventy-sixth year or in the beginning of the seventy-seventh. The same remark holds good for Mahinda, whose age is always given as sixty years.

In the case of Dāsaka, the date for his spiritual age at Sona ka’s upasampadā has not been given correctly in the text, which in one passage reads forty years, and in the other forty-five years. The correction can be made only with the help of the dates of Dāsaka’s own and Sona ka’s upasampadā. The former is placed in Agaṭāṣṭru 24 = Vijaya 16 = 16 A.D., and the three periods agree exactly. The date of Sona ka’s upasampadā is given as having taken place Nāgadaśa 10 and Pāṇḍuśa 20. The former date corresponds with 58 A.D., and the latter, if it is taken to refer to completed years, with 59 A.D. For Vijaya ruled full thirty-eight years; after his death came an interregnum of one year, and then only followed Pāṇḍuśa’s abhiseka.52 The Dipoṣa’s XI. 10) says also expressly that Nāgadaśa had completed twenty-one years when Pāṇḍuśa died; ekavantā Nāgadaśa Pāṇḍuśa tadd gato. The text of the Dipoṣa’s does not seem to be corrupt in the two passages which contain the equation Nāgadaśa 1 = Pāṇḍuśa 20 (IV. 41 and V. 78, 79). Still the date 58 A.D. is required for Sona ka’s ordination, as he is said to have died at the end of Nandaśa 6 = 124 A.D., and the difference between 58 and 124 A.D. exactly agrees with the length of his spiritual life, or nearly sixty-six years. The discrepancy therefore, must be, either real and owing to a slip of the author, or it may have been caused by his using round numbers instead of exact dates in his calculations. An author who talks as loosely as the Ceylonese chronickers do might perhaps say that at the close of Buddha 58 Nāgadaśa had ruled ten years, and Pāṇḍuśa twenty, though in reality the former counted three or four months in excess of ten years, and the latter seven or eight months less than twenty. He further might assert that eleven years later, at the close of 69 A.D., ten years of Nāgadaśa’s reign had elapsed, and that Pāṇḍuśa died after ruling thirty years. This explanation appears to me the most likely. For it may be considered certain that in very few cases only the initial dates of the reigns of the Māgadha kings and of the Ceylon kings fell on the initial dates of the corresponding years of Buddha. It seems also, from the case of the date of Siggava’s ordination, which will be discussed below, that the chroniclers possessed more exact figures, but

52 Dipoṣa’s IX. 42, XI. 2, X. 6, and XI. 3-10.
mostly thought it unnecessary to use them. If now the ordination of Sonakṣa must be placed at the end of 58 a.r., and that of Dāsaka οophile the close of 16 a.r., the age of the latter at Sonakṣa’s upsampadd must have been forty-two years, not forty or forty-five. The number 42 has therefore to be entered in col. 4, and in the text of the Dipavamsa deochattālīṣa has to be written for panchattālīṣa (IV. 41) and for chattālīṣa (V. 76). The emendation suits the metre in both passages.

The length of Dāsaka’s spiritual life, (nearly) sixty-six years, corresponds with the difference between the dates of his upsampadd 16 a.r. (col. 3) and of his death 80 a.r. (col. 6). The length of his chiefship of the Vinaya, too, agrees with the difference between his own and Upālī’s death : 80 a.r. — 30 a.r. = 50 years (col. 7).

In the case of Sonakṣa all the figures agree, with the exception of that for his spiritual age at the upsampadd of Sīggaṇa, which, though twice given as forty, must be forty-two. For the difference between the dates Nāga-dāsa 10 = Pāṇḍurāja 20 = 58 a.r., and Kālāsoka 10 = Interregnum 11 = 160 a.r., is 42 years. The text of the Dipavamsa again may be altered accordingly, viz.—

IV. 44. deochattālīṣa so thero sonakṣasavvaya, instead of the nonsensical chattālīṣa vassasi so, &c.

V. 76. deochattālīṣa so thero sonakṣasavvayo| instead of chattālīṣa vassasi thero, &c. The latter alteration recommends itself, because corresponding passages are mostly given in exactly the same words.

As regards Sīggaṇa the date of his upsampadd requires a remark. In one passage (V. 80) we have the equation Kālāsoka 10 = Interregnum (Ceylon) 11: in the other passage (IV. 44-46) Kālāsoka 10 + ½ month = Interregnum 11 + 6 months. Immediately after the last verse it is further stated that “But at that time, forsooth, one hundred years after Buddha’s death,” the Vesāliya schism occurred. It seems, therefore, that the author meant to place Sīggaṇa’s ordination just at the end of the first century after Buddha. The discrepancy in the dates of the kings may be adjusted by assuming that the beginning of Kālāsoka’s reign, as well as that of the Interregnum, did not fall exactly in the beginning of the ninety-first and of the nineteenth year of Buddha, but that the former began fifteen days, and the latter six months, after the beginning of the corresponding year of Buddha. If that was the case, it would seem that the author gave in the first passage the exact figures, and in the second, according to his usual manner, round figures only. The difference between Sīggaṇa’s upsampadd (100 a.r.) and Tissa’s upsampadd Chandragupta 2 = Pakuṇḍaka 20 = 164 a.r., is exactly 64, and agrees with the number of years allotted to him in col. 4. The length of his spiritual life (seventy-six years) likewise corresponds with the difference between the dates for his upsampadd and for his death. But he cannot have been Chief of the Vinaya for fifty-five years, as the difference between his death and that of his predecessor amounts to fifty-two years only. It seems certain that in this case also we have to deal with a corruption of the text only. Besides the total of the figures entered in col. 7 for the first five Theras must agree with the date of the last in col. 6, — 244 a.r. This agreement can only be obtained if we substitute 58 for 55. If the latter number is retained, we get 247 = 244, which is obviously nonsense. Finally the half-verse (V. 96) in which the date occurs is obviously corrupt. I propose to read for panchavāsasavvasm Sīggaṇa attasathṭhi Mogaliṭuttaasavvayo | pahāsavasm Sīggaṇa attasathṭhi Mogaliṭuttasavvayo |

In order to make out the metre, it is necessary to elide the first syllable of attasathṭhi, and to make a disyllable of Mogaliṭti, as has to be done in other cases.

In the case of Tissa the figure given for his spiritual age at the upsampadd of Māhindra is wrong. For the difference between Chandragupta 2 = Pakuṇḍaka 58 = 164 a.r. and Asoka 6 = 224 a.r. is sixty years, not sixty-six as given in the text and in the table. Though the faulty figure occurs in two passages (V. 82 and VII. 24e), still the latter verse 24c contains a certain proof that the mistake belongs to the copyists, not to the author, of the Dipavamsa. For in that line it is explicitly stated that Mogaliṭṭi was fifty-four years old at Asoka’s coronation. It is obvious that six years later he could not be sixty-six years old, but must be sixty.

\[\text{V. 76. deochattālīṣa so thero sonakṣasavvayo| instead of chattālīṣa vassasi thero, &c.} \]
The length of his spiritual life (col. 5) is given variously as 86, 80, and 33 years. The second date is the correct one, because this figure agrees with the difference between the dates for his upasampadda and for his death. The dates given for Mahinda all agree, and require no remark or rectification. The subjoined second table gives a summary of this discussion, and shows the corrected figures, as well as the faulty ones in brackets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>Date of Upasampadda</th>
<th>Spiritual Age at Upasampadda of Pupil</th>
<th>Spiritual Age at Death</th>
<th>Date of Death</th>
<th>Length of Chiefship of Vinaya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upāli</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>44 bef. B</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>cir. 74 yrs</td>
<td>30 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāsaka</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>16 A.B.</td>
<td>42 yrs (40, 45)</td>
<td>cir. 64 yrs</td>
<td>80 A.B</td>
<td>50 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonaka</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>58 A.B.</td>
<td>42 yrs (40)</td>
<td>cir. 66 yrs</td>
<td>124 A.B</td>
<td>44 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siggava</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>100 A.B.</td>
<td>64 yrs</td>
<td>76 yrs</td>
<td>176 A.B</td>
<td>52 yrs (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissa</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>164 A.B.</td>
<td>60 yrs (66)</td>
<td>cir. 70 yrs</td>
<td>244 A.B</td>
<td>68 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahinda</td>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>204 A.B.</td>
<td>224 A.B.</td>
<td>60 yrs</td>
<td>284 A.B</td>
<td>40 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we compare the above passages of the Dipavamaka with Mr. Rhys Davids' first table and his remarks thereon, the mistakes which I imputed to him, and to Mr. Turnour before him, are perfectly clear. The terms Vinaya-pamokkha, 'Chief of the Vinaya,' and Vinaya-pāthana, the office (of Chief) of the Vinaya, occur frequently, and in V. 96 the former is expressly connected with the periods of 50, 44, 52 (55), and 68 years which occur in col. 4 of his first table, and in col. 3 of his second table. Further Dip. V. 95 precludes the possibility even of a doubt whether the natural or the spiritual age of the Theras is indicated by the figures in col. 5 of Mr. Rhys Davids' first table. The period after the upasampadda ordination alone can be referred to. Hence the whole basis for Mr. Rhys Davids' deductions, by which the chronicles are shown to give really 150 years, not 218 years, as the interval between the Nirvāṇa and Asoka, disappears. The Dipavamaka gives, on the contrary, a very simple history of six Theras, the fifth of whom was a contemporary of Asoka, and died about the middle of his reign. If the four corrections proposed by me are accepted, the story shows not only no absurdities, but not even the slightest inconsistency. As regards the date of Asoka's coronation, 219 A.B., it is clear that it cannot be the result of an absurd mistake in addition, made, as Mr. Rhys Davids supposes, by the Ceylonese Buddhists.

It is no less evident that this date is the only one for the coronation of Asoka which the Ceylonese tradition supports, and that the Dipavamaka does not contain any evidence in favour of a shorter interval between the Nirvāṇa and Asoka's accession. Nor do I think that the other points which Mr. Rhys Davids brings forward in order to show its incredibility carry much weight. When he points out that the number of Theras enumerated in the Dipavamaka is too small to fill a space of more than two hundred years, the obvious answer is that the correctness of this list is by no means proved, and that, as Mr. Turnour** has pointed out and he himself admits, another and longer list is in existence. But even if the shorter list were proved to be correct, it could not be said that the account of the Dipavamaka involves impossibilities. If we assume that only one of the five Theras received the upasampadda ordination at the legal age of twenty, the longest-lived among them would have reached the age of one hundred years, and the shortest-lived the age of eighty-four. The succession of five very long-lived Chief of the Vinaya would certainly be something remarkable, but it is not absolutely impossible. Again, Mr. Rhys Davids' objection drawn from the small number of Ceylonese kings (para. 107) who are stated to have reigned between the Nirvāṇa and Asoka has very little weight. He himself, like all other scholars who have written on the subject, has seen that the Ceylonese history from Viṣayas to Daṭha-gāmini is untrustworthy. It is impossible that Mutasya lived to the age of 147 years, and that his son reigned after him, with interruptions, 102 years. Hence no portion of a story which contains such statements can be used in order to discredit another independent tradi-

** Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. VII. p. 791; compare also Lasenm. Ind. Alt. vol. II. p. 92, 2nd ed.
tion, or to support an adjustment. It is quite true that the number of kings is too small for the interval of 236 years stated to lie between Vijaya and Devānampiya Tissa. But instead of reducing that interval, we may just as well assume that Vijaya’s invasion falls later than the Nirvāṇa, or that the chroniclers did not possess the names of all the princes who ruled between Vijaya and Daṭṭhagamini, and were tempted by the legend of the synchronism of Vijaya’s conquest and Buddha’s death to spread the scanty materials over too large an area. Finally, it seems inadvisable to bring forward (para. 110) the Brahmanical tradition in order to prove that Śiśuṇāga, Kālaśoka and his ten sons reigned before Bhātiya, and to allow the number of years given by the Buddhists to stand. An indiscriminate combination of portions of two contradictory traditions, however much its results may agree with preconceived notions, has not hitherto been recognized as being in accordance with the principles of historical criticism.

These remarks may suffice to show that hitherto no evidence, be it external or internal, has been brought forward which proves the date 219 A.D. for Aśoka’s coronation to be spurious. It may, therefore, be either really historical, or at least go back to Aśoka’s own time, i.e. have been calculated by the Indian Buddhists from the Māgadha Rājāvali and their Theravādis, when Aśoka became a patron and adherent of their faith, and have been carried by the missionaries to Ceylon. Several points can be adduced in favour of the latter hypothesis. Firstly, it seems only reasonable to suppose that the Buddhists, who, through Aśoka’s protection, obtained a fresh start in the race for spiritual influence, should have tried to ascertain the distance of the royal dāyāda or ‘relative’ of their faith from their first teacher. If their account of this period is at all to be trusted, their sect was, just about the time of Aśoka’s conversion, in a somewhat fallen condition. Quarrels had taken place among the Bhikkhus, and not less than eighteen mutually hostile sects had arisen. Aśoka’s conversion at first made matters only worse, as it induced numerous followers of other faiths to pass themselves off for disciples of Buddha in order to participate in Aśoka’s bounty, and to create confusion in the Buddhist doctrines. The resistance of the orthodox ascetics against this state of things led to the council in Aśoka’s seventeenth year. Its immediate consequence was a purification of the Buddhist Church from the foreign intruders, and a new redaction of the sacred texts. Another result was the appointment of missionaries for the conversion of foreign, and even Mlechchha, countries—an undertaking which in later times gave to Buddhism a place among the great religions of the world. It seems only natural that the Buddhist Theras, at such a period, the importance of which for their faith they must have fully felt, should have revised, together with their sacred books, the lists of their teachers, and of the data referring to the chief events of their spiritual career, and that they should have connected the history of their patron and of his predecessors in Māgadha with the history of their sect. These considerations make it, in my opinion, more probable that a Theravāda and a Māgadha Rājāvali similar to, if not identical with, that which the Ceylonese chronicles give, were arranged in India and carried to Ceylon by the first missionaries, than that fragmentary materials only, out of which the Ceylonese later manufactured their account, came over from the continent. This hypothesis, though it would not prove that every one of the figures and events contained in the Ceylonese chronicles has remained unchanged, would make it probable that some considerable portion of the southern tradition might be ancient and of Indian origin. The date of Aśoka’s coronation, against which no particular objection can be urged, would probably have to be included in the latter category.

Secondly, a much stronger argument for the Indian origin of the same date is furnished by a fact which first has been brought forward by M. Burnouf (Intro. à l’Hist. du Bouddh. pp. 432-36), but has received little attention. This is the statement of a fragment of an Aṇādāna, entitled the Council,—that Aśoka lived not, as the northern Buddhists usually assert, one hundred, but two hundred years after the Nirvāṇa. The story begins: “Deux cent ans après que le bien-heureux Buddha fut entré dans le Nirvāṇa complet régnait dans la ville de Pātaliputra un roi nommé Aśoka.” It contains in the sequel an account of the birth of Kurukṣetra and the story of Sūdara, which agree with the common northern traditions. M. Burnouf
has pointed out that this fragment shows that the northern Buddhists, too, originally recognized two Aśokas, of whom most of their books have made one person, and that it confirms the authenticity of the southern tradition. I do not see how this conclusion can be avoided, and how it can be denied that the date for Aśoka's coronation, according to the era of the Nirvāṇa, must have been settled in India before Buddhism was introduced into Ceylon. As the assertion of the southern Buddhists that the conversion of the Ceylonese took place during Aśoka's reign has not been doubted, and as there is no reason to doubt it, the date, if calculated in India, must have been calculated just during Aśoka's own reign, and must be, as far as the belief of those times is concerned, perfectly genuine. The effect of this conclusion on the question of the authorship of the new edicts is obvious. As the date of the edicts agrees with the date for the coronation of Aśoka in 219 B.C., and as the latter is shown to have been settled during Aśoka's reign, the agreement of the dates itself becomes a strong additional proof for the correctness of the proposed interpretation of the edicts.

I do not see that there is at present any possibility of saying whether the belief, prevailing in Aśoka's time, that between the Nirvāṇa and the king's coronation upwards of 218 years had elapsed, deserves implicit credence or not. That would depend on a knowledge of the nature of the materials which were at the disposal of the Buddhist chronologists, and this knowledge we do not possess. Mr. Rhys Davids is therefore right in pointing out that the new edicts do not absolutely prove the length of the interval between the Nirvāṇa and Aśoka, but merely the belief on this point entertained by Aśoka and his contemporaries. But the smallness of the period, sixty years of which are besides covered by the reigns of Chandragupta and Bindusākra, where Brahmanas and Buddhists agree in the figures, makes a considerable deviation from the truth improbable, and for practical purposes the number of years given by the Buddhists may be accepted as a fact.

MISCELLANEA.

GOLDEN MASKS.

Major West, in the Indian Antiquary, vol. VII. p. 26, expresses his belief that the practice of using golden masks will appear on further investigation to be widely spread in India. He is right in his conjecture as far as Gujarāt is concerned; for, being myself a native of this province, I can say with some confidence that the practice of using masks is here prevalent to a great extent. There is hardly a temple of Śiva in Surat which does not possess a mask, and though the practice is not so general in Ahmadābād or Khandā, masks are by no means uncommon there, being found even in village temples. In this part of Gujarāt also the practice prevails, and but a few days ago I had occasion to see it at Rajkot.

I may note that the practice is confined to the temples of Śiva only, and the masks are only gilt or plated—evidently on account of the poor endowments in Gujarāt. There is, however, one circumstance connected with this practice which inclines me to believe that it has been imported from the Dakhan into Gujarāt. Whenever the masks are used, a turban like that of a Marāthā Brāhmaṇa is always placed over its head, and the practice appears to be more prevalent as we advance towards the Konkan.

As in the Dakhan, they are here used only on festive occasions. The idea that a mask represents the founder of a temple is here entirely unknown, it being looked upon as an image of Śiva only. Masks with five faces are also to be seen here and there, and I hear the practice is common enough with the Marāthās. If such be the case, it is most likely that the masks are only intended to image forth the idea of the Five-faced god (Śiva) in a more tangible manner than is done by the tiṇga. This also leads me to suspect the high antiquity assigned to the practice, and to look upon it as a very late innovation. The Dharma Sīndhu, a standard work upon Hindu ceremonies, seems to be ignorant of the existence of such a practice. I simply mention this fact for what it is worth, without laying any undue stress upon it, as I am aware that numerous works must be consulted before one can build any argument upon their silence to prove the non-existence of this practice among the old Āryanas.

Rajkot, 14th March 1878.

N. L. P.

The third and concluding volume of Spiegel's Eranische Alterthumskunde, a work worthy to rank by the side of Lassen's great work Indische Alterthumskunde, has appeared. Besides concluding the Eranian history, it describes the political and family life, and the state of knowledge and art. In a lucid chapter the author gives his results as to the origin and date of our text of the Avesta.—Academy, March 9th.
COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE CHALUKYA KING MAṆGALA.
SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo. C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 113).

No. XL.

In the Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. III., Part II., p. 203, there is a paper by Major-General Sir George LeGrand Jacob on seven copper-plate grants dug up in April, 1848, at Nérur in the ‘Kudal’ division of the Sáwan-vádá State. The originals belong to the India Office Library, from which I have obtained them to prepare revised transcriptions and translations.

The third of these grants is the earliest of the set. It consists of three plates, about 6½’ long by 3’ broad. They have no raised rim for the purpose of protecting the writing, such as is spoken of by Dr. Burnell in his South-Indian Palaeography (p. 72, para. 4). The ring connecting the plates is uncut. It is about ½’ thick, and 2’ in diameter. The seal of it has the representation of a boar, facing to the proper right. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are square and upright, and of the same standard as those of my Kádamba grants (Ind. Ant. Vol. VI., p. 22), agreeing most closely, with the characters of No. XXV. (id., p. 30).

The grant is one of the early Chálikya dynasty, anterior to the separation of the Western and Eastern branches. The name of the dynasty is here spelt ‘Chálikya.’ The first king mentioned is Vallabha, the Pulikéśi-Vallabha or Pulikéśi I. of my previous inscriptions of this dynasty. The second is his youngest son, Maṅgala—the Maṅgaliśa or Maṅgallívara of my previous inscriptions. No mention is made in this grant of Maṅgala’s elder brother Kirttivarman I. The donor is Maṅgala; and the grant made is of the village of Kujjivāṭaka in the district of the Koṅkaṇa.[1]

The grant is not dated in any era. But Maṅgala is spoken of as having driven out king Buḍḍha, the son of Śaṅkaragāna, and having slain king Śvāmi of the Chālikya family; and as these facts are not referred to in his stone-inscription (Ind. Ant. Vol. VI., p. 363) dated in the twelfth year of his reign, when Śaṅka 500 had expired, I would place the present grant slightly subsequent to that inscription. Who these two kings, Buḍḍha and Śvāmi, were, I am not at present able to suggest.

Transcription.

First plate.

[1] Svasti Śrīmatāṁ Svasi Mahāśāna-pād-anudhyātānāṁ Mānavya-sagā-
[2] ārāma Hāritīt-patraṁ, Chālikyāṁ vaṁśo saṁbhūtaḥ Mānavya-pu-
[3] nitaḥ Bṛḥipati-samānaḥ
[7] ṣaḥ paraḥ parama-bhṛjanyaḥ para-rāśṭr-āvamarddhī sva-rāpṛṣṭे(ahīte) nyāy-āṅuvartītīt dēva-dvīja-

Second plate; first side.

[1] svā-bhujā-bala-paraṅkka(kra)m-oppārijit-ānyā-rāja-vittalāḥ vrishabhā-gamanā-nayana-nimā-
[2] daḥ samada-vara-vārana-viśaḥāṁ simha-vikramaḥ naya-vinaya-dāma-dāya-
[5] guṇa-maṅu-jalāṁ 11 Tēṇa rājā Śaṅkaragāna-putraṁ gaja-turaga-padāti-
[6] kōla-balā-saṁpannaḥ Buddha-rājaṁ vidrāvyā Chālikya-vāmā-saṁbhavaṁ saṁtā-
[7] daśa-samara-vijayināṁ Svāmi rājaṁ cha hatvā saṁvatvā-saṁvijayatāmāṁ

Second plate; second side.

[12] Kārttikeyā-dvādāśyāṁ kṛpa-oppavā(ṛ)ṇ-ārachcheṭa-Vishyāṇā Kāśyapa-sagotrasya vēda-

* The Koṅkaṇa were seven in number,—saṅkha-Koṅkaṇa. The word is used in the plural, though without the numerical prefix, in transcr. 1. 8 of No. XIII. of this Series, Vol. V., p. 67.

* The first syllable looks somewhat like chō, but this is owing, I think, only to a slip of the engraver’s tool. The vowel is properly short.
Hail! Born in the family of the Chalikyas, who are glorious, and who meditate on the feet of Svāmī-Mahāśīva, and who are of the lineage of Mānayya, and who are the descendants of Häriti; conversant with the code of laws of Manu and the Purāṇas and the epics of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Bhārata; equal to Brīhaspati in philosophy; having his body purified by ablutions performed after celebrating the Agniśhāma and Vājapeya and Paṇḍarika (sacrifices) and horse-sacrifices that cost much gold; the favourite of the world on account of his meritorious qualities,—(such was) Vallabha.

His son (was) king Māṅgala, who was an excellent worshipper of (the god) Brahmā; who devastated the countries of his enemies; who adhered to justice in his own country; who delighted in worshipping the gods and the twice-born and spiritual preceptors; whose pure fame pervaded all the countries of the earth; who acquired the wealth of other kings by the strength and prowess of his own arm; who had the gait and the sight and the voice of a bull; who had the actions of a choice elephant infundibulated with passion; who had the valour of a lion; who was endowed with the wealth of statesmanship and modesty and charity and tenderness and sincerity and truth; who was possessed of the three constituents of power; and who was an excellent worshipper of (the god) Bhagavān.* He was glorious,—being possessed of fame that resembled (the fame of) Vaṇya,—with the rays of his virtues, which dispelled the darkness (of sin).

---

* The preceptor of the gods.
* Vaṇya, or Vaṇiya,—a patronymic of the Purānic king Prithu.
The first of the Nērūr inscriptions is the next in point of size. The plates are three in number, about 7½" long by 3½" broad. They seem to have a very slightly raised rim to protect the writing; but it is not very decided, and may have been accidentally caused in beating out and shaping the copper. The ring, which is neat, is about 3½" thick and 3½" in diameter. The seal has, as before, the representation of a boar, facing to the proper right.

The language is Sanskrit. The characters are decidedly rude and irregular, compared with the usual standard of the Chālukya alphabet of this period. The most noticeable points are:

1. The triangular shape of the va; 2. the method of marking the vowel ē by a stroke above the consonant, instead of at the side of it; and 3. the form of the tha, which,—instead of being like dha, with a side stroke inside it, as in other early instances, or with a binds inside it, as in later instances,—is like dha with a loop formed on the bottom stroke. These three special peculiarities may be seen distinctly in, for instance, the words prith̄ivī, l. 10, and paramēśvarā, l. 11.

Though only a few letters are absolutely illegible, yet the plates are so very much worn and abraded that, but for the recurrence of well-known expressions, many passages must have remained doubtful.

This grant gives us two new names in the Western Chālukya genealogy,—Chandraditya, the eldest son of Pulikēśī II., and the elder brother of Vikramaditya I., and his wife Vijayabhāṭṭārīkā. Some doubt may be felt as to the name of Vikramaditya's brother. The reading, in l. 14, is undoubtedly Śrindrāditya, which, if divided as it stands, would give 'Śrī Indrāditya.' But this person is mentioned again in the 'Kocher' grant, which is given by General Jacob after the Nērūr series, and the reading there seems quite plain:—Anicārito Vikramadityas-taṣṭa yajakośī Śrī Chandraditya-prithivīvaḷḷahamahārāj-drādityas-taṣṭa priya-mahāhū Kali-kāta-pratipadha-kāṭā Śrī Vijayamahādevī (four letters uncertain) sarvān-dādāpayati. Had the name been 'Indrāditya,' the composer of the inscription would certainly have avoided an awkward coalescence of vowels by writing Śrīmad-Indrāditya, just as in Śrīmad-Upendra, which occurs in l. 32 of another of the Nērūr grants to be noticed below. I myself feel confident, with General Jacob, that the name is really 'Chandrāditya,' the first syllable, cha, being omitted here through carelessness on the part of the engraver.

The grant is not dated in the Śaka era; but the details of the date,—at the autumnal equinox, on the second day after the full-moon of the month Āśvayuja,—may perhaps suffice, if a calculation is made, to fix its date in that era. If this grant stood alone, the expression swaraẏa, in l. 15, might indicate the reign of Vikramaditya, as much as that of Vijayabhāṭṭārīkā. But, taking this grant with the 'Kocher' grant, it appears that Vijayabhāṭṭārīkā did reign after her husband's decease,—probably as regent during the childhood of a son, whose subsequent death led to the accession of Vikramaditya I.

---

**TEXE**

First plate.

[¹] Svasti Śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṁstūryamāna-Mānasva-satapāta-ājīvīmāna-Mānasvamalaya-sanāta-lōka-mātṛghīs-satapā-mātṛghīv-abhir-


[³] rā(m)kahitaṁ bhaṇgaṇārāṇe-prasāda-saṁstādita-varīka-lāmērha-ākṣaṇa-kah-

[⁴] bhagavantānāṁ na-saṅkārīt-āśeṣa-mahābhir-bhāṣāṁ Chālayānāṁ kulam-alākāraṁ-dūrā-sāvamē-Śrī-Pulakēśī-Vallabha-mahārāja-

[⁵] dh-āvabhṛthasa-sāpa-pavitrikā-ḥatrasa yā Śrī-Pulakēśī-Vallabha-mahārāja-

Second plate; first side.

[¹] aya prapanṭaḥ parākrama(kram)ān-śikṣā(krānta-Vanavāsya-ādi-praṇi-pati-maṇḍalā-ṣṭivaḥvijñvānambha-mahārāja-

[²] viśadha-kṛtī-Śrī-Kīrtivaramma-prithivīvaḷḷahamahārājaśya pranibbha-

[³] ra-saṁsākta-saṅkal-patārāpi(pa)thēvarā Śrī-Haravardhanama-parājya-śaṁbha-

[⁴] paramēśvar-āparā-nāmadhyāsya Satyāśraya-śrī-prithivīvall-
Third plate.

Psalms of the Great King Śrī-Chandādītā, the favourite of the world, whose beloved queen was Vījaya-bhāttārikā.

In the fifth year of her reign, on the second day after the full-moon of (the month) Ās-
vayuṣa, at the equinox, for the sake of much religious merit, at (the village of) Naraka-
ghara, the fields of ........., to the south of Pāliyamapatha digirikā &c., were given (by her), with libations of water, to Āryasvāmidhikṣitā, the son of Śrīmā-
Chaturvēda, and the son's son of Graha-
pati of the Vatsa gotra.

He of that (king's) lineage, who preserves (this grant) without distinction, enjoys the reward of the religious merit of the giver; he, who confisicates it, incurs the guilt of the five great sins! And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa:—He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, who confisicates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

---

"There are perhaps two letters, now illegible, after this word.

[Note: A to A in the margin is illegible."

[Note: A to A in the margin is illegible.

[Note: A to A in the margin is illegible.

---

* See para. 2 of the introductory remarks.

†* General Jacob's Persians read Pāliyamapatha digirikā.

†* The privilege of supervision (i.e., benificia) of the eight marks. Pāliyama, Adigirikā &c. I do not quite see how that translation is made out of that reading. I cannot much improve on their reading; but the last two syllables seem to me kāhārd, not kāhārd.
PERSONAL NAMES IN THE SOUTHERN PART OF THE AHMADABAD COLLECTORATE AND NEIGHBOURING COUNTRY.

BY C. E. GORDON CRAWFORD, B.A.C.S.

This is a revival of the lists published in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. IV, p. 236, with additions. The gathering-ground may be said to be now Gohilwad, Jhalawad, Kathiawad proper, and the Bhol; the former list was pretty nearly confined to the talukas of Dhaundhukun and Gogha, which are arbitrary political divisions.

Experience having shown that attempts at classification are premature, one list in dictionary order has been substituted for the four lists formerly given. In it the specification of caste is only meant to show the uses which have come under the compiler's observation, without implying that other uses are non-existent.*

Abuj, Mol.
Ada, Ko. Ch.; -sing, Gr.
Agabhi, Gr.
Aj, Ko. Wagh; -bhui, Mol.
Alaia, Kath.
Alek, Kath.
Amabhi, Gr.
Ambed, So.
Ami-c, Mol. V.; -chand, W.
Anand, Khad. Khojia; -ji, W.; -ram, Br.
Anabhi, Gr.
Atabhi, Gr.
Bhaidar, Ko.
Balabhi, Gr.
Ban, R.; Banu, B.; -sing, Gr.
Bapu-bhui, Gr.; -mi, -sahch, Mol.
Bhagat, Bhang. Ko. Ch. Cham. R.
Bhalal, Ko.

* The following abbreviations are used:—

Ah, Ahir
Bh, Bhor
Bh, Bhargad
Bhag, Bhagat
Br, Brahman
Ch, Chhau
Cham, Chamkar
D, Dami (Dh.)
Dh, Dhodi
Gr, Grisai
Kath, Kathi
Kh, Kahi
Kho, Khojia
Kun, Kunabar
Mo, Mochi
Meh, Mehand
L, Lawar
Le, Larih
Luk, Lukar
Lal, Lahn
Ma, Mili
M, Muth
P, Pote
R, Rabari
S, Sabar
Sh, Shirodi
So, Soori
V, Vadh
W, Wadh
Gordhand, W. Lr.
Goyá, Kañ. Dh. W.; -bhai, Gr.
Gumán, Ko.; -bhai, Mol.
Hada, W. Haulbhái, Gr. Hargábhái, Gr.
Hájá, Ko. Wág. R.
Hálaabhái, Gr. Háma; -ji, Ko. Bh.; -bhai, Gr.
Hamir, R. Ko. Káth. Áh.; -ji, Gr. R.
Hanájí, -bhai, Gr. Bá.
Haná, Gr. Harbhám, Ko.; -ji, Gr.
Harkhá, Má. So.; -ji, W. Kañ.
Hathi-yá, Ko. R.; -bhai, Gr.
Himá, Ko.; -chand, -ráj, W.
Hirá, Ko. R.; -ji, Sut.
Hothí, Bh. Mol.
Ichábhái, -ji, R.
Jádrá, Káth.
Jagá, Ko.
Jagubhái, Gr.
Jáits, or Joitá, Káth.
Jital, W. Jáma, Ko.
Jamáabhái, Gr.
Jasmat, Ko. Kun.; -sing, Gr.
Jesá, Ko.
Jhálam, Wág.; -sing, Gr.
Jiñá, -bhai, Gr. Chá.
Jíran, Mus. R. Ch.; -ji, -rám, Káth.
Jóthá, Ko. R. Mo.; -bhai, Bá.
Juthá, Kañ. Káth. W.
Kábá, Ko. R.
Kábá, Wág. Dh. Ko. W.
Káká, Káñ. Ch.; -bhai, Gr.
Kálá, R. Ko. Mus.; -bhai, Gr.
Kalyán, Ko. W. Br. Sut.; -sing, Gr.
Kámná, Ko.; -bhai, jimbhái, Gr.
Kánthájá, Káth. Áh.; -bhai, Gr.
Káwa, Ko.
Kheáng, Ko. Bh. Sat.; -si, W.
Khimá, Ko. Cham. Dh. W.; -bhai, Gr.; -chand, W.
Khimá, Ko. Cham.; -cháñd, W.; -bhai, Gr.
Khumánsing, Gr.
Khuá, W. Kañ.
Khub, So. W.; -ji, Br.
Kiká, W.; -bhai, Gr.
Ladhá, Kun.
Ladhá, W.; -bhai, Gr.
Lagehir, Káth.
Lakshman, Káth. Sut. R.
Máá, Káth.
Madársing, Gr.
Mádhav-jí, W. Kho.; -sing, Gr.
Mánaíyá, Káth.
Máká, Ko.
Manor, Br. D.
Mánáyá, Káth.
Máanubhái, Gr.
Mála, Ko. Káth.
Mathura, Br. W. Má.
Mátrá, Káth.
Sat.; -sing, -bhai, Gr.
Méchar, Ch.
Méghá, -sur, Káth.
Koligó; -rájí, -bhai, Gr.
Mehá, Káth.
Méhtá, Bá.
Meká, Ch.
Mólábhai, Gr.
Mepá, Ko.; -ji, -bhai, Gr.
Merám, Ko. Káth.
Merá, -bhai, Gr.; -ji, R.
Mésur, Káth. Ch.
Mithá, Ko. R. V.
Móibhái, Gr.
Moká, Káth.; -ji, Gr.
Munjáish, Ch.
Mualá, Ko.; -ji, Sut., Ko. Lá.; -cháñd, W.
Nágá, W.
Nanú, Ch.
Nápa, Káth.
Nârângji, Gr.
Noghanbhâi, Gr.
Odha, Kâth. Ko.
Odhaâv, W. Râjgar.
Oghad, Kâth. R. Bâr. Okha, R.
Pachû, Bhaṅg.; -ji, Gr.
Pâna, Cham.; -ji, W.
Pânaâ, Ko. Bh. Kûm.
Parnâ, Ko. Ch. Kûm.
Parâvâ, W. Sut. Kân. Pârvai-sâng, R.
Pâtâ, -bhâi, Gr.
Pathâ, Ko. R. Wâg.; -bhâi, Gr.
Pathu, Ko.; -bhâi, Gr.
Peṭha, Kûnâ, Châ. Pâtho, Mus.; -sâng, Gr.
Phalîjbhâl, Gr.
Phulâ, Ch.; -ji, W. Mol.
Pitâmbar, Ko. Lâ.
Piṭha, Dh.
Pîlî, Ko. Mâ. Sat.
Prabhatâsing, Gr.
Pratâ-sâng, Gr.
Premejji, Ko.; -bhâi, Gr.
Punâ, Ko. Jogi, Bh.
Pûjâ, Bh. Kûm.
Raghâ, Ko. W.; -nâth, W. K.; -bhâi, Gr.
Râghûv, Kân.
Ramtu, Ko.
Rângîn, Kâth.
Râsâ, Kh. K.; -bhâi, Gr.
Râtanâ, Bh. Ko. Rab. R. Mo.; -sâng, Gr.; -ji, Br. -si, W.
Râwâ-bhâi, Gr.
Râwât, Kâth.
Rayâ, Ko.
Rewâ, Ko. W.
Ruklâ, Bh. Jogi, Ko. Dh. Sat.; -bhâi, Gr.
Rukhâl, Ko. Kâth. Rab.; -bhâi, Gr.
Rûpâ, Ko. Rab.; -sâng, Ko. R.; -sângji, Gr.
Sadâ, Jogi.
Sadul, Ko. Ah. Kâth.
Sâgâ, Bh.
Sagrâm, Ko. Bh. Gr.
Sâjan, Ch.
Sâmû, Kan.
Sângâ, Ko. Kâth.; -bhâi, Gr.
Sângâ, Ko.; -ji, W.; -bîbhâi, Gr.
Sârâ, Ko. Sartânsâng, Gr.
Sâtâbâhâi, Gr.
Sâlî, Kâth.
Sêsavâ, Kâth.
Sîbhâi, Ko.
Soma, Ko. Sâlimâ, Kâth.
Subhâg, -chând, W.
Sujâbâhâi, Gr.
Sundar, -ji, W.
Sûrâṅg, Kâth.
Sûrbânâ, Ko.
Takâ, Ko.
Takâtsâng, Gr.
Thâkâr, -sî, W. Kûnâ.
Theû, Kâth.
Tûsâ, Ko.
Trâkam, Dh. Sat. Khoja; -ji, Br.
Ugâ, Kâth.
Umsâ, Kâth.
Vijônbhâi, Gr.
Vikâsâi, Gr.
Vîsâ, Ko. Rab.; -bhâi, Gr.
Vîthâl, Lâ. Kâp.
Vodâmân, Kâth.
Wâjî, -sur, Kâth.
Wajû, Ko. R.; -bhâi, Gr.
Wâmâ, Ko.
Wâmâ, Gr.
Wardâm, Bh.
Wastâ, Ko. Khaḍ. Khoja, Sat. W.

Names of Females.

The following names were collected by the compiler in the northern tâlûkâs of Ahmadâbâd (Daskrohâi and Parkântij):
By Rajput all through, as opposed to Grāśiṭ, is meant the non-land-owning Rajputs—mere cultivators, servants, and hangers-on.

Does not the affix -siv, which is used only by Kāthis and by the Chārans of Kāthiawād proper, point to sun-worship?

The Kāthis always prefer the forms Bhim, Bhoj, Rām, Bhan, &c. to Bhims, Bhojas, Rama, Bhānas. Nor do they ever use affixes such as -sīṅg, -bhāi, -ji, but are always spoken of with the name of their tribe, as Alā Khachar, Bhoj Khachar, Bhān Khachar; Jivā Dhándhal, or dhal; Rukhāl Khawād.

A correspondent of the Bombay Gazette took exception to -sīṅg on the Dehli banners of some chiefs, saying it should be -śīṅ or -sīṅgh. Doubtless, but the Gujarātis at least always write it -sīṅg, or even, as it is often pronounced, -śīṅgh.

Sava is sometimes pronounced Sawa, and with the diminutive Śiva. Is then Śava a form of Śiv, and another instance of Gujarātī fondness for changing i into o?

The following, which have been given above as independent names, would seem to be, in origin at least, diminutives:—

Jask for Jaswant; Kāl for Kalyān; Lakhā for Lakshmana; Bhagā and Bhagru for Bhagwan; and Gopāl for Gopāl.

CHERA OR GAṆGA GRANTS OF A.D. 350 AND 481.

BY LEWIS RICE, BANGALORE.

Two more important inscriptions have come to hand relating to what have been denominated the Chera kings, but whom it seems more correct to call the Ganga kings,—a designation given to them in all the inscriptions yet discovered, not one of which contains any mention of the title Chera.

The first of these inscriptions was produced at Harihara before Major Cole, Superintendent of the Inam Settlement, in support of an alleged endowment by Bukka Rāya of Vījayanagar (!).—a sufficient evidence that its possessor had not the remotest notion of its contents, for they purport to be a thousand years older than Bukka Rāya, and relate to a part of Māsur diametrically opposite to Harihara. The grant is engraved on three copper plates (4½ in. by 2½ in.), which are in a fair state of preservation. They are strung together on a metal ring, secured by the figure of an elephant, about an inch long, the ring passing between the four legs, which are closed together below. The most remarkable feature about this inscription is the singular admixture of characters in which it is written. There are certainly two, if not three, alphabets used; the chief one, which appears to me of much importance, a very primitive form of Haḷe Kannada; another a slightly later form, but only used in a few letters; the third a form of Uḍeynāgari.

The date of this inscription, it is calculated, must be A.D. 350. It is therefore 116 years older than the Merkara plates, and—with the exception of one, mentioned by Prof. Eggington as contained in Sir Walter Elliot's collection—the oldest yet discovered of this line.

The second grant was found among the old

1 The accompanying facsimile plate will best exhibit the characters in which these plates are inscribed.—Bo.
### Alphabets of the Harihara Plates (A.D. 350)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>ñ</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>ो, u</td>
<td>ॖ</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>क</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ख</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ख</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ग</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ग</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>इ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>च</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñh</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>झ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>प</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>प</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>प</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>प</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>प</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ब</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>म</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ल</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>आ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>उ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñh</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऍ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऍ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऍ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऍ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऍ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऎ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऎ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऎ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऎ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऎ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ए</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñh</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>ओ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ो</td>
<td>औ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doubtful characters: ॐ, ॐ, ञ, ञ

Unless included in the foregoing, the following letters do not occur:—gh, ñ, th, ñh, th, ph.

It is conjectured that the following letters show the original forms of vowels in combination with consonants:

- र, र, य, य, ब, ब, ध, ध, घ, घ, ङ, ङ, ळ, ळ.
records of the Assistant Commissioner's Court in Bangalor, while removing to new premises, and has been placed in the local Museum. It consists now of four copper plates (7½ in. × 2¼ in.) a good deal worn, strung on a metal ring as usual, but the seal is gone, and a fifth plate—the last—has evidently been abstracted. The inscription is very lightly engraved in thin but distinct and well formed Hale Kamnâda characters. The last side, however, is quite illegible. There is no information as to how, when, or whence the plates found their way to where they were discovered.

In the first inscription we have the record of a gift of land in the village of Dervaṇāru, in Karenād, within the government of Talavānapura, made by the ruler of that district, a prince who was the son of Viśhū Gopa, and whose name was apparently Rāja Malla. The endowment was a reward for a gallant exploit performed by Rāma Deva, the son of a Gavuḍa, a village chief or head-man, of the Yerakula caste, in rescuing the prince's wife and attendants from the hands of some enemy and conducting them in safety to the capital. The date of the transaction is given, as far as I can make out, according to the Saka, here written Sajas, or era of Śālavāhana, followed by the name of the cycle year, which is Śādhāraṇa. Guided by this I calculate that the date is S. S. 272 (A.D. 350); but some of the characters used in this part are so strange and unfamiliar that I am uncertain whether they are numerals or letters, or the latter used for the former. An old cave-numeral occurs in the Merkara plates, but the characters here do not correspond with any of the old numerals that have been published. The letters nayana, which if 'eyes' would stand for 2, alone seem plain. If the next word is gīr, 'language,' it would be 3. But, I have failed to decipher this sentence to my satisfaction, and possibly it may not be a date at all.

But, in whatever way this may be read, there is little doubt that the date above given must be arrived at. For we are limited to the year Śādhāraṇa, and, according to the only information we have, Viśhū Gopa's predecessor on the throne, Hari Varma, was reigning in 238, and the reign of Mādhava, his successor on the throne, ended in 425. The Śādhāraṇa in question must evidently be one falling between these two dates as extremes, and it will thus be found that we have only two years to choose from,—either S. S. 273 (A.D. 350) or S. S. 332 (A.D. 410). That the former is the right one seems to me antecedently more probable. For between 288 and 425, taking it for granted we know of all the kings who ruled then, we have to allow, first, for the conclusion of the reign of Hari Varma, already for certain at least 41 years on the throne; second, for the entire reign of Viśhū Gopa, which must have been a very long one, for the expression regarding him in the first of the grants of this line last published by me (Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 137), that 'his mental energy was unimpaired at the end of life,' seems only consistent with a career prolonged beyond the usual limits; third, for the reign of Mādhava. Now the donor in the present grant is the son of Viśhū Gopa, and we may conclude from the way in which he is mentioned that he was a provincial governor under his father, who was still alive. Assuming that Viśhū Gopa came to the throne about 290, he would in 359 have reigned 60 years. If, on the other hand, the date 410 is adopted, we must keep him on the throne 120 years! Whether Mādhava, declared in the various inscriptions to have been the son of Viśhū Gopa, was the same as this Rāja Malla seems very doubtful. The Tamil chronicle relating to these kings, describes a break in the succession after Viśhū Gopa, and, although the inscriptions hitherto found give no countenance to such a break, there certainly seems room for one or more kings between him and Mādhava, and Rāja Malla may have so intervened. The second of our present inscriptions abstains, it will be noticed, from calling Mādhava the son of Viśhū Gopa, but the next king is also treated in the same way, though there seems no doubt that he succeeded his father.

The genealogy of the kings is not given in this inscription, which mentions only the founder of the line, and the donor's father. The royal
prince, Rāja Mallā, as we have assumed, has among others the title ‘lord of Kōḷāḷa PURA’ or Kōlar, and this title continued to be borne by the same line of kings long after, as may be seen in the Coorg inscriptions of the 9th century,* one of the kings in which was also called Rācha Mallā.

The site of the grant can be easily identified. The village Devanūra is still known by the same name, and is situated about fifteen miles south-west of Tālavānampura or Tālakāḍu. It now forms one of the endowments of the temple of Chāmarjēśvara at Chāmarjēnagar. It is interesting to note that the subdivision to which it belonged was called Karṇāḍ, literally ‘black country’, — no doubt on account of the black cotton soil which there abounds — for this is exactly the form conjectured by Dr. Gundert to be the original of Kāṛṇāṭa, and he gives the same reason for the name. Another village, that of Bāṇanēḷa, mentioned in describing the boundaries, is close to Devanūra, and still bears the same name. The grant is witnessed by the Head of the Etenāḍ Seventy. This sub-division has already been identified in connection with two inscriptions (Ind. Ant. I. 362, V. 135), but in the first of them, owing to a slight mistake of the engraver of the grant, it was described as saptā, ‘seven’, instead of saptāti, ‘seventy’. The latter is undoubtedly correct, as we have similar divisions mentioned in various parts of Māsur in old grants, such as the Jiddūrīgā or Jiddulīgā Seventy, the Ārabelā Seventy, &c.

But, as before stated, the great peculiarity of this inscription, and what seems to me to constitute its chief interest, is the primitive old character, different from any yet published that I have met with, in which it is mostly written, and the singular changes from that to Devanāgarī, apparently without any rule. I think this may perhaps be partly accounted for on the ground that the grant was not one made, as usual in such cases, to a temple, a Brāhmaṇ, or a member of a learned class, but to a Gauḍa’s son. He probably knew as little of Sanskrit or the orthodox forms adopted by the genealogists of the court as the same class do now: hence a sort of patchwork introduction, contributed it may be by different persons, themselves imperfectly acquainted with the forms and language. On the other hand, the exploit of which he was the hero, and for which he obtained the reward, is described in the most straightforward manner, in the plainest Kannaḍa: for this part he could fully comprehend, and there was no mistake about it. The boundaries again run off into Sanskrit, and were perhaps written down by some Brāhmaṇ sādhuḥ bhogu.

The primitive old character, to which I have referred, evidently has an affinity to those used in the edicts of Aśoka, but still does not correspond with either the earlier or the later alphabet employed in them. I am strongly inclined to believe, from the uniform reference in the inscriptions of these Gauḍa kings to the first Koṅgāṇi’s achievement in overthrowing a certain pillar, that one of those columns erected by Aśoka and inscribed with his edicts, of which several have been found in the north, may be referred to, and still awaits discovery in the south. The pillars were called sīla stambha, or ‘virtue-pillars,’ and on referring to the Merkara plates I find that sīḷa is the term most distinctly there used. It is true it is written sīḷa stambha in the present grant but one peculiarity of this is that no distinction is made between long and short i, and no conclusion, therefore, can be founded on it. The term sīḷa stambha would be unintelligible, as a rule, to Brāhmaṇs and the uninitiated, and hence its conversion into sīḷa stambha, as used in nearly all the grants—the most natural in the world.

Having gone so far as to hazard the prediction that a pillar inscribed with the edicts of Aśoka may yet be found in the south, it may be allowable to venture a step further, and anticipate that the most ancient alphabet used in the present grant may prove to be the one in which it is written, so much does it resemble in general style those deciphered by Princep.

The second inscription attached to this paper records a grant by a king whose name is generally given as A ś v i n t a—or D u r v i n t a, but who is here simply styled Koṅgāṇi M a ṛ ḍ aḷa. In the second of the grants last published by me (Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 133), most of the

---

* Published in Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 100. Mr. Kittel will no doubt permit me to suggest a correction in the third inscription, line 5, which should read Eryanga Gaṇumanaṇa magaṇa, ‘to the son of Eryanga Gaṇumana.’ The word gaṇumanaṇa, ‘a village chief or headman,’ has passed through gaṇuḍa into the modern gaṇḍa.
particulars of which are confirmed by this one, he was called Koṅgaṇi Vīdha. The present grant was made in the third year of his reign, which, according to the calculations in connection with that one, gives us the year A.D. 481, and consisted of a gift to the Somayāji Vāsa Śarmmana, a resident of Mahāsenapura. The particulars of the gift are totally illegible, and the conclusion is missing. There is no clue, therefore, to the situation of Mahāsenapura.

The description of the various kings corresponds with that given in the chief grants already published. But with regard to Mādhava II, Koṅgaṇi II, and Avinīta, or Koṅgaṇi III (as it now seems we should call him), fresh information is supplied, confirming of what was obtained from the grant of A.D. 513 already referred to. Such are the Brahmānaical revival under Mādhava II, the coronation of Koṅgaṇi II, while an infant on his mother's lap, and the romantic attachment which gave Avinīta his wife. Regarding this king it is further added that "though not matured in age, yet he was ripe in virtue," than which no expression could more fully confirm the accuracy of the calculations as to his age made in connection with the grant above mentioned.

Our advancing knowledge regarding the reigns of the Gaṅga kings of Maisur, as I will now call them, may be summed up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koṅgaṇi I</td>
<td>188-239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhava I</td>
<td>239-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari Varmma</td>
<td>247-268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīshṇu Gopa</td>
<td>270-290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Rāja Malla</td>
<td>300-320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mādhava II</td>
<td>320-340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koṅgaṇi II</td>
<td>340-360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avinīta, Koṅgaṇi III</td>
<td>370-390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushkara</td>
<td>390-410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŚrīVikrama</td>
<td>420-440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhā Vikrama</td>
<td>450-470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilanda, Śrī Vallaabhākhyya</td>
<td>480-500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Nava Kāma, Śivamāra, Koṅgaṇi IV</td>
<td>510-530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Bhima Kopa</td>
<td>540-560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Rāja Kesari</td>
<td>570-590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prithivi Koṅgaṇi</td>
<td>600-620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Among the epithets applied to him is also Suvarṇa Gaṅga, 'a Gaṅga of truth,' which bears an evident reference to the title of Satya Vākya given to one or two of these kings.

Rāja Malla Deva
Gaṅda Deva
Rācha Malla, SatyaVākya
Koṅgaṇi
√375-569
Pemmanādi, do.
Malla Deva II
-872-894

About this time the dynasty was overthrown in Maisur by the Cholās, and not long after the Hōysala Ballālas of Dorasmudra rose to power in this country. Of the inscriptions at the foot of the statues of Gaṁaśvara at Śrīvanna Belgoḷa, one which precedes a Ballāla grant informs us that a Gaṅga Rāja built the sattāyam or enclosure. An inscription at Nirguṇa, dated A.D. 1065, exhibits a Gaṅga-rasa still retaining the sounding titles of Koṅgu Varmma Dharma Mahārājādhirāja, but as a petty officer of the Hōysala Ballālas, ruling the Arabeḷa Seyenty. About the same time the Hōysala king Ereyanga assumes the name of Vira Gaṅga; and Udayaditya, at first a general and then governor of Banavase under the Chalukya king Bhuvanaik Malla, 1069-1076, calls himself a Gaṅga, "lord of Kollaḷapura (Kolā) and Nandagiri (Nandargata), and possessor of the elephant crest."*

It thus appears that when the final catastrophe occurred the family dispersed to the northwards. Some members of the same line, I think it is evident, founded the Gaṅga vāmśa dynasty of Orissa, acknowledged to have come from Karṇaṭaka, and also called Gaṅgaṭhīsing or the elephant lords, which, commencing at the end of the 11th century, ruled that country till subdued by the Muhammadans in 1544. Wilson shows (Macdon. Coll. vol. I. p. cxxviii.) that the founder was Amant Varmma, "also called Kollāhala, sovereign of Gaṅgarāhī.

This I am convinced should be "lord of Kollāhala (the same as Kollā-para) and sovereign of Gaṅgarāhī."

The province of Gaṅgarāhī, or the Gaṅgarāhī, Ninety-six Thousand, occurs so frequently in the Maisur inscriptions as to be as familiar to me as the name Maisur itself. I have also determined its limits as embracing almost the whole of the southern half of Maisur westwards. It formed a principal province under

* It is true that Wilson seeks to bring them "from the low country on the right bank of the Ganges, or Tamluk and Midespur," but this is undeniable in the face of the evidence we now have. Cf. Dr. Hunter's Orissa.
the Gaṅga kings, and may be the same as the Gaṅgākṣṛṣṇa mentioned in the Vikramāditya Deva Charita: the curious Begur stone in the Bangalor Museum, which may belong to the interval between the overthrow of the Gaṅgas and the rise of the Hoysalas, presents us with a king ruling Gaṅgavādi as an independent sovereign (eka chhatra chāṇḍyā); an inscription at Kanadey describes the Hoysalas as originally kings of Gaṅgavādi; and the Gaṅgavādi Ninety-six Thousand sand is afterwards enumerated among the provinces of their empire. The large body of Gaṅgadikira kayats are, it is conjectured, the old subjects of this territory.

The Gaṅgas eventually turn up again in their old dominions in the sixteenth century, in the persons of the Gaṅga Rajas of Śivasamudram, the island at the Falls of the Kavērī, about twelve miles north-east of Tālkād, and the line was here extinguished in the third generation.

Harishara Plates.

Transcript.

I. Śravāti * Jitam bhagavatā gata gaganābhena Padmanābhenā ēri-
maj Jāṅhaviya kulaṁma bhayomabhāsāna bhāskara śva kha-
da gaika prabhāra khaṇḍita mahā śilā śambha labdha ba-
la parākrama [kanni kahura * śya] ājñātakaṭṭodhūsāta ēri-
mā Koṇguli Varama Dhirama mahārajaśirāja taśya putra Vi-
śyu Gopa mahārajaśirāja taśya putra Kolaśapūra vairāhīva-
ra Gaṅga kulaṁ mahattanda madha gajendra lā[ṇ]chhana Padmanavatī

IIa. Deviya labdha vara prāśadhā tadaṅgatlada parama Talavānapura
madye Saha [* nayana gi * neyā] Śāhāraṇa śamachchhoṇharaṇā -Paṅga-
ṇa mā amavāsā Adivāradandu Kārenāḍa Dhevānuram-
la gge Yaraguladha Madhi gavudana śu-putta Rāma Dhevānu
He * yan iridu Raja Mallaṇa bendaḷi bhaṭṭar avanu ba-
l valāṇīd oppuśid allige mečchhoṇa gotā bhūmi pū-

IIb. rubbaśyāndiśi krishṇa mrittikāhākhorba chīchā vri-
kṣaṭa tāṭkadaḥhākhorba kāvaḷastāṇa Dēvanura dviśa-
diyā vaiśa vriśaka daṇkhaśyāndiśiḥākhorba kupa tāṭaka

III. ndiśhākhorba chīchā vriśaka krishṇa mutiśe Aṃgī-
vaṇhīya Dēvanura dviśandiya īśāṇaṁ āndaṇktā

Śākṣhiṇām Edenāde Eppattga śākṣhi.

Translation.

May it be well! Success through the adorable Padmanābha, resembling (in colour) the cloudless sky.

A sun illumining the clear firmament of the Jāṅhavī kula, of mighty valour acquired by the great pillar of stone divided with a single stroke of his sword, . . . . resplendent as a jewel on the forehead, was Śrīmaṅ Konguli Varmma Dharmma mahā-
rajaśirāja.

His son was Viscī Gopa mahārajaś-
irāja.

His son, the lord of Kolaśapūra, a sun to

The sign * indicates a letter not deciphered. Words in brackets doubtful.

* The characters read rōb are precisely the same as bē, but the word must be 'orōba,' one.
the Gaṅga kula, having the sign (or crest) of a lusty elephant, having received a boon from the goddess Padmāvatī,—in the middle of the excellent Talavanaprā which he was then ruling, [in the Sāgā year, 'eyes'] ..., the year Śādhrāṇa, the month Phalguna, full-moon day, being Sunday,—within Devanuṟu in Kārenād,—Rāma Deva, the good son of Madi Gavuṟu of the Tarakula (caste), having slain He ... and with great devotion conducted Rāja Malī's wife and guards thither, (he) being pleased thereat bestowed the following land:

The eastern boundary runs along a field of black soil, a tamarind tree and a pond, to the banyan tree at the common boundary of the guard-house and Devanuṟu; the southern boundary runs by the tamarind tree of the shining pond and the old watercourse to the wood-apple tree at the common boundary of Kalkone and Devanuṟu; the western boundary runs by a tamarind tree to the tamarind tree at the common boundary of Badenavāla and Devanuṟu; the northern boundary runs by a tamarind tree and field of black soil to the common boundary of Alaniyavani and Devanuṟu, and thus ends on the north-east.

Witnesses:—He of the Edenād Seventy, witness.

Bangalor Museum Plates.

Transcript.


II. yuktasya vidyā vināya ... sya samya prajā pāla matraḥīga-ta rāja pravajanasya vidvat kavi kānchana nīkashopāla bhūtasya viśesatopāna anaviśehasaya niti sāstrasya vaktriprayoktii kuśalasya suvībhakta bhakta bhṛitya janasya dattaka sūtra vyrtti prachaiti śrīmat Mādhavamahādhirājaya. Putrasya pitrapitāmaha guna yuktasya aneka chaturḍanta yuddhāvāpa chatur udadhi sallā svādita yasasah same dvirārā turagadhirochanāśayotpan na tejaso chatur abhīvyogam sampāditā sampad viśehasasya śrīmad-Hari V arṣma mahādhirājasya. Putrasya guru go brāhmaṇa pājakasya Nārāyaṇa charanānvāyastaya śrīmad Viṣṇu Gopa mahādhirājasya. Trīya māka charan(m) bhora sāa pavidṛkṣiṣottamāngasya vyāyāmodvyrtta pna kathina bhūja dvayasya sva bhūja bala parakrama kraya krita rāja chira pranashya deva bhoga brahmanyakena sahasa visargaṇvāyana. kariṣa parabhava hariṇa viṣyeta karmaka

III. ghāṭikīṇa maṇiḥ vidyottamanā bhūja yugasya kumudī dalabhika śīrṣa kara kiraṇa samudaya bhavad utara yaṣa prātāna vibhāṣyamāna jātah śrīmat Mādha vamahādhirājasya. Āvikalāśvaramedhavibhūbhābhibhiktaḥ śrīmat Kadamba kula mahabhashalā gabhasti mālin sār. Krīṣṇa Varṇama mahādhirājasya priya bhāgīneyasya janani devatānaka pariya(n)-ka ta-la samadhigaṇa rājābhishekasya parantaravamanardopabhujaṃāna tri vangga sāṁsya vidyā vināyaṃ sampanna paripūṣāntarātmanah aneka vara viṣayapājitī vipula yaṣa kshirodaikārṇavākṣiṣa jagr trayasya samadana śara patana vidhura vanitā nayana maṅdhukara kulakulā krupāśravinda jalaśayasya kavi janāgagraṣṭāya ati patnahu

III. pataḥṣasya śrīmat Koṅgaṇi mahādhirājasya. Putreṇa tad gunāṅgūmāna pitṛpara-suyārthe samajītayapilasya sagranālingita vipyūla vaksah stalenā viṣṭambhamāna śūkti trayopanamita samanta sāsanta maṇḍalena niranntara prema bahumānunakta prakṛti maṇḍalena niśita niśtrīṃsā kara karaṅḍīta bhunomanniśi maṇḍalena prati dināṅbivaṛddhyamāna puraṇa vara guṇa maṇī santhā satvṛttābharaṇāvabhāsyanānavaparavahā a-

* Literally, 'stabbed' or 'pierced.'
May it be well! Success through the adorable Padmanābha, resembling (in colour) the cloudless sky.

A sun illuminating the clear firmament of the Jāhnavi kula, master of countries born from the rapidity of his own victories, adorned with the ornament of a wound obtained in war with hosts of terrible enemies, was Śrīmat Kōṅgaṇī Varma Dharmma mahādhīrājā, of the Kāñcāyanasa gotra.

His son, inheriting all the qualities of his father, possessing a character for learning and modesty, having obtained the honours of the kingdom only for the good government of his subjects, a touchstone for (testing) gold the learned and poets, skilful among those who thoroughly expound and practise the science of politics in all its branches, preserving due distinction between friends and servants, author of a treatise on the law of adoption, was Śrīmat Mādhava mahādhīrājā.

His son, possessed of all the qualities inherited from his father and grandfather, having entered into war with many elephants (so that) his fame had tasted the waters of the four oceans, of a glory acquired from the equal skill with which he rode on elephants and horses, of enormous wealth acquired by the practice of the four modes of policy, was Śrīmad Hari Varmma mahādhīrājā.

His son, devoted to the worship of gurus, cows and Brāhmaṇa, praising the feet of Nārāyaṇa, was Śrīmad Vīṣṇu Gopa mahādhīrājā.

His head purified by the pollen from the lotuses the feet of Tryambaka, his two arms grown stout and hard with athletic exercises, having purchased the kingdom with his personal strength and valour, the reviver of many thousands of long-ceased donations for the festivals of the gods and endowment of Brāhmaṇa, performer of the offering of firstfruits (āgrayaṇa), both his arms shining with the gems of hard knaps produced by the drawing of his bow for the destruction of (or against the deer) the fear of the enemy, his race illuminated by his great and widespread glory, was Śrīmat Mādhava mahādhīrājā.

The beloved sister's son of Śrī Kṛṣṇa Varmma mahādhīrājā—who, being anointed with the final ablutions of a completed āveṇaṇgha, was the sun to the firmament of the auspicious Kadamba kula—having obtained his royal anointing (or coronation) on the couch of the lap of his divine mother, enjoying the essence of the three objects of worldly desire without one interfering with the other, of a mind purified by the acquisition of learning and modesty, his fame acquired by the conquest of many mighty kings surrounding the three worlds like the unbroken expanse of the milk ocean, a lake to the lotus of compassion for the bees the eyes of fair women disturbed by the shower of Kāma's arrows, reckoned the highest theme of poets, the ablest among the most able, was Śrīmat Kōṅgaṇī mahādhīrājā.

By his son, successor to the qualities of his father, his broad chest embraced by the arms of one who desired him though assigned by her father to the son of another, surrounded by bands of feudatories from all sides subjected by the growth of the three powers of increase, having parties of counsellors attached to him by constant affection and gifts, having with the sharp sword in his hand cut down the hosts of his enemies and with his arms plucked them up by the root, of a form glorious with virtue and set with the gems of the daily improving qualities of the best of men, though not matured in age yet possessed of ripe virtue, a mine of clusters of distinguished qualities, in punishing according to the superior of Vaivasvata, able in protecting the castes and religious orders which prevailed in the south, a
friend to all, of good descent, of the highest religious merit, praising the feet of the adorabe Vīṣṇu,—what more? the Yudhiaśthira of the Kali yuga, Śrīmat Kōṅgaṇī mahārājā, in the third year of the great wealth increased by himself, the month Śrāvaṇa. . . . . to the Somayājī Vāsa Śarmmaṇa, a resident of Mahāsenapura. . . .

ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTES.
BY M. J. WALHOUSE, LATE M.C.S.
(Continued from p. 159.)

No. XX.—Trojan and Indian Prehistoric Pottery, and the Svastika Symbol.

While lately looking over the extraordinary collection of antiquities disinterred by Dr. Schliemann at Hisarlik, the supposed site of old Troy, now in the South Kensington Museum, I was struck by likenesses between some of the pottery and the earthenware found in Indian cairns. In some remarks on “Miniature and Prehistoric Pottery,” chiefly from graves in Coorg, in vol. IV., pp. 12 and 13, of the Indian Antiquary, I have mentioned certain urns or jars standing upon three or, occasionally, four legs,—specimens are figured in the plate at the place referred to,—and observed that modern Hindu pottery is generally without feet. Indeed I knew of no other prehistoric pottery with any but the slightest indications of feet, and that very rarely. But in Dr. Schliemann’s collection one is struck by the number of vessels, of all shapes and sizes, that are supported on legs. Three or four large urns, figured at pp. 152-3 of the doctor’s book, Troy and its Remains, especially recall the legged Coorg vases, differing chiefly in the legs being longer and the bodies rounder and fuller, and moreover in being furnished with a loop-handle, a feature never seen in Indian cairn-pottery, and very rare in European. In the Trojan collection, however, legged vessels are most abundant and various in shape, and frequently have handles on one or both sides. Some of the most striking are figured at pp. 166, 229, 282, 285 of the doctor’s book. Even miniature vessels no larger than coffee-cups are furnished with legs; but, as far as I could see, the number never exceeded three, whereas the Indian urns not unfrequently have four.

Another resemblance was the large amount of miniature pottery: cups, jugs, and vases no larger than walnut-shells are exhibited in numbers; and miniature urns and utensils have also been largely found in the Coorg graves. Examples are figured in the Indian Antiquary above referred to, and a passage is quoted from Mr. Fergusson’s Rude Stone Monuments, in which he observes that such miniature pottery was probably made and placed in the tombs as symbols of traditions and primeval usages that had died out. I ventured rather to dissent from this hypothesis, which hardly seems strengthened by the quantity of miniature vessels discovered in ancient Troy. They are smaller even than the Indian dwarf-ware, and their use more problematical, unless indeed they were the toys of Astyanax and his playmates! Chāḍātīs of the true Indian form also appear in the Schliemann collection, and there is one medium-sized black chāḍāti perfectly corresponding with those often found in Madras cairns. There are also two or three vessels with side-spouts like that numbered 7 in the plate in the Indian Antiquary, vol. IV. previously mentioned. Earthenware platters or saucers, so abundant in Indian cairns, are also frequent, of the same shape and size, amongst the pottery from Hisarlik, as well as heads of oxen and other animals in terra-cotta; and similar objects of the same size have been found in scores in the cairns on the Nilgiri Hills; while the quaint pieces in the Museum, termed by Dr. Schliemann “Juno and Minerva idols”, strongly recall some clay figures depicted by Captain Congreve and Mr. Breeks in their works on the antiquities of the Nilgiris.

Far surpassing the rest of the flint assemblage in bulk and height, a very Ajax Telamon in earthenware, an immense jar is conspicuous in the Museum. Nearly six feet high and tapering from the shoulders, where it is 4½ feet across, to a point at bottom, it is marked as

3 Vessels standing on round bottom-rims, as in modern basins, occur in the Trojan ware,—never, I think, in Indian, ancient or modern.
probably a "substitute for a collar," and considered by Dr. Schliemann to have been used as a magazine. He gives an illustration (p. 290) of a row of these colossal jars, found side by side underground, as though used for storing wine, oil, and perhaps grain. Such indeed may have been their intention. Huge jars have served such purposes in the East long before the days of Ali Baba. This Trojan example, however, reminded me of the great burial-jars often found in the south of India, which it resembled in size, shape, and general appearance. These have been lately touched upon by Bishop Caldwell in the *Indian Antiquary*, vol. VI. p. 279, and a further notice of them may be read in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, N. S. vol. VII. p. 31. I have often found them, buried with the mouths at no great depth underground, and a large flat stone laid above; they were of coarse red ware, five feet or more high, tapering to the end, and within filled with earth, and pieces of bone at the bottom. In Travankor they are said by the natives to contain the remains of virgins sacrificed by rajahs, on the boundaries of their estates, to protect them and confirm their engagements. Near Chaughat a large vault was found full of these jars, which recalls the row of jars underground depicted in Dr. Schliemann's book. Upon this subject, and with reference also to Bishop Caldwell's remark that from the smallness of the mouths of the urns it would seem the bodies must have been put in piece-meal, I beg to subjoin a curious communication which appeared in the *Athenaeum* in February 1876, and shows that the idea of burying in earthenware vessels was not unknown in Rome:

"I cannot yet state anything definitely about the beautiful ruins found in the 'Villa Aldobrandini,' for their name, their destination, is still a mystery to the topographers. I shall simply mention, as a matter of curiosity, the discovery of a common wine amphora of terracotta, which had been used as a receptacle for a human skeleton of mature age. As the orifice of the jar was simply three inches in diameter, the different parts of the body, and especially the largest bones, had been cut, and forced through the opening. This strange process had certainly some connexion with sorcery, or rather with the superstitions of the lower classes in the fifth and sixth centuries; for I have gathered myself among the bones one of those thin rolled sheets of lead containing a formula of imprecation on a matter of love. The document, written in Greek, has not yet been deciphered, and probably will not be, owing to the corrosion of the lead, but there is scarcely any doubt of its design. This reminds me of the discovery related by Count Caylus—a discovery of the same nature, but on a gigantic scale. About the middle of the last century, he says, under the walls of the Pincio, facing the Villa Borghese, a subterranean corridor was found containing some thousand amphorae still fixed in the earth. In each was the most strange collection of objects—human bones mixed with those of horses, oxen, and monkeys, teeth, lizards, coils of serpents, and small hands of wax. No satisfactory explanation has ever been given of this discovery, and I hope that the recent instances of the same kind will turn the attention of the archaeologist towards the study of this very peculiar ancient custom."

Lastly, the extraordinary frequency with which the Svastika symbol appears on the Trojan prehistoric pottery gave occasion to Dr. Schliemann obtaining a remarkable and striking communication from the distinguished Orientalist E'mila Burnouf, author of *La Science des Religions,* &c., which he prints in the earlier part of his book. M. Burnouf holds that this mysterious and much-debated symbol is intended to denote the invention of the fire-drill, and preserve the sacred remembrance of the discovery of fire by rotating a peg in dry wood. It represents, according to him, the two pieces of wood laid cross-wise, one upon another, before the sacrificial altar, in order to produce the holy fire. The ends of the cross were fixed down by arms, and at the point where the two pieces are joined there was a small hole in which a wooden peg or lance (pramantha, whence the myth of Prometheus the fire-bearer) was rotated by a cord of cow-hair and hemp till the sacred spark was produced. The invention of the fire-drill would doubtless mark an epoch in human history. Mr. Tylor, in his *Early History of Mankind*, has largely shown its use at some period in every quarter of the globe, and it is conceivable that its invention would be commemorated by a holy symbol.
But in the Athenæum of 12th January last* Mr. Hodder Westropp altogether discredits the origin assigned to the symbol by M. Burnouf, and considers the Greek archaic cross, as he terms it, to have been evidently derived from the punch marks on early Greek coins, which marks were originally composed of four small squares, 飗, the centre assuming the form of a cross; but in the stamping of the coin the squares went a little on one side, and made the punch mark take the shape of the archaic cross 飕, so found on old Greek coins, and thence adopted as an ornamental device on early Greek pottery, as in Samos, Cyprus, and Hissarlik. Mr. Westropp goes on to remark that the Indian or Buddhist svastika is almost invariably drawn osoph, the reverse of the Greek archaic cross, and is a monogram or character composed, as General Cunningham has pointed out, of two Pāli characters, signifying 'it is well.' As a Buddhist emblem it cannot be older than the 6th century B.C., Buddha having died about 450 B.C., and the earliest Buddhist monuments are placed by Mr. Fergusson at about 250 B.C.

There appears, however, reason to think that in the first appearance of the symbol in Europe it was used not merely as an ornament, but as an emblem peculiar to some deity, generally connected with the air, or sometimes water; Mr. Newton of the British Museum designated it the Meander, and considered it emblematical of water. Its first appearance is on the pottery of archaic Greece, as on that in the British Museum ascribed to between the years 700 and 500 B.C., and now on that disinterred by Dr. Schliemann on the site of Troy. On all this pottery and on its earliest examples the sign occurs profusely, and is found drawn both ways, occurring so on the same archaic Greek urn in the British Museum; hence the distinction made by Mr. Westropp between the Greek and Buddhist forms hardly seems tenable, especially as it is found drawn both ways in India, as well as all over Europe. As an emblem it appears to have been associated with the Sky-god Zeus, the chief deity of the archaic Greeks, and to have symbolized his thunderbolt, as subsequently in Scandinavia it was called the hammer of the Thunder-god Thor.—nor is this the only indication of a common origin of the early Greeks and Norse.

After the 6th century it disappears from Greek earthenware, and is found on early Latin, Etruscan, and Sicilian ornaments, coins, and pottery, as well as in Asia Minor and North Africa, especially where there had been Phoenician colonies. It is remarkable that the symbol is not found on Egyptian, Babylonian, or Assyrian remains: crosses are frequent, but not the svastika; neither does it occur on Mexican monuments.

In the museums of Sweden and Denmark there are several hundred gold bracteates, which appear to have been worn as annulets or medals, and, according to Professor Stephens of Copenhagen, belong almost without exception to the heathen period of Scandinavia, ranging from the 3rd or 4th to the 7th or 8th century of our era. They are mostly after Byzantine models, and many of them have a marked Indian character. They frequently bear the svastika, drawn both ways, and Professor Stephens remarks that in the earliest runes the letter G is drawn thus osoph, and appears so on graveslabs in Denmark of the 8th or 9th century. He also calls attention to the resemblance between the runes and the Hymaritic alphabet, used in Arabia during the first six centuries. A character, osoph, nearly resembling the runic G, occurs in a Pāli inscription, and reversed, 飕, in a rock-inscription at Salsette; see Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. XX. page 250, &c.

In the Roman Catacombs the svastika occurs not unfrequently, so placed as to have been then evidently adopted as a Christian symbol, and is seen in Roman mosaic work in England, France, Spain, and Algeria. It is abundant on pottery, ornaments, and weapons of Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon times, and of corresponding periods in Scotland, Germany, Switzerland, and Denmark. A sepulchral urn found at Shropham, Norfolk, and another preserved at Cambridge, bear the svastika in continuous lines; the latter urn is peculiarly interesting as exhibiting the symbol surrounded by almost every other device of cross, circle, and solar emblems, and occupying, as it were, the place of honour. As Christianity spread the svastika disappears, and when found again has been adopted as a Christian device. It is so used in heraldry, where it is termed the croix cran-
Planché, in his Pursuivant of Arms, says of it: "It is a mystic figure called in the Greek Church gammadion. It is very early seen in heraldry, and appeared in the paintings in the old palace of Westminster. Its significations at present unknown." It was constantly introduced in ecclesiastical vestments, and, doubtless with a belief in its talismanic efficacy, is often found on ancient bells in parish churches. So keeping up its connection with the air, our forefathers, firmly believing that demons—the 'powers of the air'—were driven away by the clang of church bells. In our own day it has become a favourite ornamental device, — we may be sure with no thought of symbolism,—and the archaeologist returning from India may observe it covering ceilings, cornices, fenders, and other iron-work.

In India the svastika is found on Buddhist coins referred to by Mr. E. Thomas to about 330 B.C., and also appears in Prinsop's engravings of Hindu coins. It is a sacred Buddhist emblem in Tibet, the ch'unka or device of Supàrśva, the seventh Tirthaṅkara of the Jains, and is said to be used by the Vaishnavas also as a mark on their sacred jar. (Moor's Hindu Pantheon.) But probably its most remarkable existing use is in China and Japan, respecting which we will quote a passage from a very interesting article on Japanese Heraldry in Volume V. of the Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan, premising that heraldry has existed in Japan from a period far earlier than 900 A.D., and every daimio family had its own cognizances. At page 12 we read that the svastika is the Manji badge of the Hachisuka family, Daimio of Awa, sometimes drawn ă, and sometimes, but less frequently, Ӳ. It is taken from a Chinese character meaning 'ten thousand,' and is a Buddhist symbol supposed to be emblematic of good luck. It is frequently to be seen on Buddhist temples as a sign of Fudô Sama, or 'the motionless Buddha.' It is often marked upon the lids of coffins, being supposed to act as a charm to protect the corpse against the attack of a demon in the shape of a cat, called Kin'asha, which is said to seize and mangle the dead bodies of human beings." In China it is common, enters largely into ornament, and is often worn as a charm. It is curious indeed to find the same symbol used with a mystic meaning both in English and Japanese heraldry, and, for the same office of repelling demons, on Japanese coffins and English church-bells! But, whatever may have been the origin of this most archaic and wondrously wide-spread symbol, there seems little to support the theories of Messrs. Émile Burnouf and Westropp, Mr. E. Thomas (Jour. R. As. Soc. N.S. Vol. I. p. 486) thinks it may have been a mere ornamental variation of the simple cross, that might have suggested itself anywhere, without any definite meaning, but singular enough in outline to attract professors of magic and catalistic rites. Still this hardly explains its adoption in countries so widely separated as Norway and Japan, and its strange defect in the far older intermediate lands of Egypt and Mesopotamia, the very nurseries of magic and mysticism.

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

PĂRSĪ FUNERAL AND INITIATORY RITES.

Sir,—Allow me to correct a few errors in the valuable paper that appears in the Indian Antiquary, vol. VI. pp. 311-315, on "Pārsī funeral and initiatory rites, and the Pārsī religion," by Prof. Monier Williams.

It appears that the learned professor was wrongly informed that the priestly race among the Pārsīs is divided into three classes of Dasturs, Mobeds, and Herbads. Herbad, or Erwād (Iran.) as it is more commonly called, is no separate division of priests, but a mere generic term for Dasturs and Mobeds. The title of Herbad is affixed to the name of one who has passed the Nāvar ceremony, to distinguish him from O斯塔 (Iran.) or non-Herbads. Thus, a Dastur as well as a Mobed is a Herbad, which is not, as Professor Williams says, the name of the lowest order of priests. Pārsīs are divided into Herbad and O斯塔, according as they have or have not performed the ceremony called Nāvar (Iran.). Again, Herbads are either Dasturs or Mobeds by virtue of their office, the former being superior to the latter. But these divisions do not engender any

3 Poor worshippers in Jains temples may often be seen laying down a few grains of rice before the image, and arranging them into the form of the svastika while repeating a mantra.—Ed.

4 Some Herbads are neither Dasturs nor Mobeds, for they do not choose to enter the holy order.
difference in civil or social rights, as is the case among the Hindus. Females are all O斯塔. They cannot be Herbad so long as they are not eligible to the holy order.

In another place the learned writer confounds the corpse-bearers with Nasasâlârs. The former are called Khândhiâs (क्हंदीस), from khândã, meaning ‘a shoulder,’ and their office is to carry the bier on their shoulders from the house of the deceased to the Tower of Silence. They are held inferior to Nasasâlârs, who cannot strictly be called corpse-bearers.

When a Pârsâl dies the Nasasâlârs bring an empty bier from the Nasâdukhâ (नसादुखाः)—a house where they and Khândhiâs are required to be present to attend any instantaneous call for service—to the house of the deceased. An hour before starting for the Tower, they enter the room where the body is deposited on a smooth slab of stone. The Nasasâlârs take up the body from the slab and place it on the bier, which they rest on the slab. Then, after the Mobeds have chanted some prayers, the Nasasâlârs remove the bier to the entrance door of the house, where the Khândhiâs wait to receive it. This delivered, the Nasasâlârs who are always two, except when the corpse is very heavy, walk with the bier, one on each side to the inner part of the Tower. The Khândhiâs are on no occasion permitted to enter the Tower. None but Nasasâlârs can do so. The Khândhiâs are “well cared for and well paid;” but to say that they “are not associated with by the rest of the community” is far from true. They associate freely with the rest of the Pârsâl, can reside in the same house with them, can eat at the same table—in fact there is nothing to prevent them from so associating with the other members of the community.

Prof. Williams considers feeding the dog with bread a part of the ceremony called Saz-âhâ. In this also he is mistaken. The ceremony of Saz-âhâ is nothing more than showing the corpse to any dog, and not necessarily a white one or a ‘four-eyed’ one. The very etymology of the word fully explains the ceremony. It is derived from Persian sâz, meaning ‘a dog,’ and did, from dâdan, ‘to see.’

Again, “the fire sanctuary of the sâgri,” as the writer says, “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.” This is not correct. With no such design is the sâgri built. The professor himself admits that “a ray from the sacred fire had barely opportunity to fall on the corpse at all.”

The bread with which the so-called funeral dog is fed is supposed by Prof. Williams to be a substitute for the flesh of the dead body. Here, too, he is mistaken. Nowhere even in the whole of the Zand Avastâ is bread ever supposed to be a substitute for the flesh. To feed a dog at the Tower of Silence is a practice sanctioned by convention, rather than by religion. Of all animals the dog is most dear to the Pârsâls, on account of its undeviating faithfulness, and consequently they keep up the practice of feeding a dog as almost a sacred obligation.

In another place the learned professor has said that the soul of the deceased man is supposed to hover above in a restless state for the three days immediately succeeding death, in the neighbourhood of the dakshmas. This is not quite correct. Only the soul of a sinful man is supposed to do so.

Again, it is not necessary that the initiatory ceremonies on admitting a young boy into the Pârsâl religion should take place in a fire-temple. For this purpose, a private dwelling is as good as a fire-temple. Nor is it necessary that the ceremony should be performed by a Daftar presiding over several Mobeds. In many cases, when the parents are not well off, only one or two Mobeds perform the ceremony.

About the bull whose urine is drunk at the initiatory ceremony I have to add that the bull is called Pârasle (परासले), and must be of a white colour: if a single hair on its body be found other than white, the animal is rejected as unfit for the purpose. I will conclude with the remark that I cannot discover what Prof. Williams means by “the second shirt.”

Sarâbâr Kivâr Khambârâ.

SÅKA AND SAÑVÅT DATES.

Sîr.—Some authorities give 79 A.D., and some give 78 A.D., as the date of commencement of the Såka era; and similarly the Såñvåt era of Vîkramâdiya is by some dated from 57 s.c., and by some from 56 s.c. Which is the correct date in each case, and why?

2. What is the correct method for converting Såñvåt and Såka dates into years A.D.? Ordinarily the conversion is made by simply adding 57 (56), or subtracting 79 (78), to or from the date A.D., as the case may be; but, since the Såñvåt, Såka, and Christian years do not begin on the same day, I do not understand how the ordinary simple method can be correct.
2. What rules fix the day on which the Sāvat and Śaka years respectively should begin?

4. Does a year Śaka comprise the same number of days as a year Sāvat? and what is the exact length of a Sāvat year?

V. A. SMITH.

Hamīrpur, N.W.P., 22nd April 1878.

The Hindu Śaka year is properly sidereal, commencing with the sun’s entry into the sign Mēsha or Aries, and, as its length is 365 days 6 hours 12:5 minutes, its commencement moves very slowly forward on the European solar year. Thus the epoch of the Śaka era was 14th March 78 a.d., but the sun’s entrance into Mēsha now falls on the 11th or 12th April, so that the Śaka year 1800 began on Thursday, 11th April 1878,—the sidereal year having gained 28 days on the solar one in 1800 years.

From this it will be seen that, for the approximate conversion of a date,—if it fall within the first three months of the Christian year,—we find the Śaka year by subtracting 79; if in the last nine months, by subtracting 78. The first nine months of the Śaka year correspond to the last nine in the Christian, and the last three in the former to the first three in the succeeding year of the latter reckoning; making the approximate equation to the Śaka era + 78 4/9 to bring it to the Christian date.

The Sāvat year is reckoned exclusively by the Chandra-māna or luni-solar system, and over Northern India begins with the new-moon which immediately precedes the sun’s entrance into Mēsha. But, as twelve lunar months (354 days 8 hours 48:4 minutes) fall about 11 days short of the sidereal year, an intercalary or ‘round’ month is supplied, on a particular principle, about thrice in eight years,—making such years consist of 383 days 21 hours 32:4 minutes. The epoch of this era was the new-moon of March 57 B.C., whence its equation is — 564; or we subtract 56 from the Sāvat date during the first nine or ten months of the year, but 57 during the last two, to obtain the year A.D.

In Gujarāt and south of the Narmādā, however, the year commences with the new-moon of Kārtti-kā (Oct.-Nov.), and we have an equation of — 564; or we subtract 57 from Sāvat dates falling in the months of Kārtti-kā, Mārgārī, and part of Panśha (to 31st Dec.), but 56 for dates falling within all other Hindu months, in order to obtain the Christian year, and vice versâ. For fuller information on details, Warren’s Kāla-Sanakālita, Jervis’s Weights and Measures of India, &c, Pinseş’s Useful Tables, and Cowasjee Patell’s Chronology may be consulted.—Ed.

ASSYRIAN DRESS ILLUSTRATED BY THAT OF THE HINDUS.

In reading lately Rawlinson’s Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient World, I came across a passage describing the dress of the Assyrian foot archers (vol. I, p. 450), part of which is as follows:

“Their only garment is a tunic of the scantiest dimensions, beginning at the waist, round which it is fastened by a broad belt or girdle descending little more than half-way down the thigh. In its make it sometimes closely resembles the tunic of the first period, but more often it has the peculiar pendant ornament which has been compared to the Scotch phillibeg (Layard’s Nineveh and Its Remains, vol. II, p. 336), and which will here be given that name.”

On this passage I would observe, firstly, that the ‘tunic’ is a misnomer as applied to the garment in question, as the word is more properly used of a garment covering the body, whereas the article of dress in the illustration is fastened round the waist and falls over the thighs. Secondly, I think that any resident of India, looking at the illustration given on the page from which the quotation is taken, would at once remark the similarity of the archer’s solitaire garment to the Indian dhōtī. For those readers who have not been in this country, I may explain that the dhōtī consists of a strip of cotton cloth wound round the waist, the outer extremity being gathered into a thick fold or pleat, of which one end is tucked into the cloth that has been passed round the waist, while the rest of the fold hangs down in front or at the side, looking exactly like the so-called ornament which is supposed to resemble a Scotch phillibeg. The same pendent fold is to be seen in the illustrations on pp. 436 and 477 of the same volume.—E. W. W.

ARCHAEOLOGY IN JAPAN.

Japan has an active archaeological society, bearing the title of Kobutzur Kai (Society of Old Things). Its members, numbering 200, are scattered throughout the land, but meet once a month in Yeddo. They consist chiefly of wealthy Japanese gentlemen, learned men, and priests; the latter especially have the means of bringing before public attention a vast number of ancient objects which have been hidden in the treasures of the temples, or preserved in private families.

H. von Siebold, Attaché of the Austrian Embassy at Yeddo, and a member of the society, has lately published a brochure which will serve as a guide for the systematic archaeological study of the land. Von Siebold has lately made a most interesting discovery of a prehistoric mound at Omuri, near Yeddo, containing over 5,000 different articles in stone, bronze, &c. In a recent communication
BOOK Notices.


The volume before us completes one of the most valuable contributions ever made to Oriental science. Eleven years, says Professor Dowson, have now passed since he took up the work of editing Sir Henry Eliot's reliques.

The labours of his predecessors in possession of those papers, though not without value, were unimportant as compared with what remained to do; for the MSS. left by Sir Henry were quite insufficient for the accomplishment of his great design. The labours of the editor, therefore, have been to a great degree original; and he is entitled to far greater credit than might be supposed from the title of the work.

This, as it now stands, contains at least a notice of every Mahommadan chronicle relating to India known to be worth the trouble of opening, with extracts of greater or less bulk from most; so that the student is not only presented with a tolerably complete History of India from the Musulmân point of view and knowledge, but is also furnished with a valuable guide for individual research. It is to be regretted, indeed, that in a work with such a title there should be no extract from any Hindu or Buddhist author writing in his own sacred or vulgar tongue,—e.g. the Mahâbhârata or the Râjatâranga,—and still more that the arrangement of the extracts is sometimes confusing; though this latter fault is to a certain extent remedied by the excellent double Index which accompanies the present concluding volume. This contains also the Musulmân authorities for the decline and fall of the Mughal Empire (some of the writers are Hindus, but they all affect the style of Isâk). The decay of literary power was, unfortunately, as marked at this period as that of political and military talent; and the best of the later native chronicles, the Sigârî muâta abkhâhirin, is excluded from the volume, because it was impossible to devote much space to a work, however excellent, which is elsewhere attainable to the student. Probably the most interesting extracts given are those relating to the miseries suffered by the last puppet emperors before our entry into Delhi; those showing the native opinion of the invading English and French, and the accounts of the last battle of Panipat. None of these equal in value that of "Kâsâ Rai," in the Asiatic Researches, but several of them confirm it, and mention the writer in terms which show that he has not at all exaggerated his own opportuni- ties of observation.

Oriental students will be glad to hear that Prof. Dowson has been commissioned to supplement the valuable work now completed by two volumes on the southern Musulmân states of Bîjâpur, Ahmadnâgar, &c., and we may express the hope that those possessed of rare MS. histories of any of the Bahmani dynasties will communicate with him respecting them.

1 Prof. Dowson, under one of these accounts, devotes a note (p. 154) to Ibrahim Khân Gârdî, and quotes (it does not appear from where) a statement that that commander "in times of war has a stick in his hand before the palæat of M. de Basy" at Pondicherry. Unless this means that he was a khâbîdâr, or mace-bearer, an office of considerable respectability, it is probably incorrect, as Ibrahim was a Bâyad. His family still hold a small jâcher near Pondicherry, and are highly respected. Prof. Dowson rightly derives the word gârdî from guard, but does not seem to know that it is still in occasional use, and so derived by natives.
Cunha is either ignorant or negligent. To quote one instance out of many, an editorial note has been bodily conveyed, including a misprint, from Ind. Ant. vol. III p. 182, to his p. 88, and enriched with a pleonasm, but acknowledged in no way whatever.

There is some pleasure in turning from the demerits of an old contributor to his virtues, and there is no doubt that Dr. Da Cunha's work is a better guide to the Portuguese remains around Bombay than any other yet accessible. He troubles himself little with the Hindu period, of which we have, indeed, no very authentic records. The name of Bassin we know to have been from its earliest mention Wa sa i, which title it retains in modern Marathi. Nor does it appear at an earlier period to have been so well known or prosperous as might be expected from its position. Chaul, on the other hand, has been known for about two hundred years as a great port, and apparently always under its present name. Dr. Da Cunha speaks of "the ancient city of Chaul, now called B e w a d a n d a;" but the fact is that Chaul is still a recognized name for the whole ancient city, which encloses two sides of Rewadanda, as the sea does the other two, and is now chiefly covered with palm gardens. The relation between the two would seem in their best days to have been that of London in general to the posts "below bridge."

Chaul, says our author (restricting the name to the ports without Portuguese Rewadanda), was originally called C h a m p a w a t i. Be this as it may, the Greek name was certainly Si m y l a; the modern Marathi name ([:]) is (Jesuitically transliterated) C h e n w a l: the local pronunciation may be best phoneticized to the English ear as 'Tsimwall'. It is impossible to conceive a modern Greek getting much nearer to the native orthodoxy than by using his ancestors' phrase; and the later writers who called it Chivil, Chivel, Chwell, etc., as exhaustively enumerated by Dr. Da Cunha, were evidently all aiming at the same pronunciation, and led Colonel Yule to an identification of which there can now be no doubt. The second syllable, 'awal', is.

Coast officers, believe in it. From a letter of Mr. Farmer, Esq., C.S., dated from Poona, and quoted by Grant Duff, vol. II. p. 345, it may be concluded that about 1790 Chaul barr had 4 fathoms of water. Hornsbook in 1837 gives 3 only; and we think the present depth is 4½ on rock.

2 Cl. Ptol. Geog. VII. 1. 6, VIII. xxvi. 3, and I. xvii. 3. 4. In the latter place, speaking of the mistakes of Marinus, Ptolomy says: "He places Simylla (a Zacusa), a seaport and commercial city of India, to the west, not only of Cape Komara, but even of the river Indus. Yet that city is mentioned only as south of the mouths of that river by those who have sailed that country and spent much time there in those parts, and by those who have returned we have been informed that the natives call it T im u l a (Tipu n)." —Ed.

3 See Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 282.
common in the nomenclature of Western India, as 'Virswal,' 'Bhousawal,' 'Lakivli,' &c., and apparently means 'a street of huts.' The first or characteristic syllable is more mysterious, but our author's conjecture that it designates 'Chinnu Deva Silahara' is as unlikely a derivation as is possible to conceive, seeing Chhitadaya (as his name is now properly deciphered) lived long after the name had become well-known. 'Choul' is modern 'Cheechee' language, and it is most unfortunate that this 'pigeon' term should have been selected for 'Hunterization' and official and scholastic use as 'Chaul.'

Dr. Da Cunha, however, as we have said, troubles himself comparatively little about the early Hindu period, and, indeed, is hardly the safest guide upon it. For instance, on the authority (apparently) of the Bhāṅgūṇḍī plates, he says that the Silāhāra family reigned 'at Śri Rājendrapāla,' which, as far as nomenclature can be trusted, must be the modern Thān or Tanza, the capital of the island of Salsette. Now there is no evidence in the plates that they reigned at Śri Siṅhakarṇa at all, but merely over it; and the grantee is called 'sovereign of 1,600 villages'; whereas Salsette or Shatashashthi seems never to have contained more than 66 (as its name implies), so that it was but a small part of his dominions, and Thān was but the head-quarters of the sub-division in which the grant was made; strictly analogous are the cases of the Portuguese and English, under both of whom grants have been made of land in Salsette by authorities not ruling in Thān, in which the latter refer, like the old copper-plate grantors, to the local authorities of Thān. The conjecture therefore taken up by Dr. Da Cunha, that Purī, which the Silāhāra plates mention as their capital, was Thān, 'the capital par excellence,' has no foundation; and, as most authorities are agreed in the opinion that Ghōrapuri, 'Elephant's, never can have been the site of a capital city, Rājapura, which was, within our own days at least, the capital of a talukā in the North Konkan, under the Marathas and English, may be taken as the most likely place, the more so as there is some shadow of royalty hanging about the name."

A still more obvious improbability attaches to the identification (p. 167) of Kalyanā in the Konkan with the capital of "Rāja Bhuvana the Sولاًکح, in the year of Vikrama 752," derived from the Ratnasālī. Surely Dr. Da Cunha knows that the name of the royal Solaākhī race conjures up no memories of the western sea-board."

Similarly the observations on cave-temples at

p. 255, and particularly the use of the name 'Vira Chula' for Elāhā, rest on obsolete surmises of Dr. Wilson's, and are of no value.

Leaving, however, this ground, we come to the Portuguese period, in respect to which, probably, Dr. Da Cunha's opportunities are only equalled by those of some of the Catholic clergy, one of whom, we believe, assisted him somewhat in his labours. It is a pity that none of the revered Fathers of the Company of Jesus have as yet favoured us with any treatise upon subjects which must be amply treated of in their own archives. For there is no chronicle of Portuguese India which does not bear witness to the unceasing activity of the Paulistines (Indian Jesuits), and even now their position in the Presidency of Bombay is one which must give every opportunity for research.

An error may be noted at p. 181, where our author quotes (without acknowledgment) from this journal certain fortifications near Bhivaṇḍi as 'built by the Portuguese at Thān.' They are ten miles from that place, and stand to it as Kara or Batoum, and not as the castles of the Dardanelles, do to Constantinople. It is quite evident the doctor has either not seen them, or not studied military engineering and topography. The forts built 'at Thān' were doubtless those still visible from the railway bridge. The great fort there, now the jail, was begun after 1728, and was still incomplete in 1739.

The late English and French authorities are available to most students on the spot; and Dr. Da Cunha would seem not to have been particularly well qualified to deal with the latter, since he speaks, apparently on his own authority, of 'the spirituæus Da Perron,' a term not admitted by the Academy as applicable to any wit—except perhaps 'Monsieur Ponch.'

It is unnecessary, therefore, to follow him further, and most of his readers will, we think, agree with the conclusions that he could have done a good deal more if he had tried to do less; and that it is a great pity he did not, as we have certainly no other work on the subject equal to his; and he blocks the way so effectually that unless he should take advice, cut his book again into the original two portions, and substitute for his useless illustrations some sort of an index, and a few notes on the Hindu and Muhammadan periods approaching the present state of knowledge on the subject, we are not likely to get anything better for a good while.
No. XLII.

At p. 15 of the present volume, I gave a copper-plate grant of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty. I understood, at that time, that this dynasty had been noticed in print only by Dr. Burnell in his South-Indian Palaeography. But I now find that an earlier account of it by Sir Walter Elliot is to be found in his second paper on Numismatic Gleanings at Madr. Jour. of Lit. and Sc., N. S., Vol. IV, p. 75.

I find, also, that the first of two copper-plate grants published by Bāl Gaṅgādhar Śastri at Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. II, p. 1, is a grant of the founder of this dynasty, Vīṣṇuvardhana I., or Kuṭa-Vīṣṇuvardhana, or, as he is named on the seal of the grant, Śrī-Biṭṭarasa, i.e. the king Śrī-Biṭṭa or Biṭṭi. It deduces his genealogy from his grandfather Raṇavikrama, the Pulikēṣi I. of the Aihoje inscription at Vol. V., p. 67, and his father, Kṛttivarmā I. The donor is Vīṣṇuvardhana. But he is only styled Yuvārjya; and the grant is dated on the day of the full-moon of the month Kārttika in the eighth year of the reign of the Mahārāja, and without any reference to the Śaka era. The Mahārāja must be Kṛttivarmā I., or Māṅgallivara, or Pulikēṣi II. If it is Kṛttivarmā I., the inference would be that the formal division of the Chalukya kingdom into the Western and Eastern territories was carried out before the death of Kṛttivarmā, and that his youngest son, Vīṣṇuvardhana I., was his Yuvārjya for the Eastern division. This inference might be drawn without necessitating any conflict with the statement of the Aihoje inscription that Māṅgallivara became king on the death of Kṛttivarmā, and that the succession afterwards went back to Pulikēṣi II., the son of Kṛttivarmā, because he was preferred by the people to the unnamed son whom Māṅgallivara destined to succeed himself. But it is hardly compatible with the statement of the Yewar inscription that, in conformity with the custom of the Chalukyaś, Māṅgallivara assumed the government only because Pulikēṣi II. was of too tender years to be recognized as king at the death of Kṛttivarmā I., and that he voluntarily restored the throne to Pulikēṣi II., as soon as the latter became of mature age. Whatever may be the circumstances under which Māṅgallivara succeeded,—whether as a usurper, or as regent,—the facts that he, by the Bāḍāmi inscription at Vol. VI, p. 368, succeeded in Śaka 488 or 489, and that Pulikēṣi II. (by No. XXVII. of this Series at Vol. VI, p. 72) did not succeed in Śaka 531 or 532, and (by the Aihoje inscription) was still reigning in Śaka 556,1 show,—1, that Pulikēṣi II. must certainly have been of very tender years at the death of Kṛttivarmā I., and,—2, that, consequently, Vīṣṇuvardhana I., being his younger brother, must have been a mere infant at that same time, and cannot have been installed as Yuvārjya. I would therefore hold,—1, that the formal separation of the Western and the Eastern branches took place at some time after the accession of Pulikēṣi II., and also after the date of this grant; 2, that the Mahārāja of the grant now noticed is Pulikēṣi II., though he is not mentioned in the genealogy; and 3, that, in accordance with this, the date of the grant is Śaka 559 (A.D. 617-8) or 560. The full titles of Vīṣṇuvardhana I. in this grant are Śrī-prithiviesotadabha, or ‘favourite of the world’; Yuvārjya; and Vīṣhamsiddhi, or ‘he who is successful under difficulties.’ The last was adopted as one of the standard mottoes of the Eastern Chalukyaś, and appears on the seals of some of the grants of subsequent kings of that dynasty.

Another copper-plate grant of Vīṣṇuvardhana I. is given as Plate xxiv. of Dr. Burnell’s South-Indian Palaeography. The only other name mentioned in this grant is that of his elder brother Satyāraya, i.e. Pulikēṣi II. An explanation of the title Vīṣhamsiddhi is given in l. 3, in the words dhala-jala-cena-giri-vīṣhama-durgāshu labhā-siddhihītād-Vīṣhama-

1 I shall shortly explain my reasons for altering my reading of the date of the Aihoje inscription from “when Śaka 506 had expired” to “when Śaka 556 had expired.”
The Indian Antiquary, [August, 1878.

siddhi, i.e. 'he who is called' Vishnusidhi, because he acquired success by land and sea, in the woods and on the mountains, under difficulties, and against fortresses,' or, perhaps, 'because he acquired success against fortresses, difficult of access, (which were situated) on land and in the sea and in the woods and on the mountains.' In these plates Vishnuvardhana I. is styled Mahārāja; the grant must, therefore, be subsequent to the formal establishment of the Eastern branch of the dynasty. It was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon in the month Śrāvaṇa. And the date, though it is not referred to the Śaka era, is specified more fully in numerical symbols in the last line, in the words sauk 16 sā 4 di 15, i.e. 'in the sixteenth year and the fourth month (of his reign), and on the fifteenth day (of the month).'

Also, translations of two more copper-plate grants of this dynasty have been given at Ind. Ant., Vol. II., p. 175.

The inscription now published is another Eastern Chālukya grant, from the original plates, which belong to Sir Walter Elliot, and are marked as having been obtained from J. R. Pringle, Esq. I have no information as to where they were found.

The plates are seven in number, about 7½' long by 2½' broad. The ring connecting them had been cut before they came into my hands; it is about 3½' thick, and 2½' in diameter. The seal is rather oval than circular, and has— at the top, the moon; in the centre, the motto Śrī-Vishnusiddhi; and at the bottom, a lotus.

The plates are well preserved, except towards the ends of the lines, where they are rather corroded, though they are sufficiently legible.

The language is Sanskrit, ungrammatical in the details of the grant. The characters are of the usual early Eastern Chālukya type. The Anuvāra is written usually above the line, but is sometimes irregularly placed; and in a few cases it is written on the bottom line,—e.g., in Chīṅhārdvīyasa, l. 24, Anjugarivamana, II. 28 and 29-30, Vaiṣṇavaravatā, l. 34, and Māndubhīyasa, l. 59.

It is a grant of Vīshnūvardhana II., the grandson of Vīshnūvardhana I., with whom the genealogy commences. It is dated on Wednesday, the tenth day of the bright fortnight of the month Chaitra, under the Maṅga nakshatra, in the second year of his reign. The date is not referred to the Śaka era, but it must be somewhere about Śaka 590 (A.D. 668-9).

This grant, and No. 5 of Major Dixon's copper-plates,—a grant of the Western Chālukya king Vīnayaditya Sātyāśraya, which is dated "when Śaka 614 had expired," in the thirteenth year of his reign, on Saturday, at the time of the sun's commencing his progress to the north, under the Rūḥiṇi nakshatra,—are the earliest instances that I have as yet met with of the day of the week being named.

Transcription.

First plate.

[["Svasti Śrīmatāṁ saha-bhuvana-saṁśaya-mahā-a-saṁ-

[+] ptā-lōkā-māṭribhir=māṭribhir=abhiraddhitānāmū Kārttikeya-pariraksha-prāpta-rājyavibhavānān bhaga-

[+] van-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-sāṁ(sa)mā(mas)ādita-vara-ha-lāṁcha(fcha)n-eśkhaṇa-khaṇa-vāsīka-haśa-mahi(h)mṛ-

[+] tām mahi(hi)-bhṛtām=iv-āchala-sthitāni aśvamēh-avabhṛt(a-tha)-snān-āpani-Kali-

[+] kyānāṁ kulak-alaukikarṣhṇaṁ(ahṣṇḥ) anēka-samara-sāṅghaṭṭ-epalabha-vijaya-pattak-

[+] g-maṇḍala-sa Vīshnūvardhah-mahārājasya pautraḥ sakal-āvati(ni)pati-maṅkata-

[+] ta[ta*]-gauṁāna-maṇi-mayāka(kha)-puṇjaḥ?]  

Second plate; first side.

[+] maṅjarita-charaṣa-saṅrūhayaṁ(ayya) saṁdhi-kṛṣ(kṛt)ya-saṁsādita-sarvva-siddhēḥ  

Jayasiṣaḥ-Vallabha-ma-

[+] Perhaps two letters, containing the name of another nakshatra also, have been broken away after the word Maṅgh in l. 60.

[+] Here, and in a few places below, the mark over the line seems to be, not the Aṣṭāda, but the final form of n.
[*] hārūjasyaḥ (ya) priya-ānujasyaḥ = Endra-sama-vikramasyaḥ = Ēndra-bhaṭṭāraṇaṣyaḥ priya-tanayaḥ (ya) śakti-trīyā-anamitā-śakti
[*] nēka-rājanya-mukha-kamala-sabhā-ābhyarochita-charanā-yugaśāḥ chatur-nadadhi-vēlā-vālāṇa-pa-
[19] chakravarttīta (tā-) lakṣaṇā-ālaṅkṛita-sārīra (rāḥ) parama-māheśvaro mātā-pitā-pādānudhyātaḥ Śrī-Vishnuvarddhana-

Second plate; second side.

[*] Mrānumi (?)-Dekontha-Rāvinīyū ity-ētasya gra[ma*] = madhyamasya Rēyūru-nāma-grāma (rūḥ) Bhāṛadvāja-gō-
[*] trāya Nāgāśarmmaṇaḥ pauṭrāya Agniśarmaṇaḥ (yaḥ) putra(trāya) Kuṇḍiśarmaṇaṇaḥ dvādaśāṁśa (sah) [1*] Bā (bāh) rādva [ja*]-gō-
[*] trāya Nāgāśarmaṇaḥ (yaḥ) pauṭrāya Śaṅkaraśarmaṇaḥ putra(trāya) Maṇḍiśarmaṇaṇaḥ [1*] daśāṁśa [1*] Puṇa Bhāṛadvāja-gōtrāya Nāgāśarmaṇaḥ puṇṭāya (yaḥ) Kuṇārāśarmaṇaṇaḥ [1*] aṣṭaṁśaḥ || Kuṇḍiliya-gōtrāya Śaṅkaraśarmaṇaṇaḥ dvaṇaṁśaḥ || Kuṇḍiliya-gōtrāya Kuṇḍi-
[*] raśarmaṇaḥ dvaṇaṁśaḥ [1*] Tasya-ānujya Agniśarmaṇaṇaḥ dvaṇaṁśaḥ || ĀṁśEyasya Kuṇḍiliya-

Third plate; first side.

[*] gōtrasya Kattyśarmaṇaḥ putra Kandaśarmaṇaḥ putra Kappaśarmaṇaḥ chatārāṁ putra aṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa
[*] Kappaśarmaṇaḥ ḫka aṁśaḥ [1*]* Puṇa Rēvaśarmaṇaḥ dvē aṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Kandasarmaṇaḥ dvē
[*] aṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Kandasarmaṇaḥ ardhadhaṁśaḥ || Kēyilābōyaśa Bhāṛadvāja-gōtra Bā-
[22] diśarmaṇaṁ muyyardhaṁśaḥ || Uṭpītrōbuasya Kāṭyā-gōtra Pāḷāśarmaṇa
[22] na ekāṁśaḥ || Kūvālabōyaśa Gauṭama-gōtra Kuṇḍiśarmaṇaṇaḥ ekkaṁśaḥ || Aṇa-
[22] buṁlabōyaśa Kāṣṭāḥ (yaḥ) pa-gōtra Ṛā (rā) diśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ. || Ciṇcāḥrōbuasya

Third plate; second side.

[*] Bhāṛadvāja-gōtra Sarvāśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ || Muḍālabōyaśa Kuṇḍiliya-gōtra Sarvāśa-
[21] rmmaṇaḥ putra Jēṭṭiśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Kuṇḍiśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Śaṅkaraśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁ-
[22] śaḥ [1*] Puṇa Sarvāśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Ěuddāśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Kattyśarmaṇaḥ putra
[*] Aṇjaśarmaṇaṇa putra Kattyśarmaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Sarvāśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Jēṭṭiśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁ-
[22] śaḥ [1*] Puṇa Samudraśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Jēṭṭiśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Anantaśarmaṇaṇa putra A-
[22] ṇjaśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Pāḷāśarmaṇaṇa putra Rēvaśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ aṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Puḷōrōbuasya

Fourth plate; first side.

[*] putra Vasiṇāraṇaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Beṇbidibōyaśa putra Ēruvāśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Puṇa Vēda-
[21] śarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Penbībidibōyaśa Kuṇḍiliya-gōtra Jēṭṭiśarmaṇaṇa ekkaṁśaḥ [1*] Kuṭāvabōyaśa Vē-
Fourth plate; second side.

[Dâdibôyasya Kaunâjîlîya-gôtra Gubota-sarmama ekkañâsa 1 (||) Ponphalûrbôyasya Kaunâjîlîya-gôtra Rêvasthrarmama ekkañâsa ||] 34

[va-sarmama ekkañâsa || Chêyûrbôyasya Kaunâjîlîya-gôtra Rêvasthrarmama mûnyard-dhaññasah || Miribô] 34

[yasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Anaata-sarmanama dvayañâsa || Mûdugonthabôyasya Bhîravadya] 34

[ja-gôtra Duggasarmanama ekkañâsa] [||*/] Chanthirûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Fâlûsrarmanama chatha] 32

[ri aûnisa || Mûratabôyasya Kaunâjîlîya-gôtra Veñûsîsrarmanama ekkañâsa || Mûddamûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Rêvasthrarmanama ekkañâsa ||] 32

Boppîrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)-

Fifth plate; first side.

[pagôtra Kumârasarmanama ekkañâsa 1 (||) Ponnalûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Sarvasthrarmanama dvayañâsa 1(1)] 34

[Vêgûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Kuñdisarmanama ekkañâsa (||) Kutumarbôyasya Bhîravadya-gôtra] 34

[Lu-ûddasarmanama ekkañâsa (||) Kondalûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Kuñdisarmanama ekkañâsa (||) Ma-] 34

[tûnthibôyasya Kaunâjîlîya-gôtra Veñûsîsrarmanama ekkañâsa (||) Alabûnumabôyasya Kaâ-] 34

[qûjîlîya-gôtra Bhîtuîsrarmanama arddhaññasah (||) Kësavabôyasya Bhîravadya-gôtra Vinâyasthrarmanama] 34

[ekkañâsa] [||*/] Punnâ Vinâyasthrarmanama ekkañâsa (||) Râ(râm)puñ(hu)rbôyasya Kaunâjîlîya-gôtra Jetüisarmanama ekkañâsa [||*/] 32

Sixth plate; second side.

[Pûlkonthabôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Rêvasthrarmanama ekkañâsa (||) Pundiribôya(âya) Bhîravadya-gôtra Pavrsthrarmanama e-] 34

[ekkañâsa || Kësavabôyasya Vinâyasthrarmanama ekkañâsa] [||*/] Punnâ Vinâyasthrarmanama ekkañâsa (||) Mûratabôyasya] 34

[Kaunâjîlîya-gôtra Châmûnisarmanama ekkañâsa (||*/) Punnâ Shiûva(âya)sarmanama ekkañâsa ||] 34

[Rëkâdiûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Dûnûsrarmanama ekkañâsa || Punnâ] 34

[Rëkâdiûrbôyasya Rêvasthrarmanama ekkañâsa || Mûnîkibôyasya Bhîravadya-gôtra Kândûsrarmanama ekkañâsa || Chêbûnûûthibôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gô-

Sixth plate; first side.

[tra Virasthrarmanama ekkañâsa || Eddûnûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Nâga-] 34

[sarmanama ekkañâsa || Lûttalûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gôtra Nâga-] 34

[sarmanama ekkañâsa || Chîchhakûnûrbôyasya Kâsyâ(âya)pa-gô-] 34

[goûtra Nandîsrarmanama ekkañâsa || Samaâribôyasya Veñûsîsrarmanama ekkañâsa || Mûnûnbôyasya Bhîravadya-gôtra Kattisarmanama dvayañâsa] 34

Sixth plate; second side.

[Bala-vîjay-ârûgna-nimittam-asamâhâi samâpâpta(pta) [||*/] Gamûyâ râja-va-] 34

[habha(âha) sarvâ-parîhâm(âm) pariharantu parîharântu [||*/] 32

[Apî cha têshâ(âshâ) sîdôkah [||*/] Bhûmi-dânât-paran-dânâm na bhûtan-na] 32

[bhâvishyati tasya-nâva haraâât-pâpan-na bhûtan-na bhâvishyati ||] 32

* Mna was first engraved, and the lower m was then partially erased.
Hail! The grandchild of the Great King Vīṣṇu-vardhana who illumined all the territories of the regions with his banners of victory acquired in the contest of many battles, and who adorned the family of the Chālukyaśa, who are glorious; who are of the lineage of Mānava, which is praised over the whole world; who are the descendants of Hārītī; who have been nourished by mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind; who have acquired the dignity of sovereignty through the protection of Kārttikāyā; who have had 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 Nārayaṇa; who are of immovable stability like the mountains; and who have had the guilt of the Kali age removed by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—the dear son of Indra, the venerable one, who was equal in prowess to (the god) Indra and was the dear younger brother of the Great King Jayasimha Vāllabha, whose feet, which were as lotuses, were covered with clusters of flowers which were the rays of the jewels set in the tiaras of all kings (who bowed down before him), and who attained success in all things by practising profound meditation,—(viz.) the Great King Vīṣṇu-vardhana,—whose two feet have honour done to them by the court of the lotuses which are the faces of the numerous kings who are bowed down by his (possession of the) three constituents of regal power; whose fame extends up to the circuit of the shores of the four oceans; who practises being the refuge of all people in accordance with the sacred writings composed by Mānava and others; who,

Translation.

like the Wielder of the discus, has his body decorated with the marks of the status of a universal emperor; who is a zealous worshipper of Maheśvara; and who meditates on the feet of his mother and his father,—thus issues his commands to all people:

Be it known to all! The village of Rāyūra, in the midst of the villages of Pusiṅḍi and Paṅgūnida and Mrānumi and Dekaṅtā and Rāyūra, in the district of Kamarāshtra, has been apportioned by Us, for the sake of strength and victory and freedom from sickness, in the following manner. Twelve shares to Kūṇḍiśārmā of the Bhāradvāja gotra, the son's son of Nāgaśārmā and the son of Agniśārmā. Ten shares to Maṅgaśārmā of the Bhāradvāja gotra, the son's son of Nāgaśārmā, and the son of Śaṁkaraśārmā. Again, eight shares to Kūmakāraśārmā of the Bhāradvāja gotra, the son of Nāgaśārmā. Two shares to Śaṁkaraśārmā of the Kauḍilya gotra. Two shares to Kūmakāraśārmā of the Kauḍilya gotra. Two shares to his younger brother, Agniśārmā. Four shares to Kappārārāma of the house of Alaboya and of the Kauḍilya gotra, the son of Kandāšārmā who was the son of Kattīṣārmā. Again, one share to Kappaśārmā. Again, two shares to Rāvaśārmā. Again, two shares to Kandāśārmā. Again, half a share to Kandāśārmā. Three and a half shares to Bāḍiśārmā of the house of Kūmakārābaya and of the Bhāradvāja gotra. One share to Pālaśīrmā of the house of Utpitarubaya and of the Kauḍiya gotra. One share to Kūṇḍiśārmā

Coldwell in his Grammar of the Dravidian Languages; but it is one of the forms given by Mr. Kittel in his Notes concerning the Numerals of the ancient Dravidians (Ind. Antiq., Vol. II., p. 94). Sandison's Dictionary gives two words containing it,—muyy-erol-adī, 'the carpenter-bee, which has six feet' (or lit., 'three twos of feet'); and muyy-fr-mopā, 'Shannuska, the god of war, who has six faces' (or lit., 'three twos of faces'). (In the analogy of these two words, muyy-adīka may possibly mean 'three halves', i.e. 'one and a half'; but it seems to me to be used in the sense of šrī-ūcīt, 'three and a half'.)
of (the house of) Kavilaboya and the Gantama gotra. One share to Padiisarm of (the house of) Alabunaboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Sarvasarma of (the house of) Chinturboya and the Bharadvaja gotra. One share to Jettiisarm of (the house of) Mudumbabya and the Kaundilyagotra, the son of Sarvasarma. Again, one share to Kaundisarma. Again, one share to Saunikarasarma. Again, one share to Sarvasarma. Again, one share to Luddasarma. One share to Kattiisarma, the son of Ajaisarma who was the son of Kattiisarma. Again, three shares to Sarvasarma. One share to Samudrasarma, the son of Devasarma. Again, one share to Jettiisarma. One share to Ajaisarma, the son of Anantaasarma. Three shares to Revasarma. One share to Vasnasarma, the son of Pulolurboya. One share to Aruvasarma, the son of Benbidiboya. Again, one share to Vedaasarma. One share to Jakkisarma of (the house of) Penbidiboya and the Kaundilyagotra. One share to Vebasarman of (the house of) Kesa-vaboya. Two shares to Sarvasarma of the Bharadvaja gotra, the son of Vinayasarma who was the son of Agnisarma. Two shares to Vasudevasarma of the Kaundilyagotra, the son of Nandiisarma who was the son of Venusisarma. Two shares to Nagasarma of the Kaundilyagotra, the son of Nandiisarma who was the son of Vinayasarma. Two shares to Devasarma of (the house of) Paumudidiboya and the Kaundilyagotra. Again, one share to Badiisarma. One share to Gabotasarman of (the house of) Dudiboya and the Kaundilyagotra. One share to Revasarma of (the house of) Tondadurboya and the Kauksikagotra. Three and a half shares to Revasarma of (the house of) Choeyurboya and the Kaundilyagotra. Two shares to Anantaasarma of (the house of) Miritiboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Duggnasarma of (the house of) Mudugonthiboya and the Bharadvaja gotra. Four shares to Palaasarma of (the house of) Chanthurboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Venusisarma of (the house of) Maraataboya and the Kaundilyagotra. One share to Revasarma of (the house of) Muddumurboya and the Kasyapagotra. Again, one share to Revasarma. One share to Kumaramarma of (the house of) Boppiboya and the Kasyapagotra. Two shares to Sarvasarma of (the house of) Ponnadurboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Kauandisarma of (the house of) Vetimboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Luddasarman of (the house of) Kutmurboya and the Bharadvaja gotra. One share to Kauandisarma of (the house of) Kondaliboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Venusisarma of (the house of) Muttinthiboya and the Kaundilyagotra. Half share to Bhattisarma of (the house of) Alabunaboya and the Kaundilyagotra. One share to Vinayaasarma of (the house of) Ke-savaboya and the Bharadvajarotra. Again, one share to Vinayaasarma. One share to Chanaundisarma of (the house of) Maraataboya and the Kaundilyagotra. Again, one share to Sivasarma. One share to Donasarma of (the house of) Rekadiboya and the Kasyapagotra. Again, one share to Revasarma of (the house of) Rekadiboya. One share to Kandasarman of (the house of) Munikolboya and the Bharadvajarotra. One share to Viraasarma of (the house of) Chembudthiboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Nagasarma of (the house of) Edoqadiboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Nagasarma of (the house of) Luttajurboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Nandiisarma of (the house of) Chichehakadiboya and the Kasyapagotra. One share to Venusisarma of (the house of) Samatiboya. Two shares to Kattiisarma of (the house of) Manduboya and the Bharadvajarotra.

Let future favourites of kings treat (this grant), and cause it to be treated, with all
exemption (from taxation). Moreover, there are these verses for them:—There has not been, and there shall not be, any gift better than a gift of land; there has not been, and there shall not be, any sin worse than confisca-
ing such a gift! Land has been given by many, and has been continued in grant by many; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefits of it!

This charter is the writing of Vināyaka, the son of Dirghāchāya, veḻayīlañkanmāraṇaknd-Era, from Our own word of mouth (given) in the second year of Our augmenting reign, in the month Chaitra, in the bright fortnight, under the Mahā nakshatra, on Wednesday.

No. XLIII.

This is another Eastern Chalukya copper-plate grant, from the original plates, which belong to Sir Walter Elliot, and are marked as having been obtained from Mr. Porter. I have no information as to where they were found.

The plates are about 6½ long by 2½ broad. They are numbered; and, contrary to the usual rule, the writing commences on the first side of the first plate. Two plates only are now forthcoming; the rest of the grant has been lost, and seems to have been already missing when it was forwarded by Mr. Porter. The ring connecting the plates had been cut before they came into my hands; it is about ¼ thick, and 3½ in diameter. The seal is circular, about 1½ in diameter, and, as in the preceding case, has,—at the top, the moon; in the centre, the motto Śrī-Viṣṇuvardhī; and at the bottom, a lotus. The language is Sānskṛti. The characters are of the usual early Eastern Chalukya type. The Anuvāda is written above the line,—except in viṣṇuṣ neatly, l. 17, and suṣūnasvāra, l. 20, where it is on the line from want of space in which to insert it above the line.

The genealogy commences with Kṛṣṭivarmā I. It is another grant of Viṣṇuvardhana II., and is dated in the fifth year of his reign. Here, again, the date is not referred to the Śaka era. But, the statement, that the grant was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun, which occurred on the day of the new-moon of the month Pāḷigaṇa, enables us to determine that the date of it is probably Śaka 581 (A.D. 659-60). The details of this calculation will be explained fully hereafter.

This inscription gives the earliest instance that I have yet met with of the use of the epithet samadhiṣṭa-puṣca-mahāsadbha, and the only instance in which I have as yet found it applied to a paramount sovereign.

Transcription.

First plate; first side.

[1] Svasti Śrīmatāṁ sakala-bhuvana-saṃstāya-mānamā-Mānavaya-sagōṭraṇaṁ


First plate; second side.

[6] laṁkarshonḥ(trishôḥ) Śrī-Kṛṣṭivarmmāṇaḥ pramāṇā sakal-āvanipati-makuta-tata-ghatita-

[7] maṇi-mayukha-puṇja-pi(pī)mja(ja)rita-charaṇa-yugālasya Śrī-Viṣṇuvardhanamahārājasya

[8] napatā sakti-traya-saṁśādī-āsēsā-bhū-maṇdal-ādhipatīḥ

[9] narakta-prakṛti-sāmpādita-saurva-saṃpadaḥ Śrī-Jayasi(sī)n(ha)-Valabha-va(ma)hārājasya


Second plate; first side.


[12] sthānāḥ Viṣṇu-siva Śrī-nivāsḥ Śrīnāma Viṣṇu-vardhanamahārājāḥ Gudrāhāra-

11 See notes 2 and 7.
12 Here, and in mādāyākṣaṁ, l. 20, the mark on the upper line is probably not the Anuvāda, but the final form of mū.
13 Yā was first engraved, and then the stroke denoting the a was partially erased.
14 In the same way, aḥ was engraved and corrected into aḥ.
Hail! The great-grandson of Śrī-Kṛttivarman who adored the family of the Chaṇḍikṣ, who are glorious; who are of the lineage of Mānaya, which is praised over the whole world; who are the descendents of Hāriti; who have been nourished by mothers who are the seven mothers of mankind; who have attained an uninterrupted continuity of prosperity through the favour of Kārttikēya; who have had all kings made their own (feudatories) by the sign of the Boar, which they acquired through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa; who are of immovable stability like the mountains; and who have had the guilt of the Kali age removed by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—the grandson of the Great King Śrī-Viṣṇuvardhana whose feet were made to appear of a reddish-yellow colour by the rays of the jewels which were set in the diadems of all the kings (who bowed down before him),—the beloved son of Indra, the venerable one, whose body was adorned with victory acquired in many battles, and who was the dear brother of the Great King Śrī-Jyāśamihovallabha who acquired all the regions of the earth by means of the three constituents of power, and who achieved all prosperity through his subjects being devoted to his virtuous qualities,—(viz.) the glorious Viṣṇuvardhana, the Great King,—who has attained the five great sounds (of musical instruments), and who possesses all accomplishments, and who, like (the god) Viṣṇu, dwells with the goddess of fortune,—issues his commands to all who reside at the village of Pāli in the district of Gudrahara and in the vicinity of (the village of) Arutaṅkūr:

At this village, in the fifth year of Our victorious reign, in the month Phalguna, on the day of the new-moon, on account of an eclipse of the sun, [there has been given] to Dhruvasarma, who has studied two Vedas,—the son of Dhruvasarma, who inhabited (the city of) Asanapura, and who was of the Kāhyapa gōtra, and who was a fellow-student of Nāvuchitti, the knower of three Vedas, in the school of the Tāttiriyas, and who knew the Vedas and the Vēddagas and the epics and the Puranas and the Nyāya and the numerous sacred writings, and who performed many sacrifices commencing with the Agniśṭoma and ending with the Purandarika,—the son of Dechisarma, who knew the Vedas and the Vēddagas.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTES.

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

(Continued from p. 170)

No. XXI.—The Old Tanjor Armoury.

Mahirāja Śivāji, the last king of Tanjor, died in October 1855.

An eye-witness has recorded the stately and solemn spectacle of his funeral, when magnificently arrayed and loaded with the costliest jewels, his body, placed in an ivory palanquin was borne by night through the torchlit streets of his royal city amid the wail of vast multitudes lamenting the last of their ruling race. The change of death, it was said, cast an
air of power and majesty over the old king's features, so that he almost seemed to acknowledge the salutations of the crowds as he passed in state for the last time through the embattled gateway of these wide-circling ramparts round which so many famous commanders and the armies of so many races have met in fight. There, on the bank of the sacred river, without the walls, a huge pile of sandalwood was laid, and with great weeping the royal robes were taken off one by one, and the body, wrapped in a simple muslin garment, placed upon the pile, and heaped over with the fragrant fuel. The nearest descendant, a boy of twelve, was carried thrice round the pile, and at the last circuit a pot of water was dashed to pieces on the ground, emblematic of the life of man. The boy then lit the pile, and the loud long-sustained lament of a nation filled the air as the flames rose.

With this king the raja became extinct, but eventually all the personal and landed property, the palace, treasury, jewels, &c., were made over by Government to the chief Raja,—everything in the palace, except the contents of the old armoury, which, as useless to the family, the Government decided to remove and disperse. The need of preparation for war and all its pomp and circumstance had long since disappeared from Tanjore, and the 'armoury' consisted of great heaps of old weapons of all conceivable descriptions, lying piled upon the floor of the Sangita Mahall = 'music-hall,' a large detached building within the precincts of the palace, entered by a low massive antique portico. The floor of the interior was sunken, much resembling a huge swimming-bath, and a covered gallery ran round the wall above, whence, it was said, the ladies of the court in old days used to look down upon games, wrestling-matches and the like. But the bottom had long been occupied by many tons of rusty arms and weapons, in confused heaps, coated and caked together with thick rust. Hundreds of swords, straight, curved, and ripple-edged, many beautifully damascened and inlaid with hunting or battle scenes in gold; many broad blades with long inscriptions in Marathi or Kanarese characters, and some so finely tempered as to bend and quiver like whalebone. There were long gauntlet-hilts, brass or steel, in endless devices, hilts inlaid with gold, and hilts and guards of the most tasteful and elaborate steel-work. There were long-bladed swords and executioners' swords, two-handed, thick-backed, and immensely heavy. Daggers, knives, and poniards by scores, of all imaginable and almost unimaginable shapes, double- and triple-bladed; some with pistols or spring-blades concealed in their handles, and the hilts of many of the kuttars of the most beautiful and elaborate pierced steel-work, in endless devices, rivalling the best medieval European metal-work. There was a profusion of long narrow thin-bladed knives, mostly with bone or ivory handles very prettily carved, ending in parrot-heads and the like, or the whole handle forming a bird or monster, with legs and wings pressed close to the body, all exquisitely carved. The use of these seemed problematical: some said they were used to cut fruit, others that they had been poisoned and stuck about the roofs and walls of the women's quarters, to serve the purpose of spikes or broken glass!

Eventually the whole array was removed to Trichinapalli and deposited in the arsenal there, and after a committee of officers had sat upon the multifarious collection, and solemnly reported the ancient arms unfit for use in modern warfare, the Government, after selecting the best for the Museum, ordered the residue to be broken up and sold as old iron. This was in 1863. Being on the spot at the time, I was able to inspect and purchase a quantity of the weapons. A curious point about them was the extraordinary number of old European blades, often graven with letters and symbols of Christian meaning, attached to hilts and handles most distinctively Hindu, adorned with figures of gods and idolatrous emblems. There was an extraordinary number of long straight cut-and-thrust blades termed Phiraiyas, which Mr. Sinclair, in his interesting list of Dakhat weapons (Proc. Asit. vol. II. p. 216) says means 'the Portuguese,' and were "either imported from Europe by the Portuguese, or else made in imitation of such imported swords." Mr. Sinclair adds that both Grant Duff and Meadows Taylor have mentioned that the importation was considerable, and that Raja Sivaji's favourite sword Bhavani was a Guern blade. This sword is figured in the History of the Mahrattas, and is said to be still preserved as a sacred relic in the Sitarr family. It is curious to note how ancient and wide-spread the custom of giving names
to favourite swords has been; there was the Prophet's sword Zulafkair, the Cid's Durindana, King Arthur's "brand Excalibur," the Dwarf-sword Tifrowg of Scandinavian Sagas, and many another celebrated in the annals of chivalry. The Tanjor armory strongly confirmed the statements of the great importation of European blades; it contained hundreds, whole or in pieces. Two phiranyas in my possession have double-channeled blades, one set in a beautiful hilt of copper inlaid all over with ornamentation in gold, including four figures of griffins and ten of gods, the blade bearing on one side this inscription, repeated in each groove,  * C M E O S E N Y S *  and on the other side the letters  O E N B C T  also twice repeated. The blade of the other phiranyak set in a hilt covered with tasteful gold foliow-work, spread also over hold-fasts prolonged four inches up the blade, bears these symbols and letters in one line on each side * * * N O V A E X * * * These, as well as scores of others, were evidently European blades, and the signification of the letters may probably be obvious to antiquaries conversant with old weapons. And besides these there were multitudes of kuttars with handles of very exquisite pierced steel-work, in which were set blades evidently formed of pieces of European swords bearing various inscriptions.

I have seen no medieval or modern steel-work surpassing these Hindu hilts in excellence of workmanship, artistic ingenuity, and tastefulness of design and ornament. The finish shown is endless, and the execution minute and admirable. The sides of the handles, the crossbars between for grasping, the tops of the handles, and the hold-fasts running from them up the blades, are all wrought in steel, generally pierced, and hardly any two designs the same. All the mass of weapons when taken from the armory were thickly caked over with rust, and too many lamentably corroded and destroyed. It was only after great and persevering labour that the inrustations, perhaps of centuries, were more or less successfully removed, and the designs and inscriptions disclosed.

One kuttar of fantastic design now by me has the grasp covered by a shield-shaped guard of pierced steel, bearing a griffin on each outer rim, from whose backs small blades project on each side at right angles to the central blade, which bears this inscription on both sides: —  ** INTI  ** DOMINIX (See Fig. 6 in the first of the accompanying plates.) Another fantastic dagger has three long narrow blades parallel to one another, the middle one longest, and on it are the letters  E D R O . A kuttar (Figs. 3, 3) with a handle throughout of beautiful workmanship, the openwork sides an arrangement of griffins, phoenixes, and clustered fishes, and the hold-fasts of the blade each four fancifully grouped parrots, bears on one side the blade, which is broad and three-channeled, the letters  S . M . V . N . , and on the other the letters  C V M , with a human face in a crescent further up. A second kuttar (Fig. 5)1 has the handle of fine pierced steelwork covered with a guard representing a cobra with expanded hood between two rampant griffins; the long narrow blade exhibits a single deep groove, in which on one side are the letters  I O H A N I S  V L L , and on the other four or five indistinct letters and then  A L I V N . A third, with a handsome well-wrought steel hilt, after the thick layer of rust that coated it had been removed, disclosed, to my surprise, in two deep channels on each side the blade, the well-known name  A N D R E A F E R A R A  (sic).

It seemed strange to meet the famous Italian swordsman of three centuries ago in such an association, but Sir Walter Elliot has informed me that when a notorious freebooter was captured in the Southern Marathia Country many years since, his sword was found to be an "Andrea Ferrara." So widely have these old European blades been spread over India; whether frequently found in Bengal and the North-West I do not know; but in the extensive collections of Eastern weapons in the India, South Kensington, and Bethnal Green Museums there are very few—less than a dozen—blades that appear unmistakably European, whereas in the Tanjor armory they were numbered by scores; perhaps they had been collected there for a long period. One noticeable feature was the immense number and variety of arrows and arrowheads: the former, as usual, of reeds, with bone or ivory nocks and spike-heads of all possible

---

1 1, 1, are the side and front of one handle; and 2, 2, and 4, 4, on the plate represent two others.
OLD HINDU ARROWHEADS.
ACTUAL SIZE.
shapes, short and lengthened, rounded, three- or four-sided, channelled, or bulging in the centre; many were barbed, and many flat-tipped or ending in small globes,—perhaps for killing birds without breaking the skin; and there were some headed with hollow brass balls perforated with three or four holes, which were said to be filled with some inflammable composition and shot burning on to roofs and into houses. (See No. 13, on the accompanying plate of Old Hindu Arrow-Heads.) Under the head each arrow was elaborately gilt and painted for six inches down the stem, and also for the same length above the nock, and each bore above the feathers an inscription of two lines in Marathi characters, in gold.

But besides the arrows there were extraordinary quantities of detached heads embedded in the mud of the floor, apparently of more antique types and still more fantastic forms, some not a little elegant: for example,—No. 4 on the same plate,—two paroquets joined beak to beak and breast to breast, their tails meeting in the point; No. 12, a flat blade with both edges rippled; No. 10, a double prong with barbed points; Nos. 3, 5, 6, 9, and 16,—several heads broad and tapering to a point, with curious openwork centres, sometimes all the centre open, the head indeed being merely a steel rim drawn to a point; these open-work heads were declared to be peculiarly dangerous, the flesh closing into them, and rendering extrication very painful. Some long spike-heads (Nos. 8, 14, and 15) were grooved on the sides or roughened under the point, for the purpose, it was said, of carrying glutinous poison. There were also crescent-heads (Nos. 1 and 7), a very antique form, used in the Roman circus-games; with such an arrow Amantaguna-Pandion, the king of Madura, is said to have destroyed an Asura sent in the form of a striped serpant by the Samnals or Jainas to devour the inhabitants of Madura. Some small elegant heads inlaid in gold (No. 11), with an elephant and monograms, appeared intended for royal use. A considerable number of the large heavy arrow-heads used by native huntsmen was also found, some four or six inches long and more than an inch wide. Several were identical in form with arrow-heads brought by Commander Cameron from the interior of Africa; a barb with only one tang is common to both continents, and so is the crescent shape.

The demand for blades of European make formerly existing in India seems rather strange when it is remembered how skilful Indian smiths were, and how famous Indian steel has been from remote antiquity. The workmanship of the native hilts can scarcely be surpassed, and it might be supposed that the smiths who made them could also have forged blades as good as those of European origin which they actually bear; moreover, the districts of Salem, Koyam- batur, and North Árka, in which the best Indian steel has been manufactured from time immemorial, are almost contiguous to Tanjor, where a great collection of European weapons had been assembled, and the name of Arumachelam of Salem has been known all over India for the last fifty years: the shikárdh knives and spear-heads made by him could not be excelled, hardly equalled, in temper and finish by any English smith, and the same might be said of him in all iron and steel wrought by hand. It is in this region that the famous ferrum Indicium was probably produced, a hundred talents of which was held a fitting present to Alexander the Great: for, though the now well-known fusing and smelting process is said to be practised all over India, it is in these southern districts that the ore is richest and most magnetic, and hence the much-prized grey-steel ingots, whose production was so long a puzzle to the scientific, were exported far and wide to Damascus and Europe. There are many casual allusions which show how highly Indian steel was estimated in antiquity; for example, Clemens Alexandrinus, discussing of luxury, observes, "One can cut meat without Indian iron." And when, in venturing some remarks (Ind. Ant. vol. V. p. 239) upon the occurrence of Roman coins in the neighbourhood of aqua-marin mines in Koyamatur, and observing that I knew of nothing they were likely to have been used in purchasing except the gems, I might have added the steel so abundant and excellent both there and in the bordering district, Salem. When at the end of the past century some pieces of Indian steel were sent to the Royal Society, none could conjecture the method of their preparation, and it remained long unknown; even now somewhat of the more delicate manipulation is a secret amongst the native smiths, but the general method is understood, and may be read, well described, in Ure's Dictionary of Arts and Manufactures, art. 'Steel,'
and elsewhere. Nothing can be more simple and primitive than the native process, which, albeit involving a recondite chemical application, is probably the same now as in the days of Alexander the Great. The ore used is the magnetic oxide of iron, which, though sometimes forming small hills, is generally dug out from various depths. Occasionally it forms regular octahedrons yielding 72 per cent. of iron. The furnace is formed of clay, four or five feet high, cone-shaped, with a hearth at the bottom, round, and about twenty inches in diameter, the mouth at the top half that breadth. A pipe is inserted at the bottom of the cone, the outer end of which is connected with a pair of bottle-shaped skin-bellows. A layer of charcoal is placed at the bottom of the furnace and lit, on that a layer of ore, and this is repeated till there are seven layers of charcoal and as many of ore. Two men then work the bellows for two hours, when all the ore fuses, and the metal runs together in a mass. It costs less than a rupee to construct a furnace, and about thirty rupees' worth of iron can be made in it in a year. But a further process is necessary to convert the iron into the famous steel, and that process hardly yet seems thoroughly understood; its success probably depends upon a manual instinctive dexterity handed down from generations. The iron cake is again fused, and some uncharred wood and green leaves of the Aselepias gigantea are enclosed with it in the crucible. The fusing takes twenty-four hours, and on breaking the crucible the steel is found in a sort of button, the surface radiated as though crystallized. It has increased in weight, is extremely hard, of compact texture, and brilliant white colour at the fracture, and requires to be annealed three or four times, and exposed to a red heat for twelve or sixteen hours.

This is the far-famed 'wootz,' or Indian steel, whence were forged those Damascus blades that would shear asunder fine muslin webs floating in the air, and sever sheets of paper drifted against them on running water. The success of the forging is said to depend on the due application and proportion of the Aselepias leaves. This plant grows, dock-like, in profusion over the plains and waste ground of the dry central districts of Madras. In Malabar and on the rainy western coast it is hardly ever seen, and there, though the laterite soil is richly charged with iron and extensively smelted, the Malabar smiths cannot produce the steel—they lack the secret of the mysterious leaf. The Aselepias plant throughout its stem and broad bluish-green leaves is filled with a milky juice, and its effect on metal depends on a recondite chemical cause, very far from obvious; and it is difficult to imagine how it could have been discovered in an unscientific age and country: its use and application were probably hit upon by accident, like the making of glass and the Tyrian dye.

But the Indian steel has one defect which goes far to explain the rarity of its appearance, and the profusion of European steel, in great armouries of old date, like that in the Tanjor palace, and that defect is its exceeding brittleness. Worked up in the European style it would break like glass. Hence, doubtless, the preference shown for the tougher and more enduring European blades. Moreover, the ancient Indian smiths seem to have had a difficulty in hitting on a medium between this highly refined brittle steel and a too-soft metal. In ancient sculptures, as at Srirangam, near Trichinapalli, life-sized figures of armed men are often represented bearing kutars or long daggers of a peculiar shape; the handles, not so broad as in later kutars, are covered with a long narrow guard, and the blades, 24 inches broad at bottom, taper very gradually to a point through a length of 18 inches, more than three-fourths of which is deeply channelled on both sides with six converging grooves. There were many of these in the Tanjor armoury, perfectly corresponding with those sculptured in the old temples, and all were so soft as to be easily bent,—recalling the fault noted by Tacitus and Caesar in the weapons of the ancient Gauls and Germans.

MISCELLANEA.

HIWAN THSANG'S ACCOUNT OF HARSHAVARDHANA.

The reigning king is of the Pei-sha (Vāśyā) caste; is surnamed Ho-li-sha-fa-t'can-na (Harshāvardhana); he rules over and holds the whole country. They reckon three kings in two generations. His father's surname was Po-lo-keis-lo-fa-tan-na (Prabhākaravar-

\[1\] In Chinese Hi-kseng, 'increaser of joy.' See note 9 below.
your father: what merit will be comparable to yours? We supplicate you, do not spurn our wishes."

"In all times," replied the royal prince, "the inheritance of a kingdom has been a heavy load. Before mounting a throne one ought to consider maturely. For myself, in truth, I have only moderate ability; but now, that my father and my brother are no more, if I decline the inheritance of the crown, shall I thereby do any good to the people? It is right that I should obey public opinion, and forget my weakness and incapacity. Now, on the banks of the Ganges there is a statue of Kuan-ten-ts'ai-pu-na (Avalokiteśvara Boddhisattva). As it works many miracles, I wish to go and pray to it." He went at once to the statue, fasted, and made fervent prayers. The Boddhisattva, touched by his heartfelt sincerity, appeared to him in person and asked thus: "What do you ask for with such pressing importunity?"

"I have done nothing but accumulate evils," replied the royal prince; "I have lost my father, who was good and affectionate, and my elder brother, a pattern of gentleness and kindness, has been Shamefully massacred. Their death has been to me a double affliction. I perceive that I have but little ability; however, the inhabitants of the state wish to raise me to honours, and require that I should succeed to the throne, to render famous the heritage of my father. But, as my mind is dull and devoid of knowledge, I venture to ask your holy opinion."

The Pu-si (Boddhisattva) said to him: "In your previous life you dwelt in a forest; you were the Bhiaksh of a hermitage, and you discharged your duties with indefatigable zeal. By the effect of that virtuous conduct you have become the son of this king. The king of the state of Kiu-cu (Karnasuvrana) having destroyed the law of Buddha, or Rājyaśri. To Bhanḍā, a subject of high rank, Rājyaśrihanda and Harshavardhana were entrusted for their education. Rājyaśri was married at Kanyakubja to Grahavarmā, the son of Avantivarman, of the Manthara family; but on the day of Prabhakarvardhana's death Grahavarmā was massacred by the king of Mālava, and Rājyaśri carried off Rājyaśrihanda, taking Bhanḍā with him, and an army of ten thousand horse, followed the king of Mālava and slew him; but he himself was defeated and killed by Sāgas Narendragupta, king of Gaurī or Beagul, and succeeded by his younger brother Harsha, whom his officers urged to avenge his brother's death. But the Hindu epic breaks off on the recovery of Rājyaśri among the Vindhyā mountains. — See Hall's Vatsaveda, pp. 51, 52; Jour. Ro. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. X. pp. 38-46.

Bhandi—according to Bāja.
it is right that you should succeed to the crown, to restore the splendour of the kingdom. If you fill your heart with affection and compassion, if your mind sympathize with distress, before long you will rule over the five Indies. If you wish to prolong the duration of your dynasty, it will be necessary to follow my instructions. Through my secret protection I will obtain for you distinguished honour, and no neighbouring king will be able to resist you. But do not ascend the Sīhāśana (throne), nor take the title of Mahārāja.

Having received these instructions he returned. He then accepted the inheritance of royalty, called himself by the name of prince royal (Kumāra-rāja), and took the title of Shi-lo-o-tie-to (Śiḷādiya).

Thereupon he gave the following orders to all his subjects:—"The death of my brother is not yet punished, and the neighbouring states are not obedient to my laws; I do not know when I shall be able to eat in peace. Let all you magistrates unite your hearts and arms."

Immediately he collected all the troops of the kingdom, and caused the soldiers to be exercised. He had an army of five thousand elephants; the cavalry numbered twenty thousand horse; and the infantry fifty thousand men. He marched from west to east to punish the insubordinate kings. The elephants did not put off their housings, nor the men their cuirasses. Finally, in the middle of the sixth year, he made himself master of the five Indies. After increasing his dominions, he still further added to his army; the elephant corps was raised to sixty thousand, and the cavalry to a hundred thousand.

At the end of thirty years the war ceased, and, by his wise administration, he spread union and peace everywhere. He applied himself to economy; cultivated virtue, and practised doing good at the risk of neglecting food and sleep. He forbade throughout the five Indies the use of meat, adding that if any one slew a living being he should be condemned to death without hope of pardon. Near the banks of the Ganges he caused he was raised many thousands of Stūpas that were each a hundred feet high. In the cities, large and small, of the five Indies, in the villages, in public places, and at the crossing of roads, he caused almshouses to be built, where are placed food and drink and medicines to be given in charity to travellers, the poor, and the indigent. These benevolent distributions never cease. Wherever the Saint (Buddha) had left the mark of his feet, he erected Kri-la-m (a stupa monument). Every five years he convenes an assembly called Wu-che-to-hei (the great assembly of Deliverance—Moksha mahā parishad). He empties the treasury and state stores to do good to everybody; he only reserves the arms, which are not suitable to give in alms. Every year he collects the Sha-mo (śramana) of the various kingdoms. On the third and seventh day he makes the four offerings. He decorates richly the Chair of the Law, and causes seats of exposition to be arranged in great numbers. He orders the monks to argue together, and judges of their force or weakness. He rewards the good and punishes the evil, degrades the ignorant and promotes men of ability. If any one faithfully observes the rules of discipline, if he is distinguished by the purity of his morals, the king makes him ascend the Sīhāśana (lion's seat—on his throne), and himself receives from his lips the precept of the law. If any one, however, who leads a pure and irreproachable life be deficient in knowledge and learning, he is pleased to give him proofs of his esteem and regard.

If a man forget the rules and discipline, and allow his vices to appear in open day, the prince expels him from his kingdom, and wishes to see or hear no more of him. When the petty kings of the neighbouring states, their ministers and their principal officers, unweariedly practise good, and strive after virtue with unabated zeal, he takes them by the hand, makes them sit on his throne, and calls them his "good friends." As for those who pursue a different course he scourcs to speak to them face to face. If he require to consult any one about a matter, he puts himself in connection with him by means of a continual exchange of couriers. Often he himself visits his dominions, and examines the manners of the inhabitants. He has no fixed residence; wherever he stops, he causes a cottage to be constructed and there stays. Only in the three months of the rainy season (Varshās) he suspended his excursions. Daily at his travelling abode he caused choice victuals to be prepared to support men of different creeds, namely, a thousand monks and five hundred Brāhmans. He divided the day into three parts: in the first he was engaged with public affairs and the government; the second he devoted to meritorious deeds.

1 In Chinese Kao-ki, 'sun of moral conduct,' Hall remarks that he has not found this title in Būpa's HarshaΧarita; and questions its accuracy, because the titles of Khastrīya only end in a śāta, whilst Hiwan Thang informs us that Harsha was a Vaiśya—Pālev. pp. 55, 56. But in Heineaud's Mém. sur Inde the first sentence of this extract is translated thus:—"The actual king is of the Vaiśya caste; the (late) king bore the hortensive title of Harsha-Vardhana (the increaser of joy); he reigned over that country." As Hiwan Thang wrote after his return to China in A.D. 648, when Harsha was dead and a usurper had seized on the government, this very slight alteration in the translation removes all difficulty.

2 In Chinese, Tōng-ling—'true sound,' Punyāśāka.

3 We may here understand the seat of the president charged to expound the Law (or teaching), and the seats of the clergy who should assist or take part in the exposition of the texts. In Chinese these are t'ien-lo, 'the seat of sound' (tah-ho justice).
and cultivated goodness with unremitting favour: the entire day is not sufficient for him.

At the beginning (Hiwan Thang) having received an invitation from the king Kee-n-Lo (Kumára), he replied, "I go from the kingdom of Mo-kie-lo (Magadha) to the kingdom of Kie-n-lo-pa (Kāmārā)."

At that time the king Kiat-ji (Silādiya) was visiting his states. As he was in the kingdom of Kie-chu-ki-Lo (Kaśāgiri), he gave this order to the king Kee-n-lo (Kumāra): "Come with the foreign monk from the convent of Nolan-lo (Nālanā) and see me at once."

The above (most in company with Kee-n-lo (Kumāra), proceeded to the king. After refreshing himself from his fatigue, the king Kiat-ji (Silādiya) said to him: "From what kingdom do you come; what do you see for?" "I come," answered the traveller, "from the kingdom of the great Thang; and ask your permission to inquire after the law of Buddha." "In what country is the kingdom of the great Thang?" asked the king; "how far is it from this?" "It is situated," replied he, "to the north-east from this country, and is distant many tens of thousands of its. It is the country which the Indians call Mo-ho-china (Mahāchīna)." "I have heard it said," rejoined the king, "that in the country of Mo-ho-chīna (Mahāchīna) there is an emperor called the king of Thang. In his youth he distinguished himself by marvellous sagacity; having become great, he displayed a remarkable ability in the art of war. During the preceding reign the empire was the prey of anarchy; it was divided and fell to pieces; every one flew to arms, and people were immersed in misfortune. But the emperor, styled the King of Thang, who at a fortunate moment had devised great plans, manifested all his kindliness and tender mercy. He saved the people from shipwreck, and stills the interior of the seas (the empire). His laws and benefactions were spread abroad. The peoples of other countries and strange lands received his reforms with delight, and avowed themselves his subjects. The multitude which he generously supported sang musical pieces in honour of the victories of the King of Thang. For a long while past I have heard his praises celebrated. Has the commendation of his splendid virtues a real foundation? Is that indeed what is called the kingdom of the great Thang?"

"Yes," was the reply, "Chi-na is the name of the dominion of our first kings, and Thang (the great Thang) is that of the ruling dynasty. Now, before the sovereign had inherited the throne, he was called the 'King of Thang'; now that he enjoys the supreme power, he is called Thien-tso (the son of heaven—the emperor).

"At the termination of the preceding dynasty" the people were without a master; civil war prevailed and men were slain. The King of Thang, who had received from heaven a great soul, manifested his good will and mercy. Thanks to the power of his arms, the wicked were destroyed, the eight regions began to breathe, and the ten thousand kingdoms came to offer him tribute. Bountifully he sustains all creatures; he reverences the three precious things; he lightens the taxes and mitigates punishments; the realm has superabundant resources, and the people enjoy undisturbed peace. It would be difficult to enumerate completely all his great views and his grand reforms."

"Wonderful!" exclaimed Kiat-ji (Silādiya): "the peoples of that country (China) owe their happiness to their saintly king."

At this time Kiat-ji, being about to return to the city of hunhachado maindas (Kanya-kabja), summoned an Assembly of the Law. Proceeded by a multitude of several hundreds of thousands, he stopped on the south bank of the Ganges. The king Kee-n-lo (Kumāra), preceded by a multitude of some tens of thousands, occupied the northern bank. Then the troops, separated by the river which flowed between them, advanced at the same time by water and by land. The two kings opened the procession. The four corps of the army formed an imposing escort. Some on boats, others on elephants, advanced to the sound of drums, marine conches, flutes and guitars. At the end of ninety days they arrived at Kanya-kabja, in the middle of a great forest of trees in blossom, on the west bank of the Ganges. At this juncture twenty kings of different districts, who had previously received the orders of Silādiya, each brought the most distinguished Sha-men (Śrāmanas) and Po-lou-men (Brāhmans) of their kingdoms; magistrates and warriors had come to join the great assembly.

The king (Silādiya) had already constructed an immense Kio-las (Saṅghārāma). On the east of the Saṅghārāma he had raised a tower richly ornamented and nearly a hundred feet high. In the middle was a golden statue of Buddha, of the same size as the king. To the south of the tower about Bujmahāl, which district went by the name of Klakjol (Gladwin's Aryan Akber, vol. II. p. 178; Hamilton's Gazetteer, s. v. Bujmahāl), from a town 15 miles south of Bujmahāl (Cumingham, Asia, Geog. p. 429); conf. also Jour. R. As. Soc. (N. S.) vol. V. p. 237; M. Julien, Mém. sur les Cons. Occid. tom. III. p. 387.

13 The dynasty of the Sau.
he had set up an altar made of precious materials, where to bathe the statue of Buddha.

Fourteen or fifteen li to the north-east of this place he made also a travelling palace. It was then the second month of the spring season. From the first day he had delicious viands presented to the Shams (Sama) and Po-lo-men (Brahma). On the twenty-first day, from the travelling palace to the great Kian-lam (convent), he caused tents to be placed on both sides of the road, which shone bright with the richest ornaments. Musicians who stayed there constantly made concerts of harmony in turns. The king sent out from his travelling palace a golden statue, hollow inside and in altor-lilien, about three feet high. It was carried on a huge elephant covered with a trossing of great value.

King Kiarji (Siladitya), in the character of Toshi (Indra), carried a precious parasol and went on the left of the image. King Kew-mo-lo (Kumara), in the character of Fan (Brahm), took a white fly-flap in his hand and went on the right. Each of these had for escort a body of five hundred elephants covered with armour. Before and behind the image of Buddha were a hundred great elephants. They carried musicians who beat the drum and filled the air with sounds of harmony. King Kiarji (Siladitya) scattered at every step fine pearls, precious stones of every sort, and flowers of gold and silver, in honour of the three precious things. Forthwith he stood on the altar, made of precious materials, and bathed the image with perfumed water. The king took it upon his shoulders and carried it to the top of the western tower. Then, to do it honour, he offered tens, hundreds, thousands of vestments of silk decked with all sorts of precious stones. At that time there were only twenty Shamas who followed the statue; the kings of different countries acted as an escort.

When they had done eating, the king re-assembled (in a conference) the men of different studies (the monks and the Brahmins), who discussed the most abstract expressions and handled the most condeite principles. Towards evening the king returned to his travelling house. Daily the statue was thus conducted and accompanied in great pomp as at first. But when the last day of the assembly had come, all at once the great tower took fire, and the double-storied pavilion which rose over the gate of the convent became a prey to the flames. The king then said: "I have spent the wealth of my kingdom in alms. After the example of our ancient kings I have built this convent, and have desired to distinguish myself by meritorious acts; but my weak virtue has found no support. At the sight of such calamities, and so sad omens, why should I care to live?"

Then he burnt perfumes, addressed humble prayers to Buddha, and pronounced these words:—

"Thanks to the good deeds of my previous life, I have become king, of the five Indies. I desire by the power of my virtue to extinguish this terrible fire. If this vow be without effect, may I die at this instant!"

At these words he threw himself before the gate; the fire was extinguished as if it had been at once smothered, and the smoke disappeared. The kings, witnesses of this marvel, felt redoubled fear and respect; but he, without change of countenance, and in the same tone of voice as before, questioned the kings in these terms:—

"This fire suddenly has reduced to ashes the work which I had succeeded in making. What do you think of this event?"

The kings prostrated themselves at his feet, and answered him with tears in their eyes. "We hoped," said they, "that the sacred monument you had finished would last to future ages. Who would have imagined that on the first day it would be reduced to ashes? Add to this that the Brhamas might rejoice at it in secret, and are congratulating one another."

The king said to them: "By what has happened one may see the truth of Buddha's word. Brhamas and men of other studies obstinately hold that all is eternal. But our great master (the Buddha) has shown us the impermanency (of all). As for me, I have completed my aims and have fulfilled the wish of my heart. In seeing this fire quenched, I recognize anew the truth of the words of Ju-lai. Here has been great happiness, and there is no cause to yield to tears."

Having finished these words, he followed the kings and ascended by the east side to the top of the great Stupa. Having reached the summit, he looked around, then he descended the steps. But all at once a strange man ran to meet him with a dagger in his hand. The king, closely pressed, retreated some steps and remounted the stairs, then descending he seized the man to give him over to the magistrates.

At this moment the magistrates, filled with fear and dismay, did not delay to run to his aid. All the kings demanded that the man should be killed. But king Kiarji (Siladitya), without showing in his and to be renewed without interruption." In this passage, the king undoubtedly alludes to works made by man, namely, to the tower and pavilion which the fire had destroyed.
manner the least anger, prevented his being put to death. The king himself questioned him thus:—

"What wrong have I done to you, that you should make such a criminal attempt?" "Great king," said he, "your goodness is free from partiality, and men from within and from without owe to you their happiness; but I, fool that I am, and incapable of forming noble aims, I have allowed myself to be duped by a word from the Brāhmans. All at once I have become an assassin, and bind myself to kill your Majesty."

The king said to him: "Why have the Brāhmans formed so wicked a purpose?"

"Sire," answered he, "after bringing together the princes of all kingdoms, you have emptied your treasury and stores to honour the Śa-mes (Śramaṇas) and to make a statue (in gold) of Buddha; but the Brāhmans, whom you have made come from far, have received no mark of attention from your Majesty. They have felt greatly disgraced by it, and charged the madman with whom you speak to make this shameful attempt."

Further, the king severely questioned the heretics and their partisans. There were five hundred Po-lo-mes (Brāhmans), all endowed with superior talents, who had presented themselves at the call of the king. Jealous of the Śa-mes (Śramaṇas), whom the king had loaded with honours, they had thrown a fire-arrow which had set the precious tower in flames. They hoped that during the efforts that would be made to extinguish the fire the crowd would be scattered in disorder, and they would take advantage of the occasion to kill the king. Having missed the opportunity they hoped for, they had hired this man to run upon him in a bye-path and stab him.

At this moment the ministers of all the kings demanded the extermination of the Brāhmans. The king punished the chiefs of the plot and pardoned their partisans. He banished five hundred Brāhmans beyond the limits of India, and returned to the capital.13

On the north-west of the city is a Stūpa, built by king Wu-gen (A-sō-ka). At this place Ju-lai (the Tathāgata) had expounded the most excellent laws.

Near by are places where the four past Buddhas had sat, and where they had walked in exercise. There is, besides, a small Stūpa which contains the hair and nails of Ju-lai (the Tathāgata), and another called the Stūpa of the Exposition of the Law.16

On the south side and close to the Ganges are three Kia-lau (Saíghárânas), which have walls alike and the gates different. The images of Buddha are of striking beauty; the monks are grave and given to silence; they are served by many thousands of Brāhmans. In a casket ornamented with precious stones, which occupies a pure house (Vihāra), there is a tooth of Buddha, an inch and a half long. It is of remarkable brilliance and extraordinary colour which changes from morning to night. It is visited from everywhere; the magistrates and representatives of the people unite in giving their homage to it. The daily crowds are reckoned by hundreds and thousands. The keepers, observing the noise and confusion increasing daily, have imposed a heavy tax, and have made it known everywhere that whoever wishes to see Buddha's tooth must pay a large gold piece. Nevertheless the devotees who come to see and worship the tooth are still as numerous, and willingly pay the tax of the piece of gold. Every fast-day it (the box?) is brought out and placed on a raised pedestal. Hundreds and thousands of men burn perfumes and offer handfuls of flowers. But thought they do so the tooth casket never disappears under the heap of flowers.

Before the Kia-lau (convent), right and left, there are two Vihāras, each nearly a hundred feet high. The foundations are of stone, and the building of brick. The statues of Buddha which are set up inside them are decked with many precious stones. They are cast partly of gold or silver, and partly of yellow copper. Before each of these two Vihāras is a small Kia-lau (convent) to the south-east, and at a little distance from the Kia-lau is a great Vihāra, built of brick on stone foundations. In the middle of it is the image of Ju-lai (the Tathāgata), represented standing. It is nearly thirty feet high. It is cast of bronze, and decked with precious stones of exquisite beauty.

On the stone walls which surround the Vihāra successor of Hīranya, is represented as having been placed on the throne by Hārsha Viśra Māditya of Īpās, who is described as ruling over all India (ib. III. 135, 248, 295, 334, 335, 337, 338). And Hārsha's son and successor is called Vrāṇa Rājā and Śrī Māditya (ib. III. 323). This Śrī Māditya of Mālāya seems to be the same as is spoken of by Hīwān Thang (Vie et Voyages, pp. 314–326; Mem., tom. II. p. 120) as having lived sixty years before his time, and who had reigned fifty years, probably about A.D. 580–590—but who must not be confounded with Hārshavardhana of Kanauj (ib. IV. 189; Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 236; Ind. Ant. vol. II. pp. 128, 194, note; vol. IV. p. 365.18

13 A stūpa raised in the place where the law had been expounded.
clever sculptors have represented in full detail all the acts of the Ju-lai (the Tathâgata) whilst he led the life of a Pu-su (Bodhisattva).

A short distance south of the stone Vihâra is a temple of the Sun-god.

To the south, and not far from this monument, is a temple of the God Ta-t’e-te (Mâva râ Dë-p’a). These two temples are constructed of a blue stone, beautifully bright, and ornamented with wonderful sculptures. They are of exactly the same form and dimensions as the Vihâra of Buddha. Each of these temples has a thousand attendants to water and sweep it. The sound of the drum and of chants accompanied by the guitar are continued day and night without interruption.

Six or seven li to the south-east of the capital, and on the south of the Ganges, is a Stûpa about two hundred feet high, which was built by king Wû-yao (Aśoka). Formerly in this place Ju-lai (the Tathâgata) preached for six months on the non-eternity of the body, and on the emptiness (uselessness) of mortifications of it, and its inherent impurity.\(^1\)

Near by are various places where the four past Buddhas had sat, and where they had walked in taking exercise. There is, besides, a small Stûpa which contains the hair and nails of Ju-lai (the Tathâgata). If a sick person reverently makes the circuit of it with active faith, he never fails to recover health and to secure felicity.—From Stanislas Julien’s Mémoires sur les Conquêtes Occidentales, tom. i. pp. 247-265.

CONTI POMIGLIANESI.

"Pomigliano d’Arco is a large village lying at the foot of Mount Vesuvius, on the road from Naples to Nola," which, moreover, has an illustrious citizen, Signor Vittorio Lombriani, not above collecting and publishing the folklore of his neighbourhood, and has further had the good fortune to attract the notice of Signor De Gubernatis and M. Marc Monnier, to the latter of whom (apud the Revue des deux Mondes of 1st November 1877, pp. 133ff.) I am indebted for the above information, and for the two stories appended. The resemblance of one to the Râmâyana is commented on by the authors quoted; that of the other to the story of Turli and Basanta (Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 260) is almost as striking; but for my part I am shy of drawing conclusions.

\(^1\) We know that, according to the Buddhists, man runs ceaselessly through the circle of transmigration (Dict. San-thang-su, bk. iv. fol. 27): see above, note 13.

\(^2\) The Dict. San-thang-su, bk. iv. fol. 1, enumerates thirty-six sorts of impure things inherent in the human body, e.g. tears, spittle, perspiration, urine, faces, &c.

The story of the prince who had an ill step-dame, and who slew the giant with ten heads.\(^3\)

In the days when all men were healthy, wealthy, and wise lived a great king 9000 years old. His first wife had left him a fine brave son. But having wed a second queen he had in a loving moment promised her a boon, be it what it might: and she required that the eldest son should be banished, and her own son have the crown.

Expelled by his cruel stepmother, the prince fled to the greenwood with the princess his wife. But one day that he had chased a deer till he was a long way from his hut the ten-headed monster carried off the princess.

The prince, not finding her on his return, was in a bad way, and set off in pursuit. After a long tramp he met the king of the monkeys, who complained to him of being vexed by a monster. (In those days beasts had speech.) To do him a good turn, the prince faced the monster and slew him. In those days beasts had gratitude too; the king of the monkeys, having learnt that the ten-headed monster had carried off the princess, sent his subjects to see what had become of her. The monkeys lost their way and were famished, but a good fairy gave them victuals and put them in the way.

They seek long and hard; at last they meet the vulture, who tells them that the ten-headed monster has carried off the princess beyond the sea. But how will they cross the ocean? The monkeys, in their distress, seek the king of the bears; he is too old, and advises them to apply to the son of the wind. This last flies over the sea, sees the princess and brings back news of her. Then the prince, by means of a marvellous bridge, crosses the sea himself, meets the tea-headed monster, himself slays him, and brings back his unlucky wife.

The story of two boys who ate the heart and liver of a fowl, whereby the first became a pope, and the other won a purse of fifty ducats daily.\(^4\)

Once upon a time there was a man who, having naught to do in the streets, set off for the country. He chanced to look up at a tree and saw the nest of a certain fowl. He climbed up and took the mother-bird and two eggs, whereon was written, "Whoso eateth the heart of this fowl will become a pope, and whoso eateth its liver will win a purse of fifty ducats daily;" but he saw naught of all that. He went home and said to his wife, "What shall we do with this fowl? Our children perish of hunger.

\(^3\) Revue des deux Mondes, tome XXIV. (1 Nov. 1877) p. 164.

\(^4\) See in "francisco." If the definite article or an equivalent is used in the original Italian or patois, it is a curious testimony to the wide-spread renown of Râvana.
I will carry it to our gossip, and we will make a
trifle of porridge for the weans.” He went to his
gossip, and quoth he, “Gossip, I bring you this
fowl and her two eggs to amuse your children.”
The gossip said he wanted none of it; but, as the
other insisted, at last told him to be off with his
bird. The man took it and went off in a huff,
forgetting the two eggs on his gossip’s table.

He, looking on his table, finds the two eggs,
reads the inscription, and says he, “Bad luck to
it! what have I done? I let my little gossip
carry off the fowl, and here’s all this written on the
eggs,” He runs to the other and says that his
children are crying for want of the fowl. “Then
the man answered him, ‘You are late, the
fowl’s eaten!’ His gossip went home and took
counsel of his wife, and said, ‘What shall we do
now, old woman?’ She said that he should take
the things (the poor man’s children) and say that
he’d ream them; and that was what the gossip
did. He went to the man and says he, ‘Little
gossip, I want your two youngsters because you
can’t feed them; and I’ll ream them.’ He brought
them home and put them to school; and every
morning his wife made their bed, and every
morning she found in it a purse of fifty ducats;
and she used them right well. After six or seven
years the gossip had laid in lots of money, and
the weans were well grown. One morning the two
lads set to playing one with the other in their
bed, and if they did, cut fell the purse of fifty
ducats. When they saw that, they said, ‘This is no
place for us now; our father’s gossip has put the
purse here to see if we’d take the money’; and
that same day they said to him that they would
be off. Now he wasn’t willing to let them go, but
after many words he gave them two hundred du-
cats a-piece and let them go. Off they went, and
as they went they found themselves that night in
a wood, and for want of better shelter they sat
themselves down under an oak tree. When they
got up in the morning, down fell the purse of fifty
ducats. ‘Ah, ha! that’s why our dad’s gossip
wanted to have us at home—for this luck that’s in
us.’ And off they went again, and came to cross-
roads; and if they did, it chanced that one was
behind just then; and they were parted and couldn’t
find each other. He who should win the purse of
fifty ducats every morning got to one town, and
he who should be pope to another; and he was on
the street, for naught had he to eat; so to win
his living he would be sexton of the church.
Now one day there was a pope to be made in that
town, and they loosed a dove; and when she
lit on that sexton’s head they made him the pope.

“Voilà,” says M. Marc Monnier, “un nouveau
genre de conclave qui se retrouve dans plus d’un
coupe populaire in Italie et d’aileurs? Pareillement
quand les rois sont embarrassés pour
trouver un gendre, ils laissent tomber du haut
d’un tour un mouchoir sur la foule.” &c.

In India we should have let out the late lamented’s
elephant to find his successor in the first
case; and in the second we have the Svayam-
vara. In both, the Eastern procedure seems the
more dignified, and in the latter it has the addi-
tional merits of chivalry and common sense—things
more easily combined than most people seem to
think.

To cut a long story short, after adventures of
little import to the purpose of this note, the
brothers met at the court of him who had become
pope, and lived happily ever after.

METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE MAHÁBHÁRATA.

BY J. MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., &c.

(Continued from p. 199.)

VIDULÁ AND SANJATA.

A Khatriya heroine’s exhortation to her son.

Mahabhárata, vv. 4404-4657.

There lived a Khatriya queen of old,
Well known to fame, far-sighted, bold,
Who sate in councils, heard debate
Proceed on grave affairs of state,
Who, studying much and long, a store
Possessed of rich and varied lore.
She dwelt with joy ‘mid war’s alarms,
And loved to hear of feats of arms,
How Khatriyas’ power the proud subdued,
And blessed the subject multitude.
It chanced, a foe’s superior might
Once overcome her son in fight;
And, all his host dispersing, drove
The prince in foreign lands to rove.
There, stunned by fortune’s crushing blow,
He lived, and pined, in want and woe.
Desponding, sad, he deemed it vain
To seek to raise his head again.
His spirit seeing so depressed,
The mother thus her son addressed:

Vidulá.

“Of all thy friends the grief and bane,
Of all thy foes the joy and gain,—
No real son art thou of mine,
No scion of the kingly line.
A Khatriya thou wast never born;
Of every warrior thou the scorn.

(Continued.)
Whence spring'st thou from what outcast race?
All nobler sires thou wouldst disgrace.
Who can of thee with honour speak?—
In spirit fain, in act so weak.
Desponding thus, hast thou no care
Thy shattered fortunes to repair?
Contemn thyself no longer; rise,
Awake to deeds of high emprise.
Why liest thou prone, as if the dread
Forked bolt of heaven had struck thee dead?
Start up, aspire to high renown;
By knightly deeds regain thy crown.
By force of will respect command;
Blaze fiercely, like a glowing brand.
Like smouldering chaff, that only smokes,
A weakling men's contempt provokes.
Whoever strikes a manly blow,
And strives to lay his foeman low,
Has done his duty; though he fail,
That failure let him ne'er bewail.
For duty wage a constant strife;
Than this, what other use has life?
Thy pious acts have borne no fruit;
And cut is now thy welfare's root.
If all thy hopes of good are gone,
In life why shouldst thou linger on?
Though hardly pressed, a warrior ne'er
Should yield to sad and weak despair;
Though fell'd to earth, a man should seize
With deadly grasp his foeman's knees,
Should drag him down with all his might,
And, smiling, end the deadly fight.
The sons who earn no honoured name
Can bring their mothers only shame.
Who'er in splendour, valour, lore,
Stands forth all other men before,
He justly claims—no other can—
The high and noble name of man.
He's falsely called a man whose heart
Is weak, who plays a woman's part.

On this our sad condition think:
We stand on utter ruin's brink,
From home and country driven, laid low,
Of joy bereft, and plunged in woe.
And wilt thou, nerveless, thus lie low,
Nor dare to strike another blow?
I called thee son, but now I see
I bore the Kali age in thee.¹
May woman never bear again
A son so base, so dire a bane!

Submission, meekness, ne'er can raise
The sunk, or bring them happier days.
Fierce, energetic, strive alone
Can win thee back thy father's throne.
Ambition only, restless, proud,
Can lift a man above the crowd.
Steel, then, thy heart—a hero grown,
From haughty foes wrest back thy own.²

Sanjaya.

"What worth has earth, its wealth, its joys,
Its power, its state, its glittering toys,—
What worth has even life—for thee,
My mother, if thou hast not me?
Then urge me not to peril life,
In fruitless, bootless, desperate strife."

Vidura.

"Their lot is base who once were great,
But now have fallen from high estate,
Who, masters once, dependent now,
To others' wills must humbly bow,
Whom none regards, and who, by need
Constrained, on others' bounty feed.
To such a servile life as now
Thou lead'st, my son, no longer bow.
Win back those days,—alert and brave,—
When thou wast lord, and not a slave,
When all men watched thy kindly nod,
And bent before thee as a god.
Like heavenly bliss is kindly sway,
Like hell their lot who must obey.²
The prince whose arm his rule assures,
And well his kinsfolk's will secures,
He during life enjoys renown,
And earns at length a heavenly crown.
Yet thou continuest faint of heart,
And wilt not act a hero's part.
But know, whoe'er from love of life,
A Kshatriya shrinks from battle's strife,
With no fierce warlike ardour burns,—
His tribe that recreant soldier spurns.

Yet why should I my speech prolong?
No pleas of mine, however strong.
Can sway, poor youth, thy wavering mind,
To all bold action disinclined.
Just so, no drugs his death can stay
Whose life is ebbing fast away.

Yet hear another reason why
Thou still in war thy chance shouldst try.
The foe who now usurps thy throne
The peoples' love has never known.

¹ The Kali, which is the present Yuga, is the last of the four immense periods into which the Indian system of cosmogony divides the duration of the existing creation. The first, or Satya Yuga, was the age of perfection; and during those which have followed, the world is conceived to have been undergoing a gradual course of deterioration to the extent of one-fourth in each succeeding Yuga. In

² This line, which has nothing corresponding to it in the original, is given as a counterpart to the preceding.
Too weak to rise,—with none to guide,
They watch the turn of fortune's tide.
But if men saw thee bent on war
Allies would flock from near and far.
With these combined, thy plans prepare,
Thy standard raises, and war declare.

Thy foe is mortal, bears no charm
To guard his life from deadly harm.
Go forward, then; to battle stride;
Successes yet thine arms abide.
Thy name is Victor; prove thy right
To bear it: triumph now in fight.

Whilst thou wast but a child, of old
A Brāhman see thy lot foretold,
That after dire reverses thou
Once more in pride should'st rear thy brow.
The sage's word remembering, I
Expect thy coming victory.

But what a life is this we lead,
Starvation dreading, sunk in need!
What sad vicissitudes I've seen!
A princess born, a wedded queen,
Resplendent once with jewels bright,
My husband's joy, my friends' delight,
In splendour nursed, I knew no care;
And now!—but yet I'll not despair.

Should'st thou continue still to see
Thou plunged in woe thy spouse and me,
What joy could life then have for thee?
Our servants, all attached and good,
Have left us, forced by lack of food.
Our honoured teachers, Brāhman priests,
Enjoy no more their former feasts.
What comfort have I yet in store?
Shall glad bright mornings dawn no more?
It rends my heart, augments my woe,
To say a needy Brāhman "no."
In happier days my spouse and I
A Brāhman's suit could ne'er deny.

We stand before a trackless sea,
We have no raft, no guide but thee:
Be thou our pilot, steer us o'er,
And land us on a happier shore.
A dying life is this we live;
Do thou full life and vigour give.
What joy have I if thou disgrace
By shrinking fear thy fathers' race?
I could not bear to see thee act
A slacker's part with servile tact.
A many Kshatriya, highly born,
All base unworthy arts should scorn;
By fawning, cringing aspect meek

For others' grace should never seek.
Think what our race's law requires,—
A law observed by all our sires,
On all their hearts inscribed, divine,
And why not, too, engraved on thine? —
A Kshatriya bold, with lofty brow,
To lower men should never bow,
But always grandly stand erect
With conscious, noble, self-respect.
And even when nought can doom forebend
Defiant let him meet his end;
By force be broken,—never bend.
To duty, Brāhmans, gods above,
A Kshatriya bows with reverent love:
To these alone he homage pays;
All humbler men he lord-like sways."

Sanjayo.

"Thou hast a hard, an iron heart,
And play'st no loving mother's part,—
True daughter of a warrior line;
A fierce unbending soul is thine.
To all thy Kshatriya instincts true,
Thou dost not yield to love its due;
Nor seek to guard me as thy one
Supreme delight, thine only son!
But spurrst me on, devoid of ruth,—
As if I were an alien youth,—
To join again in hopeless strife,
And all in vain to peril life.

What worth would earth, its wealth, its joys,
Its power, its state, its glittering toys,—
What worth would life,—possess for thee,
My mother, if thou hadst not me?"

Vidult.

"Life has two aims,—with zeal pursued
By thoughtful men,—the right, the good.
These worthy ends of life to gain
I've urged thee on, as yet in vain.
The time has come, the favoured day
For action,—long it may not stay;—
Improve it e'er it pass away:
Thy fame is perilled by delay.
Should I to warn thee now decline,
I'd show a foolhardy asinine."

Thou cravesst love, then prove thy right
To be indeed my heart's delight.
When thou shalt play the hero's part,
I then will clasp thee to my heart.

The Kshatriya race was formed for fight,
In martial deeds should take delight;
For heaven is earned by warriors all,
By those who conquer, those who fall."

---

* His name, "Sanjayo," means "victorious," or "victory."
* In the original these ideas are repeated here.
* Dharma and Artha, or Duty and Prosperity.

---

* This follows the original: "Were I not to address thee when thou art affected by infamy, this would be the weak, baseless falsehood of a she-ass."
Sanjaya.
"I lack all means, have no allies,
To aid my hostile enterprise.
From home and empire rudely driven,
My forces into fragments riven,—
How can I face my conquering foe,
Or think, unhelped, to lay him low?
Alone, could even a giant hope
With fierce embattled hosts to cope?
But thou art fertile in resource;
Do thou direct and shape my course.
Thou bid'st me now the strife renew;
What thou commandest, I will do."

Vidulh.
"Let not thine ancient ill success
In war, my son, thy soul depress.
To self-distrust no longer yield;
Once more thy sceptre hope to wield.
Misfortune lasts not always long;
The strong grow weak, the weak grow strong.
But trust not chance; by strife alone,
And tell, canst thou regain thine own.
Heroic men, awake, alert,
Spring up, and all their force exert.
Resolved to win, with stubborn will,
Despising risk and braving ill,
They never rest, but struggle on
Till all the good they seek is won.
A well-starred prince, religious, wise,
To high estate must surely rise.
On such Sri's smiles, benignaly bright,
As rising suns the Orient light.

But listen yet, while I reveal,
How thou with other men should'st deal;
How thou with art, and tact, and skill,
May'st always mould them to thy will,
By varying means may'st all persuade,
Thy will to work, thy schemes to aid.
Men's several natures sharply note,
The various loves on which they dote,
Gold, splendour, pleasure, honour, fame,
Revenge, and every other aim;—
These mark, indulge, to these give scope;
And, swaying all by fear and hope,
Their passions use to serve thine ends,
To thwart thy foes, attach thy friends.
By such means, too, the wise man knows
To sow disseision 'mong his foes.
And never, son, evince alarm,
Whate'er may rise to threaten harm.

A ruler fear should never know,
Or, if he feels, should never show;
For if he shows he danger dreads,
O'er all his host a panic spreads.
I've shown thee how, if thou wilt dare,
Thou may'st thy losses yet repair.
I've stirred thee up to flee from shame,
To gain thyself a glorious name.
I've sought thy soul with hope 't inspire,
With martial glow thy breast to fire.
I've told thee how, though now forlorn.
Thou wast for future glory born.
And now, my son, at length arise,
Arise, and snatch the envied prize.

Now, last of all, my secret hear.
That thou no more may'st doubt or fear.
We yet possess, to thee unknown,
Large treasures, known to me alone.
And many hundred friends remain,
Good friends, who've borne misfortune's strain,
Whom no reverse of ours could shake,
Who common cause with us will make,—
They surely will not leave us now,
When fortune comes to crown thy brow.
What need for more, my son, what need?
So on to fight, and victory speed!"

Sanjaya.
"O thou, thy race's joy and pride,
Heroic mother, sagest guide,
Fond prophetess of coming good,
How thou hast roused my timid mood!
Whilst thou didst strive, in long discourse,
My languid soul to nerve with force,
In war of words I strove in vain
O'er thee the mastery to gain.
For thou couldst all my pleas refute,
And leave me stunned, abashed, and mute.
With thee to lead, sustain, and cheer,
How can I longer shrink or fear?
Drunk with the nectar of thy word,
To superhuman valour stirred,
I must, with thee to show the way,
Impossibilities essay.
I will not see the ocean whelm;
My own, my dear, paternal realm,
But lift it high above the wave,
Yea, death itself with joy will brave
My cherished heritage to save."

Thus by his mother's taunting stung,
By these her exhortations fired,
Away the youth his weakness flung,
And snatched the prize her soul desired.

*The goddess of good fortune.

The original verse (4638), literally translated, runs thus:—"This earth must be supported in the water. I must die, (plunging) down into an abyss, or precipice." This is thus explained by the Commentator: ""This land, my paternal kingdom, sinking as it were in the water..."
The women of Rájputána, as represented by Colonel Tod in his *Aurans and Antiquities of Rájputána* (see chapter xxii. vol. I. pp. 607ff.), maintain in more recent times the character of heroism ascribed to Vídulá in this passage of the *Makhdám bahr*ata. I give a few extracts. Vol. I. pp. 609ff. (Madr. ed. pp. 523, 526, 528, 530, 537, and 543) —
"C'est aux hommes à faire des grandes choses; c'est aux femmes à les inspirer," is a maxim to which every Rájput cavalier would subscribe, with whom the age of chivalry is not fled, though ages of oppression have passed over him. He knows there is no retreat into which the report of a gallant action will not penetrate, and set fair hearts in motion to be the objects of his search." P. 610:
— "Like the ancient Germans or Scandinavians, the Rájput consults her in every transaction; from her ordinary actions she draws the omens of success, and he appeals to her name the epithet of dev, or godlike." P. 613:
— "Nor will the annals of any nation afford more numerous or more sublime instances of female devotion than those of the Rájputs; and such would never have been recorded were not the incentive likely to be revered and followed." P. 614:
— "The annals of no nation on earth record a more ennobling or more magnanimous instance of female loyalty than that exemplified by Délwaldé, mother of the Binauf brothers," &c. P. 617:
— "Délwaldé says, 'Would that the gods had made me barren, that I had never borne sons who thus abandon the paths of the Rájputs, and refuse to succour their prince-in-danger.'" P. 633:
— "The Rájput mother claims her full share in the glory of her son, who imbibes at the maternal font the first rudiments of chivalry; and the importance of this parental instruction cannot be better illustrated than in the ever recurring simile, 'Make thy mother's milk resplendent,'" &c.

(To be continued.)

BOOK NOTICES.

**LA LANGUE ENGLIÉE LITTÉRATURE HINDOUTIENNE EN 1877:** Revue annuelle. Par M. Garcin de Tassy, membre de l'Institut, professeur à l'école spéciale des langues orientales vivantes, président de la société asiatique, &c.

The venerable M. Garcin de Tassy has again inaugurated the advent of another year by issuing his *Revue annuelle* of the past. As the first and great event was the Imperial Assemblage of Dehli, some space is allotted to the description of the literary productions connected with it. The chief publications of the year are a canto of the *Bádmích* of Tulai Dási, printed with the greatest care and an accurate translation by Mr. F. S. Growse; the *Adí Granth* of the Sikhs by Dr. Trumpp, consisting of cxxxviii. and 716 pages; the *Grammar of Oriental Hindi* by Dr. A. F. R. Hoernle; and a Hebrew Grammar in Urdu by the late Dr. Warren. These appear to have been the only works published by Europeans, all the others being by natives, except Eastwick's *Kálgránmá i Hindí*, which, however, is only announced as being in course of preparation.

The Panjît Pyari Lál, well known by his numerous publications, has now issued a complete Urdu translation of the *Bhagwat Purana* in twelve *śaktas* or parts. The Hakim Amanat A'lí, Rais of Saharánpur, has produced a History of the Khilás—*Táhirát ulkhulafát*—in Urdu verse, according to the *Futáh ušhádám* of Wáqídí and other celebrated works. The titles of three works useful to Government servants are:—The *Upáš i-ahláq-o-Qawwám*, treating on general principles of law, on civil tribunals, and on police; the *Qávin i-ruslám i-a'dálkháth-i Hindí*, or Code of usages in the Law Courts of India, and the *Sharh i gámín-i shahádat*, or Explanation on the Law of Testimony.

Some polemical works have also made their appearance, and the most important of them appears to be the *Khutbat i Ahmadiyah*, or "Addresses of Ahmad," written by the eminent Sayyid Ahmad Khán, who some years ago published an English work under the title of *A Series of Essays on the Life of Muhammad, and subjects subsidiary thereto*. This Urdu work, M. Garcin de Tassy thinks, has for its chief object to refute *The Life of Muhammad* of Sir W. Muir, which has been very well received, and of which a new abridged edition has just come out. According to Sayyid Ahmad, the work of Sir William is based on the recital of Wáqídí, who, he says, is a much-esteemed author, but undeserving of any credit—a somewhat dubious criticism.

The number of books, of all sizes and subjects, is as large as ever, and we must refer the reader desiring to learn their titles, &c. to the *Revue* itself, as there is no other work which summarizes the publications of the whole peninsula. Besides the various notices scattered about in the *Revue*, there are seven special lists, namely,—1st, works printed in the N.W. Provinces; 2nd, in Lahore and Oudh; 3rd, in the Panjáb; 4th, books lately published in Calcutta and other towns of Bengal; 5th, in Bombay; 6th, the works of Muhammad Nusrat A'lí Qájár; and 7th, the list of Muslim polemics works by the same.

Due notice is taken of independent native schools, such as the Aligarh College, Sir Salar Jang's Female College at Haidarábád, and the Pát-

Our actual knowledge of Puranic literature is still very fragmentary and unsatisfactory. Of the eighteen chief Puranas, only two, the Visnuy and Bhagavata, have hitherto been made accessible through editions published in India, and by the translations, either complete or partial, of Wilson (and Hall) and Burnouf. Portions of the others, more or less considerable, have, it is true, been published; but it is to be hoped that complete editions will in course of time appear of all of them, to enable us to extract from these texts what useful matter they contain. Though we cannot, perhaps, expect from the as yet unpublished Puranic literature much actual gain of trustworthy historical and geographical knowledge, we must not forget that these works constitute a by no means unimportant chapter of Sanskrit literature, and that a much fuller acquaintance with them is required to fill up many blanks in the history of religions and speculative thoughts in India. Of the great mass of separate treatises that claim to form part of the Skanda-Purana, the most extensive of these medieval repositories of Brahmanical lore, comparatively little has hitherto been published. Dr. Haas, in his Catalogue of Printed Sanskrit Books in the British Museum, mentions fifteen separate titles under this heading, most of them consisting of single māhātmyas or kathās contained on a few leaves. A few more treatises have been noticed and analyzed in Prof. Aufrecht's Catalogue of the Bodleian Sanskrit MSS. Under these circumstances Sanskrit scholars cannot but feel grateful to Mr. da Cunha for his convenient edition of a complete khaṇḍa of the work, together with the supplementary māhātmyas bearing on the foundation of temples along the Sahyadri range, To Western archaeologists especially the book cannot fail to prove very useful and interesting, and they will look forward with interest to the appearance of the translation which Mr. da Cunha promises. That the edition cannot be regarded as a critical one, in the strict sense of the word, the editor himself must be quite aware. The various readings of the MSS. announced in the title-page extend only over a small portion of the work; with the exception of one solitary note at p. 369, no varia lectiones have been noted from p. 73 to p. 490. There are also a good many mistakes in the text. Thus some couplets of the seventh aśhyadya at pp. 23 and 24 are unintelligible as they stand; moreover, there seems to be a half-sūka wanting somewhere in the beginning. At any rate the verses from 2 to the end have been wrongly divided; thus the second half-sūka of couplets 3-11 should form the first half of couplets, and in each of them rāmadi should be changed to yaśod. If we might venture to make a suggestion to Mr. daCunha, we would advise him to go again carefully over his text, and print a list of errata along with his translation. He would thereby do more justice to himself, and save a good deal of trouble to those who make use of his edition.
No. XLIV.

THE date that has hitherto been accepted by Sir Walter Elliot and other authorities, for the era of the early Chalukya king Pulikēśī I., is Śaka 411 (a.d. 489-90), based on a copper-plate grant presented by Captain T. B. Jervis, of the Bombay Engineers, to the British Museum. A transcription of this grant is given at Vol. I., p. 9, of the Elliot MS. Collection, and has also been published, with an abstract translation, by Mr. Wathen, at Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. V., p. 343. The authenticity of this grant has been questioned by Mr. Ferguson and Dr. Eggeling. I now re-edit it with the object of dispelling any doubt that may remain as to its being really a fabricated document of comparatively modern date.

The plates are five in number, each about 8½\(^{\text{a}}\) long by 4½\(^{\text{b}}\) broad. The edges of the plates are raised into rims to protect the writing. Dr. Barnell tells us, at p. 72, para. 4, of his South-Indian Palaeography, that the earliest instances of this practice belong to the ninth or tenth century. But I find it, accidental or not as the case may be, in the plates of the grant of Vijayabhaṭṭārikā, No. XLII. of this Series, at p. 168 above; and two other sets of the Nerūr grants, which, also, I have no reason for assuming to be forgeries, have very decided raised rims, undoubtedly intentional. The ring on which they are strung is about ½\(^{\text{c}}\) thick and 8¼\(^{\text{d}}\) in diameter. It has the appearance of not having been cut; but, as both photographs and casts have been taken of these plates, it must have been cut and very carefully joined again. The seal of the ring is oval, and has the representation of a boar, facing to the proper right. I have no information as to where the plates were found, except that it was somewhere in the Southern Marṭha Country, or in the Karnāṭaka.

The grant gives the genealogy of Pulikēśī I. from his grandfather Jayasimha, and his father Raṇarāga. In ll. 7-9 occurs the passage Jayasimhāya rāja-simhāya rīvun... Raṇarāgā bhavat,—from which Sir Walter Elliot, at Mad. Jour. of Lit. and Science, Vol. VII., p. 200, deduced, but doubtfully, 'Rājasimha' as a second name of Raṇarāga. If rīva-
tion of a chhatra-bhaṅga, or 'interruption of the succession';—lit. 'a breaking of the umbrella (of sovereignty)';—it would seem that a period of anarchy ensued between the death of Māṅgaliśvara and the accession of Pulikēśi II. But it follows, from the above dates, that Māṅgaliśvara reigned for at least forty years. He cannot, therefore, have been much over thirty years of age, if indeed so old, when he succeeded. Taking him to have been then thirty years old, he was born in Śaka 458. And then, even if we assume that Pulikēśi I. was not more than twenty years of age when he succeeded, and that Śaka 411—the date of the present grant—was the very year of his accession, it follows that he was at least sixty-seven years old when his second son, Māṅgaliśvara, was born to him. And this, I apprehend, is hardly probable.

But, apart from any such argumentative reason, there are substantial grounds for disputing the date assigned to Pulikēśi I.—1. The plates are more numerous, and the language is more prolix, than is usual in grants of this early date.—2. The name of the dynasty is written 'Chālukya', in l. 5, with the vowel of the first syllable long. Whereas, in all genuine grants of early date, it is written either 'Chālkya', or 'Chālikya' and 'Chalukya', with the vowel of the first syllable short. Now, Sir Walter Elliot, in his paper On Hindu Inscriptions at Madr. Journ. of Lit. and Science, Vol. VII, p. 193, tells us, and on ample authority, that from the middle of the eighth to about the middle of the tenth century A.D., 'the power of the Chalukyas was alienated for a time, or suffered a partial obstruction.' It was restored in the person of Tailapa II, in Śaka 895 (A.D. 973-4) or thereabouts. And I find from inscriptions that, unless metrical reasons required the use of the form 'Chalukya', he and his successors are always called 'Chālukyas', and that this form of the name is peculiar to them. There seems, too, to have been a special reason for this; inasmuch as 'Chālukya' means 'the descendant of a Chalukya', this second derivative form points, not only to a temporary eclipse of the Chalukya power, but also to an actual break in the direct line of hereditary succession.—3. In l. 15, Pulikēśi I. is called 'Satyāśraya-Pulakēśi', and, in l. 31, he is called simply 'Satyāśraya.' In no other inscription is this title applied by itself to anyone anterior to Pulikēśi II, who, as we learn from the Ahhoj inscription, was the first to acquire the name. And only in No. XXVII. of this Series, transcr. l. 5, is it elsewhere applied to Pulikēśi I. at all; and it is coupled there with his own proper name, and, I suspect, is introduced by the writer without any authority, save that it was one of the titles of the similarly-named grandson, Pulikēśi II.—4. The mention of the horse Chitrakāṇṭha, in l. 11, is at variance with all the other inscriptions, which tell us that it was Vikramādiya I. who was the owner of 'a horse of the breed called Chitrakāṇṭha', or 'of an excellent horse named Chitrakāṇṭha.'—5. The mention of the Kuhnjī district in l. 22 is another anachronism. For in l. 27 of No. II. of my Raṭṭa Inscriptions at Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. X., p. 194, we are told that it was the Raṭṭa Great Chieftain Kārtavirya A., about Śaka 970, who, 'when king, fixed the boundaries of the country of Kuhnjī'; and I have not found this district spoken of in any other early inscription.—6. This grant is dated in the Vibhaṭa sīvavēṣṭara. By the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronology, the Vibhaṭa sīvavēṣṭara would be Śaka 410,—quite near enough for the purpose. But, let the time at which the cycle of sixty sīvavēṣṭaras was first devised and used by astronomers be what it may, the cycle was not in use in public documents in the Cālukya kingdom at the date to which those plates purport to belong. The earliest instance of its use that I have met with is in an Old Canarese inscription on stone at Nandwājige in the Kalāki District; part of the name of the king, and the word expressing the centuries in the date, are unfortunately effaced, but I shall show hereafter that it is an inscription of the Rashtrekūṭa King Dharavarsha-Kaliyullabhā, or of his son Gōvinda-Prabhūtavarsa or Gōvinda III, and that the date of it is Śaka 722, the Dūndubhi sīvavēṣṭara. The earliest indisputable instance to which I can refer is an Old Canarese copper-plate grant of the Rashtrekūṭa king Gōvinda III, dated Śaka 727, the Subhānu sīvavēṣṭara; the original plates belong to Sir Walter Elliot and are now with me, and a transcription of
the first plate is given by Dr. Burnell at p. 88 of his South-Indian Paleography. I am inclined to think, *en passant*, that it was the Rāṣṭrāṅga kings who first introduced the use of this cycle into the Chālukya dominions.
—7. Śaka 411 is A.D. 489-90. Mr. Burgess informs me, as the result of calculation, that no lunar eclipse such as that spoken of occurred in A.D. 489, 490, or 491. —8. The almost invariable use of 1, whenever it can be used in the place of t, is quite opposed to ancient orthography, and is in itself a strong indication of the modern composition of the inscription. —9. The characters, instead of belonging to the fifth century A.D., are fully developed Old Canarese characters of at least the tenth or eleventh century A.D. I have no published facsimile to which I can refer for purposes of comparison. But, out of the unpublished materials that I have on hand, the characters of this grant resemble most nearly the characters of two grants of the Chōjā successors of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty; one is a grant of Rāja Ṛajja II., dated Śaka 944, and the other is a grant of Kulaṭṭuṅga Chōjādeva II., dated Śaka 1056. Among all the inscriptions of the Western dynasty, I can find none with the characters of which those of the present grant may suitably be compared. —In fine, I place the composition of this document at certain points not earlier than the tenth century A.D.

I have not succeeded in tracing on the map the localities referred to in the grant.

**Transcription.**

*First plate.*

1. Svasti || Jayantya-ananta-saṁsāra-pārāvāra-sīlāvaḥ Mahāvīra-āha(rha)taḥ-pūtāscha-charaṇ-

2. māhābhuja || Śrīmatāṁ viśva-viśvambar-aṁbhisañśīśyayamāna-Mānavyā-sagōtrānāṁ Hārīti-

3. putraṇāṁ sapta-loṭa-mātrībhiḥ-sapta-mātrībhiḥ-abhivardhiṭānāṁ Kārtikeya-

4. pta-kalyāṇa-parāṁparāṇāṁ bhagavān-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-samāśāsita-varāha-lāñchana-

5. n-ekśaṇa-kṛṣṇa-vaṣīkṛṣṭ-āśeṣha-mahībhṛtiṇāṁ (sc. bhrītāṁ) Chālukyānāṁ kulam-

6. ṣaṇkarishyoh || sva-bhujā-ḥ

7. pārījita-vasundharāya niya-yaśas-śravaṇa-mātṛē-in-āvanata-rājakasya kṛitti-patā-

8. k-āvabhāsita-digantarāsya Jayasindhyasa rāja-sinhyasa sūnus-sūṁrita-vā-

9. gr-anavarata-dān-ārdriṅgita-karaś-sura-gaja iva praśama-nidhiḥ-tapō-nidhir-iva dṛ-

10. pta-vairishu prāpta-raṇa-rāgō Rājarāgō bhavat [||] Tasya chu-śanajā śravādamhat-

11. āva(sc. mārtha-āva)bhītā(tha)-smān-pavī-

12. trkīta-gātrē praṇīta-par-nipati-makuta-tata-gaṁita-hatau-maṇi-gaṇa-kiraṇa-vār-dhā-

13. rā-dhauta-chāru-caraṇa-kamaḥ-yuγaḥ Chitragaṇṭh-ābhidhina-turaṁgama-kaśṭharaṁvṛtv-

14. āṁśi-śaṃbharaṇa-maṇḍalē varṇa-āśrama-sarva-dharmma-paripālaṇa-parē Gaṅgā-

15. Sēta-madhya-

16. varti-dēś-ādhisvurē śakti-traya-pravardhita-praśyā-sāmrājya Śaṅgā-ya-munāma-

17. mālikā-

18. dhvaja-daḍakk-ādi-paṇcha-mahāśabda-chihānē karadikṛtā Chōja-Chēra-Kērala-Siṁha-

19. Ga-bhūpara daṇḍita-Pāṇḍya-āḍi-maṇḍi(ṇa)likē a-pratīśanāḥ Satyāśraya-Śri-

20. bhīdāna-prithibhīvallabha-mahārajax-ādhirajē prithivim-ākñ-ātapataṇā sati [||] Rāja-Runda-

21. nila-saṁdraka-vaiśṛṣa-saṁsākāramānaḥ pracaṇḍa-śor-dhāgda-maṇḍita-maṇḍal-āgṛhō Goṇḍa-

22. sit [||] Aya-naya-vinaya-sampannar-ṭanayō sya ssa(ma)a mara-rasa-rasikas-

23. khyātaḥ [||] Putrō sya bhūtā(ṭō) dhātri-lījākāramānaḥ-parakram-akṛanta-vair-

24. nikurumbah
Second plate; second side.

†[27] yatanaṃ bhaktya-ākrayat-su-manoḥaraṁ || Prōttanūga-prāśadānī Tribhuvana-

†[28] nālāyaṃ pravaraṃ nānā-stambha-samudhrīta-virajāmanānaḥ chiraṃ jagati || Śaka-nrip-

†[29] kādaś-ottarēśu chatoś-satēśu vratītēśu Vihava-saṁvatare pravarttanānē || Kṛitē cha

†[30] yē | Vaiśākha-ōdita-purūṇa-paṇya-divasē Rāhō(hau) vidhau(dhor) maūḍalaṃ

†[31] pagata(taṁ) snāhād-grihān bhūbhujān Śrī-Satyāsrayam-āsrayaṁ guṇavatām vijñāpayā

†[32] māsā sa taj-Jainālaya-pōjan-ôchita-nata-kahētāya dharma-priyā(yaḥ) || Āyu-

†[33] r-ījanaṃvata[m]-idaṃ na madu tadi(dī) sandhy-ēndrēchāp-ōpamaḥ jātēva dharmama-ma(ha)n-

†[34] ārijanaṃ budha-ja-

†[35] nair=mārtya(ryai)ḥ=phālaṁ manyate ity-ērāṁ pravibdhyā sabhya-janaṇāṁ Satyārayaṁ

†[36] ktyā taj-Jina-mandir-ōpama-kriyē kahētrañ ādava śāsanaṁ || Vaiśākha-paurvamānayāṁ

†[37] dhu-maṇḍala(taṁ) praviṣṭhavati Śrī-Satyāsraya-nripatis-triḥbuvaṇa-tījākāya dattavā(ṇ)ṣa

†[38] kahētraṁ ||

†[39] Kanakopaḷa-sambhūta-vṛkṣha-Mūlagan-a(ā)nvayē bhūtasamagra-rāddhāntas-Siddhan-

†[40] n-Īsvaraḥ || Tasya-āsīt-prathamaśa-śishyō dēvata-vinuta-kramaḥ śīshyaiḥ=pasiṣha-sutair=

Third plate; first side.

†[41] ē-Chitak-āchāryya-sa(sam)jñītāḥ || Śrīmat-Kākopaḷāmnoyaḥ khyāta-kirtīr=bahu-śrūtaḥ

†[42] n=Nāgaḍēv-ākhyāṣ=Chitak-āchāryya-dlkhitaḥ || Nāgaḍēva-gurōṣa=śīṣyaiḥ=prabhūta-guna-

†[43] vārdhiḥ

†[44] saṃasta-śastra-sambōdhi(dī) Jīnaṇandaiḥ=prakṛttātāḥ || Śrimad-vividha-rājendra-

†[45] praspurana-makut-ā

†[46] lībhīḥ nigroṣha-śaṣṭi-ēbhāya prabhavē Jīnaṇandini || Jīnaṇandī-āchāryya-sūrya-

†[47] ya duśchara-tapō-śiṣṭhā-nikāhōḍala-bhūtāya samadhigata-sarva-śāstrasā mag-


†[49] vāyavyām

†[50] diśi tataśkaṇaḥ tato rjū-sūtra-kramaḥ paśchima-ābhimukham gatvā patnam āsya madhye

†[51] nikhāta-pāśchaṁ tasmād-dakshin-ābhimukhaṁ-aau-pathaṁ gatvā pravahāṁ āsya(ya)

†[52] madhye nikātā-pā-

†[53] shāṇaṁ pūrva-ābhimukhaṁ gatvā tīmtrīṇkā-vṛkṣhaṁ yavat-tasmād-ntar-ābhimukhaṁ
gatvā pūrva-ē
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[48] kta-tatākañ | yāvat=sthitām ētan=nagara-nivēsana-kshētrañ || Tatra tala-bhūga-kshētra-sīmāñ-āña [1 1]

[49] Nagarasa dakshināyām diśi sētu-bandhāt-prabhūty-anu-jañJa-rāhalañ pūrvv-ābhimukhañ gā-

[50] tvā yāvat=anūchhiña-kshētrañ tat-paschima-sīmni nikhāta-pāshāpām yāvat-tasmād= anu-sīm=ō-

Third plate; second side.

[51] tat-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvach=chhami-valmikañ tasmāt=punah=pūrvv-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvat

[52] sthañ-giri tasmāt=punar=anu-giryy=uttar-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvat=git-rīt=nehchā-pradēśām tasmāt

[53] paschim-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvad=giri tasmāt=paschim-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvat= ta(stha)la-giri

[54] tasmād=dakshin-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvat=sētu-bandhana(na)ñ sthitām rāja-māñēña

paṁchāsat u(sc.śad-n)ttara


[56] diśi Narindaka-Sāmarāvāda(ñ)gra-ma-pathi madhyān-vartti-Sinhasāga-tatākañ

[57] dṛjñ-sūtra-kramēga Narindaka-grāma-pathan yāvat=tāvat=sthitān chattvāriṁṣat

[58] ni(sc.śan-ni) vardtanañ kshētrañ dakshinā-dīśī rāja-māñēna || Kinayike-nāma-grāma-phē-

[59] rvaayāñ diśī aśti-nivarttanañ kshētrañ rāja-māñēna Piśch-ārāmān-narīryāñ

[60] diśī yāvach=chham i-jhāṭa-valmikañ tasmāt=pūrvv-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvat=patanañ tasmā-

[61] dakshin-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvat=sthalā-giri tasmāt=paschim-ābhimukhañ=anu-sthañ-

[62] la-giri gatvā yāvach=chhami-sthalājan tasmād=uttar-ābhimukhañ gatvā yāvach=chhañ-

[63] i-jhāṭa-valmikañ sthitām chatus-sīmā-viruddhañ || Pantiganage-nāma-grāme

Fourth plate; first side.

[64] narīryāñ diśī māñyasa kshētra uttarasayañ diśī chattvāriṁṣat(n)-nivarttanañ kshētrañ

[65] rāja-māñēña

[66] nēna paschimāṁ(nasyāṁ) diśī sthañ-giri tasmād=anu-sīmañ pūrvv-ābhimukhañ gatvā

yāvach=chhami-

[67] valmikañ tasmād=dakshin-ābhimukhañ gatvā Kōmarāche-grāma-sīma tasmāt-pu-

[68] rva-ābhimukhañ=anu-sīmañ gatvā yāvaj=jañJa-rāhalañ tasmād=uttar-ābhimukhañ-sa-

[69] nu-vāhalañ gatvā yāvach=chhami-jhāṭa-valmikañ tasmāt=paschim-ābhimukhañ gatvā

[70] yāvat=tāvat=sthitām tasāñ-grāma || Maṅgala-nāma-grāma-

[71] paschima-diśī rāja-māñēña chattvāriṁṣat(n)-nivarttanañ kshētrañ taṣya simā

[72] nyāha sthalā-girē=paschim-ābhimukhañ=anu-pathañ gatvā yāvad=Rūvika-grāma-sē-

[73] ma tasmād=uttar-ābhimukhañ=anu-sīmañ gatvā yāvat=sthalā-giri tasmāt=pūrvv-ābhi-

[74] mukhañ=anu-sthalā-giri gatvā yāvat=sthalā-giri tasmād=dakshin-ābhimukhañ=

[75] sthalā-giri gatvā sthitām chatus-sīmā-vi(r)uddhañ || Karandige-nāma-

Fourth plate; second side.

[76] śchimasyāṁ diśī Chandavura-Pandarigavañi-nāma-grāma-mārgga-madhyē aśvatha-

[77] tatāka(kid) vāyavyāṁ diśī rāja-māñēña paṁcha-viṁśat-nivarttanañ kshētrañ ||

[78] Dāvavālī-nāma-grāma(mē) paṁchasyāṁ diśī Alakṭaka-nagara-Kamba-

[79] yija-nāma-grāma-mārgga-madhyē Bimbālaya-Piśch-ārāmā=paṁchīmē rā-

[80] ja-māñēña chattvāriṁṣat(n)-nivarttanañ kshētrañ || Punar-āpi tasminn-ēva grāma(mē) pā-
The son of Jayasimha,—that lion of a king, who adorned the family of the Chāvakya, who are glorious, and who are of the lineage of Mānavya which is praised over the whole earth, and who are the descendants of Hariti, 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 protection of Kārttikeya, and who have had 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; and who acquired the earth by his own arm; and who had kings bowed down before him by simply hearing of his fame; and who irradiated the intermediate spaces of the regions with the banner that was his fame,—was Rāparāga, of true yet pleasing speech, whose hands were moistened by his ceaseless charities, thus resembling the elephant of the gods, whose trunk is moistened by the ceaseless flow of his rut; who, like an austere devotee, was the receptacle of tranquillity; and who acquired a fondness for war against his proud enemies.

And while his son, the favourite of the world, the Great King, the supreme king, who was named Satyārasya-Srī-Pulakesi,—whose body was purified by aubitions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices; and whose beautiful feet, which were like lotuses, were cleansed by the trickling drops of water which were the rays of the many sparkling jewels that were set in the diadems of the hostile kings who bowed down before him; and who drove away the troops of elephants of his enemies by a very lion of a horse that was named Chitrakānta; and who was intent on preserving all the regulations of the four classes and the four stages of life; and who was the supreme lord of the country lying between the (river) Gāṅgā and the Bridge (of Rāma); and whose mighty universal sovereignty was increased by (his possession of) the three regal attributes; and who possessed

* The last of the twenty-four Jain teachers of the present age.
the signs of the banners of the Gângâ and the Yâmûnâ and the sword-edge, and the five great sounds of the Daâkâkâya and other (musical instruments); and who made the kings of Câlêla and Cêra and Kârâla and Sîmâhâla and Kalînga to pay tribute; and who punished the Pâvâya and other chieftains; and whose commands were unresisted, was governing the earth under one umbrella:—

There was a king named Cûnda, who was the moon of the family of Purânâ-lâ-Sain-drâka, and whose scimitar was adorned by his mighty arm. His son,—who was endowed with good fortune and skill in polity and modesty, and who delighted in the flavour of war,—was renowned by the appellation of Sîvâra. His son was the truthful and pious Sâmîyâra, who was the forehead-ornament of the earth,—who attacked the assemblage of his enemies with his prowess,—who was possessed of bravery that could not be withstood,—who was well versed in what things should be done and what should not be done,—and who was the servant of him, (Pukâkâ), as Hanûmân (was the servant) of Râma.

Having acquired the district of Kâhuqâ through his favour,—while governing it, he, who was as glorious as Mahândrâ, in his piety caused to be made an excellent and large and very charming temple, a shrine of Jinândrâ, in the east quarter, in the city which was named Alâkâkâ and was included in that (district); and which was the chief town of (a circle of) seven hundred villages; and which was the glory of the whole district; and which abounded in ëlî rice and erithi rice and groves of sugar-canes and chick-peas and priyangu-plants and varaka-beans and udâraka-grain and tyâmâka-grain and wheat and many other kinds of grain; and which shone like the lotus which is the fan of the lovely woman which is that district; and which was full of husbandmen who abounded in wealth and grain.

The excellent shrine of Jinâ (which was thus constructed),—that very lofty temple, (named) the ornament of the three worlds, decorated with many columns, (endures) for a long time in the world.

And this shrine of Jinâ having been built,—when four centuries and eleven (years) had elapsed in the years of the Sâka king; while the Vihâra-sâmâkâra was current; on the holy day of the full (moon) of (the month) Vâsâkhâ; when Râhu had closed upon the orb of the moon, .................. 1—

he, who was fond of religion, asked the king, Sri-Satyâsraya, the asylum of virtuous people, who through friendship had come to his house, for a field fit for the worship of that shrine of Jinâ.

Having known that the life of those that are born is (transient) like the lightning and the evening rainbow, and having impressed on his courtiers that the acquisition of religion and wealth is esteemed the (only true) reward by wise people, who are but mortal,—the lord Satyâsraya in his piety bestowed a field (aut) a charter, worthy of that shrine of Jinâ. On the day of the full-moon of (the month) Vâsâkhâ, when Râhu had entered the orb of the moon,—the king, Sri-Satyâsraya, gave a field to the ornament of the three worlds.

In the lineage of the (sect called) Mûrgâna, a tree which sprang from Kanâkâpâlâ, there was born that lord of saints, Siddha-nândî, who possessed (a knowledge of) all demonstrated truths. His first disciple was Chitakâchârya, whose observances were praised by the gods, and who was attended by five hundred disciples. He, whose name was Nâgâdevâ, who was renowned in the traditions of the glorious Kâkâpâlâ; and who possessed much (knowledge of) sacred lore; and who enjoyed good fortune,—was initiated by Chitakâchârya. The disciple of the preceptor Nâgâdevâ was the famous Jina-nândî, who was a very ocean of meritorious qualities, and who was acquainted with all the sacred writings.

To the excellent master Jina-nândî, whose feet, which were as lustues, were chafed by the glittering diadems of many glorious kings, (who bowed down before him),—to Jina-nândî, a very sun among Achâryas, who was the touchstone by which to test the value of penances that were hard to be performed, and

1 I do not find this word in the dictionaries. But Moisier Williams gives dhakka, 'a large or double drum'; and Sanderson gives the same, and also dakka, dakkâ, or dakke, 'a small drum, shaped like an hour-glass.'

2 This must be the founder of the sect.
who had mastered all the sacred writings,—he
gave towns and the enjoyment of sites of land.

There he declares the boundaries of the (right of)
 enjoyment of sites of land.—On the north-west of the Chaitya-hall, there is a tank. Going
in a straight line to the west from there, there is
the road, in the middle of which there is a
stone set up. Going to the south from that,
along the road, there is a stream, in the middle
of which there is a stone set up. Going to
the east (from that), as far as a tamarind-tree,
and then going to the north, there is the tank
mentioned above. That which is thus situated
is the field of the entrance of the village.

There he declares the boundaries of the fields
( which are the objects of the right) of
 enjoyment of sites of land.—Starting from the bridge on
the south of the city and going along the stream
to the east as far as the gleaning-field, on the
west boundary of it there is a stone set up.
From that, going along the boundary to the
north, there is an ant-hill near a śāmi-tree.
From that, again, going to the east, there is the
sthāla-giri.3 From that, again, going to the
north along the hill, there is the high part of
the hill. From that, going to the west as far
as the hill (extends), and then to the west as far
as the sthāla-giri, and then to the south, (we
come to the place where) the bridge stands.
(Thus is constituted) the field (which is the
object of the right) of enjoyment of a site of land,
(measuring) one hundred and fifty niwarta
nas by the royal measure, and encompassed by its
four boundaries.

At the village of Narinda ka, in the south
west quarter, (there was given) a field, (of the
measure of) forty niwarta nas by the royal measure,
in the south quarter, encompassed by its
boundaries, and constituted (by a boundary-line
drawn) up to the road to the village of Narinda ka in a straight line from the Sin gā
tēga tank, which is in the centre of the roads
to the villages of Narinda ka and Sama rivāda.

At the village of Kiṇayige, in the east
quarter, (there was given) a field (of the measure
of) eighty niwarta nas by the royal measure,
encircled by its four boundaries, and lying thus:
—At the south-west of the grove of the

Piśācha, there is an ant-hill at a clump of
śāmi-trees. From that, going to the east as far
as the road, and then to the south as far as the
sthāla-giri, and then to the west, along the
sthāla-giri as far as the place of the śāmi-trees,
and then to the north, (we come) to the Ant-hill
at the clump of śāmi-trees.

At the village of Pantigane ge, in the
south-west quarter, and in the northern quarter
of the mānya-field, (there was given) a field, (of
the measure of) forty niwarta nas by the royal
measure, encompassed by its four boundaries
and constituted thus:—On the west there is the
sthāla-giri. Going along the boundary to the
east from that, as far as the ant-hill near a śāmi-
tree, and from that to the south as far as the
boundaries of the village of Kā maraṅche,
and from there along the boundary to the east
as far as the stream, and from that along the
stream to the north as far as an ant-hill near a
clump of śāmi-trees, and from that to the west
as far as the northern weir4 of the tank, and
from that to the south along the sthāla-giri.

In the west quarter of the village of Māngali (there was given) a field, (of the
measure of) forty niwarta nas by the royal measure. He
declares the boundaries of it. Going to the
west from the sthāla-giri along the road as far as
the boundary of the village of Rāvika, and
from there to the north along the boundary as
far as the sthāla-giri, and from there to the
east along the sthāla-giri as far as the sthāla-
giri (extends), and from there to the south along
the sthāla-giri,—(thus is it) situated, and encompassed
by its four boundaries.

In the village of Karandige, in the west
quarter, (there was given) a field, (of the measure
of) twenty-five niwarta nas by the royal measure,
on the north-west of the tank of the aśvattha-
tree between the roads to the villages of
Chandavura and Pandarūgavallī.

In the village of Dāvanavallī, in the west
quarter, (there was given) a field (of the measure
of) forty niwarta nas by the royal
measure, on the west of the grove of the
Piśācha, Bimbālaya, between the roads to
the city of Alaktaka and the village of Kumbayija. And again, in that same
village, in the south quarter, (there was given) a

3 sthāla-giri, 'a hill on the plain', perhaps denotes one
of those isolated masses of hipped-up boulders that we to
be found all over the black-soil fields in the eastern part
of the Dāiśdāl District, and probably still further inland.

4 The name of a class of demons.

5 If the reading is kēṭ, it is the Canarese word meaning
a 'weir, outlet of a tank.' If the reading is kēṭa, the
translation will be 'the northern edge, i.e. bank.'
field (of the measure of) one hundred nivaritanas by the royal measure, situated close to the north of the Hiṅguṭ tank.

In the village of Nandinaige, in the east quarter, (there was given) a field (of the measure of) forty nivaritanas by the royal measure, between the boundary of (the village of) Barávelka and the road to (the village of) Śrīpura.

In the village of Siripatți, in the west quarter, (there was given) a field (of the measure of) forty nivaritanas by the royal measure, to the south of the road to (the village of) Śrīpura.

In the village of Arjunaవāda, in the west quarter, (there was given) a field (of the measure of) fifty nivaritanas by the royal measure, to the north of the road to (the village of) Śrīpura.

He declares the names of the villages.—The first village is Rûvikā, in the Kumbhayija Twelve. The second village is Samarivāda. The third village is Lattivāda, in the Badhamälē Twelve. The fourth village is Pelliidakā, in the Šrīpura Twelve. These four villages (were given), together with their fields encompassed by the four boundaries, and with the udraṅga and the sparisara, and not to be entered by irregular or regular troops. This grant should be preserved as long as the moon and the sun and the earth and the ocean endure, just as if it were a grant made by themselves, by future kings, desirous of acquiring fame, whether they are of my lineage, or whether they are others,—bearing in mind that the charms of life and riches, &c., are as transient as the lightning! And it has been said by Maṇu and others:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Saṅkara; (＆c.)! It is very easy to give one's own property, but the preservation of (the grant of) another is difficult, (＆c.)! He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, (＆c.)!

No. XLV.

Sir Walter Elliot's date of Śaka 514 (A.D. 592-3) or 515 for the accession of the Western Chalukya king Vikramaditya I. is based on a copper-plate grant, said to have been discovered in digging the foundations of the house "a Kukarni at Kurtaκoṭī in the Gadag Tālukā of the Dāhrvād District, and presented by him to the Royal Asiatic Society. In the genealogy at Jour. Madr. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. VII., p. 199, he gives Śaka 514 as the commencement of his reign. In describing the grant, at id., p. 201, he writes, "It bears date the thirty-third [year] of his reign, Śaka 530; and his accession is thus fixed as having occurred in [Śaka] 515." The first part of this statement is owing to some confusion on the part of his Paṇḍit in interpreting the date. In a footnote to the latter passage, he speaks of it again, and as being dated "in Śaka 530, on the eighth day of the sixteenth royal victorious year." Dr. Burnell, again, has given the first side of this grant as Plate xxii. in his South-Indian Palæography, and, in transcribing it, at p. 87, has entered the date as A.D. 608, which would be Śaka 530. The real date, as will be seen from the facsimile and transcription, ii. 20-21, is "when Śaka 532 had expired, in the sixteenth year of his victorious reign."

I have obtained the original plates to edit from. Only two plates are forthcoming; the third, probably the last, is missing. They are rather thick plates, not very regularly shaped, and with several flaws in the copper; they measure about 12" long by 5½" broad. They have a peculiarly high and broad raised rim to protect the writing. The ring connecting them had been cut before it came into my hands; it is about 1" thick, and 3½" in diameter. The seal, which is very massive, is square,—about 1½" each way; it has the representation of a boar facing to the proper left, with the sun and moon above it. Through some mistake the seal properly belonging to the grant of Rājāraja II. has been printed off with the facsimile of these plates. A facsimile of the right seal will be supplied hereafter.

It is unnecessary to offer a full translation of so inaccurate and mixed-up a document as this is; and there are, in fact, several passages in it of which no sense can be made at all. I shall confine myself to giving an abstract of its contents. Down to the commencement of the details of the alleged grant, in l. 20, it follows, or rather tries to follow, the corresponding portion of the other copper-plate inscription of Vikramaditya I. already published, No. XXVIII. of this Series, at Vol. VI., p. 73.

* A-chāṭa-bhatra-pravāja. The meaning of this term is disputed. I follow the translation given by Dr. Bähler at Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 71.
first mentions Pulikēśī I. or Polekēśī-Vallabha, as he is here called; then his son, Kurttivārmā I.; then Satyāśraya, i.e. Pulikēśī II., the son of Kurttivārmā I.; and finally Vikramāditya-Satyāśraya, or Vikramāditya I., the son of Pulikēśī II. It then purports to record that, when five centuries and thirty-two years of the Saka era had expired, on Sunday, the day of the new-moon between the months Vaiśākha (April-May) and Jyaiśṣṭha (May-June), under the constellations Rāhiṇī and the Great Bear, when the sun was in the sign of the Bull, and at the time of a total eclipse of the sun, Vikramāditya I., in the sixteenth year of his reign, while residing at the city of Kisuṭvala,10 bestowed upon Raviśārma of the sect called Basari-saṅgha and the Agastya gītra, the son of Jayāśarman who was the son of Mādhavaśarman, the village of Kūṭakūṭā,11 which was in the Belvela country and in the centre of the seven villages of Benevitavara, Anngēre, Ittage, Pasuṇḍi, Mugiṇi, Paranti, and Mālghandu.

According to this inscription, therefore, the reign of Vikramāditya I. commenced in Śaka 516 or 517.

But I reject it entirely, as a forgery and of no authority, on the following grounds. — I. The date is completely at variance with the dates of all the other early Western Chāluṅka inscriptions. For, Pulikēśī II., the father of Vikramāditya I., commenced to reign in Śaka 531 or 532, as in No. XXVII. of this Series, at Vol. VI., p. 72, and was still reigning in Śaka 556. And Vinayāditya, the son of Vikramāditya I., commenced to reign in Śaka 600 or 601, by Nos. XXIX., XXX., and XXXXI., at Vol. VI., pp. 86, 88, and 91, and by the Fourth Part of No. XXXIX., at p. 111 above, which is probably dated in the seventh year of his reign. And Vijayāditya, the son of Vinayāditya, commenced to reign in Śaka 617, 618, or 619, by the Second Part of No. XXXIX., and by three unpublished inscriptions that I have in hand. And Vikramāditya II., the son of Vijayāditya, commenced to reign in Śaka 654 or 655, by the Third Part of No. XXXVIII., at p. 101 above. — 2. As in the case of the forged grant of Pulikēśī I., published immediately above, the name of the dynasty is spelt, in l. 4, ‘Chāluṅka’, sc. ‘Chāluṅka’, with the vowel of the first syllable long. — 3. The word ba-triṣṭa, ‘thirty-second’, used in expressing the date, is a hybrid word, part Prākrit and part Sanskrit, and I have not found an analogous instance of such a word in any other early grant. — 4. Whereas Śaka 532 is a.d. 610-11, Mr. Burgess informs me, as the result of calculation, that no solar eclipse did occur, on the date given, in a.d. 610, 611, or 612. — 5. The language and orthography are far more inaccurate than I have ever yet found to be the case in any other grant of early date. But this, of course, might by chance be due to the ignorance or carelessness of a copyist or the engraver. — And finally, 6. In the letters ja, except in l. 1, and ga and ku, an attempt is made to imitate the ancient forms. But, with this exception, the characters are fully developed Old Canarese characters of at least the ninth or tenth century a.d. And I have to draw especial attention to the fact that, except in the words paramēśvara, once in l. 7 and twice in l. 8, and tvarūgamāna, in l. 9, there is used for the letter ma a character which, with the corresponding forms of ya and va, is purely medieval. The earliest genuine instance in which I have found this form of the ma used is the copper-plate grant of the Rāṣṭrakūta king Gōvinda III. spoken of above, — e.g., in para-dattam-ba, sc. para-dattāṇa va, l. 14, Pl. II. b. The corresponding forms of ya and va,—the former, however, not very clear,—may be seen in the Munōli stone-tablet inscription, Pl. LXXXIV. of Mr. Burgess’ Second Report, in Ballalageyal, l. 55, and Bāinivērāl, l. 56.

After rejecting the present plates, we have no dated inscription of the time of Vikramāditya I. Consequently, and because we do not know how long his father, Pulikēśī II., continued to reign, and whether his elder brother, Chandrāditya, did actually reign or not, his date cannot be determined with much certainty. I would place him, however, somewhere about Śaka 580 (a.d. 658-9). We have not to search far, I think, for the reason

10 The literal reading in the text is sarvavāmaḥ-saṃhāraḥ, ‘giving for a whole month’. This, of course, is only a mistake for sarvaśṛṣṭi-bhāvaḥ, ‘swallowing or engulfing all’, which is the usual expression for a total eclipse.

11 The Puladā-Kisuṭvala of other inscriptions, and the modern Patanadaki on the banks of the Malaprabhā in the Bādāni-Tāntā of the Kalkā District.

12 The modern Kurtaṭāli.
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why there is no dated inscription of his time, and why probably none such will be found. For, as I have previously had occasion to point out, Nos. XXVIII. to XXXI. of this Series indicate very plainly that, after Pulikēś I., the succession was interrupted by the hostility of the Pallavas of Kāchṭi, and by a confederacy of the three kings of Chōja and Pāṇḍya and Kēraḷa, and that, at least, Vikramāditya I. did not immediately succeed his father, but was ousted for a time. The authority of him and of his elder brother, Chandrāditya, must have been confined, at the best, to the country of the Kōkāṇas. Both Vikramāditya I., and his son, carried on the war against these enemies. But, though Vikramāditya I. seems to have been to a certain extent successful, it was probably not till the time of Vinnayāditya that the Western Chalukya power was thoroughly restored, and the kingdom consolidated again, in such a way that the head of it could refer to any specific date as the commencement of his reigh.

Transcription.

First plate.

[1] Jayatya=āvishkṛitaṁ Vīṣhār-śvārāhah(hah) kshōpi(bhi)t-ārupya-van-dakhya-dūnata-
[2] dāraṁ(dan)bhiṣṭ-āgraham(gra)-vī-rātattan(ata)-bhuvanah vapiḥ [ ][*] Śrīmatāṁ sa-

Ruddhītanāṁ Kārtti(ṛti)kēya-parirakshaṇa-prāpta-kalīya-praṇamḥparāṇāṁ[Naṛāyaṇa-prasād-
[5] sāma(ma)sāditattan(ā)varahā-lānccha(cha)

[u-śekhaṇa]-śekhaṇa-vaśa-vaśikrīt-āśeṣha-mahbrītanāṁ[ec.'bhiratāṁ] Chālukhya-śya(ka)-nāṁ kulam-alakṣākshaṁnāḥ sasvamāḥ śrava-padtipād gāṅgā-ja-

[6] la-sūnā-pavitrīkṛita-gāḍ(ga) trasya Śrī-Polekēś(śi)-Vallabha-mahārāj-āḍi(dh)īrṣiān-

[8] kram-a(a)kranta-Ba(va)na-vāyuyā-āḍi(di)-pari-nipati-maṇḍala-praṇa(ni) baddha viśuddha-

[kṛttē[*] Kārttī(ṛti)varma珣āri-prithu(thi)vivallabha-mahārāj(ā)-a-

[9] di(dh)i-raja-paramēśvara-paramabhaṭṭāraka[saṁ] putraḥ(trasya) samara-samāsena(ṣek)ka-

sakal-ottara(ṛ)patha-śvara-Śrī-Hariṣa(harsa) varadhana-parāṁ-

[10] y-śralambha-paramēśvara-parama-nāmādhēyasya Satyaśraya-śrī-prithu(thi)vivallabha-

mahārāj-āḍi(dh)īrṣi-rama-paramēs-


paramēśvaram(a) jīvaṃ pratiṣṭha(prēcī?) nēkō-samara-mukhi ripu-nipati-ra-

[12] dhīra-jala-śvādana-rasa-nāya-māna-jvalana-niśita-nisthīnī-chāhār(a)ya(yu) da(n)āvabhṛta-

dharaṇīkāra-bhun.

Second plate : first side.


[13] mavaṇḍyay(sc. magu) anēkā-praha(ha) raḥ svaguru-śrī(śri)yā(ya)m avan-

[15] pati-tritim-āntarita(tita)mā-śatama(ṣata)(ṭkṛ)tya kṛś-ē(ni)ka(kā) dihattri-hint(a(a)śeṣha-ṛṣya-

ch(a)(ba)raḥ taśmin rājya-trayō(ṛ)ṛṣaṇ-ṛti(rati) raipu-narāndra(nma) dian-

[17] [śi(si)][diṣi[*] jīvā sa(sva) vaśiṣṭha-lakshmim(kshim) prāptā(ṇvā)[*] paramāṇamānant(a(ma) [nī][nī] dhā(ṛa) vitar-Vikramādityam (=tāy)[[[*]] = (A)jī ta(ta)ch ch-yādī-narasiṅgha(ha) yāśeṇa(yaṁsa) vihitā-Ma-

[19] hṛṇḍra-pratāp-vilayēna nayana-vijī-śvara-raṇa-pragūpa-Śrī-Vallabhaṇa jita(ta) ba-kṛta-

Pallava-āvamarāṇa(nu) dakhinī(ṇu)dīt(g)y-yu-

[21] vatim-āpta(ṇvā) Kaṁch-lā-karyānvāsēmaśvāyām-āpi sutarāṁ Śrī-vallabhavam-

itaḥ vahati śrāmālavaṃ-

[23] rē(ra)ra-ṛasika-śrīyagruṇapraśīkhandhah(ṇdhī) yō rājamaḷa-śe(ṣa) bāda-vihitā-ru-ah Śrī-Pallava-

kula-nāṇaḥ [][*] Dūrāmāṅgha(gya)-

[25] dusvā(sta)ra-vinē(bhē)da-vidhā-sāla(lā) durmūma(durgādha)-dustha(sta)ra-bṛihat-

pariṣṭa(parikhā)-pari(ṛit)ā [a[*]bhrā(grā)hi yēna Jayateśvara-pōta-rāja-
NOTES ON THE KURRAL OF THE TAMIL POET TIRUVALLUVAR.


No. I.
The name 'Kurral' is given par excellence to a very celebrated poetical composition in the Tamil language consisting of 133 chapters, each containing 10 couplets or kurrales. It thus numbers 2660 lines.

Kurral means 'anything short'; (κουραί, S. κρίτι, Lat. curtus, Gr. κορις, A. S. secor-t), and is properly the name of the couplet, as being the shortest species of stanza in the Tamil language.

Tiruvalluvar's poem is thus by no means a long one; though in volume it far outweighs the whole of the Tamil literature, and is one of the select number of great works which have entered into the very soul of a whole people, and which can never die. According to a custom not unknown in Europe, a series of verses bearing the names of all the great Tamil poets is prefixed to the Kurral under the name of 'The garland of Tiruvalluvar,' and exhausts the subject of his excellence with every variety of hyperbole.

Several of these are neat. One says that as Vishnu, when he appeared as Vaman or the dwarf, strode in two steps over heaven and earth, so with the two lines of his diminutive verse has Tiruvalluvar transcended the universe.

Complete in itself, the sole work of its author, it has come down the stream of ages absolutely uninjured,—hardly a single various reading being found,—and every rival sect in the Tamil country claims the Kurral as its own.

Meanwhile Tiruvalluvar furnishes another illustration of the saying that the world knows nothing of its greatest men. The name even of the great bard is unknown, for Tiruvalluvar means sacred priest, and is simply his title as priest of the Parijah clergy. Tradition makes him the son of a Brahman father and a low-caste woman, and represents the poetess
Avvalas his sister, while several other poets, a few of whose verses are preserved, were his brothers. There is no foundation for these stories. He certainly was a Pariah, lived at St. Thomé, or Mayilapūr, and appears to have had an intimate friend, probably a patron, called Elēia Sīngan, a sailor.

He is said to have composed his Kurral at the request of his neighbours, that the Tamil people might have a Vēdam of their own. It was doubtless intended to become the authority on all ethical subjects for the Tamil country. The author must have already possessed a great reputation, or this request would not have been made; yet there are no traces of any other writings of his.

The Kurral when finished is said to have been taken by its author to Madurā, where there was a college of learned Tamil scholars. Lists are given of the forty-eight members of this academy, but there are no genuine remains of their writings. The result of the appearance of Tiruvalluvar is variously stated. The general idea is that the high-caste assembly would not permit him to take his seat on the bench with the learned pandits, on account of his want of caste, but that, meekly acquiescing in his own exclusion, he simply requested permission to lay his book on the end of the seat. On this being granted, the book was placed where the poet should have been seated, and the whole bench at once disappeared, leaving the learned professors afloat in the Lotus-lake. This story is inconsistent with the idea, which is equally prevalent, that the president was Kāpilār, himself a Pariah, and a brother of Tiruvalluvar.

The truth seems to be that the southern school of Tamil literature was supreme till the advent of the St. Thomé poet, whose fame eclipsed that of the southern sages.

There are no data whatever which may enable us to fix the period at which our poet flourished. I think between A.D. 1000 and 1200 is its probable date. The style is not archaic—far less so than that of the Śivaga Čhīntāmani. Remembering that its author was not fettered by caste prejudices, that his greatest friend was a sea-captain, that he lived at St. Thomé, that he was evidently an 'eclectic,' that Christian influences were at work in the neighbourhood, and that many passages are strikingly Christian in their spirit, I cannot feel any hesitation in saying that the Christian Scriptures were among the sources from which the poet derived his inspiration. I think that even Muhammadan influences are not to be excluded.

The edition published by the late Dr. Graul, in Leipzig and in London, in 1856, is likely to be in the hands of all who care to read this paper. Dr. Graul has incorporated Beschi's Latin translation.

Mr. F. W. Ellis, an Oriental scholar of extraordinary ability, a member of the Madras Civil Service, printed a large portion of the Kurral with copious notes and illustrations. The sheets of this unfinished work can still be had. The Rev. W. H. Drew, a missionary of the London Society in Madras, published an edition with the Tamil commentary of Parimēlaragār. This is the best edition.

The purely native editions issued under the editorship of the late learned Šarvaṇapuruṣaimalaiyar of Madras are very correct and valuable.

Twelve native commentators have illustrated by verbal commentaries the whole text; but the student will do well to disregard the meanings read into the verses by persons, native or European, who are anxious to prove that the Tamil sage taught their own favourite dogmas.

Tiruvalluvar is generally very simple, and his commentators very profound.

In regard to the philosophico-theological system taught in the Kurral various opinions have naturally been held. Of course every Hindu sect claims the great poet, and strives to interpret his verses so as to favour its own dogmas. The Jains especially claim him, and he has used several of their terms. He seems to me to have been cognizant of the latest developments of that system.

Dr. Graul's account of the spirit of the work is fair and accurate. He says: "The Kurral breathes throughout the atmosphere of Buddhism, or rather Jainism, although the Brahmanas have thought fit to appropriate it to themselves, by making Tiruvalluvar an incarnation of Śiva."

"The monotheism taught in it is that of the later Buddhists or Jainas, who acknowledged an Ādībuddha or Ādiśvara, called sometimes even Ādiddēvan, 'primordial god.' Nothing is said about the dignity of Brāhmaṇas, who are
not even mentioned by their exclusive official name; the real greatness of man is independent of birth, and rests on purely moral grounds. Among the four Brāhmaṇical stages of life we see only those of the householder and of the ascetic treated of; the Brāhmaṇical pantheon retreats to the background, and, when made to advance on the stage, sometimes appears in the garb of allegorical figure, and sometimes even is lightly spoken of. Besides, the poet lavishes praise beyond measure on the ascetic life; absolute abstinence from destroying any animal life in a direct or indirect way (ahimās) is enforced; only general rules for moral conduct are given, while no mention is made of any special caste-rules. Such is the character of the Kurāli, and every single feature of it testifies to its essentially Buddhistic or Jainistic spirit.

There is one couplet, however, that is quite destructive of the idea that Tiruvalluvar was a Jain. In ch. III, fourth couplet, a story regarding Indra is referred to as proving that ascetics have power over the gods. The sage was Gauțama, who cursed Indra for deceiving the sage's wife, Ahalayā. Now according to Jain ideas a sage could have no wife, nor could he feel the emotion of anger, nor had he the power to inflict punishment. A Jain would not believe the story, nor use it as the author of the Kurāli has done.

Dr. Caldwell says: "The Kurāli contains no trace of the distinctive doctrines of Sankara. It teaches the old Sānkhyā philosophy, but ignores Sankara's additions and developments, and would therefore appear to have been written before the school of Sankara had risen to notice, if not before Sankara himself, who lived not later than the ninth century.

"There is no trace in the Kurāli of the mysticism of the modern Paurāṇic system; of Bhakti, or exclusive, enthusiastic faith in any one deity of the Hindū pantheon; of exclusive attachment to any of the sects into which Hindūism has been divided since the era of Sankara; or even of acquaintance with the existence of any such sects. The work appears to have been written before Saivism and Vaishnavism had been transformed from rival schools into rival sects; before the Purāṇas, as they now stand, had become the text-books of Hindū theology; and whilst the theosophy of the early Vedānta and the mythology of the Mahābhārata comprised the entire creed of the majority of Hindūs. The author of the Kurāli is claimed with nearly equal reason by Śaivas, Vaishnavas, and Jainas. On the whole the arguments of the Jainas appear to me to preponderate, especially that which appeals to the Jaina tone that pervades the ethical part of the work:—e.g., scrupulous abstinence from the destruction of life is frequently declared to be the chiefest excellence of the true ascetic. Nevertheless from the indistinctness and undeveloped character of the Jaina element which is contained in it, it seems probable that in Tiruvalluvar's age Jainism was rather an esoteric ethical school than an independent objective system of religion, and was only in the process of development out of the older Hindūism."

These reasons led the learned writer to assign to the Kurāli a date not later than "the ninth century A.D." He adds, however, that "the reasons for this conclusion are rather negative than positive."

To my own mind the internal evidence is all in favour of a much later origin. I understand that Sankara's chief work (as appears from the only real authority on the subject, the Sankara digvijaya) was, in the words of Dr. H. H. Wilson, to secure "the recognition of Brahma Para Brahma as the sole cause and ruler of the universe." He left other things untouched. I know of no other doctrines taught by him which Tiruvalluvar could have recognized than this, which is implied throughout the Kurāli. Tiruvalluvar's teaching is just such as the study of Hindūism, in the light of Sankara's reforms, combined with that of the Jaina system in its later developments, and of the Bhagavadgītā, might have produced.

There is no trace in the Kurāli of many things current in South India at different periods, because, I suppose, they had been eliminated from the sage's own eclectic system of faith and practice, and because his work is didactic, and not controversial.

I cannot subscribe to the statement that "it teaches the old Sānkhyā philosophy;" for I find in it no hint of prakṛti or of prakṛti, or anything that looks like a reproduction of any of the Aphorisms of Kapila. What philosophy he teaches seems to me to be rather of the eclectic school as represented by the Bhagavadgītā.
Of Bhakti—that compound of ποιησις and φώνη, the introduction of which into India I think (with Weber) is due to the influence of Christianity—the first chapter of the Kurral is a beautiful exposition.

These topics will be further illustrated when we proceed to the consideration of the text itself.

The Kurral owes much of its popularity to its exquisite poetic form. A kurral is a couplet containing a complete and striking idea expressed in a refined and intricate metre. No translation can convey an idea of its charming effect. It is truly an 'apple of gold in a network of silver.' Something of the same kind is found in the Latin elegiac verse. There is a beauty in the periodic character of the Tamil construction in many of these verses that reminds the reader of the happiest efforts of Propertius. Probably the Tamil sage adopted it as being the best representative in Tamil of the Sanskrit ásūka.

The brevity rendered necessary by the form gives an onomatopoeic effect to the utterances of the great Tamil 'Master of the sentences.'

The choice of the most difficult metre in the language for a long work showed that the author intended to expend upon it his utmost of power, and to make it a 'possession for ever,' a 'delight of many generations.'

Of the laws of this metre, as a great curiosity, and as being quite unique in prosody, I will try to give the English reader some general ideas. I venture to refer the student of Tamil to my Third Tamil Grammar for a more complete exposition. In the Olavis humaniorum litterarum sublimioris Tamilici idiomatica, by the great Beschi, the whole subject of Tamil poetry is discussed. Dr. A. C. Burnell, M.C.S. (among his very many benefactions to Oriental learning), has issued a reprint of this valuable work, which is most faithful to its native sources, some of which I have printed in my Third Grammar.

A. The feet admissible in the kurral metre are called—

I. 1. ṭimār  —  a spondee.
2. pulimār  =  an anapæst.

II. 3. kǐviḷam  =  a dactyl.
4. karuviḷam  =  a procelesumaticus.

III. 5. tēmāngārī  =  a molossus.
6. pulimāngārī  =  an ionicus a minore.

IV. 7. kūviḷangārī  =  a choriambus.
8. karuviḷangārī  =  the same with first long resolved.

V. The last foot in the second line of a kurral may be

10. kā su : the same with a very short ū.
11. mālār : a pyrrhic.
12. pūripū : the same with a very short ū, hardly sounded at all.

B. Of these feet the former line of the kurral contains three, which may (observing the proper sequence—see I. below) be any of those numbered 1—8; the latter line consists also of three feet, of which the last must be one of the short feet numbered 9–12.

C. Classical ideas of arsis, thesis, and iulus must be dismissed; each metrically short or long syllable is simply pronounced, without any accent, a slight pause marking the end of each foot. The voice lingers on the long syllable, and hurries over the short, but with no inflexion or emphasis, except that of the tune or chant.

D. There must be no casura: in no part of a line can the end of a word coincide with the middle of a foot. Very closely related words—words in construction with one another—may be taken as one word; but every foot is, with this explanation, a single word.

E. The difficulty arises that a word may consist of three short syllables, or of a long syllable followed by a short (trochee). What feet are these? The former is pulimār, the latter tēmā: every tribrach is treated as a dactyl, and every trochee as a spondee—the single short syllable is lengthened in the pause.

The first kurral of Tiruvalluvar transliterated runs thus:

āgarā | mūdālā | ērrāt' ēllām ; ēdi
pāgāvān | mūdāṭṭā | ēlāgū |

This is scanned

pulimā | pulimā | pulimāṅgāi | tēmā
pulimā | pulimā | pirappu |

The rhythm is anapætic.

F. Syllables are not generally long or short, in Tamil, by position; the vowel alone counts.

G. Tamil verse has a rhyme at the beginning, never at the end—a peculiarity found in some Celtic poetry.

H. There must also be, in general, an assonance or alliteration in each line, as in Saxon and Scandinavian poetry. To this the Tamil
ear is very sensitive. This has many rules, with which I need not weary the reader.

Here the first foot begins with a and the third with ā, which is a sufficient assonance.

I. There still remains to be considered the taḷaī (= bond, S. dhāra, I. firm-us), or sequence of feet.

The rule for this is: "The two feet ending in ma (1, 2) must be followed by a foot beginning with a short syllable (2, 4, 6, 11); the other feet (3-8) must be followed by a foot beginning with a long syllable (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10)."

This gives an inexhaustible variety to the rhythms.

THE EDIFICE FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE CHINESE OR JAINA PAGODA AT NEGAPATAM.

BY SIR WALTER ELLIOT, K.C.S.I.

Till within the last few years there was to be seen on the Coromandel coast, between one and two miles to the north of Negapatam, a tall weather-beaten tower, affording a useful landmark to vessels passing up and down the coast. It went by various names, as the Pāṇuveligopuram, the old pagoda, Chinese pagoda, black pagoda, and in the map of the Trigonometrical Survey (sheet 79) it stands as the Jeyna (Jaina) pagoda. But save in name it has nothing in common with Hindu or Muhammadan architecture, either in form or ornament. Tradition is silent as to its origin or purpose, and, although it has been the subject of frequent speculations, no satisfactory theory has been formed to account for it.

In the year 1846 I took a sanitary trip on board the Government steamer Hugh Lindsay, ordered down the coast to touch at several ports on the public service, which gave me an opportunity of seeing the great temple at Rāmēsvaram and other places of interest. On the way back we touched at Negapatam for treasure, and I gladly embraced the occasion to pay a hasty visit to the old pagoda. I found it to be a somewhat four-sided tower of three stories, constructed of bricks closely fitted together without cement, the first and second stories divided by corniced mouldings, with an opening for a door or window in the middle of each side. At the top of the lowest story, were marks in the wall, showing where the floor of the second had been fixed. The top was open. The base of the ground-story was worn at the angles, from collision with passers-by and cattle, but the structure was solid and firm. No trace of sculpture or inscription was visible.

Hard by, in a small building, I found several French Jesuits, who had established themselves on some waste ground near the tower when the Order was expelled from the French territory at Pondicherry some time before. On my expressing surprise at their scanty accommodation, the superior—a gentleman-like, intelligent man—informed me that they intended to build a college on the same site, of which the apartments I saw formed a part, and he showed me a plan and elevation of an extensive building which they hoped to complete in time, and meanwhile all their work was constructed in subordination to the general plan.

Before returning on board I met a sergeant of the Department of Public Works, a good draughtsman, who undertook to make a sketch of the tower for me. (Fig. 2.) This I showed afterwards to Col. Yule, who has introduced it into the first edition of the Travels of Marco Polo (vol. II. p. 273, 1871).

Several years later—in 1859—the Jesuit Fathers presented a petition to the Madras Government representing the tower to be in a dangerous condition, and requesting permission to pull it down and appropriate the materials to their own use. This was referred to the local officers, and soon afterwards (in June 1859) a report was received from Captain Oakes, the District Engineer, who stated that the building was an old ruin, crumbling to decay, which did not deserve the name of an ancient monument, for it had neither sculpture nor inscription, and the tops of the doorways and windows had been supported by timber, which was still remaining in some places. He therefore recommended that an estimate of Rs. 400 which had been

\footnote{1 It is mentioned under this (Pagoda China) name by Valentyn (1726), vol. vii. p. 21.}

\footnote{2 That this circumstance does not militate against the antiquity of the building is proved by the preservation of the timber remaining in the Kālūd cave, where the climate has not the dryness of the coast of Coromandel. See Mr. Ferguson's remarks, Hist. Ind. Arch., pp. 119 and 120, note.}
sanctioned for its repair should be cancelled, and the building demolished.

Against this proposal, being then in Council, I protested; and the Governor, intending shortly to visit the southern districts, agreed to suspend the issue of final orders until he should have an opportunity of seeing it himself.

Meanwhile I left India, and Sir Charles Trevelyan went to Negapatam. He does not appear to have been impressed with a high opinion of the antiquity of the structure, and considered that any expenditure on its repair would be a waste of public money. At the same time he did not concur in the recommendation for its demolition, but directed that it should be fenced round with an enclosure, to secure it from wilful injury, and that good photographs should be taken of it in its present condition.

These orders were never carried out, owing to obstructions thrown in the way of their execution by the Jesuit missionaries, and the building remained in status quo until 1867, when the Fathers renewed their application for leave to remove it, on the following grounds: “1st, because they considered it to be unsafe in its present condition; 2nd, because it obstructed light and sea-breeze from a chapel which they had built behind it; 3rd, because they would very much like to get the land on which it stood; and 4th, because the bricks of which it was built would be very useful to them for building purposes.”

The Chief Engineer, who meanwhile had himself examined the edifice, and had directed the District Engineer to prepare a small estimate for its repair, reported that the first only of the above reasons had any weight, and that it would be met if Colonel O’Connell’s estimate, prepared under his own orders, received the sanction of Government. He therefore recommended that this should be given, and the tower allowed to stand, since, he added, “there is no doubt that it is used as a landmark for vessels approaching the Negapatam roadstead.”

The Master Attendant of the port, however, was of opinion that the inconvenience would be diminished by sighting the five white columns at Nagore, four miles further north, but, he added, “the native population objected to its removal, and if it be ordered would petition against it.”

The Chief Engineer’s proposal did not meet with approval, and on the 25th August 1867 the following order was made on the Jesuits’ petition:—“The Governor in Council is pleased to sanction the removal of the old tower at Negapatam by the officers of St. Joseph’s College, at their own expense, and the appropriation of the available material to such school-building purposes as they appear to have in contemplation.”

The Fathers were not slow in availing themselves of this permission. The venerable building was speedily levelled, and the site cleared. Some time afterwards, when Lord Napier visited Negapatam, they presented him with the bronze image represented in Fig. 3 of the plate, which had been found in making excavations connected with the college. It represents a Buddhist or Jaina priest in the costume and attitude of the figures in wood and metal brought from Burma. A band encircles the neck, and the lobes of the ears are pendent and elongated, as if by wearing heavy earrings. The hands are open, the right upraised, the left turned down, as in the act of preaching. On cleaning the pedestal some ancient Tamil characters were discovered, occupying the greater part of the front and right sides, which are represented in the plate as Fig. 4. These have been deciphered by Dr. Burnell, who writes—“The inscription is Tamil of the 12th century, or perhaps the beginning of the 13th. It runs Sravati śrī [This] Agamasapādita [dedicated] Uyyakondha Nāyak. There are only two words, the first in the 2nd (accusative) case, the second in the 1st (nominative) case. The meaning is plain; but who was

6 and 7 miles in length, running N. and S., and from 3 to 4 miles distant from the shore. Ships bound to the north must not come into less than 71 fathoms until the Negapatam flagstaff or the Black Pagoda bears N. by W. The town lies to the N. of the Fort near the entrance into a little river; and about 11 miles NNW. from the fort stands the old Black Pagoda, which is one of the most conspicuous objects in approaching this part of the coast, the whole of which has a low, drowned aspect when first seen from the offing, consisting as it does of a sandy, barren soil plastered with cocoanut trees &c. &c.
I took the image some years ago to be Buddhist. There was, however, a Śaiva teacher Umāpatiśivāchārya, also called Sakalāgamaṇḍita, and it may represent him."

It can hardly be doubted that the statuette is connected with the character of the building, and the purpose for which it was erected. Now the general aspect of the figure, the loose mantle, the crisp chevelure, the conical head-ornament, the pierced and elongated ear-lobes, savour strongly of a Buddhist (or Jaina) origin, which would imply a corresponding relation between the structure and that faith. Granting this, it may be set down as a Vihāra, or as a memorial of some holy man.

I did not omit to consult Mr. Ferguson on the subject, but he finds a difficulty in pronouncing a decided opinion from a mere sketch without plan or measurements, and adds, "The only buildings I know in India at all like it are the tombs of the Jaina priests at Mūnubidri (Hist. of Ind. Arch., p. 275, woodcut 154). If it be not a tomb I do not know what it is."

The fate of this "interesting building," as Col. Yule calls it, strikingly illustrates the importance of forming an Archaeological Survey Department for the Madras Presidency, as has been done for every other part of India and for Ceylon. It cannot be supposed that the Government would have thus ruthlessly consigned to destruction a monument unique of its kind, which had never been carefully examined by a competent observer, if they had been aware of its claim to protection. Nor is this a solitary example. The work of demolition is daily going on, and too late it will be found that other precious relics of the past have been lost forever through simple ignorance of their value.

I am convinced, from my own observation, that if this one had only been left to itself it would have stood for years. All that was wanted for its protection was to enclose it with a substantial wall, at the cost of a few rupees, to hinder cattle and passing vehicles from destroying the angles at its base. The state in which I saw it, as depicted in the plate, Fig. 2, twenty years before it was reported to be in danger of falling, shows that the lower story had only suffered externally from the attrition to which its exposed situation made it liable, without damaging the stability of the structure.

Since the foregoing was written I have received a photograph of the College taken in 1866 by Mr. Middleton Bayne when employed on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. In this the tower appears in the background (as represented in Fig. I of the plate) to the left of the College, which has now assumed an imposing appearance.

A "livraison" of the 1st volume of the Athénée Oriental (Paris, 1871) has likewise come to hand, in which (at pp. 79-86) there is an article entitled "La Bouddha Sākya Mouni," by M. Ph. Ed. Foucaux, Professor of Sāntākrit in the College of France. In this he has introduced woodcuts of three Buddhist images found in the grounds of the College of St. Joseph at Negapatam, copied from sketches communicated by the Academic Society of St. Quentin, through the kindness of M. Testor de Ravissi, late Governor of Karikal, whose acquaintance I had the pleasure of making at the International Oriental Congress of 1874.

The circumstances under which the images were discovered are stated in the following extract from a record made at the time:—

"Not far from the tower is an old Mahwa tree (Bassia latifolia, L.), the diameter of which above the root is more than a meter—indicating, according to the usual growth of the tree, an age of 700 to 800 years.

"In March 1866 the missionaries, having cut it down for the requirements of their work of construction, discovered five small Buddhist idols at a depth of somewhat more than a yard below the surface.

"From the position in which they were found, they appear to have been concealed, with a view of being again used in religious worship, for they were carefully placed in a chamber under a covering of bricks arranged for their protection.

"Four of the idols are of bronze, the fifth of a mixture of porcelain and clay, of exquisite workmanship."

M. Foucaux adds that one of the idols had been retained in the College, and that the fifth had been sent to Rev. Fr. Carayon, in Paris, but he does not state what became of the remaining three. One of these, No. 16, is almost identical with that figured for our article (Fig. 3), differing only in the absence of the square pedestal bearing the inscription, which, however, forms a separate piece from the lotus stand common to both, and in the disposition of the mantle, which is pendant from the

---

* See Moor's Hindu Poothoon, p. 251, plates lxx-lxxi.
* Mr. Bayne at present fills the post of Chief Engineer of the Sindh and Punjab Railway, and is now at Multā.
* The Tamil name is Iluppai-muram.
FIG. 5. INDIAN BUDDHA.

FIGS. 6, 7. BUDDHA IMAGES.
left shoulder only, and not from both as in ours. The left hand, also, is held up, instead of pointing downwards. In all other respects they are identical.

It is probable that these three (figs. 5, 6, 7) have been deposited in the Academy of St. Quentin, and that the one retained by the Fathers is that which was given to Lord Napier.

No. 6 represents Buddha, seated in the usual attitude under the sacred tree. No. 7 appears to be a female devotee, of very rude workmanship. Copies of the three are introduced into our plate.

The discovery of these relics places the Buddhist origin of the tower beyond dispute.

Note by Dr. Burnell.

As I several times in 1866 visited the ruin referred to, I may be permitted to say that it had become merely a shapeless mass of bricks. I have no doubt that it was originally a vihăna or shrine of some temple; there are some of precisely the same construction in parts of the Chinglepet district.

Sir Walter Elliot’s remarks about the destruction of ancient monuments in the Madras Presidency must be a source of great satisfaction to all interested in South-Indian antiquities; for my own part, I am confident that, if something be not soon done, there will not be anything left in a few more years that has the least historical interest. I may mention a lamentable instance of the destruction of a relic of much interest which occurred some four years ago: I refer to the blowing up of the flagstaff tower at Cochin. This was the tower of the old Church of the Cross (afterwards the Cathedral of Cochin), where St. Francis Xavier preached, and was the last known building that could be connected with the history of a man whose name will always survive in South India. The cathedral was once a very fine church (see the view in Baldamus); the Dutch used it as a storehouse, but it remained for the English to destroy the body of the church early in this century, and then in 1874 to remove the still remaining tower. (See, as regards the first, Mr. Anstey’s indignant remarks in Lord Stanley’s Three Voyages of Vasco da Gama, Hakl. Soc. 1869, p. 425.)

I have searched, and had search made, to ascertain if Āgama pāṇḍita can possibly be a Buddhist or Jain title used in South India, but cannot find the least trace of such use. It is tolerably certain that the image is that of a Śaiva devotee, and it certainly was the practice to dedicate such images in temples (see, e.g., the great inscription at Tanjor). I may remark that the Śaiva monks (Tambiran) in this district are hardly to be distinguished from Buddhist monks, except by the ashes they smear on their foreheads and by their matted hair.

Tanjor, 27th June 1873.

Pārshi Funeral and Initiantory Rites.

I am glad my paper on the above subject has at length elicited a little criticism. My intention was to give a lecture or lectures on the Pārši religion before the University of Oxford immediately after my return from my second Indian journey. But on referring to my notes I found that so many different opinions existed on various knotty questions that I felt obliged to postpone the fulfilment of my design till I had gained further information, or, at least, cleared up some of my chief doubts.

Of course, I know that the researches of German scholars are at my command, but I am most desirous to examine the Pārši religion from the point of view of the Pārshas themselves, and to ascertain the opinions of their most learned men in regard to all controverted points.

My article in the Indian Antiquary was intended to provoke criticism. Of course, therefore, I feel grateful to Mr. Sorabji Kavasji Kambhâda for setting me right in matters about which he is likely to be better informed than I am. If I now criticize some of his criticisms, it is not so much with a view of vindicating my own accuracy as of stimulating further discussion, that the real truth may be ascertained in regard to certain points which evidently admit of some difference of opinion.

For in the course of my inquiries into the religions of India few things surprised me more than the difficulty of obtaining a satisfactory explanation of many ambiguities in the creed and practice of modern Indo-Zoroastrians. Though no class of Indians can boast better educated or more cultivated and enlightened men than the Pārshas, community, very few have studied their own religion in the original documents, and even those learned men to whom I appealed confessed their inability to answer some of my queries. While, therefore, I willingly defer to Mr. Kambhâda’s superior knowledge of his own religion, I feel bound to suspend my judgment in regard to questions still in issue among the Pārshas themselves.

1 Vide vol. VI. pp. 811-315, and vol. VII. p. 179.
Let me take Mr. Khambätā's criticisms in order. He says I have been wrongly informed that the priestly race among the Pārxās is divided into three classes of Dasturs, Mobeds, and Herbas. But, according to his own showing: “Some Herbas are neither Dasturs nor Mobeds, for they do not choose to enter the holy order.” Is not this tantamount to a division of the priestly race into three classes?

In the next place Mr. Khambätā says that I am wrong in calling the Nāsāsalārs “corpsbearers.” Yet again, according to his own showing, they are quite as much corps-bearers as the Khândhīṣas: “The Nāsāsalārs,” he writes, “take up the body from the slab and place it in on the bier.” . . . . . “The Nāsāsalārs again receive the bier and carry it into the inner part of the Tower.” It appears that I ought to have distinguished more clearly between the Nāsāsalārs and the Khândhīṣas or bier-bearers. But I must here observe that my description of a Pārxā funeral in my letter to the Times of 28th January 1876 was reprinted with alterations by the Pārxā Panchāyat, yet no corrections in regard to that point were made. The following sentence was also allowed to stand: “As the bearers are supposed to contract impurity in the discharge of their duty, they are forced to live quite apart from the rest of the community.”

Mr. Khambätā says: “Professor Williams considers feeding the dog with bread a part of the ceremony called Sag-ddā. In this also he is mistaken.” No, my only mistake has been in expressing myself too loosely. It should be observed that the hyphen in Sag-ddā was mine. I knew I was writing for Oriental scholars, and the hyphen seemed to me quite sufficient to indicate that Sag-ddā meant ‘dog-gaze.’ In my Times letter I said: “The corpse is exposed to the gaze of a dog, regarded by the Pārxā as a sacred animal. This latter ceremony is called Sag-ddā.”

Again Mr. Khambätā takes exception to my words, “The fire sanctuary of the sagāri has a window or aperture so arranged that when the sacred fire is fed with sandal-wood 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.” Mr. Khambätā says “this is not correct. With no such design is the sagāri built.” But what I stated was that the aperture (not the building of the sagāri) was arranged with that design. This, however, was not my statement, but that of the Secretary to the Panchāyat, who attended me on both occasions of my visit to the Towers.

With regard to the bread with which the funeral dog is fed, I owe the rational explanation I have given of this remarkable custom to a well-known scholar and distinguished living authority, Mr. K. K. Kāmā. Let others judge if Mr. Khambätā’s explanation is preferable.

Again, Mr. Khambätā calls in question my assertion that the soul of the deceased man is supposed to hover about in a restless state for the three days immediately succeeding death, in the neighbourhood of the dakhmas. Mr. Khambätā informs us that the souls of only sinful men are supposed to do so. Will he tell us what becomes of the souls of the righteous during these three days?

As to the initiatory ceremonies, I must remind Mr. Khambätā that my description had reference to the highest form of these ceremonies. This is what I meant by their “due celebration.”

I quite admit that I ought to have mentioned the white colour of the bull.

In conclusion I must express my surprise that Mr. Khambätā should not have divined from the context that ‘second’ was a mere misprint for ‘sacred’; still I do not excuse myself for having overlooked this error in the proofs.

Monier Williams.

Oxford, 28th July 1878.

THE PHRYGIAN INSCRIPTIONS AT DOGANLI.

Sir,—The question of the geographical course, advance, and development of the Arya languages will have so much interest for your Indian readers that I venture to ask for a small space, in your close columns, to originate a new line of inquiry, which has lately presented itself to me, in the interpretation of the Phrygian inscriptions at Doganlu, near the old Nacoleia. The site of Doganlu lies SE. of the prominent town of Kutia: it is more immediately associated with the traditional Metropolis, which is identified, in Smith and Grove’s Atlas, with Gurgijare Kaleh (Lat. 39° 18’ N., Long. 30° 36’ E.), Doganlu being placed in the same map, under the designation of Castellum et sepulcra regia, in about Lat. 39° 8’ N., Long. 30° 37’ E.

H. Kiepert’s map, attached to the valuable work of P. de Tellihatkeff, Anie Mineurs (Paris, 1860), gives the emplacement of the three sites of Kümbet, Yapoulak, and Doganly, the position of the latter being defined as Lat. 39° 16’ N., Long. 30° 37’ E.¹

¹ The proximity of these historical remains to the ancient Synnada (Asam-Karim-bassar), Lat. 35° 46’ N., Long. 50° 31’ E., is also noteworthy.
I must frankly tell you that these inscriptions have been copied, recopied, and commented on from the days of Walpole, Leake, &c., and, as I now find, put under critical solution in Rawlinson's translation of Herodotus. I am glad to say that I was altogether unaware of this last error, or perhaps I should not have undertaken a new and independent examination of these archaic writings. Nor do I wish now to controvert other people's readings, but to suggest the exercise of free thoughts: to which end I shall be prepared to submit to your readers the full text of some ten or eleven inscriptions with the derivation and associate adaptation of other forms of the old Phoenician alphabets. In the mean time, perhaps, you will allow me to give a general outline of the results I have arrived at. These inscriptions are written in an early form of Greek character very little removed from the archaic type of the Phoenician alphabet on the stèle of Meshas of Moab (a. c. 896), and are arranged, in the boustrrophédon form, reading from right to left and from left to right. The alphabet when compared with the full scheme of the Greek series of 25 letters is found to be deficient in the letters Ï, Ï, and ω; the ϕ seems to have been a subsequent incorporation, and the indeterminate use of the ρ, ς, and σ indicates a very imperfect appreciation of the true value of the adopted letters. One very significant sign of the adaptation of the Semitic alphabet to its new requirements is seen in the simple elaboration of the ordinary ἄς = Ӕ into Ӕ = Ӣ by the convenient addition of a fourth side-stroke. The Ӕ is the Latin Ӕ, distinguished from the Ӕ, for which it might otherwise be mistaken, by the retention of the down-stroke of the latter in a directly perpendicular line, as opposed to the slope given to the down-strokes of the Ӕ and Ӕ. This peculiarity is preserved in the formation of the contracted Ӕ and Ӕ of the Etruscan alphabets.

The Ӕ = Ӕ (see) of the Semitic series seems to have held an anomalous position in its new place, having to do duty for f, v, p, ph, as well as sometimes serving as an accent, and being occasionally employed also as a means of separating vowels, as in the Carian tongue, where vowels were so persistently severed and isolated, as opposed to ordinary Greek rules.  

But the main point for consideration for Aryan scholars is the curious predominance of Latin forms and inflexions in the texts themselves, which, as affecting the affiliation of languages, is of the highest importance in the present state of our philological knowledge. The alphabet in like manner abounds in many of the early identities which were retained intact in the Etruscan and other Italian alphabets.

The texts themselves, as I read them, result in the preservation of the names of several of the old kings of Phrygia, inscribed on the tombs or rock-cut surfaces wherein their ashes may have been enshrined, or in secret places around. The names appear in the following order:

b. A second king called Bab a Mæs, discriminated by a different title.
c. A t y s.  
d. Midas, and  
e. Epæyn, or preferentially Epæyn (ὑπηεύν).  

But by far the most important contribution to ancient archæology which these epigraphs permit me to cite are the dates, which have been hitherto consistently ignored or misunderstood. We have in the first place a distinct record of a life ΑΔΙΤ,  

Iapet (Ἰαπετ), ending at the age of 23 (Γ). Next we meet with a specific date in the form of ΑΤ = 301, which is appended to the name of a certain Chersonesian, outside the rock-cut face of the earliest temple front, which bears on its frieze the name and titles of Epæyn.

The date itself will not therefore apply to the epoch of any given king, but it may be freely accepted as a record made subsequent to the execution of the possibly votive sculpture, and thus indicates the priority, recent or remote, of the ornamental device within whose pattern the leading designation is engraved. The inquiry may now be raised as to what em these latter figures refer. To my understanding there can be but one system of reckoning at all applicable to the circumstances in the race which made its mark and held its continuity from father to son for 505 years, as Herodotus tells us was the case with the proximate Phrygian Herculis.

Asia Minor, Pontus, &c., by W. J. Hamilton (London, 1842), vol. i. p. 409.


The Latin text given by Cory from the Armenian version, with variations from the old Latin version of Hieronymus, uses 'Mæs' as the equivalent of the Greek Μηηηη.

See also Basset, p. 95.
whose dynasty was finally extinguished on the accession of Gyges, in 716 B.C. \\

The dates, therefore, arrange themselves thus:—\[716 + 505 = 1221 \text{ B.C. for the accession to power of the Lydo-Phrygian kings. The recorded date of} \]
\[505 - 301 = 204 \text{ amounts to} \]
\[204 + 716 = 920 \text{ B.C.},
\] or so much before the anomalous reckoning by the Olympiads of 776 B.C., or the local era of the foundation of Rome, a.u.c., which dates only from 754 B.C.

There is one possible objection to the reception in full faith of the initial date of the Heraclidæ as the determining epoch of the period to which we are to assign the execution of these monuments—that is, the highly advanced stage of the alphabetical characters, as opposed to the retarded progress, in that direction, of the Greeks of the islands.

I am not disturbed at all upon this point. If the Egyptians recognized the Phrygians as older than themselves, there must have been some very civilized focus in the latitude in which these rock-cut frontages are preserved to the present day. Mr. Fergusson, as the latest commentator from the architectural point of view, pronounces them to be the very earliest examples of quasi-wooden designs extant.

In regard to the more matured forms of the alphabetical characters at Dogeanu, it is to be remarked that, although they are obviously very much in advance of the Greek of the Homeric development, there is nothing inconsistent with an earlier local civilization, and a more direct and intercourse with the nations who used Phoenician writing as their ordinary method of literary communication. In this respect we may continue the comparison with the Phoenician record on the stele of Meba. This document is now generally conceded to belong to the close of the 9th century B.C., and to exhibit the alphabet in an advanced stage of maturity.

But with the exception of a natural advance upon the special exigencies of a Semitic language, and a mechanical re-adaptation of the outlines of the normal forms, there is nothing in the Phrygian alphabet that is inconsistent with the immediate improvements necessitated by the larger requirements of Aryan speech. Those who care to compare a parallel rate of progress may find identities in the development and adaptation of the Baktrian Semitic alphabet of Asoka’s inscriptions, and see how readily an Aryan tongue improved upon its Semitic teachings, and advanced towards a more perfect, though utterly inconsistent and unsuitable alphabet, in respect to the configuration of the outlines of its letters.

I need not say that this subject is likely to attract much attention among the critical classic authorities of the present day, who may be disposed to agree with Max Müller, who seeks to reduce Greek literature to as comparatively low a level as he assigns to Vedic writing and Indian alphabets.

Indeed, signs of opposition have already manifested themselves, but I have been, strange to say, greatly strengthened in my leading argument by one of the primary objections, which took this form—“How do you know that the letter ṭ was the recognised letter equivalent of 300 in these early times?” It is confessed freely that the later Greek numeral ṭ stands, is figures throughout, for 300, and has never meant anything else in their arithmetic; but how, it is added, can I establish so primitive an application of the use of the letter for the purposes of dates? My reply is, simply, that the Phrygian dates—in their double entries—were clearly well-understood records, where letter figures sufficed for all purposes of identification without further definition.

As regards the doubt about the ṭ and its value then and afterwards as 300, a most curious and instructive piece of consecutive evidence crops up.

The learned world who rely upon Greek priority have long ago admitted that the drop or loss of the F, or digamma, amid the early numbers of the Greek numeral system, afforded conclusive evidence of derivation from the consecutive order of the Phoenician alphabet.

That is clearly so, but a new proof of the antiquity of the Phrygian epigraphs may probably be established from the contested T.

Perhaps your readers are not in possession of all the data which I hope to submit to them, but I may prepare the way by saying that in the Moabite stone and in the Phrygian inscriptions, with which we are more immediately concerned, there is no such letter as the Hebrew ẑ, or the corresponding Greek Θ, and the same remark holds good in regard to most of the Aramaean alphabets.

p. teth, remarks.—Ante bria lustra hujus litterae figura Palæographia sua ignota erat. M. de Layens (Prisseh, pl. ix c), has only one teth, that under Sidon, from Sargon to the epoch of the Romans 140 B.C.

Madden, Coins of the Jews, 1864, finds no such letter in the “Assyrian Lion weights,” nor in the “old Hebrew from Coins.” M. de Vogüé, Mélanges, 1865, has none in his Phénicien Archéologie, but plenty in the Egyptian Alphabets.
In these cases, therefore, the final letter of the alphabet counts as 21, and not as 22. No. 21, in the ordinary course of Eastern letter notation, is equivalent to 300, and as such the Greeks received the Τ, out of its regular Phoenician order, and adopted it into their own system, which goes far to suggest that this Phrygian medium was the true channel of communication, in opposition to the tentative numerals of the Egyptians, which the Phoenicians perhaps suggested to the Laisins. So much avowedly depends upon the sequent order of the letters that we find in the proper Hebrew alphabet the ד tpו = 490, and where the current Hebrew adds a second כ p ( = c f), the ד grows into 500.

To reiterate somewhat, in order to test and check the dates bearing upon the mechanical adaptation of letter figures, I will re-state the case from another point of view. The missing Θ of the Aramean writing regains its place in the accepted Greek scheme under the Phoenician influences, to which it was so largely indebted, and from whose alphabetical notation the letter perhaps had never been absent. So also the Hebrew ש yod =10 is constant in the Greek series of letter numbers. The Greek scheme of amalgamation evidently experienced a second jerk in the number of 99, where it had to supply a figure like a reversed Ρ or a revived Π (kopa), as in consecutive a form as the revised equivalent of the σις, in order, per chance, to retain or bring back the γ = f to its proper numeral position as 100, the fixed succeeding ι to its ancient function as 260, and the Τ to its coincident value of 300, from which, as the 21st letter of the primitive Mosite and Phrygian order of notation, it ought never to have been displaced.

E. THOMAS.

THE FIREARMS OF THE HINDUS.

Sir,—Under the above heading Bābu Rām Dās Sen (ante, p. 136) appears to claim for the Hindus of some unknown but very ancient period a knowledge of military projectiles at least equal to that possessed by their descendants in the last century. He speaks of the Agni-Astra as mentioned in the Agni Purāṇa and Mābha Rākhana, and as more particularly described in the Śuka-Nīṭi; a work said to have been written by the sage Śuka-Āchārya; from which he quotes descriptions which as translated undoubtedly refer to true firearms.

But, in the first instance, all the external evidence goes to show that no foreign invaders found the Hindus in original possession of anything of the sort. The scanty records which we have of Greek and Roman contact with ancient India may be ransacked in vain for any positive evidence on the subject, while their silence is strong negative testimony per contra.

No Muhammadan historian mentions gunpowder before a.d. 1317; and Sir H. Elliot thinks the earliest date at which it can have got to India a.d. 1400, and does not put much faith in a Chinese account of something like a firearm in a.d. 1259 (Elliot and Dowson’s Hist. Ind. vol. VI. pp. 455, 459, 460). Col. Yule, referring to a burnt ‘Fire-Pao’ used in China in the 13th century, agrees with MM. Favé and Reinandt that it was probably a sort of rocket. Now, if the Hindus ever had anything of the sort, how did they come to forget all about it before they came in contact with Western races capable of bearing testimony to the fact? or, if they had not forgotten it, how is it that Greek, Arab, and Persian are equally silent on the subject? The Hindu armurer is conservative enough. The sword, the battle-axe, the war-quoit, are the same to-day in steel that they are in the stone of sculptures 1200 years old; and, in respect of the first weapons, the Muslim invaders had no sooner settled in India than they adopted the peculiar and inconvenient Indian hilt. It is hardly likely that so important an art as that of the artillerist would have dropped out of sight, and its only record be found in a Sākṣīrī manuscript not very well known; and this is the next point to which I wish to draw attention.

“The sage Śuka-Āchārya” has already appeared in these columns as the contemporary of the Vāman Avatār and of Bṛ̤haṇapati (Ind. Ant. vol. IV. p. 243, vol. V. p. 5). Was he the author of the work quoted by Bābu Rām Dās Sen? And if not, who was? The Bābu says that the ślokas quoted do not seem mere modern interpolations. His authority upon this point is superior to mine, and I must bow to it till some scholar of weight has examined the MS. and given his opinion on it. But, from the evidence above given, it seems to me that if they are not such interpolations the whole work must be a forgery of, at best, the 17th century—a period which I am led to select by the mention of the flint.

W. F. SINCLAIR.

Finally, under the Italian aspect, though the Umbrians and Etrusans used the Θ, the Romans and Oceanis made up the letter of the ordinary combined TH.

ASITA AND BUDDHA, OR THE INDIAN SIMEON.

In the Lalita Vistara—a legendary history in prose and verse of the life of Buddha, the great Indian saint, and founder of the religion which bears his name—it is related that a Rishi, or inspired sage, named Asita, who dwelt on the skirts of the Himalaya mountains, became informed, by the occurrence of a variety of portents, of the birth of the future lawgiver, as the son of king Sudhodana, in the city of Kapilavastu, in Northern India, and went to pay his homage to the infant. I have tried to reproduce the legend in the following verses. The similarity of some of the incidents to portions of the narrative in the second chapter of St. Luke's Gospel, verses 25ff., will strike the reader.

I may mention that the Buddhist books speak also of earlier Buddhas, that the word means 'the enlightened,' or 'the intelligent,' and that Buddha also bore the appellations Gautama, and of Sākyasiṅhā, and Sākyamuni—i.e. the lion, and the devotee, of the tribe of the Sākyas, to which he belonged.

That I have not at all exaggerated the expressions in the text which speak of Buddha as a deliverer or redeemer, or assimilated his character more than was justifiable to the Christian conception of a saviour, will be clear to any one who can examine the original for himself. Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, a renowned Brāhmaṇical opponent of the Buddhists, while charging Buddha with presumption and transgression of the rules of his caste in assuming the functions of a religious teacher (with which, as belonging to the Kahatriya, and not to the Brāhmaṇical class, he had no right to interfere), ascribes to him these words—"Let all the evils (or sins) flowing from the corruption of the Kali age" (the fourth, or most degenerate, age of the world) "fall upon me; but let the world be redeemed!" If we might judge from this passage, it would seem that the character of a vicarious redeemer was claimed by, or at least ascribed to, Buddha. I was informed by the late Mr. R. C. Childers, however, that in his opinion the idea of Buddha's having suffered vicariously for the sins of men is foreign to Buddhism, and indeed opposed to the whole spirit and tendency of the system.

Another esteemed correspondent is unable to think that the sentiment ascribed to Buddha by Kumārila is foreign to his system, as it is thoroughly in accordance with the idea of the six pāramītas. He does not understand it as implying any theological notion of vicarious atonement, but rather the enthusiastic utterance of highly-strung moral sympathy and charity, and would compare it with St. Paul's words in Romans ix. 3, and explain each in just the same way as, he thinks, Chrysostom does. He further refers to the existence of numerous Buddhist stories in the Kathāsāratī-adgāra, among which is one from lvi. 153, viz. the story of the disobedient son with a red-hot iron wheel on his head, and he says—"Pāpano 'nye 'pi mūchāntām pṛthvyaḥ tat-pātakair api! A pāpa-kṣayaṃ etad me chaṃkram bhrānyatā mādhanaṃ." "Let other sinners on earth be freed from their sins; and until the removal of [their] sin let this wheel turn round upon my head." In either case it is only a wish, and it is not pretended that it really had, or ever could have, any effect on other men. It only expresses a perfection of charity. The same idea (borrowed, as the writer supposes, from Buddha) comes in in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, ix. ch. 21.

On Himalaya's lonely steep
There lived of old a holy sage,
Of shrivelled form, and bent with age,
Inured to meditation deep.

He—when great Buddha had been born,
The glory of the Sākyas race,
Endowed with every holy grace;

To save the suffering world forlorn—
Beheld strange portents, signs which taught
The wise that that auspicious time
Had witnessed some event sublime,
With universal blessing fraught.

The sky with joyful gods was thronged:
He heard their voice with glad acclaim
Resounding loudly Buddha's name,
While echoes clear the shouts prolonged.

The cause exploring, far and wide
The sage's vision ranged; with awe
Within a cradle laid he saw
Far off the babe, the Sākyas' pride.

With longing seized this child to view
At hand, and clasping, and homage pay,
Athwart the sky he took his way
By magic art, and swan-like flew

And came to King Sudhodana's gates,
And entrance craved—"Go, royal page,
And tell thy lord an ancient sage
To see the King permission waits."

The page obeyed, and joined his hands
Before the prince, and said—"A sage,
Of shrivelled form, and bowed with age,
Before the gate, my sovereign, stands,

"And humbly asks to see the King."
To whom Sudhodana cried—"We greet
All such with joy; with honour meet
The holy man before us bring."

The saint beside the monarch stood,
And spake his blessing—"Thine be health,
With length of life, and might, and wealth;
And ever seek thy people's good."
With all due forms, and meet respect,
The King received the holy man,
And made him sit; and then began—
"Great sage, I do not recollect
"That I thy venerable face
Have ever seen before; allow
Me then to ask what brings thee now
From thy far-distant dwelling-place."
"To see thy babe," the saint replies,
"I come from Himálaya's steeps."
The King rejoined—"My infant sleeps;
A moment wait until he rise."

"Such great ones ne'er," the Rishi spake,
"In torpor long their senses sleep;
Nor softly love luxurious sleep;
The infant Prince will soon awake."

The wondrous child, alert to rise,
At will his slumber light dispelled.
His father's arms the infant held
Before the sage's longing eyes.

The babe beholding pass bright,
More glorious than the race divine,
And marked with every noble sign,¹
The saint was welcomed with deep delight;

And crying—"Lo! an infant graced
With every charm of form I greet!"
He fell before the Buddha's feet,
With fingers joined, and round him paced.²

Next round the babe his arms he wound,
And "One," he said, "of two careers
Of fame awaits in coming years
The child in whom these signs are found.

"If such an one at home abide,
He shall become a King, whose sway
Supreme a mighty arm'd array
On earth shall stablish far and wide.

"If, spurming worldly pomp as vain,
He choose to lead a joyless life,
And wander forth from home and wife,
He then a Buddha's rank shall gain."

He spoke, and on the infant gazed,
When tears suffused his aged eyes;
His bosom heaved with heavy sighs;
Then King Suddhodán asked, amazed—

"Say, holy man, what makes thee weep,
And deeply sigh? Does any fate
Malign the royal child await?
May heavenly powers my infant keep?"³

"For thy fair infant's weal no fears
Disturb me, King," the Rishi cried;
"No ill can such a child betide;
My own sad lot commands my tears.

"In every grace complete, thy son
Of truth shall perfect insight² gain,
And far sublimer fame attain
Than ever lawgiver has won.

"He's such a Wheel of sacred lore
Shall speed on earth to roll as yet
Hath never been in motion set
By priest, or sage, or god before.

"The world of men and gods to bless;
The way of rest and peace to teach,
A holy law thy son shall preach—
A law of stainless righteousness.

"By him shall suffering men be freed
From weakness, pain, and grief,
From all the ills shall find relief
Which hatred, love, illusion, breed.

"His hand shall loose the chains of all
Who groan in fleshly bands confined;
With healing touch the wounds shall bind
Of those whom pain's sharp arrows gall.

"His potent words shall put to flight
The dull array of leaden clouds
Which helpless mortals' vision shrouds,
And clear their intellectual sight.

"By him shall men who, now untaught,
In devious paths of error stray,
Be led to find a perfect way—
To final calm at last be brought.

"But once, O King, in many years,
The fig-tree² somewhere flowers perhaps;
So after countless ages' lapse,
A Buddha once on earth appears,

"And now, at length, this blessed time
Has come: for he who cradled lies
An infant there before thine eyes
Shall be a Buddha in his prime.

¹ Certain corporeal marks are supposed by Indian writers to indicate the future greatness of those children in whom they appear. Of these, thirty-two primary and eighty secondary marks are referred to in the original as being visible on Buddha's person.

² The word here, imperfectly translated, means, according to Professor H. H. Wilson's Dictionary, "reverential salutation, by circumambulating a person or object, keeping the right side towards them."

³ The term here translated 'insight' is derived from the same root as the word 'Buddha,' and means 'intelligence,' or 'enlightenment.'

⁴ The term thus rendered, dharmachátra, expresses a somewhat singular figure. It denotes the 'wheel of the law,' or the 'wheel of righteousness,' or the 'wheel of religion.'

⁵ The word in the original is nirvána, a term of which the sense is disputed—some scholars esteem it to mean absolute annihilation; others explaining it as the extinction of passion, the attainment of perfect dispassion. Mr. Childers considers nirvána to signify active bliss on earth for a brief period, followed (upon death) by total annihilation.

⁶ The tree referred to in the original is the Udumbára, the Ficus glomerata.
"Full, perfect insight gaining, he
Shall rescue endless myriads tost
On life's rough ocean waves, and lost,
And grant them immortality.

"But I am old, and frail, and worn,
I shall not live the day to see
When this thy wondrous child shall free
From woe the suffering world forlorn.

"Tis this mine own unhappy fate
Which bids me mourn, and weep, and sigh;
The Buddha's triumph now is nigh,
But, ah! for me it comes too late!"  

When thus the aged saint, inspired,
Had all the infant's greatness told,
The King his wondrous son extolled,
And sang, with pious ardour fired—

"Thee, child, th' immortals worship all,
The great Physician, born to cure
All ills that hapless men endure;
I, too, before thee prostrate fall."

And now—his errand done—the sage,
Dismissed with gifts, and honour due,
Atheart the other swan-like flew,
And reached again his hermitage.

J. MUIR.

ANCIENT BURYING-GROUND AT MUNGAPETTA, AND CROSSES.

It is well that officers of geological surveys who
are working in unfrequented districts should keep
their eyes open to any prehistoric remains which
may come under their notice. Mr. W. King, of the
Indian Survey, has shown himself fully alive to the
value of archaeological observations, by the notes
which he has recently communicated to the Asiatic
Society of Bengal. These notes describe a prehi-
storico burial-place, which he visited in the course of
his geological work, near Mungapet, in the Nizam's
dominions. The cemetery consists of an assem-
bly of about 150 stone cists, enclosed in megal-
ithic rings, with four large monoliths in the shape
of crosses. Each tomb is formed of four upright
slabs of stone, with another for a covering-lid, the
largest cist measuring 9½ feet in length by 9 feet
in width, with a height of about 5 feet. The stone
slab which forms the floor of each cist is hol-
lowed into one or more cavities for reception of
the bodies, which were probably embalmed. The
surrounding circle of stones is in some cases 30
or 40 feet in diameter; and one of the crosses mea-
sures 16 feet in height. The cists and crosses are
all of dressed stone, the material being the sand-
stone of the country. It is suggested by Mr. King
that this burial-place is of pre-Aryan age, or be-
longs to Hindu-Kolarian times. Ruder remains of
similar style are scattered over the surrounding
country, but the group of tombs which he describes
is of special interest from the presence of the
crosses, which is quite an exceptional feature.—
The Academy, 29th December.

Mr. King observes that the crosses are distin-
guished from those of Christian origin by the differ-
ent size of the limbs, and by the curved junction
between the arms and the lower limb. Another
similar cross is reported to exist in the Hazari-
bhâg districts at Basapar, near Leyo, in the valley
of the Bikaro river. Near it there are a number
of dressed memorial stones of truncated pyramidal
shape.

It is not clear whether the Mungapetâ group of
crosses are the same with those at Katapur and
Nirmal, in the Nizam's country, described and
figured at pp. 465-8 of Ferguson's Rude Stone
Monuments. Mr. Ferguson inclined to ascribe
them to a Christian origin; see too Ind. Ant. vol.
IV. p. 306, where the same view is taken, and the
circumstances of their being of dressed stone tells
against their belonging to a prehistoric period.
But Mr. King does not appear to regard the
Mungapetâ crosses as Christian, and the pyramidal
memorial stones accompanying another cross are
also spoken of as dressed, and they would not be
claimed as Christian; the localities, too, of these
crosses in only recently penetrated jungles seems
against Christian derivation, and it must be re-
membered that the cross-shape is a pre-Christian
symbol, seen on the breasts of Assyrian statues,
and among the ruins of Palenque, in Mexico.
Meanwhile it seems strange, considering how long
these venerable Indian crosses have been known,
that the question of their association has not
declined.

W.

NOTE.—CANARESE INSCRIPTION.

In February 1874, rambling about Chaul, the
old Greek Simylla, (or Τιμοσίλα) I came upon an
unfinished Śāiva temple, commenced, it was said,
in memoriam of one of the Northern or Kulâhâ
branch of the pirate house of Angria. Just to the
cast of this, beautifully embosomed in the coconut
orchards, was a fine temple of the 18th century,
with tank and ghâts, of which I was told the fol-
lowing legend :

"In the quasi-reign of one of the earlier Pesh-
vás a Drāvījia Brâhman dwelling at Chaul was
warned in a dream, by I forget what god, that he
should proceed to Purâ and demand from the
Government money wherewith on this spot to
dig a tank and build a temple. He obeyed, found
that a corresponding dream had simultaneously
visited the ruler, and faithfully applied the grant;
"and the bricks are there to this day to testify of it."

Between the temple and the cenotaph toddy-drawers were whetting their knives at the time of my visit, upon a loose slab bearing a Kanarese inscription—a thing of itself (philologically speaking) very remarkable in so thoroughly Marathi a country as the North Kuchana. A little money and a good deal of diplomacy enabled me to place it in the collection of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, where it has remained unchecked from that day to this, upon a landing-place, where scholars pass it every week.

W. F. SINCLAIR.

ABYSSINIAN KINGS.

The following is a list of the kings of Abyssinia during the greater part of five centuries from B.C. 139—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Menilek or Ibn Hakim reigned 29 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Za-Hendecyu 1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Awda 11 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Za-Awuyu 3 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Za-Tsawe 3 yrs. 10m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Za-Gesyu, half a day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Za-Mante 3 yrs. 4 mts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Za-Bahse 9 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kâwudu 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Kanaa 10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Haduna 9 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Za-Wasih 1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Za-Botdir 2 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Za-Awzeta 1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Za-Berwaa 29 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Za-Mahaa 1 yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Za-Basse 1 yr. 6 mts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>Za-Setnani 26 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Za-Les 10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Za-Masen 1 yr. 6 mts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Za-Sutuwa 9 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Za-Adgaba 10 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Za-Agba 6 yrs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 9th year of Abreha, A.D. 330, Christianity was introduced into the lists as to the rulers between Tsegab and Abreha.

Za-Hakale, who ruled A.D. 76-89, is in all probability the Zoskala mentioned by the author of the Periplus Maris Erythraei, § 5.

The Axomites are correctly distinguished from the Homites by Philostorgius, by the appellation of Æthiopæ; and Procopius (De Bello Persico), Cedrenus (Hist. Comp. p. 324, Paris, 1647), Cosmas, and John Malalæ (Hist. Chronica Ioannis Antiochi, Oxon. 1691, p. 163), though all apply the word Ættiopæ to both people, confine the epithet Æthiopæ to the Axomites. The term Ethiopæans, too, or Itip-jawound, is the favourite appellation by which the Abyssinians designate themselves. (Conf. Sakh's Abyssinia, pp. 460ff.; Ludolph, Histor. Æthiop. II. 4; Corpus Inscrip. III. p. 513; Tellez, Travels of the Jesuits, Lond. 1710, p. 74.)

STAN,—DAGHESTAN, &c.

It may be interesting to 'Gaikwad' to know that a century and three quarters ago, and on the spot, Daghastan was considered to be derived from Dalg, "which in their language signifies a mountain." My authority noted below, always calls it "the Daghestan," and the inhabitants "the Daghestani" or "Dagestan Tartars." He states that they spoke in his time (1722) the same language as the neighbouring Tatars of the plains.

W. F. S.

BANYANS AT ASTRAKHAN IN 1722.

The Banyans "are a sort of pagan Indians whose principal pursuit is trade, and have their factory within the city (of Astrakhan). One of their chief merchants dying at this time (1722), his widow desired leave of the emperor to burn herself with his corpse, according to the custom of their country; but his majesty, unwilling to encourage so barbarous a custom, refused her request, and the Indian factory withdrew from the city with their effects. His majesty, finding no argument could prevail on the woman to alter her resolution, at last gave them leave to do as they thought proper. The corpse, being dressed in his clothes, was carried to some little distance from the town, where a funeral pile of dry wood was raised, and the body laid upon it; before the pile were hung Indian carpets, to prevent its being seen. The wife, in her best apparel, and adorned with earing, several rings on her fingers, and a pearl necklace, attended by a great number of Indians of both sexes, was led by a Brahman, or priest, to the

Dublin, 1738. Bruce was of Scotch descent, born in Westphalia in 1692. Among other details, he says he surveyed the Caspian for Peter the Great, and expressly mentions the Oxus (4th ed., p. 314), "a river both large and rapid, and a mouth-shot broad at its entrance," as flowing into that sea.
funeral pile, which on her approach was kindled; she then distributed her upper apparel and jewels among her friends and acquaintances, of whom she took her last farewell with a great deal of ceremony, and the pile being in full flame, and the carpets taken down, she leaped into the midst of the fire; her friends then poured quantities of oil over her, which soon suffocated her, and reduced both corpses to ashes, which were carefully gathered and put into an urn, to be conveyed to their relations in India."—P. H. Bruce's Memoirs, 4th ed., pp. 252, 253.

BOOK NOTICES.


Dr. Da Cunha's Memoir on the Tooth Relic of Ceylon is now two years old—which is as much as to say that in the light of later researches there is no difficulty in finding faults, particularly with the chronology. It is, however, a useful little pamphlet for any one approaching the subject as a beginner; and the conclusion, viz. that the tooth is 'bogus,' is incontrovertible except by a good Buddhist relying on faith as against reason. The photographs, though not original, are good enough; and the index is more than we usually expect in so modest a work.


Dr. Da Cunha has compiled into a pamphlet of 28 pages an account of transactions almost forgotten, although they took place within the memory of men still alive. His knowledge of the Portuguese language gives him an unusual advantage in this ground, of which he will, no doubt, be found in sole possession if the course of political events should ever bring the subject before the public.


Professor Williams has collected and remodelled a number of papers communicated to this and other less exclusively Oriental periodicals in a modest octavo volume—perhaps, of all works of recent Indian tourists, that most suitable for the 'Griffin' who is not also a 'Philistine.' His long study of Oriental subjects has enabled him to assimilate and reproduce with unusual success his impressions de voyage; and no Old Indian who remembers how little he knew of the country after an equal time spent in it will be hypercritical in respect of the errors into which our author has here and there fallen. We are glad to see a book so different from most of the rubbish with which the press was inundated immediately after the Prince of Wales's tour, and shall be prepared to welcome the further volume which Professor Williams promises us, as the result of his "researches into modern Indian religious life." A good many of us know too well the extreme difficulty that attends such inquiries to hope for any very important results from those of Professor Williams, conducted under the least favourable circumstances; but we can rely upon his recognition of the danger of hasty generalizations, and may fairly expect that his forthcoming volume will be suited for students of a somewhat larger growth than those for whom the present work has been written.


The title of this work led us to expect a treatise upon the curious phenomena of the Hindu mania for pilgrimage—the contrast between isolated expeditions undertaken in consequence of a vow, or even to spend a holiday, and the lives of travel spent by regular devotees in wandering from end to end of the peninsula; the strange ceremonies of the holy places; and the legends which account for or create their sanctity. The subject would be most interesting, and Mr. Sherring has already given proof that he could deal with at least a portion of it. It is not, therefore, without considerable disappointment that we find his pilgrims and their travels a mere connecting thread for a series of legends interesting themselves, but conveyed in the most prosaic verse imaginable, and supposed to be recited over the camp fires of their nightly halting-places. Our readers would hardly thank us for samples.


This modest little collection of poems does credit to the author, and is a good sign of the times. There is perhaps hardly a classical scholar in England who has not tried to render in verse the Odes of Horace; and the young Artillery Officer
who has made the same attempt upon tales from the *Amar r Sukadd* and other Persian and Arabic stories was evidently not merely cramming for an examination when he sat with his Manafi'. Such books, too, do some good in familiarizing the English public with the lighter forms of Oriental literature, and may stimulate a few young scholars to make themselves acquainted with the original; while the metrical talent of the translator is certainly much better employed in such exercises than in writing slangy 'Lays.' Some of the translations are very spirited; and the following extract is interesting as exemplifying a curious system of mnemonics not yet entirely superseded by the drier methods of our Government schools. The subject is a young Tatar learning his alphabet.

"He marked the rank'd letters go
In ordered lines as warriors do.

* * *
There Alif lifted high the spear,
And Ha the moony shield did bear,
And Be his bended bow.
The crooked sabre Lam did wield;
And Mim, conspicuous in the field,
His helmet crest did show."

The allusion, of course, is to the forms of the characters.

The worst fault of the book is that some of the pieces show the influence of too severe a course of the *Ingoldby Legends*, the style of which is hardly congenial to the subject.

---


It is much to be regretted that the time, trouble, and cost which have been spent on the work under notice have been almost wasted. Mr. Morris's book abridged by two-thirds and bound in paper would have been valuable to subordinate officers in the collectorate of which he has constituted himself the *vates sacer*. It contains a great bulk of tabulated returns,—which no one will ever read who has not equal access to the original materials in the Collector's office,—a great many quotations from works equally accessible to any one ever likely to want them, and no spark of original matter worth reading at all.

All this would be nothing if the book was not published in an expensive form at a first-rate publisher's, and under the supposed patronage of the India Office, instead of getting itsdeserts at a Secretariat press in Madras. The general public, or even Orientalist students, can find no possible interest in the matters which seem to Mr. Morris of first-rate importance,—the exact gate of a town where the police-barracks or school is situated, or the wreck of an ill-managed steamer near Cocos-nada, and the suspension of its skipper's certificate.

On the other hand, writing of the great Eastern Chalukya dynasty, and of their very capital (Rājamālandri), he thinks that there "would be little use in giving here the bare list of these sovereigns," though he does bestow upon the site a notice which seems to have been translated from a Tashtaurk's report,—a remark which applies more or less to the whole of this bulky volume except a few extracts from the Madras and India Office records. As long as any encouragement is given to the compilation of district manuals in this Philistine style the Government of India need not be surprised to find few scholars among its servants.

---


Mir Abd'al Kerim Bukhârî, it appears from the preface to the translation of the work before us, was a Sayyid of Bukhârâ in the diplomatic service of the Amir Shâh Mahmûd of that Khânate. In this character he visited Kâshmir, European and Asiatic Russia, and a large part of the intervening countries. Finally, in company with Mirza Muhammad Yusuf, Ambassador of Bukhârâ, he arrived, in September 1807, in Constantinople.

In one year more he was the sole survivor of the embassy, and apparently took this as a hint from Providence that he had wandered far enough, took to himself a wife (he does not say whether he had left any at home), and settled in the village of Beshik-Tash, in Boumelia, "whereof the charms are equal to those of Paradise."

While here he became acquainted with Arif Bey, then master of the ceremonies at the Porte. For him the Mir compiled a sort of joint Gazetteer and Almanach de Goa of Central Asia, of which a single manuscript exists. This, at the sale of the Bey's library in 1851, fortunately fell into the hands of a worthy possessor, M. Charles Schefer, who has had the text printed at Boukâlî, and now publishes it with a French translation, numerous and valuable notes and appendices, and a tolerable map. It is much to be regretted that there is no index,—a capital fault in a work purely of reference.

The author, after a short preface, enumerates the districts of Afghanîstán,1 and gives tables of

---

1 Of these he treats Lâghmân, Jellâkûd, and one or two others which we consider extra-Indian, as 'in Hindu-
their revenues in rupees, and of the principal routes in farsakhās. He then proceeds with the history of the Saduazai dynasty, which he brings down to the date of writing, A.D. 1293 (A.D. 1617), and concludes with the question, "What will happen next?" To which the answer of Time has been strange enough.

Next follows a similar account of Bukhārā, which is very full, the author being naturally well up in his subject. Thirdly, Khiva is described in the same way. Fourthly, Khokand, a good deal mixed up with Kāshgār and Yarkand. Fifthly, Khurasān, Tibet, and Kāsām divide a chapter among them. Here ends the work of Mīr Abdul Karīm, but not that of M. Schefer, who has, to supply the deficiencies of his author, added 52 pages of appendices, consisting of translated extracts from original Asiatic works, except only a short notice of the citadel of Kābul taken from Masson.

Mīr Abdul Karīm seems to have been a diligent observer and collector of materials, and, when not blinded by his religious passions (like most Tajiks of the Khānates, he was a violent Sunnī), to be a tolerably candid and trustworthy historian. His great fault is that he hardly ever gives a date. Several of his geographical statements are corroborated by more recent European travellers, and he deals little in the marvellous. The following account of the Yah seems worth transcribing:—

"There is found in these mountains an ox called Kūthā; it hath a great brush like a fox's, whereof the hairs are as long as those of women, and which is used in Turkistān to mount upon the Tughrā. These oxen are found in great numbers all along the route from Tibet to Yarkand. In Tibet they are tamed and used for burden; they work as well as buffaloes; their flesh and milk have a very sweet savour. On the road to Tibet I caught a young Kūthās napping, and slew him with a pistol-shot; his flesh was delicious. 'Delicious' as the yerald is the Mīr's brief and candid account of his sporting feat. A real Persian would have given a chapter to the chase, and finally shorn off the head of the 'mighty mountain bull' with one sweep of his khamshar. His historical style is equally brief and matter-of-fact, bar a few pious remarks and indifferent verses; and he gives few anecdotes. One is introduced in illustration of the character of the Yomud Turkmāns, on whom so much sympathy has of late been expended. Abdūl Karīm would have wasted little on them; he calls them 'perverse brigands,' whose habits ' reminded him of those of the Janissaries' (it will be remembered that he wrote for an officer of the court of Maḥmūd the Reformer), and says, 'A preacher was describing paradise. There was in the congregation a certain Turk, and quoth he, 'Do they go on alamān (forests) there?' 'No,' was the answer. 'Then,' retorted the Turk, 'would I liefer be in hell.' The Yomuds are of his opinion.' A much worse infidel, however, was 'Alam Khān of Khokand, whose seal illustrates M. Schefer's title-page. "It is related," says the Mīr, "that a certain Shaikh had many disciples in Khokand, and asserted that his holy life had procured him the privilege of revelation, and the power of thaumaturgy. One day, 'Alam Khān, who was sitting by a cistern, bade stretch a rope across it and call the Shaikh. The latter came, with some disciples, and sat down before the Khān. After a short time, 'Alam Khān said, 'O Shaikh! Shortly, on the day of resurrection, thou wilt pass thy disciples over the bridge Al Sirat, under which is hell. At present do thou walk along this rope, that I may be witness to one of thy miracles.'" The Shaikh protested, the Khān insisted; and the end of it was that the holy man made the attempt, failed ignominiously, and got not only a ducking, but such a thrashing, in the character of a detected impostor, that he died of the effects. 'Whenever 'Alam Khān caught a dervish he seized him and set him to drive camels.' This irreligious prince, naturally, was dethroned and murdered by his brother and uncle.

We give the following genealogies of the reigning families:

The House of Saduazai is said by Abdūl Karīm to have come from Multān. Though they were certainly powerful there during the time of the last Nawābs and the Sikhs, this is unlikely, and it is more probable that their settlement there dates from 1731 A.D., when Nādir Shāh banished their chiefs thither. The following is the genealogy of the family:

Zamān Khān Abdālī Durānī Saduazai came from Afghanistan proper to Herāt about 1708, and joined his subordinate Asad Ul'la Khān, governor of Herāt for Shāh Husain.
Safārī; killed about or after 1760. His brother was Muḥammad Khān.

Zamān Khān’s sons were: (1) Za’līkhar Khān—end uncertain. (2) Aḥmad Khān, afterwards Aḥmad Shāh, became chief of the tribe; followed Nādir, founded the Durānī empire on Nādir’s death in 1747; died at Murgha, Toba hills, Aḥrakzai country, June 1773. He had eight sons:

(1) Timūr Shāh, succeeded 1773, died 20th May 1793 at Kābul.
(2) Suleimān made an abortive attempt to secure the succession, and was imprisoned for life in the Bala Hisar or citadel of Kābul, where he died about 1796, leaving four sons in confinement in the citadel of Kābul.
(3) Majmūd, (4) Gohar, (5) Hamāyūn—all died in confinement in the citadel of Kābul.
(6) Sikandar—strangled in the citadel of Kābul, in consequence of a plot in his favour, 1779. (Elphinstone, however, says he was spared.)
(7) Dārāh—escaped from the Bala Hisar with other confined princes about 1809, but afterwards returned to Kābul of his own accord, and died there before 1818.
(8) Shāhī—was alive at Kābul in 1818.
Timūr Shāh had 300 wives, all foreigners; the seraglio was maintained on the revenues of Jelīlshāh, amounting to four lakhs of rupees per annum. He had thirty-six sons:

(1) Hamāyūn, endeavoured to succeed his father, defeated by his brother Shujā’ 1793, captured near Leīa 1795, blinded and confined in the citadel of Kābul. His son Ahmad was killed in battle 1798.
(2) Maḥmūd, assumed royalty in Herāt on his father’s death in 1793; expelled by Shāh Zamān 1797; returned and expelled Shāh Zamān 1800; expelled by Shujā’ 1803; escaped from Kābul in the same year; returned and reoccupied the kingdom 1803–9; was still in power 1818 (7) Had one son, Kāmrān, who was in power in Herāt in 1841.
(3) Zamān, succeeded his father 1793; de-throned and blinded 1800; was in Baghchād in 1817. He had four sons,—Kaisar, murdered in prison by his cousin Kamrān 1800; Haidar, Mānsur, and Fāghūfr.
(4) Shujā’, expelled and succeeded Maḥmūd 1803; expelled by him 1809; returned with the English; defeated and murdered by his nephew Sultan Jān 1841 (9).
(5) Fīrūz u’d-dīn, turned out of Herāt 1797; regained it; defeated by the Persians at Chāde

* But see Vincent Eyre’s account for this last event.
* Abdu’l Karim contradicts himself about this, saying in one place that Abbas was spared; and in another that he was strangled, which is more likely.
* Shāh Wali Khān Bārkzai was vaḍr to Shāh Ahmad. His son Sher Muhammad took a principal part in enthroning Shujā’, and was vaḍr to him; is called by Elphinstone 1807; made prisoner and confined in the citadel of Kābul 1816. Had one son, Malik Khāim, and a daughter who poisoned herself rather than marry a Shāh, 1807.
(6) Abbas: Abdu’l Karim says he was remarkable for courage, strength, and skill in the use of the sword. Strangled in prison in the citadel of Kābul, under Zamān Shāh.
(7) Shāpur, poisoned in the citadel of Kābul. These two princes were children of the daughter of Sharbat ‘Ali Khān Jindawul, Kāsīlābsh, the chief of Sūltān’s time. Abdu’l Khān, styled Jān Nisār Khān, governor of the citadel, paid improper addresses to her in the time of Zamān Shāh. Shāpur stabbed Jān Nisār to avenge his mother’s honour, and was murdered in consequence at the same time with her and Abbas.*
(9) Jahān Wāhī; (9) Aymāb; (10) Hasān; (11) Hamīd; (12) Gohar; (13) Kaisar; (14) Akbar; (15) Aftālaghr; (16) Ahmad; (17) Yākub; (18) Salim; (19) Fāghūfr; (20) Jahān; (21) Shāh Rukh; (22) Muhammad; (23) Usmān; (24) Umar; (25) Khan; (26) Rastam; (27) Daryā Dīl; (28) Khan Dīl; (29) Rahmat; (30) Farukh; (31) Anrangab; (32) Sabīr; (33) Tipū; (34) Darāb; (35) Zakariā; (36) not named. Abdu’l Karim says that the 35 survived their father.

Names of the Amirs murdered by Zamān Shāh and his vaḍr, Rahmatulla Khān Sadzawī, in 1799, which massacre led to Zamān’s downfall:—
(1) Payanda Khān Bārkzai,* father of Fateh Khān, Dost Muhammad, and 20 others, and grandfather of Sher ‘Ali Khān now reigning.
(2) Hukumat Khān, governor of Balkh.
(3) Bahīm Dād Khān, (4) Kāmar u’d-dīn Khān,

Mangī Dynasty of Bukhārā.

Khudayar Beg Mangī Uzbek, claimed descent from Toktamish, who was defeated by Timur Lang. Had two sons:—(1) the father of—I. Muḥammad Raḥīm Beg, an officer in the service of Nādir Shāh, detached by him to assist Abdu’l Fauz Khān valad Subhān Kuli Khān—a chief of the White Bone ruling as Nādir’s tributary in Bukhārā—against Ibadulla Khān, an Uzbek plunderer. On hearing of Nādir’s death

Mukhtar u’d-daula; rebelled against him afterwards, and was killed in action. His son Atta Muhammad was vice-roy of Khwājīr for Shāh Shujā’ after the death of Abdu’l Khān. He made himself practically independent, but was eventually conquered by a joint invasion of Rangī Sīng and Fateh Khān valad Payanda Khān Bārkzai (his own maternal uncle).
(1747) he dethroned and expelled Abü'l Faiz, and seized the sovereignty. Issue—two daughters.
(1) married to Abü'l Momin wives Adü'l Faiz, who was murdered by Muhammad Rahim: she had a son. (2) The other daughter had also a son.

II. Dā'uyal Beg, succeeded his nephew Muhammad Rahim Beg. He had ten sons:
   (1) Shāh Murād Beg, Amir Ma'sum, superseded and succeeded his father, June 1784.
   (2) Mahmud Beg, living in exile in Khokand in 1718.
   (3) 'Umar Beg and (4) Fāsil Beg, put to death with their families by their nephew Amir Haidar Turā.

IV. (4) Sultān Murād Beg, died at Mischei in 1703. He had three sons (see infr.).
   (5) Rustam Beg, died at Bukhārā.
   (6) Gānji 'Ali Beg, alive in 1718.
   (7) Rajab 'Ali Beg: insane.
   (8) Tekumish Beg, died at Kābul in the reign of Timur Shah; i.e. before 1793.

Shāh Murād Beg had three sons:

V. Sayyid Haidar Turā, styled Amir Sayyid,* succeeded his father Sultān Murād Beg 1803. He had six sons:
   (1) Muhammad Husain, by a Sayyid lady.
   (2) Bahādur Khān Naṣrū'lla succeeded his father 1826. He murdered Stoddart and Conolly. His son—
   VII. Muzaffar ud-Dīn succeeded him 1860.
   (3) Abdu'lla, (4) 'Umar, sons of a slave woman.
   (5) Zūbair.
   (6) Jahāngir, son of a lady of the Khwāja's of Juiabā.

Dū Naṣīr Beg, second son of Sultān Murād Beg (supra), was an exile in Russia in 1818. Muhammad Husain Beg, third son, an exile at Shahr-e Sabz.

Kungusāt Dynasty of Khiva.

I. Ahmad Beg Ināk (chief) of the Kungusāt Usbaks in 1717 (period of Bokovitch Cerkaski's expedition), had at least one son—
   II. Muhammad Amin Beg, succeeded 1755, had sons—
      (1) Fāsil Beg, blind from disease, was alive in 1818, and
   III. (2) Twâz, succeeded his father, died in 1804.

IV. (3) Iltûzar, succeeded Ikbas; superseded the Khān of the White Bone, under whom his predecessors had been maîtres du palais, and was the first Kungusāt Khān killed in battle, with Amir Haidar Turā of Bukhārā.

* Haidar Turā was the son of a lady of Abü'l Faiz Khān's family, which must have been Sayyid, as he thus styles himself for the first time in the pedigree.

(4) Muhammad Rahim, succeeded Iltûzar; was still reigning in 1818.
(5) Niyyās Muhammad and (6) Muhammad Rizā, put to death by Muhammad Rahim before 1818.
(7) Jan Murād and (8) Hassan Murād, killed with Iltûzar in 1806.
(9) Muhammad Niyyās, died a natural death before 1818. (10) Kutl Murād, alive in 1818.

Usbak Dynasty of Khokand.

I. Nar Būta Beg, Usbak, governed Khokand in the time of Shāh Murād of Bukhārā. Did not strike money or put his name in the khutba subsidized by the Emperor of China. Had three sons—
   II. (1) 'Alam Beg, succeeded him, struck money and read the khutba in his own name; had one son,—Shāhrukh, murdered by his uncle 'Umar Beg.
   III. (2) 'Umar Beg, defeated, killed, and succeeded 'Alam Khān. Still reigning in 1818.
   3. Rustam Beg, murdered by his brother 'Alam.

Of a different character was the pious Shāh Murād, our author's own first patron. He was the son of a rough but good-tempered soldier, Dā'uyal Beg, Amir of Bukhārā, who was so lost to all sense of religion that he allowed Persians openly to smoke 'hubble-bubbles' in the court and city. Horrified at this and similar enormities, Shāh Murād became the disciple of a Shaikh, who imposed upon him during his novitiate the duties of a bāzār porter. From this point on, his career presents a singular analogy with that of the hypocrite Aurangzib. The penitent waded through blood and intrigue, till he superseded his good-tempered sinner of a father. Only—

To the credit of both be it spoken—the father exacted, and the son kept, an oath not to shed the blood of his brethren. This was an isolated instance of mercy in the history of Shāh Murād, and indeed in the whole book, in which almost every page has its tale of blood or treachery, related as naively as the surprise of the Yak calf, and often immediately before or after a general certificate of the virtues of the 'first murderer. It is not the province of a scientific journal to digress upon the politics of the day, but the student of history may be permitted to regard with satisfaction the fate of these cut-throat little dynasties, which are now falling, one after another, under the heavy hand of a civilized power.

W. F. S.

*Kungusāt, i.e. Chestnut Horse, was the name of a great Mongol clan under Jīrgis Khān, probably inherited from them by the Usbāk tribe.
No. XLVI.

The copper-plate grant, of which a revised transcription and translation are now given, has been published by Professor J. Dowson at Jour. R. As. Soc., New Series, Vol. I., p. 247. It appears that this grant,—with two of the Gurjara king Dadā II. or Praśāntaratāga, and one, the details of which are not specified,—was found, about A.D. 1827, in the town of Khēdā or Kaira. "The river Watrus" runs close to the walls on the north-west side, and was the cause of the discovery, by washing down the walls and earth." The original now belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society's Library, whence I obtained it to edit.

The plates are two in number, about 13½" long by 8½" broad. Their edges are slightly raised, so as to form a rim to protect the writing. They are pierced with holes for two rings; but the rings are not now forthcoming, and I cannot trace any mention of them, or of the seal that must have been on one of them. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are radically the same as, and differ but very little from, those of the early Chalukya and Kadamba copper-plate grants which I have published in this Journal. The chief points of difference are:—1. The letters are slightly cursive, which is not the case in the earliest grants from the south;—2. The vowel ē, as attached to a consonant, is carried rather lower down than in the southern grants, and the curve is sometimes continued up to the consonant again, e.g., in avayā, l. 3, nyāyāna, l. 10, and vṛddhayē, l. 11; and the same remark applies to the lower stroke of ai, e.g., in Vaiśākha, l. 11;—3. The subscribed ṣ is more like a subscribed r cut short, as with the subscribed ṣ and oh in the grant of Devavarmanā at p. 33 above;—and 4. The ta has a more decided horizontal top-stroke than it has in the southern grants. It is also to be remarked that the rule of doubling consonants after the letter r is not adhered to as regularly as in the southern grants. The Anuśāvara is written above the line.

1 He is called Vaiṣñavarmanā in l. 7 of the cancelled inscription on the backs of these plates, No. XLVII. below. With this we may compare 'Kṛtārāja' as a varying form,

The charter is issued from the victorious camp at the city of Vaiṣākha, a place which I do not know. The grant is made by Vaiṣākha, the son of Buddhavarmanā, who was the son of Jayaśimha of the Chalukya family. It confers the village of Pariyāya upon the priests and religious students of Jambūsara. This is the modern Jambūsar, almost in a direct line between Kaira and Broach, about fifty miles to the south by east of Kaira, and twenty-five miles to the north by west of Broach. I cannot identify Pariyāya. The grant is dated in the year three hundred and ninety-four, on the day of the full-moon, or the fifteenth day of the bright fortnight, of the month Vaiśākha.

The date is first given in words in l. 32, and is then repeated in figures in l. 34, where we have the numerical symbols for 300 and 90 and 4, whereby to express the year, and for 10 and 5, whereby to express the lunar day. The symbols used here agree, except the 4 and the 5, with the Vaiśākha and Chalukya numerals given by Paṇḍit Bhagwānlī Indrajī in the table that accompanies his paper On the Ancient Nāgarī numerals at Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 42. As in the instances given by him, the lower part of the 4 is the letter ṣa. It is difficult to say what the upper part is meant for; but it certainly is not ṣa, sa, or ṣ, and it resembles ya more than any other letter, though it is not exactly the ya of the rest of the inscription. The symbol for 5 is theoretically the same symbol that is given by him. He gives three forms of the Vaiśākha 5, and remarks that "the first figure is clearly trād, and, on the assumption that "the loop" [which introduced a varying form of the ta] was not doubt caused by hasty writing,"—that "the following two signs, which look like nā, are mere corruptions of trād." But, as will be further exemplified by the recurrence of the same symbol in a slightly different form in No. XLVII. below, it is really nā; and the Paṇḍit's erroneous explanation of it is due to his having had before him three instances in which the
form of the na used in composing it was the form with a loop, whereas in the present instance the form used is, as throughout the body of the inscription, that without the loop. Originally, neither the ta nor the na was formed with a loop; but in later times the distinguishing feature of the two letters was that, in the south the ta was formed with a loop and the na without, whereas in the north, as is clearly shown by the modern Dēvanāgarī, though not so clearly by the modern Baṅgāli, alphabet, the process was the reverse of this, and the na was developed by the loop, while the ta retained substantially its original form without a loop. In intermediate times there appears to have been considerable hesitation in determining the distinguishing forms of ta and na, and the same forms were used for each other indifferently; see, for instance, my remarks at Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 176, note 7. In his paper referred to above, the Pāṇḍita remarks of the symbol for 4, that “the lower part always shows the figure of that form of ka which is used in the alphabet of the period.” The same rule applies to the symbol for 5; whichever form of the na is used in the body of the inscription, the same form is used in the na employed to represent the 5.

The era to which the date of this grant is to be referred is not stated. Prof. Dowson took the use of the word saṃvatasa as an indication of the era referred to was that of the Sañvat of Viṅkrama, and he read the date as Viṅkrama-Sañvat 394, or a.D. 338. But Mr. K. T. Tālāṅk, in a dissertation on this same grant in his paper On a new Chalukya copper-plate at Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. X., p. 348, points out,—that saṃvatasa is a common word for ‘year,’ and refers to no particular era whatever,—that even the word sañvat, an abbreviation of saṃvatasa, is not by any means used to designate exclusively the era of Viṅkrama,—and that such of the other known grants of the Chalukya dynasty, as bear any date at all, are expressly dated in the Sañaka era. On these grounds, he draws the conclusion that the era intended in the present grant, also, is that of the Sañaka. In addition to the reasons brought forward by him, I have to adduce the following.

In the comparison of the Gūrjara family with the ocean; in the titles of some of the officials addressed; in some of the conditions and privileges attached to the grants; in the names of many of the grantees; in the address to future kings on the subject of continuing the grants; and in their character, closely allied, though with distinctive features of their own,—the two Kaira grants of Daṇḍa II., given with facsimiles in Prof. Dowson’s paper, bear so close a resemblance to the present grant of Viṅjaya-rāja that, being grants of a different dynasty, they must be almost synchronous with it, and very possibly all three grants were composed by one and the same person. These two Kaira grants of Daṇḍa II. are dated in the same way in words and in figures, one in the year 380, and the other in the year 385; and here, again, the word saṃvatasa is used without any specification of the era to which it refers. In their case, however, this point is made quite clear by a third grant of Daṇḍa II., from Ilā, published by Professor R. G. Bāṇḍārkar at Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. X., p. 19, which, like Prof. Dowson’s two grants, was written by Reva, the High Minister for peace and war, and which is dated, in words only, in specifically the year 417 of the Sañaka era; the expression in the original, in l. 18, is,—Sañaka-nripa-kāldī-dīla-saṃvatasa-kara-saṅkara-chatamkaye upadād-dākidhē. And the same precise specification of the era, in words only,—Sañaka-nripa-kāldī-dīla-saṃvatasa-saṅkara-chatamkaye, i.e., ‘in the year’ 400 of the years that had expired in the era of the Sañaka king,—is given in l. 22 of a fourth grant of Daṇḍa II., from Umeṭā, published, with facsimile, by Dr. Bühler at p. 61 above. On all these grounds, there can be no doubt that the same era is the one intended in the present grant of Viṅjaya-rāja. The date of it, therefore, is Sañaka 394 (a.d. 472-3), and it is the earliest Chalukya grant that we as yet know of.

After expressing their opinions as to the date, Prof. Dowson and Mr. K. T. Tālāṅk have entered into lengthy disquisitions with the object of making the genealogy and date of this Chalukya grant from the north fit in, in direct lineal succession, with the genealogy and dates of the other Chalukya grants from the south. Their views are so radically wrong on this point, that it is undesirable to allow them to remain without refutation. To enable me to refute them, I must point out the errors on which they are fundamentally based. In doing so, I must be held excused for occupying
space and attention with matter which would otherwise be quite foreign to the subject in hand. Their remarks extend over a considerable portion of the Chalukya genealogy; but it will suffice for me to confine myself here to the first three generations.

As originally given by Sir Walter Elliot in his paper On Hindu Inscriptions, first published at Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. IV., p. 1, and afterwards reprinted with corrections and emendations at Madr. Jour. Lit. and Sc., Vol. VII., p. 193, the genealogy commences with,—

Jayasimha I.

Raṇaragā, or (?), Rājasimha.

Pulakēśī I. (Śaka 411.)

At a later period, in his second paper on Numismatic Gleanings at Madr. Jour. Lit. and Sc. New Series, Vol. IV., p. 75, he inserted another step, and commenced the genealogy with,—

Jayasimha I., or Vijayāditya I.

Raṇaragā, Rājasimha, or Vīshṇuvardhana I., or Vijayāditya II.

Pulakēśī I. (Śaka 411.)

And in the same paper he gives the following narrative:—

Previous to the arrival of the first Chalukya in the Dekkan, the Pallavas were the dominant race. In the reign of Trilōchana-Pallava, an invading army, headed by Jayasimha, surnamed Vijayāditya, of the Chalukya-kula, crossed the Nerbudda, but failed to secure a permanent footing. Jayasimha seems to have lost his life in the attempt; for, his queen, then pregnant, is described as flying after his death, and taking refuge with a Brahman called Vīshnu-Somayāji, in whose house she gave birth to a son named Rājasimha, who subsequently assumed the titles of Raṇaragā and Vīshṇuvardhana. On attaining to man's estate, he renewed the contest with the Pallavas, in which he was finally successful, cementing his power by a marriage with a princess of that race, and transmitting the kingdom thus founded to his posterity.

His son and successor was named Pulakēśī; and his son was Vijayāditya. A copper śālana, recording a grant made by Pulakēśī which bears date Śaka 411 or A.D. 489, is extant in the British Museum. There is a mistake here in the fifth sentence, which makes Pulakēśī the son of Raṇaragā, and Vijayāditya the son of Pulakēśī. The genealogy represents correctly the order of succession that was intended.

Starting with this second genealogy of Sir Walter Elliot, including A.D. 489 as the date of Pulakēśī I.; assuming that the Jayasimha of the Kaira grant, and the Jayasimha of Sir Walter Elliot, were one and the same person; interpreting the date of the Kaira grant as Vikrama-Saṅvat 394, the consequence of which was that, "the date of this grant being A.D. 338, a period of about two hundred years intervenes between Jayasimha and the grant of Pulakēśī in A.D. 489, and to fill up this period Sir Walter Elliot gives only three names, Pulakēśī standing fourth in the list"; and making the assumption, quite opposed to fact except in the case of a few documents which show their own want of value, that "the loose and varying nature of the genealogies in these grants" is such that "if would seem, indeed, that the word 'son' meant nothing more than 'descendant' in many cases, and that the writers, either from ignorance or from utter indifference to the truth, frequently confined themselves to the recital of some of the more prominent and best-remembered names", and, again, that "the order of the names is sometimes found inverted, and other discrepancies are met with which show that the Chalukyas were but poorly informed about the history of their line";—Prof. Dowson deduces the following genealogy,—

Jayasimha I., or Vijayāditya I.

Buddhavarma

Vijayarāja (A.D. 338)

Rājasimha, Raṇaragā, or Vīshṇuvardhana I., or Vijayāditya II.

Pulakēśī I. (A.D. 489.)

Starting with the same second genealogy of
Sir Walter Elliot, but rejecting ‘Vijaya-\-dītīya\’ as a second name of Jayasimha, and ‘Rājasimha’ and ‘Vishnuvardhana’ as second names of Rāgarāga; making the same assumption with Prof. Dowson as to the identity of the two Jayasimhas; interpreting the date of the Kaira grant as Śaka 394; and concluding “from the substantial identity of the names, and from the agreement of the dates, that the Vijayarāja of the Kaira grant is the same person as the Vijayarāja [II.] of Sir Walter Elliot’s list”.—Mr. K. T. Telang deduces the following genealogy,—

Jayasimha I.

Buddhavarmi, or Ragarāga.

Vijayarāja, or Vijayarājadiya I. (Śaka 394.)

Pulakši I. (Śaka 411.)

I have now published the British Museum plates as No. XLI. of this Series, and have given in detail ample reasons for holding conclusively that the grant is a forgery of not earlier than the tenth century A.D. I have shown at the same time that, though it is just possible, if we assume Śaka 411 to be the very first year of his reign, yet it is hardly probable, that the date given in it is the correct date for Pulikēśi I. I am willing, however, to concede that the forgers of the grant may have his upon the correct date.

‘Rājasimha’, as a second name of Ragarāga, which Sir Walter Elliot himself accepted with hesitation, is based only on a mistaken rendering of a passage in the British Museum plates, to which I have drawn attention in my paper on them.

The additional name and titles in Sir Walter Elliot’s amended list are founded on the narrative passage which I have quoted. The original of this narrative is in a copper-plate grant of Rajarāja II., one of the Chōla successors of the Eastern Chalukya kings, who, according to the grant, ascended the throne in Śaka 944. I have now examined the original plates. The grant commences with the mention of Nārāyaṇa or Vīṣṇu, from the water-lily which grew in whose navel Śvayambhū or Brahmā was born. It then traces the genealogy, after the Purānic fashion, from Brahmā, through Ātṛi and the moon, down to Udayaṇa. It then continues:

Text.


* The usual reading would be ṣuk-ṇa-shaḥṣiḥ; by Prof. Monier Williams ṣuk-da-na shahṣiḥ is Vedic Sanskrit.
Translation.

"After that, sixty emperors less by one, commencing with him, in unbroken lineal succession, having sat on the throne of Ayadhya, a king of his lineage, Vijayaitya by name, went to the region of the south from a desire for conquest, and, having attacked Triłochana Pallava, lost his life through the evil influence of fate. While he was in difficulties, his queen, who was pregnant, came with the family-priest and with a few of the women of her bed-chamber and with her chamberlains to the agrahāra-village named Mūdīvēmu, and, being cherished just like a daughter by Vishnu bhaṭṭā-Somayaśī who dwelt there, brought forth a son, Vishuvardhana. And, having caused to be performed the rites of that prince, such as were befitting to his descent from the two-sided gōtra of the lineage of Mānavya and of the sons of Hārti, she reared him. And he, being instructed in history by his mother, went forth, and—having worshipped Nandā, the holy Gaurī, on the Chālukya mountain; and having appeased Kumāra and Nārayaṇa and the Mothers of mankind; and having assumed the emblems of universal empire which had descended to him by the succession of his family, and which had been, as it were, voluntarily laid aside, (viz.) the white umbrella, and the single couch-shell, and the five great sounds of musical instruments, and the banner of the sword-edge, and the pratidakkā, and the sign of the boar, and the feathers of peacocks' tails, and the (banner of the) spear, and the throne, and the garland in the form of a sea-monster, and the golden sceptre, and the (signs of the river) Gaṅgā and the (river) Yamunā, and other (such emblems); and having conquered the Kadambas and the Gaṅgas and other kings, he ruled over the region of the south, lying between the Bridge (of Rāmā) and the (river) Narmada, and containing seven and a half rores (of villages). The son of king Vishuvardhana, and of his queen who was born in the family of the Pallavas, was Vijayaitya. His son was Polakēśi-Vallabha. His son was Kirttivarma. His son,—Hail, Kubja-Vishuvardhana,—the (younger) brother of Satyārāya-Vallabhēndra who adorned the family of the Chālukya's, who are glorious, and who are of the lineage of Mānavya which is praised over the whole world, and who are the descendants of Hārti, and who acquired dominion through the excellent favour of Kausikī, and who have been nourished by the assemblage of the Mothers (of mankind), and who have meditated on the feet of Śvāmi-Mahāśēna, and who have had the territories of their enemies 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, and whose bodies have been purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices, ruled over the country of Veṇgi for eighteen years."

After this passage, the inscription continues the genealogy, in the usual style of the Eastern Chālukya grants, down to Rājarāja II., who seems to have also borne the name of Vishuvardhana.

It will be seen at once that the names of Jayāsimha, Rājāsimha, and Rānapraga are not mentioned at all in this grant; and that it is only by pure supposition that the first Vijayaitya of this grant is to be identified with Jayāsimha, and the first Vishuvardhana with Rānapraga, and that the second Vijayaitya is to be inserted between Rānapraga and PulikēŚī I. If any such identification of persons had to be made at all, the simpler and more natural course would be, to identify the second Vijayaitya (the father of PulikēŚī by this grant) with Rānapraga (the father of PulikēŚī) close to the moon that may be the head of a spear (kūtaja); in the centre, the motto śrī-Tvaharuva-sthāna; and in the lower compartment, a floral device which is probably a lotus, an elephant-god, a sceptre (kanaka-danda), and something like the letter ṣ, which may be the makarasātra, or may be the pdyū-kāla (see p. 111, note 25), if we take pdyū in the sense of 'bridge.'

We have here the later form of the name, which is properly used only by the Western Chālukyas after the restoration of their dynasty; see the introductory remarks to No. XLIV., para. 8.
kēśi by other grants)—to identify the first Vishnuvarthana with Jayasimha,—and to insert the first Vijayāditya at the head of the genealogy, as the newly discovered father of Jayasimha. But the authentic portion of this grant,—authentic as being copied from other similar grants of the same dynasty,—only commences with the words Saasti Śrīnātha, &c., in Plate II., b; l. 31. All that precedes is a mere farago of vague tradition and Purānic myths, of no authority, based on the undoubted facts that the Chālukyas did come originally from the north, and did find the Pallavas in possession of some of the territories afterwards acquired by themselves, and on a tradition of the latter Kadambas that the founder of their family was named Trilōchana or Trinētra. Quoting the Mackenzie Collection, Mr. Rice, in his Gazetteer of Myore and Coorg, Vol. I., p. 204, tells us that "A Trinētra-Pallava is said to have introduced Brähmaṇas into his territory; but, as this event is placed eleven thousand years B.C., it may be disdained as a fabrication." I know of no other grounds for allotting the name of Trilōchana or Trinētra to any member of the Pallava family.

Accordingly,—expunging Rājasimha as a second name of Rānagara, and marking the date of Śaka 411, allotted to Pulikēśi I., as rather doubtful,—Sir Walter Elliot's first list of the first three generations is the one that stands correct. It was based then only on the plates in the British Museum and on the Yēkūwar tablet. It has now the authority of the Aihole inscription at Vol. V., p. 67.

As it is thus apparent that there are no grounds for taking 'Vijayāditya' as the name, or as a name, of the father of Pulikēśi I., Mr. K. T. Telang's proposal,—evidently based chiefly on the supposed similarity of the name of Vijayarāja with the name of this phantom Vijayāditya,—to make Vijayarāja the father of Pulikēśi I., falls to the ground. He gives no very clear reason for identifying Buddhavarmanā with Rānagarāja, except that Rānagāna "may be regarded as a mere epithet meaning 'lover of war.'" So, also, may Jayasimha, 'the lion of victory'; Satyāśraya, 'the asylum of truth'; Vikramaditya, 'the sun of valour'; Vinayaditya, 'the sun of modesty'; and many other such names, be regarded as mere epithets. But these are, nevertheless, the names by which those kings were known in history and in official documents. Probably enough they had also household names of a mere simple nature. Witness, for instance, the titles of Annapati, 'the lion of Anā', and Mānavasimha, Sēnana-simha, and Boppa-simha, which were borne by some of the feudatories of the later Western Chālukyā kings, and which, when compared with Jagadekādāni, 'the rutting elephant of Jagadeka', in trans. I. 9 of No. I. of this Series, in Ind. Ant., Vol. IV., p. 179, point to Anā, Māva, Sēna, and Boppa being, as much as Jagadeka, names of the paramount sovereigns. Witness, also, the motto Śrī-Bihatara, 'the king Śrī-Bihatā, or Śrī-Bihatī', which is on the seal of a copper-plate grant of the Eastern Chālukya king Vishnuvarthana I., published at Jour. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. II., p. 1. Mr. K. T. Telang refers to the fact that rānagāna-vikrama, 'he who is valorous in war', is one of the epithets applied to Buddhavarmanā; but he does not seem to rely much on this in his identification of the two persons. And rightly so; for, precisely the same epithet, rānagāna-vikrama, is applied to Maṅgalāvāra in l. 5 of the Bādami inscription, at Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 363; and in l. 4 of the Eastern Chālukya grant, of which I have just spoken, the father of Kirtivarmā I. is mentioned, not under his proper name of Pulikēśi, but under the name, or epithet, of Rānavigraharaṇa, i.e., 'king Rānavigrama', or 'the king who was possessed of valour in war.'

As regards Vijayāditya II., Prof. Dowson's genealogy falls through in the same way. As regards his insertion of Buddhavarmanā and Vijayarāja between Jayasimha and Pulikēśi I.,—which was necessitated by the length of time to be accounted for that resulted from his reading the date of the grant as Vikrama-Saṁvat 394, and was justified, to him, by the assumption as to the vague and unsatisfactory nature of the genealogies of similar to, 'Vijayarāja', we ought to have 'Vijayachandra', not 'Vijayāditya.'
copper-plate grants in general,—it falls through, because the necessity ceases if we interpret the date as Śaka 394, and because the assumption is not warranted by facts.

That Buddhavarmanā is to be identified with Rājarāja, or that he and Vijayarāja are to be foisted into the direct line of descent before Rājarāja and Pulikēśī I, I do not believe for a moment. If Buddhavarmanā and Rājarāja were closely connected at all, they were brothers. As to the identity of the two Jayasimha, I am strongly inclined in favour of it, though I would not speak with absolute conviction at present. On the one hand, the difference in their dates is somewhat against the hypothesis that Vijayarāja, or Vijayarājan, and Pulikēśī I, were of one generation, being grandsons of one and the same Jayasimha. On the other hand, the present grant is from the north; and there are the facts that the Chalukyas of the south always represent themselves as having come originally from the north, and that they commence their genealogy with a Jayasimha, as does the king for whom the present inscription was composed. And the characters of this grant connect it paleographically very closely with the southern grants.

Now,—except in the preamble of the grant of Rājarāja II., of which, I trust, I have said quite enough above,—it is nowhere stated that Jayasimha I. of the Chalukyas of the south, or his son, Rājarāja, did actually rule in, or even did invade, the south. And the negative evidence is opposed to any such supposition. For, the Ahole tablet and the Miraj plates,—the two authentie sources of information for this period,—do not speak of any of the royal families of the south, the Kadambaras, the Pallavas, the Gaṅgas, the Mauryas, and the Nālas, as having been conquered by Jayasimha I., or by Rājarāja; nor does even the forged grant of Pulikēśī I. And I know of no other inscription which takes the genealogy back beyond Pulikēśī I.; which fact suggests the inference that he, the con-

queror of Vatapi or Bādami, came subsequently to be looked upon as the real founder of the dynasty. Further, on reconsidering the verse that describes Pulikēśī I. in 1.8 of the Ahole inscription, I consider that the epithet śīra-bhuja-kādaṅgī applied to him there, and contrasted by the word api with the statement m juggati = Vatapi puri-vanāh-varātān, indicates that, before he acquired Vatapi 10, he had a capital named Indukanti, which must be looked for somewhere in the north. Finally, after the present grant of Vijayarāja, we have no mention of any Chalukyas in the north until we come to the Chalukyas of Aihillavīḍ, the accession of the first of whom, Mālarāja I., is placed by Dr. Bühler at A.D. 941-2, though he speaks also of an ancestor of his, named Bhūpaṭi, who is said to have been reigning in A.D. 695-6.

Taking all these indications together, the conclusion at which I arrive is that, at the death of Vijayarāja, or possibly by an invasion of his kingdom which resulted in his defeat and death in battle, the power of the Chalukyas in the north was subverted, and the family expelled, by the Gūrjaras kings, or by the kings of Valabhi, the other most powerful rulers of those parts; that his cousin, Pulikēśī I., was the only surviving representative of the family; and that, in his flight, directing his course to the south, Pulikēśī I. was attended by a band of adherents sufficiently numerous and strong to enable him to invade, and conquer a part of, the dominions of probably the Pallava kings 11, and, by wresting the city of Vatapi from them, to establish for himself a new seat of government there. Or, taking into consideration also the close resemblance of the style of this grant of Vijayarāja to the style of the grants of Dadda II., as noticed above and in the notes to the Text below,—it is even possible that the Chalukyas were originally sedentaries of the Gūrjaras kings, but, in the person of Pulikēśī I., threw off that yoke, and, emigrating to the south, established an independent sovereignty of

---

9 Lit., "went to the condition of being the bridesmaid of the bride which was the city of Vatapi;"

10 This fact is nowhere expressly stated. But I discovered at Bādami itself a rock inscription, unfortunately very fragmentary, but of early though uncertain date, which mentions Vatapi; and also "the Pallava, the foremost of kings," kṣātra-vēmūru, kṣātra-vēmūru, Pallavaha. I have little doubt that Vatapi was originally a Pallava capital.
their own. And to reconcile the dates of Vija
yarājaj and Pulikēḻi L, on this supposition that
they were grandsons of one and the same

Jayaśūha, we have only to assume that,
of two brothers, Baṇarāga was the younger
by some considerable difference of years.

Transcription.
First plate.
[1] Svasti Vijaya-sāndhāvārānt Vijayapura-vāsakāt sarad-upagama-pusanna-gagana-tala-vimala-vipulā vividha-purusha-ratna-guna-
[2] nkar-āvabhaśite mahā-satv-āpārāya-durlaṅghyō gāmbhīryavati shtiya-anugraha-paśe mahā-
dādaiva-mānaya-sagotraṇāṃ Hā-
[3] rīṭi-pratapān Svāmi-Mahāsena-pād-ānudhyātanāṃ Chālukyaṇām-anvayō vyapaga-saṅjala-
jaladhāra-patāla-gagana-tala-gata-sīrākara-
[4] kirāṇa-kuvabaya-ta-yaśasāṃ(etc. yaṣṭiḥ) Śrī-Jayaśūha-rāja [[**]] Tasya suvaṇa āraṇa mañjúyaśaṃ-a prataraṇaḥ chatur nātakān diva-
[5] m-asya-akhaṇḍita-pratāpo dhūjīrakāra iva valabhara-raja-virānta-Śrī-Buddhavarman-
rāja [[[[]]] Tasya sūnuḥ piṣṭhīrāyāṃ-a prataraṇaḥ chatur nātakān diva-
rāja(īya) śrī pratāt-ātiśaṃ daṅita samagro-śānta ma-
[7] ṇālaṃ paraspar-āśṇīta dhammad(rmm) ārthā-kāma-nimō(rmm)chi pranati-mātra-saṅkarīśa-
ghobhrī-ānūta-hṛdayaṃ samayā-prajā-pādenaśitaḍhamāṅaṃ din-
Śrī-Vijayaṛaj-sarva-śvāṃ[**] viśayaṇvata-prāśraṇa-
[9] grāṇamahattar-ādikārkād iṣina sarvadurṣaya-astuṃ vas saudiptam asaṁbhrūya yathā
Kāśkāla-vishay-āntargataḥ Saṁbhayo-pūrvī[rvī]ṃ[rvī] Parīya-
[10] ya čhe graṃaḥ sūtraḥ dūrānī ṃīgaḥ sōparikaḥ sarvā-dītaḥ-viśeṣa- prabhedikā
durviḥ rekaḥ-čchāiḥ(chi)dār-nayiṃ cāhā-bhūta-praveṣaḥ[ ] Janbūsa-
cu parya-yaśo-hīrvīdaḥyā Vaisākha-pūrṇamāṃśum adak-āti-
[12] sarggeṇa pratipādat[ ] Bhavādaṇa-sagōṛ-Āṭiyaraviḥ(ṛ) pattiḥ[ ] dvē Indraśraṇy
pattikā Tāviśaḥrāya dvya-artha-pattikā Jāvasaṃ-ārdha-pattikā[ ]
[14] Shasṭhitihēvāyā-ārdha-pattikā Śoṃyā-ārdha-pattikā Rāmaṇa-
[15] rmmane-ṛddha-pattikā Bhāiyāyā-ārdha-pattikā Drōṇḍhārya-ārdha-pattikā [[ ]] Dhuṃrā-
yaṣa-sagōṛ-Āvyakāya divya-artha-pattikā Śṝṇyā-ārdha-pattikā Daumakṣa-
[16] sagōṛa-Bhaṭṭēn patiḥ Samudrāya divya-artha-pattikā Drūṇya pattikā-trayaṃ
Tāviśaṃmane pottikā dvē Bhaṭṭeṇe-ṛddha-pattikā Va[ccha]ṛṭra pattikā[ ]
Vapasaṃvinā tirṇaḥ pottikā Durgāsaṃmane-ṛddha-pattikā Daṇyāy
[18] y-ārdha-pattikā || Kaunṣāna(ṇya)-sagōṛa-Vādāy-āṃ[ ] v-ārdha-pattikā Sēlaya pattiḥ
Drūṇya pattiḥ Śoṃyā-ārdha-pattikā Śoṃyā-ārdha-pattikā[ ]
Viśākha pattiḥ Dharāya pattiḥ Nandine pattiḥ Kuṇḍaraṇya pattiḥ
[21] Bhāgya(bha)ṭṭāya-ārdha-pattikā Narmane-ṛddha-pattikā Rāmaṇaṃ-ṛddha
pattikā || Hārti-sagōṛa-Dharmadharyā divya-artha-pattikā || Vaiṣṇava-sagōṛa Bhaṭṭeṇe
pattikā || Gauṭama-sagōṛa-Dhaṇḍa-ārdha-pattikā Ammacaḥaraṇa
[22] Sēṇḍu-sagōṛa Dāmaṇya-ārdha-pattikā ||
Lakṣmaṇa-sagōṛa Kārkaṇya pattiḥ[ ]

[**] This letter, us, was at first omitted, and then inserted below the line.
[1]** In the two Kairā grants of Dāda II., L. 52 in each
grant, the corresponding words are sarva-ṛṇa-ṛṇa vajra-adrāma-
vīra-śeṣa-samāsaḥ-ādhikāṇa; the words are sarva-ṛṇa-ṛṇa vajra-adrāma-
śeṣa-samāsaḥ-ādhikāṇa, etc. as in text. In the couplet of the II. grant, L. 10, and the Umēti grant, L. 20, the
words are sarva-ṛṇa-ṛṇa vajra-adrāma-śeṣa-samāsaḥ-ādhikāṇa, etc. as in text.
[2]** See note 37 below.

1. One letter here is quite unintelligible.
Hail! From the victorious camp, located at (the city of) Vijayapura. —

In the family of the Chalukyas, who are of the lineage of Mānavya, and who are the descendants of Hārīti, and who meditate on the feet of Śvāmī Mahāsēna, — (which family), like the great ocean, is as pure and extensive as the expanse of the sky which is pellicud at the approach of autumn; and is made radiant by the mass of the virtuous qualities of various jewels of men; and is hard to be crossed, through being the place of refuge of great beings; and is possessed of profundity; and is intent on preserving stability; — (there was) the king ŚrīJayasimha, whose fame was just like a blue water-lily under the beams of the cold-rayed moon in an expanse of the sky from which the veil of clouds laden with water has passed away: —

His son (son) the king ŚrīBuddhavarman, the lord, the valorous one in battle, — who,
such as are desired; and who meditates on the feet of his mother and his father,—issues his instructions to all the lords of districts and the Mahattaras\(^{11}\) of countries and villages and the Ādhikārikas\(^{12}\) and others:—

Be it known to you that, on the day of the full-moon of (the monih) Vaiśākha, in order to increase the religious merit and the fame of Our mother and father and of Ourselves, the village of Pariyāya, which was formerly (called) Sandhiyara\(^{13}\), included in the district of Kāśikula, has been given by us with plentiful libations of water,—with the udāraṇīya and the uparikara, and free from all the dītya\(^{15}\) and (the liability to) forced labour\(^{16}\) and the prātibhādikā, and (to be enjoyed) by the rule of bhūmi-chhedikā\(^{17}\), and not to be entered (for the purpose of billeting) by the irregular or the regular troops\(^{18}\), to the general body of officiating priests and religious students of the village of Jambūśara, who belong to the Vājrasanāya (sect) and the Kānya (school of the Veda). (The shares are):—Of Ādityaravi, of the Bharadvāja gōtra, two pattikās\(^{22}\); to Indrasūra, one pattikā; to Tāvishāra, two and a half pattikās; of Iśvara, half a pattikā; to Dāma, one pattikā; to Drūna, half a pattikā; to (?) Aṭṭāsvarāmī, half a pattikā; to Māila, half a pattikā; to Shashthi, half a pattikā; to Śoma, half a pattikā; to Rāmaśarma, half a pattikā; to Bhāya, half a pattikā; to Drūnadhara, half a pattikā.—To Āvuka, of the Dūmrāyaṇa gōtra, two and a half pattikās; to Śūra, half a pattikā.—To Bhaṭṭi, of the Danuṭākiya gōtra, one pattikā; to Sāma, two and a half pattikās; to Drūna, three pattikās; to Tāvishāra, two pattikās; to Bhaṭṭi, half a pattikā; to

\(^{11}\) The precise meaning of Mahattaras and Ādhikārikas, as classes of officials, is not very well settled as yet.

\(^{12}\) Sandhiyara-purvina, I. 9. But the meaning is very doubtful. Perhaps it should be, "which was the ancestral property of the Sandhiyaras." Prof. Dowson reads wrongly Sandhiyapuriyena, and does not suggest any explanation, except that some name or descriptive title of the village granted must be intended.

\(^{13}\) Prof. Dowson derives dītya from dū, dū, "cut, split," and prātibhādikā from prāṭi- bēkā, "break, tear," and suggests "cutting and tearing (of wood)" as the translation.

\(^{14}\) V śi ṭi is the Sanskrit equivalent of the Canarese bōtī, "compulsory and unremitted labour." We have had it also in l. 40 of the Lakshūmārāsa tablet, at p. 101 above.

\(^{15}\) No satisfactory explanation of this term has been suggested.

\(^{16}\) A-kha-bhaṭṭa-prātiśhyā. The explanations of this term are various. Prof. Dowson adopts the translation "in which the entrance of cheats and outcasts is interdicted;" and he quotes, as translation by others,—I., "there shall be no passage for troops," Sir Charles Wilkins; 2, "the

\(^{18}\) See note 17 above.
and other rites, and which is to continue as long as the moon and sun and ocean and earth may last and is to be enjoyed by sons and sons' sons in succession,—should be ascertained to and preserved by future governors, whether of my lineage or others, who are desirous of the general reward of bestowing a grant of land, having taken into consideration that worldly existence as (frail as) the pith of a reed or a bamboo or the stem of a plantain-tree, and that pleasures are as transient as the waves of the ocean, and that fortune is as unstable as the leaves of the sacred fig-tree when struck by a strong wind, and that youth fades away like the flowers of a sûrûsa-tree in bloom. He shall incur the guilt of the five great sins, who, having his mind obscured by the thick darkness of ignorance, may confiscate (this grant) or assent to its confiscation! And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa, the arranger of the Veda;—The giver of land dwells for sixty thousand years in heaven; but the confiscator (of a grant), and he who assents (to such confiscation), shall dwell for the same time in hell! They, who confiscate a grant of land, are born as black snakes, dwelling in the dried-up hollows of trees in the forests of the Vindhyā mountains, destitute of water! Land has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sagar; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefits of it! O Yudhishthira, best of kings! carsely preserve that land which has been previously given to the twice-born; the preservation of (a grant) is better than making a grant! Those gifts of land, producive of religion and wealth and fame, which have been made by kings in former times, are like the unused remnant of garlands (offered to an idol); what good man would take them back again?

(This charter) has been conveyed as a message by Nanaavāsapaka, and written by Khudadavāni, the High Minister for peace and war, on the day of the full-moon of (the month) Vaiśākhā, in the year three hundred and ninety-four. The year 894; the

fifteenth (day) of the bright fortnight of Vaiśākhā. Engraved by the Gahatriya Mātrisimha.

No. XLVII.

It remains to add of the Kaira grant of Vijayarāja that it is in a way a palimpsest. The backs of the plates contain a cancelled inscription, which was evidently intentionally hammered down after heating the plates. This cancelled inscription commences on the second plate; there are twenty-three lines of writing on the back of that plate, and sixteen on the back of the first plate. It is, of course, very indistinct and difficult to read, and no facsimile can be made of it; but careful cleaning of the plates has made a good deal of it legible, with the help of the inscription in favour of which it was cancelled. The characters in which it is engraved differ from those of the extant inscription in only three points;—1, The vowels ś and ñ are marked by strokes above the line;—2, The letter ns is invariably formed with a loop;—and 3, The letter va is more of a triangular shape. In these three peculiarities, which happen to be illustrated by one of the passages containing the date of which a facsimile is annexed, they agree with the characters of the two grants of the Gūjara king Dadda II., which were found at the same place and time, and also with those of the Umēṣa grant.

I have transcribed as much of this cancelled inscription as is legible, and can be supplied, without any doubt. It commences:

[...] Svaetō Vijayāyi-[śrī]kshāyātman-Ne(ta) 2[...]


[udha] Hūri[li]-putrīṇām Śodmi-Mahādēna[pa]-[d]-

śīla-rđjaḥ [/*] Taiya [su] lok prabala-rupitimī[ra]-[ś]c[pa]-h[da]-bhīdrāh satam-[udaya-]

stthē naktan-dīvam-oṣy-am-aḥhataj[da]-[prati]pa[.]

[...]-di[pa][k]ārāvallabha-ravikārtana-Šrī-Buddha[va]-ra[m]-ra[rđjaḥ [/*] Taiya [su] lok[.]

In the remainder of this line, the whole of ll. 5 and 6, and the greater part of l. 7, only a

Vol. V., p. 109. The Dātaka, 'messenger,' must be the official to whom the charter was entrusted to be conveyed from the court, where it was issued, to the local authorities concerned.

24. 'caused to be written, by an engraver employed in his office.'

25. One letter, or perhaps two, is quite illegible here.

26. Four or five letters are quite illegible here.
few detached letters are legible with any certainty. The only entire words I can make out are [dwa]dita-yahā, parājyā, and nay-lakehā-päh; and I cannot complete the passage, since the remaining scattered letters show that it differed substantially from the corresponding passage of the extant inscription. The name of the son of Buddhavarma is at the end of l. 7, in the words—

[pad-drañataḥ Śrī-Viś[a]varma-rajaḥ]. It continues—[(8) sarvda-va] viś[a]-

ita(f)26  


Vāsākha-ān 15 [I*]

The first six or seven letters of l. 10 are not legible with any certainty; but then come the words [Bha]radajā-sogotraṣya Ādityavarṣaḥ26, which show that the specification of the grantees and their shares commences here. Several of the names and shares are distinguishable; thus—


Dṛṇaṣya pahṭikā. —l. 12, Śrī[ca]kṣa[ra] arōda-pahṭikā Samasty-arōda-pahṭikā Kāśyapa-yāna-sogotraṣya(?) 

Antarṣya div-arōda-pahṭikā. —l. 13, sogotraṣya Dharmamadharṣya div[ca]-arōda-pahṭikā Vaiśākha-sogotraṣya Bhallāṭ pahṭikā Daun̄jakā[14]ya-sogotraṣya Bhallāṭ pahṭikā Samūrya div-arōda-pahṭikā Dṛṇaṣya pahṭikā-tra[yā].—l. 15 to 22, the words arōda-pahṭikā, pahṭikā, and div-arōda-pahṭikā are of frequent occurrence, but no names can be read with certainty;—l. 23, Mitrā-varṣya arōda-pahṭikā Shaktikā[deva]-ya-arōda-pahṭikā[15]kā;—l. 24, Dāmāṣya pahṭikā. In l. 26 commences the sentence Etiṣṭhāya sarvotbhāyā bali- 

churu-vaśīvaḍa[27]nātha-kriṣṭe-sarpapan-ārtha[i] 

Vaiśākha-(pa)[1]-raṇamadyam-vaśūṣa-dīna-


And so on, in much the same words as in the extant inscription, down to pāchaha-bhir-mmāh-pahṭikā saṃyuktaḥ syet, in l. 32. Then,—prefaced by the words Uktān cha bhagavatā veda-vyāsa Vaiṣāyaḥ,—come the same five verses as in the extant inscription;

l. 32, Shashthiḥ varsha-sahhavāṇī, &c.; l. 33, Vindhyā-vatāhī-vaṭāyāṇī, &c.; l. 34, Bhūbhā-

vamśaṇdh bhaktā, &c.; l. 35, Pāravā-dattānā dvi-jātiḥ bhūd, &c.; and l. 36, Yān-tha dattāṇā puraḥ, &c. At the end of this verse, in l. 37, it continues—


It is thus seen that, with some slight variety of construction, this cancelled grant of Vija- 

yavorṣa is substantially the same as the extant grant of Viṣajyarāja on the sides of the 

plates.

Like the Umētā and Ilā grants of Dāda II, it is issued viṣajya-vikṣekdūt, not viṣajya- 
skāṇḍhavārdha, as in the extant grant. As Dr. Bühler has pointed out, at p. 62 above, note 8, vikṣeaka, in such a passage as this, must have much the same meaning as skāṇḍhavārdha, 'camp', though there is no lexicographical authority for it. The name of the vikṣeka is unfortunately in part quite illegible. But the first syllable is undoubtedly na or na. Now, the two Kaira grants of Dāda II are issued Nāṇḍipūrīn, 'from Nāṇḍipūrī', which place Dr. Bühler, at p. 62 above, has identified with a fort of the same name just outside the Jadhēswar gate of the city of Broach. It is just possible that this cancelled grant commenced,—whether intentionally, or by a mistake of the composer of the inscription in following too servilely a model that he had before him,—as it was issued from the same place, and that the text ran =Nāṇḍipūrī-vaṇakān, &c.

In the name of the dynasty, in l. 2, the first syllable is undoubtedly kā; the second may be either lū or lī. This may be a mistake of the composer or of the engraver of the inscription, or it may be an early varying form of the name.

The names of the first two kings are just the same as in the extant grant,—Jāyasiṁha, and Buddhavarma. The son of Buddhavarma is called 'Vijayatāja' in the extant grant; but his name is here given as 'Vijayatāra.' With this we may compare 'Kṛttirāja' as a varying form, in one of the Néu

26 About eighteen letters here are not legible with any certainty. The words would seem to differ from those in the extant inscription.

27 Four or five letters here, at the end of the line, are illegible.

28 See note 27 above.
plates which remains to be published by me, of the name of the southern Chalukya king who is elsewhere always called 'Kirtti-varmâ' I. And in my Kadamba grants at Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 22, and at p. 33 above, other instances will be found in which the termination varman, in the names of kings, sometimes is used and sometimes is omitted.

The date of this cancelled grant is precisely the same as that of the extant grant,—the (Saka) year 394, and the day of the full-moon, or the fifteenth day of the bright fortnight, of the month Vaisakha. And, in the same way, it is given in both words and figures. The accompanying facsimile of the passage containing the figures has been made from a careful hand-drawing, directed by myself. The broken appearance of some of the letters and symbols is due to the way in which the inscription was hammered down; and, though the last few lines are comparatively well preserved, this specimen will serve to give an idea of the fragmentary nature of the characters of this cancelled grant, as they now stand. With the exception of the symbol for 90, which has a projecting stroke on the right side as well as the left,—these symbols agree with those which are given in Pañdita Bhagwanlal Indrajil's paper at Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 42. Here, again, the symbol for 5, the letter sā, illustrates what was evidently an invariable rule in the use of alphabetical characters to form numerical symbols, viz., precisely the same form of sa, with the

loop, is used in composing it, as is used in the body of the inscription.

It is difficult to say why this grant was cancelled. But the characters, besides having slight differences of type, as noted above, are not nearly so neat as those of the extant grant; they are rather sprawling, and they have wider intervals between them than is usually the case. And, though it was conveyed by the same Dūtaka or messenger, Nānāvāsīpakā, it was prepared in the office of a different minister; for, in the last line, the first syllable of his name is undoubtedly ha, the penultimate consonant is t, and the last syllable is sa, and, though the second and third syllables are rather indistinct, the name seems to be 'Haridatta.' At any rate, it certainly is not 'Khaddavāmī,' as in the extant grant. And the name of the engraver is not given at the end. And, finally, the names of the sharers seem to be not so full as in the extant grant. Bearing in mind how repeatedly the word paṭṭikā occurs, any one acquainted with the capabilities of the average Hindu copyist will understand at once how often he would lose his place, and become confused, in copying such a document. If, therefore, I may hazard a conjecture, it is that the grant, when first engraved, was too full of errors to admit of correction as it stood, and accordingly it was cancelled, and a fresh copy was prepared, in a different office, and by a different engraver of more skill in writing and fidelity in copying.

THE KUḌĀ INSCRIPTIONS.

BY PROFESSOR H. JACOBI.

The Kuḍā inscriptions have already been edited by the Rev. Dr. J. Stevenson—Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. V. pp. 169-174. But as his translations are not trustworthy, and sometimes rather fanciful,—with the assistance of Dr. G. Bühler I have made the subjoined transcripts and translations according to Mr. Burgess's facsimiles.

Inscription No. 1 in Cave 1.

Mahābhōjya Ṣaḍāgeriya Viṭṭayāputra Mahābhōjasa Maṇḍavasa Khāḍapālītasa lokhaka Sivasuttisasa bhavya Ṣaṇḍaya deyadhama (lepana).
Sanadhī of No. 1.

1 Mahābhōjyaḥ Ṣāḍāgeriyā viṭṭayāḥ putrasya Mahābhōjasya Maṇḍavasya Skandapālītasya lokhaka (aya)
2 Sulasadatputrasya Utāradatputrasya cha Śivabhūteḥ sahas bhavyaḥ Nandaya deyadharmo [layanam ||}
Translation of No. 1.

This cave is the benefaction of Sīvabhūtī [Sīvabhūtī], son of Sulasadatta [Sulasadatta], and of Uttarādāta [Uttarādāta] the writer of Mahābhōja Mandava [Mandava] Khandapālita [Khandapālita], son of Mahābhōji Sadageriya Vijayā [Sadageriya Vijayā] together with his wife Nandā [Nandā].

Remarks on No. 1.

1. The correctness of the way in which the two parts of this inscription have been connected is proved by the statements made in No. 3 regarding Khandapālita and Sivasadatta.

2. Mahābhōja and Mahābhōji are evidently titles, as the words immediately following them have to be taken for family names. Bhōja is commonly uses in the inscriptions with the meaning of 'a priest in charge of a temple.' Another meaning, 'great prince,' is given to Mahābhōja in the Bhāgavata Purana (see the Petersburg Dictionary, s. v.). Bhōja, too, is used as a royal title in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa VIII. 12. Mahābhōja occurs also in the Bedā inscription No. 2, Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. VIII. p. 222. As the persons bearing this title seem to have occupied a high position, the second meaning is the more appropriate one, and we may assume that Vijayā was the wife, if not of a sovereign king, at least of a Sāmanta, and that Khandapālita ruled over some district or province. This explanation is also confirmed by the construction of inscription No. 6.

3. Sadageriya would be in Sanskrit Śādagāryā or Sādagāryā, i.e. belonging to the family or to the country of Śaṅgīrī or Śaṅgīrī. Śaṅgīrī and Śaṅgī are mentioned as proper names by Panini, IV, 3, 52. Dr. Stevenson's conjecture, according to which Śādāgīrī would correspond to Salsette, does not appear tenable, as the ancient name of Salsette is Śāṭha śaḥ, i.e. containing sixty-six villages.

4. Mandava probably corresponds with the Sanskrit Māndavāsya: compare also below, No. 3. The Mandavās are enumerated (Brihatanāhita XV. 9) among the nations of Central India, together with the Medaor Mers, who probably then, as at present, resided in southern Rajputānā—Medapāta or Mewād. Mandava occurs also in the Bedā inscription No. 2.

5. The name Sulasadatta is of some interest, as (according to Dhanapāla's Pāyulachāta) Sulasa and (according to Hemachandra's Destkota) Sulasa matanjari are names of Vaihnu's sacred basil-tree, the tulsi. The proper name Sulasadatta means therefore 'given by Tulasi,' and corresponds with the modern Tulsiās, and seems to indicate that the worship of the plant dates from early times.

Inscription No. 2 in Cave V.

Siddhāṁ therāṇa bhādata Pātāmatāna bhādata Āgimitāna cha bhāgīneyāḥ pāvajītikāya Nāgānīkāya vaṭahāya pāvajītikāya Padumani kāya deyadhamma leṣa puta saha taṭavāsīnyā Bodhiya saha ātwāsīnyā Asalhamitiyā.

Sanskrit of No. 2.

Siddhāṁ shavirāṇām bhādata-Pātāmatāna bhādata Āgimitānām cha bhāgīneyāḥ pāvajītikāya Nāgānīkāya vaṭahāya pāvajītikāya Padumani kāya deyadhamma leṣa puta saha taṭavāsīnyā Bodhiya saha ātwāsīnyā Asalhamitiyā.

Translation of No. 2.

Hail! This cave and tank are the benefaction of the female ascetic Padumani (Padimini), daughter of female ascetic Nāgānī (Nāgini), the sister's daughter of the Therā Bhādata Pātāmatāna (Bhādata Padumani) and Bhādata Āgimitāna (Bhādata Agimitra), together with her disciple Bodhi, and her disciple Asalhamiti (Ashadhāmitra).

Remarks on No. 2.

1. Siddhāna has been misunderstood first by Dr. Stevenson, and later by Dr. Bhād Dāji and Professor Bhāndārkār, who all translate it by "to the Perfect One." If this meaning were intended it would be either Siddhāna or Siddhāya. Siddhāna is really the neuter nominative singular of Sidda, and, like Siddhi, a synonym of svasti.

2. The plurals Pātāmatāna (n) and Agimita (n) are plur. majestatica: compare below in inscription No. 9; see also Stevenson, Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. V. p. 173.

3. For the name Nāgānī compare 'Devī Nayanika' over one of the figures of the Nānāghat cave.

Inscription No. 3 in Cave VI.

Mahābhōjiya Sādageriya Vijayāya putasa Mahābhōjasa Māndavasa Mahābhōjas Mandava Sulasadatasa Uttaradatyā cha Putaṁnaṁ bhūtanam lekha- Sivasahāmikā kanēthasa Sivasahāmikā dheyadhammaṁ lepa
THE KUDÁ INSCRIPTIONS.

saha bhāyāya Vijayāya putānāṁ cha sa Sulasadatasa Sivapālītasa Sivadatasa Sapilasa cha selaripakamaṁ duhutānaṁ Sasapāya Sivapālītasa Sivadatasa Sulasadatasa cha thambha.

Sanskrit of No. 3.

Mahābhōjyaḥ Sādagairya Vijayāyaḥ putrasya Sulasadattasa Uṭtaradattāyaḥ cha putrapāṁ bhrātṛiṁāṁ lekha kich Śivabhūteḥ kanishṭhāya Śivasarmāno deyyadharmo layamāṁ saha bhāyāya Vijayāyaḥ [| putrapāṁ cha sa Sulasadattasa Sivapālītasa Sivadatasa Srapilasa cha śailaripakarma duhutriṁāṁ Sasypāya Sivapālītāyaḥ Sulasadattāyaḥ cha sthamāṁ ||

Translation of No. 3.

This cave is the benefaction of Śiva(sa)ma (Śivasarman), after the writer Śivabhūti (Śivabhūti), youngest amongst his brothers the sons of Sulasatasa (Sulasadatta) and Uttaradattā (Uttaradattā), servants of Mahābhōja Mandava (Mandavya) Kandapālīta (Kandapālīta), son of Mahābhōji Sādagairi Vijaya (Śatāgairi Vijaya), together with his wife Vijaya; and the decoration of the rock (is the benefaction) of their sons (whose father is alive) Sulasatasa (Sulasadatta), Sivapālīta (Sivapālīta), Sivadatasa (Sivadatta), and Sapilā (Sarpila); and the pillars (are the benefaction) of their daughters Sasapā (Sasypā or Sasapā), Sivapālītā (Sivapālītā) Sivadatasa (Sivadatasa) and Sulasatasa (Sulasadatasa).

Remarks on No. 3.

1. The change of Śivamasa to Śivasamasa is supported by Junnar inscription No. 7, Ind. Ant. vol. VI. p. 40, and by the fact that Śivama gives no sense.

2. The sa in the phrase putanāṁcha as Sulasatasa is probably an abbreviation for sandhāthā, which we find in No. 4: putasa cha sandhāthasā Isirakhitasa. Professor Bhāndārkar (Nālik Inscriptions, No. 24, Transactions Or. Cong. 1874, p. 347) thinks that either chasā may be traced to chasa, or if read as cāsā to cāsā, and translates it by ‘worthy.’ In his inscription, as well as in all the Kudā inscriptions where it occurs, the cha must necessarily be taken in the sense of ‘and.’ Sandhāthā if applied to females means one whose natural protector, i.e. husband, is alive; if applied to males it probably denotes that the father was alive, though I am unable to produce any authority for the latter interpretation. The ultimate meaning of the term is probably ‘worthy,’ as conjectured by Professor Bhāndārkar.

Inscription No. 4 in Cave VII.

Māmakavējiyasā vejasa Isirakhitupśakasa putasa vejasa Somadevasa deyyadharmo leqāṇaḥ putasa cha sanāgasa Isirakhitasa Sivaghoṣasa cha duhutya cha sa Isipālītāya pusāya dharmāya sapāya cha.

Sanskrit of No. 4.

Māmakavaidyikasā vaidyasa Rishirakhitopaśakasa putrasya vaidyasa Somadevasa deyyadharmo layamāṁ putrasya cha sanāthasya Rishirakhitaya Sivaghoṣasya cha duhutuscha sa Rishipālītāya Budhāya dharmāya sanāghāya cha ||

Translation of No. 4.

This cave is the benefaction of the physician (vaid) Somadeva, son of the Bandhā devotee Isirakhita (Rishirakhitā) Māmakavejiya (Māmakavaidyika), a physician, and of his sons (whose father is alive) Isirakhita (Rishirakhitā) and Sivaghoṣa (Sivaghoṣa), and of his daughter (whose father is alive) Isipālītā (Rishipālītā), for Buddha, the Law, and the Fraternity.

Remarks on No. 4.

1. Māmakavejiyasā apparently corresponds to a Sanskrit Māmakavaidyikasā, and may mean 'belonging to the country or town of Māmakavaiyā,' though such a name is not known from other sources.

2. Sandhāthā looks like sandgasa, but that reading would give no sense.

3. Pusāya and Sāpāya do not readily give any good sense; one is tempted to read Buddhāya dharmāya samghāya cha.

Inscriptions No. 5 and No. 6 cannot be translated with any confidence—the stone is much abraded.
Inscription No. 7 in Cave XIV.
Karā́ḍākṣaśa lōhavānīyiṣaśa Maṇḍikāśaḥ[pahā]
dayadhammāṁ leṇa.

In Sanskrit.
Karā́ḍākṣaśa lōhavānījo mahikāśa deya-
dharmo layaṃ ||

Translation of No. 7.
This cave is the benefaction of Mahika, an
ironmonger of Karā́ḍāśa.

Remarks on No. 7.
1. It ought to be noted that the first six as
well as the ninth letters of this inscription re-
semble those used in Aśoka's edicts, and differ
considerably from the rest.
2. Mapika gives no sense; it must be changed
into Mahika. Dr. Stevenson reads Mohika—Jour.
3. Lōhavānīyiṣa would be in Sanskrit either
lohanvaniyasya or lohanvaniyasya. I prefer the
latter etymology, because the former gives no
sense.
4. Dr. Stevenson has already recognized in
Karā́ḍākṣaśa the name of 'Karā́ḍ, a town on
the Kriṣṇa, nearly in a direct line south from
Satārā'.

Inscription No. 8 in Cave XV.
Mahābhogē Maṇḍatē[maṇḍārē] Kohiputre Maṇḍatē Apilase putasa suthagachchakasa Rāmadatta-
dhema[dhanmā]cha bhichhagra[bihchhagra] uyaraṇaka cha bhayāva sa Vēlidatta deya-
dhammaṁ uyaraṇaka.

Sanskrit of No. 8.
Mahābhogē Maṇḍavyē Kohiputre Maṇḍatē apilaseṣa sūdha gotrasya Rāmadattasya
dēya.
dhamāṣa bhikshagrihaṁ uyaraṇakāṣa bharyāyāḥ sa Vēlidattāyā deyaḥ dhammaṁ uyaraṇakāḥ ||

Translation of No. 8.
While Maṇḍaśa (Maṇḍavya) Maṇḍatē (Maṇḍatē) son of Kohi (rules as)
Mahābhogē, a dwelling for the ascetics and an
Uyaraṇaka [has been dedicated as] a charitable
gift by Rāmadatē (Rāmadatta) of pure
family, son of Apila, and an Uyaraṇaka [has been
given] as a charitable gift by his wife Vēli-
dattā (Vēlidattā), whose husband is alive.

Remarks on No. 8.
1. Uyaraṇaka apparently corresponds with the
ūvaraka of Nāsiṇa No. 24, Transactions Or. Cmogr.
1874, p. 347, which Professor Bāhpāḍarākur renders by ‘apartment’. Childers’ Pali Dict. gives oyarā
with the meaning of ‘inner or store room’, and this
explanation fits here also very well.
2. Maṇḍatē looks a Jainā name, as Maḷi is
a name of one of the Tirthāṅkaras.
3. For the forms bhayāva and Vēlidattāva comp.
Purisaṃdatēva, Nāsiṇa 24. I think sa is merely a
substitute for ya, just as in Tavattāna for
trayāntimikā devadāha dhyaṇa, &c.—compare Kahn,
Briefs Pali Grama, p. 42—and forms like alabha-
deyo for dvarabhaγheya in the Aśka inscriptions.

Inscription No. 9 in Cave XVII.
Siddha theraṇa bhayāta
Vījyaṇa ativāsinīya
pava-itiṣkaya Sapilāya
deyadhammāṁ leṇaṁ saha sā—

lohitāhī Vēṇhūyāhi sacha
ātivāsinīya Bodiya.

Sanskrit of No. 9.
Siddhāṁ sthavirāṇāṁ bhadanta-
Vijyāṇāṁ antevāsinīyāḥ
pravṛttikāyāḥ Sarpilāyā
deyadhammaṁ layaṁ saha sa-
lohitātibhiḥ Vīshṇu-kābhīḥ sa[ka]cha
antevasinīyā Bodiya ||

Translation of No. 9.
Hail! This cave is the benefaction of the
female ascetic Sarpilā (Sarpilā), disciple of the
Thera Bhaṭa Vījya (Bhadanta Vījya), together with her venerable kinswoman
Vēṇhūyā (Vīshṇu), and her disciple Bodiya.

Remarks on No. 9.
1. Siddhāṁ is a not unusual Pāli word, equiva-
tent to the Sanskrit Salohitā. The plural salohi-
tāhī Venhūyāhi may be explained as plur.
maja-
tattis. Vīshṇu probably was a paternal or mater-
nal aunt, and as such entitled to particular respect.

No. 10 on a Well south of Cave XVIII.
Mālākāraṣa Maṅgūpa ... [de]1
yadharmahān
Sanskrit.
Mālākāraṣa Maṅgū[paśantasya de]
yadharmānāṁ stambhāḥ [ll]-

1 In the first line of the inscription four akṣaras have
been lost, the last of which must have been de. As the
half-defaced letter before the lacuna seems to be pa, the
whole name was most probably Maṅgūpāḷīta.
DATE OF THE CANCELLED COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE CHALUKYA KING VIJAYAVARMÀ.

1. SEAL OF THE COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF VIKRAMĀDITYA I. DATED ŚĀKA 532.

2. SEAL OF THE COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF KHANHARADÉVA. DATED ŚĀKA 1171.
1. Seal of the Copper-Plate Grant of Rājarāja. Dated Śaka 944.

2. Seal of the Copper-Plate Grant of Kulōttunga-Chōḍadeva II. Dated Śaka 1036.

3. Seal of the Harihara Grant of Vinayāditya, of Ś. 616.
### Translation

This pillar is the benefaction of the gardener Munagapālita.

**Inscription No. 11 on back wall of the Verandah of Cave XVIII.**

\[ \text{...) no satavahāsa Nāgāsa leenaí deyadharmam.} \]

**Sanskrit of No. 11.**

\[ \text{...) sārthavāhasya Nāgasya layanam deyadharmam.} \]

### Translation

This cave is the benefaction of Nāga, leader of a caravan.

**Inscription No. 12 in Cave XIX.**

Sethipo Vasupānaka sa deya dhatamam lepa.  
**Sanskrit of No. 12.**

Śreśthino Vasupānaka-sya deyadharmo layaam ||

**Translation of No. 12.**

This cave is the benefaction of the merchant Vasupānaka.

---

### THE INSCRIPTION OF RUDRADĀMAN AT JUNĀGDH

**By Bhagavatīlā Indrājī Pandit and Dr. G. Bühler.**

From the following inscription it appears that an artificial lake, called Sundaśana, was situated at the foot of the Girnar. It had first been dug by the brother-in-law of the Maurya king Chandragupta, a Vaisya called Puṣhyagupta, and had been adorned with outlets by Tushāpa, the Yavana governor of Aśoka. In the seventy-second year of Rudradāman's reign, on the first day of the dark half of Mārgaśīrsha, a heavy storm, attended by a copious rainfall, happened, quite out of season, and so much increased the force of the current of the rivers which flowed through the lake that it destroyed a great portion of the embankment which enclosed the latter. The water of the lake ran off, and its loss no doubt caused great inconvenience to the inhabitants of Junāgdh. A little later the dyke was repaired by the Pahlava Suviśaka, who, as Rudradāman's governor of Soraṭh and Anarta, resided at Junāgdh.

No tradition even of the former existence of the Sudarsana lake survives in Junāgdh. But it seems to me that it must have been situated to the east of the Girnar hill, on the site which is now called 'Bhavanātha's pass' (bhavandithuva nākha). This narrow valley or ravine extends in length from east to west a little more than a mile, and is about as broad. On three sides it is enclosed by high hills; and on the fourth, towards the west, a narrow passage leads from it to the town. Two small perennial rivers, one of which is called Sona rekhā, flow through it; and in the rainy season numerous other brooks, which

---

1. As the text calls Tushāpa ṭeṇa, 'that'-i.e. 'the celebrated'-Yavanarāja, it is not improbable that he was come from the surrounding hills, carry abundant water into it. The valley looks as if were destined by nature to be made a talāo. All that is required to convert it into an enormous reservoir is to close up its mouth on the west by an embankment. In favour of the identification of this valley speak the resemblance of the modern name of one of the rivers, Sonārekhā, to the Susrāsikatā of our inscription, and the fact that the foundations of an ancient wall or embankment are still extant on the side of the hills in the narrow opening of the valley, a little above the so-called Dāmar Kunda, and opposite the sanctuary of the Mushalmaṇa jātkar Jaraś. These foundations I believe to be a remnant of the old embankment.

The inscription states that the dyke was destroyed in the seventy-second year of Rudradāman. But it seems altogether improbable that Rudradāman should have reigned for so long a time, and it is still less probable that he should have had a still longer reign, as the fact that the inscription was written after the completion of the long and difficult work of restoration would force us to assume. It seems therefore necessary to assume, as has been done by the former translators of the inscription, that the figure seventy-two refers not to the years of Rudradāman's reign, but to the era used on the Kshatrapa coins. This explanation is confirmed by the fact that the coins of Rudradāman's son, Rudrasīmha, are dated between the years 102 and 117 of the same era. The same circumstance indicates also that Rudradāman's more than a mere official. Perhaps he was the Sāmanta or feudal lord of Soraṭh.
reign must have come to an end about the year 100. The reign of Rudradâman must have been a long one, and cannot be estimated at less than thirty years. He therefore probably mounted the throne about the year 70. If this was the case, the inscription cannot have been written immediately after the destruction of the lake in the year 72. An interval of at least eight or ten years must lie between the two events. For, on the one hand, it is said that the work was abandoned after the first beginning by the king's ministers, because it was found too difficult, and that later only Suviśākha succeeded in completing it. On the other hand, the numerous exploits of king Rudradâman which the inscription enumerates cannot have been performed in a few years. It is said that he conquered the Yaudhëyas, who lived in the extreme north of his dominions; that he twice completely defeated Sâtakarnî, who ruled over the Dekhasap; and that he reinstated kings who had lost their thrones. Such a career requires at least ten years. I therefore conclude that the date of the incision of the inscriptions falls in the year 80 of the Kshatrapa era, or even a little earlier.

The name of Rudradâman's father, which has been effaced in our inscription, was, according to Mr. Burgess's inscription from the Junigadl cave, Jayadâman. The visarga before putrasya is a remnant of the genitive joyadâmanah which doubtlessly preceded it.

The three inscriptions of the Kshatrapas which have been hitherto discovered all begin the dynasty with Chashtana. Not one of them gives the name of Chashtana's father. The reason for this omission seems to be that Chashtana really was the first of the Kshatrapas, and that his father possessed no such title. The name of the father occurs on Chashtana's coins. But it is to be regretted that no really good specimens have been found, and that for this reason the name cannot be read with certainty. As far as I can make out, the legend on the coins is râjâ vaiâkshatrapasam yasvatâkunâra, Chashtanae, "(the coin) of the king, Mahâkshatrapa Chashtana, son of Ysamotika." The latter name is very curious, and the initial combination yas altogether without analogy.

Perhaps it may have been intended to indicate that the yas is to be pronounced soft, as ya.

Be this as it may, Chashtana certainly was the first of his family who bore the title Kshatrapa. Before him it had been borne by another lord of western India, Nahapâna, who belonged to the family of Kshaharata. This ruler, whose priority to Chashtana follows from a comparison of the types of their coins, or his immediate successor, was destroyed by the Andhra king Gotamiputra, as we learn from the Nasik inscriptions. Shortly afterwards Chashtana must have obtained the dignity of Kshatrapa, and seems to have retaken some of Gotamiputra's conquests from the latter's son Vâsishthiputra. The word Kshatrapa has been identified by Mr. Prinsep with the Persian Satrap, and it has been conjectured that originally the wearers of this title were governors of some paramount king in the interior of India. It seems to me that the correctness of this conjecture, as far as Nahapâna, Chashtana, and Jayadâman are concerned, is corroborated by the fact that the coins of the first two show, besides the Nâgarî (or Pali) characters, Bactrian Pali legends also. The occurrence of the latter unmistakably points to a connection with the north, where this alphabet was in general use. Besides, the epithet svayamadhiyatamakshatrapanâmad, by him who himself has earned the title Mahâkshatrapa, which is given to Rudradâman in our inscription, indicates that he had become free, and perhaps had freed himself, from subjection to a lord paramount.

It is not certain who the Satakarni was whom Rudradâman conquered. For Satakarni is not a name, but a title which probably belonged to all the kings of the Andhra dynasty. My conjecture regarding the question is that the person intended is either Majhariputra or Gotamiputra II., as the letters in the inscriptions and coins of these two kings belong to the same time as those of Rudradâman's inscription. Further details regarding the Andhra dynasty have been given in my papers in the Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. XII., pp. 308ff.

As regards the names of the countries.


3 See also Archæol. Survey Report on Kshishvat and Kachh, pp. 131-133.—Ed.
mentioned in the inscription, I offer the following identifications:

(a) Parvapara Akaravanti. I take to be the names of the two ancient divisions of Mālavā, and I construe Pierre, ‘eastern,’ with ākara and apara, ‘western,’ with Avanti. This identification may be supported by a passage from the commentary of Vatsyayana’s Kāmasūtra (adhikaraṇa 3), where it is said that western Mālavā (which the text mentions) is Ujjayini, and eastern Mālavā is Mālavā properly so called. The latter would correspond with the Bhilā district, the ancient capital of which was Vīdiśa (now the deserted town of Benagar), on the Vetravati. That Avanti is another name for Mālavā is well known.

(b) Anūpa means literally ‘a well-watered country,’ and nīrapat ‘country’ in general. I take the two words as a compound, and the first part as a proper noun. I therefore translate the Anūpa country.’ But I am unable to identify it.²

(c) Ānarta is known from the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas. It corresponds to northern Kāthiavār. Its capital was Kusasthali, the modern Dvārkā.

(d) Surashtira was the name of southern Kāthiavār, which has been preserved in the form Soraṭh as the designation of the Junagadh territory.

(e) Śvabhra is either the country on the banks of the Sādbharmati, in Sanskrit Śvabhramati, in northern Gujarāt, or the old name of Sambhar (Sambhar), in the Ajmir territory.

(f) Mrun is, of course, a portion of modern Mārvā, and Kaṅkhā the province north of Kāthiavār, still called so.

(g) Śindhu-Sauvira probably com-

[1] "सिंधु शहरां देवकुंड पुरुषवर्णिनरा हिरिदारम.

prizes modern Śindh and a portion of the Mūltān districts. The two names are very commonly mentioned together, and the Jainas name Vītabhaya as its capital (Pravachanesārādaṇḍhāra, Apāra 12).

(h) Apārānta is, according to Varāhamihira (Bṛhatsāhanīhīd XIV. 14. 20), a western country, and, according to the commentary of the Vītāyana Kāmasūtra, the coast of the western ocean. It corresponds with the modern Kōnkaṇa, the district extending from Gokarna, in the Karwar Collectorate, to the Dāmān Gāṅgā, the frontier river of Gujarāt, or perhaps even further north to the Tāpi. This identification is supported by a passage of the Arjunatārāhātrā in the Adiparva of the Mahābhārata where it is asserted that Arjuna, after going to visit the sanctuary of Paśupati at Gokarna, travelled to all the tirthas in Apārānta, and, following the sea-coast, finally arrived in Prabhāsa (Sonāth Patīn in Kāthiavār).²

Raghunātha IV. 53, too, Apārānta is described as the country between the Sāhībdrī range (the western Ghats) and the ocean; and Māllinātha, in his commentary on the verse, quotes the Viśvavesa to the effect that Sārāraka was the capital of Apārānta. This town is the modern Soparā, near Bassein (Vassali), in the Thāpā districts, as has been shown by Mr. J. Burgess.

In my opinion the Greek name of the western coast of India, Apsaik, Ariaia, is a corruption of Apārāntika, which in Prakrit may have become Abarāntika or Avarāntika.

Regarding the other countries mentioned I am unable to say anything, nor am I able to decide where Rudradāman’s capital was. On the latter point I will, however, say thus much, that it was not in Kāthiavār, as this province was ruled by a governor.

---

* Ujjainyadāsaśāhavāyadāvā dhāvāmālayaḥ...

² Professor Bhagdārakar has shown that the capital of Anūpa was Mākṣikmati, and that it consequently corresponds with Nīmoda.

See Trans. Orb. Cong. of 1874, p. 315.—G. B.

² Vālī, adhikā, 3: aparāntikā vā pariśnito mūndakātē tāparāntikā.

³ Gokarnamahero gotam ||

yānāḥ paśupate tābhāmayo dārmaṃdāva muktīdāna ||

yatā prāpito maṇiçāya prāpyoṇtyabhayah paḍāma ||

[8] Varāhamihira's text is distinct, though faint, on the stone. The reading is very improbable. Bhagadārakar's text is doubtless the correct reading. But the stone has tā for tā, G. B.
L. 2, the letters तम, visible in the photograph, have been left out by Bh. \textsuperscript{66} for परिवारह is doubtful.—G. B.
L. 3, probably न. [Bhagavatūla]. Eggeling's \textsuperscript{69} is, I suppose, a misprint. The stone shows faintly Bh.'s reading.—G. B.
L. 4, \textsuperscript{67} पराकयान for नागी is caused by a fissure in the stone, which has come out too clearly in the photograph. The down-stroke in the figure ज which appears on the photograph is caused by an accidental fissure. The mason incised ज only.—G. B.
L. 5, Bhagavatūla's सरसम (सरसम) is by no means certain. I think that the reading of the stone is \textsuperscript{68}. The stone has clearly \textsuperscript{69} (r) above the \textsuperscript{69}, which is not clear in the photograph.—G. B.

L. 7, Bhagavatūla's \textsuperscript{70} is certain from the stone, though only the right-hand portion of the first akṣaru has been preserved.—G. B.
L. 8, the ai of \textsuperscript{71} is clearly visible on the stone. But the lower part of the akṣaru has completely peeled off. I think Bh. is right in his conjecture.—G. B.
L. 9, the akṣaru over रस्त्रिक is not clear on the stone. A letter has been lost after this word, perhaps रस्त्रि. Bhagavatūla's restoration, \textsuperscript{72}, is doubtful.—G. B.
L. 10, the marks on the photograph after गितम are fissures or scratches, not letters.—G. B.
L. 11, only the ra of the syllable \textsuperscript{73} in रिवाल is quite clear. \textsuperscript{74} म in मरु is certain even from the photograph.—G. B.
L. 12, for \textsuperscript{75} नीय्य\textsuperscript{6}, \textsuperscript{6} जीत्य (NIYAM), \textsuperscript{66} जीत्य, [Bhagavatūla.] The क in सनायतन and the ज in रज (ROJ) are doubtful.] न and ज may be the correct readings.
and grandson of Mahâkshatras, king Svâmi Châshâna, whose name is of auspicious import, on the (first day) of the dark half of the month of Mârgaśîraha.

When, in consequence of the rain which had fallen very copiously, the earth had become, as it were, one ocean, by the excessive swelling of the currents of the Palâśi, of the Su-varnasikâ, and of the other rivers which (come) from Mount Urjâyat, the embankment, in spite of suitable devices employed, an extremely furious hurricane, similar to the storm (which rages) at the Deluge, throwing down hill-tops, trees, rocks, terraces, (pieces of) the neighbouring ground, gates, houses, and pillars of victory, violently stirred the water, which (in its turn) displaced and broke.

---

L. 13, read इस्तोललबाट —

L. 15, the form of the ता [ढ] in अयावितता shows that Bhagavakâla's reading of the sign in prândhâhita, &c. as त is correct.—G. B.

L. 19, श्रेष्ठम् should be श्रेष्ठम्, as the stone and photograph read.—G. B.

All translators have copied Dr. Stevenson's old mistake. The meaning of Siddhârtha is the same as that of svastì, 'hail!' — G. B.

11 Add 'which is situated near' the foot of the Girinâgara hill.—G. B.

12 Parvatâpâs are probably the spurs at the bottom of the hill, which in Gujarâtî are called वट or वट. — Bh.

13 Add 'solid' before 'embankment.'—G. B.

14 'Natural' refers to the hills which surrounded it on three sides: see below, Remark 1.—Bh.

15 Mihrakâ is a common expression in Gujarâtî for 'crooked.' — Bh.
As the water escaped through the rent (in the embankment) one hundred and twenty ells long, as many (ells) broad, and seventy-five ells deep, it resembled a desert and became exceedingly unsightly... for the sake of... the Vaiśya Pusya-gupta, the brother-in-law of the Maurya king Chandragupta, had caused to be constructed. It had been adorned with conduits that Yavanarāja Tushāspa (the servant) of the Maurya (king) Aśoka. With the conduit made by him, the construction of which was worthy of a king, and which was visible in that rent, an extensive embankment...

He whom men freely elected their lord for their protection on account of this quality, that from his birth he bore the indelible and greatest (mark of) Royal Fortune; he who took, and kept to the end of his life, the vow to stop killing men except in battle; he who showed a compassionate disposition... to slay foes (of) equal (strength) that came to meet him, to surpass... he who afforded special protection, on account of their submission, to people that came to him of their own free will; he (who is) the lord of eastern and western Ākara-vatī, of Anūpadesa, Ānarta, Surāḷastra, Śvabhrā, Māra, Kachha, Sindhū, Sāvīra, Kukura, Aparānta, Nihāda, and other territories, in which the people of new towns (even) and bāzārs are not attacked by thieves, snakes, (wild) beasts, diseases, and the like, which he has gained by his own valour, in which all people are loyal, (in which,) in consequence of his power... (are found all) objects of enjoyment; he who annihilated the Yauvheya... who had become arrogant and disobedient in consequence of their receiving from all Kaśatris the title 'the heroes'; he who has obtained glory because he did not destroy Sātakarnī, the lord of the Dēkhaṇ, on account of his near relationship, though he twice really conquered him; he who has gained victorious...; he who has restored to their thrones deposed kings; he who by raising his hand not in vain (i.e. by giving religious gifts) has earned the affection of Dharma; he who has gained great fame by studying to the end, by remembering, understanding, and applying the great sciences such as grammar, polity, music, logic; (he who)... the management of horses, elephants, and chariots, fighting with the sword and the shield, &c.; he who easily and fully conquers hostile armies; he whose nature it is to give daily presents to, to confer honours on, and not to slight (his servants); he who possesses large views; he whose treasury overflows with gold, silver, diamonds, lapiz lazuli, and quantities of (other) precious objects, which he has obtained in a righteous manner as presents, dues, and (royal) shares; (he whose) prose and metrical compositions are clear, (distinguished by) brevity, sweet, admirable, lovely, remarkable for grammatical correctness and embellished by (rhetorical) ornaments...; he whose beautiful frame is endowed with the most excellent marks and signs, such as proper size (in height and breadth), (proper) weight, (due) proportion (in the limbs), (a pleasing) voice, (majestic) gait, (a beautiful) complexion, strength and prowess; he who himself has earned the title Mahākshatrapa; he who has obtained numerous garlands at the euyanvaras of kings' daughters;—he, the Mahākshatrapa Rudradāman, for the sake of a thousand years, for the sake of... cows and Brahmans, and for the increase of his merit and fame, has rebuilt the embankment three times stronger in breadth and length, in a not very long time, expending a great amount of money from his own treasury, without oppressing the people of the town and of the province by (exact) taxes, forced labour, acts of affection, and the like,—the whole town... (and) has made the lake more beautiful (or more worthy of the name Sudaśana) (than before). When in this affair the Mahākshatrapa's advisers and engineers, though possessed of the qualifications of ministers, lost heart on account of the enormous size of the gap and gave up the undertaking, and when the people, despairing of seeing the em...
bankment rebuilt, began to lament, (the work) was accomplished by the minister Suviṣākha, the son of Kuaipta, a Pahlava, who has been appointed by the king, out of kindness towards the town and country people, to protect the whole of Anarta and Surāśṭra, who by the proper dispensation of justice in temporal and spiritual affairs increases the affection of the (subjects), who is able, of subdued senses, neither hasty nor wanting in presence of mind, of noble family and unconquered, who governs well and increases the spiritual merit, fame, and glory of his master.”

**Note by Dr. G. Büchter.**

The Gujarati original of the above article was made over to me for translation by Pandit Bhagavánlal in the end of May 1877. Various personal reasons prevented my going to work on it at once. But even now, after Professor Eggeling’s revised transcript and version of the inscription has appeared in Mr. Burgess’s *Report of Kâdhêvid,* I do not think that the publication of Bhagavânlal’s paper will be deemed superfluons. Mr. Burgess’s facsimile, it is true, is a very good one, and Professor Eggeling’s work shows great progress as compared with Dr. Bhâd Daji’s. Still a repeated and careful comparison of the stone with the photograph from Mr. Burgess’s paper cast, which I made in December 1876, has yielded a few better readings in such places where the faintness of the letters, or accidental scratches, necessarily made the readings from the photograph doubtful. Most of these have also been given by Bhagavânlal, but I have once more pointed them out in the notes to his transcript.

I fully concur in most of the Pandit’s important new readings and new renderings. One of his remarks also I recommend to special notice, the identification of the Greek name of the western coast, Arabiko or Ariake, with Aparrântika. I have no doubt that he is right, and that the reading Arabiko (Aprikhi) in the Periplus has to be altered to Abarântike (Abapakh). The identification of Aparânta with the Konâka has been made first by Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar, *Trans. Or. Cong.* p. 313. The same gentleman’s identification of Kukura with Hiwan Thang’s Kin-che-lo cannot stand, as ku is never represented by Chinese che, and the identification with Gûjjarâ is perfectly unobjectionable. Mr. Burgess’s identification of Nishâda with Berar rests on a mistake. Nala’s kingdom is called Nishâda, not Nishâda. It would seem that there were several districts in ancient India which bore this name. In our inscription, probably, the north-western Nishâda, which, according to a passage of the Mahâbhârata (see the *Pet. Dict.* s.v. Nishâda), corresponded with the Hisâr and Bhatnâr districts, is meant. Bhagavânlal’s Sva bhr a is a bold conjecture which is not sufficiently supported. But he is right in not accepting the form Asvâka’s which former decipherers have imported into the text.

**Correspondence and Miscellanea.**

**The Parsi Priesthood.**

*To the Editor of the “Indian Antiquary.”*

Sir,—The communication from Mr. Sorâjji Kârsjî Khambât in the *Indian Antiquary,* vol. VII. p. 179, pointing out some errors in the information which Prof. Monier Williams had received regarding the Parsi religion and rites, shows that there are still some obscurities with respect to the classification and titles of the Parsi priesthood, which it ought not to be difficult to clear up.

Mr. H. G. Briggs, in his work on *The Parsis or Modern Zoroastrians,* says, on the subject of the priesthood (p. 45)—“Mabed is the general term, and tantamount in acceptation to our word Clergy. The learned among them, and those who hold spiritual dignity, are denominated Dasturs or Ahdîdrus, almost significant to our Doctors and Bishops. *Horbads* are the inferior clergy.”

This is not the same as the account given by Prof. Monier Williams. Mr. Sorâjji Kârsjî’s differs from both. And it might be assumed that his is correct, were it not that it has an appearance of being a little at variance with itself. *Horbad,* it says, is “a mere generic term for Dasturs and Mobeds,” while a footnote says, “Some *Horbads* are neither Dasturs nor Mobeds, for they do not choose to enter the holy order.”

The account of this priesthood would be made more distinct if, in addition to a statement of the second, the reading *Apa*stânu occurs in the codex, but is generally regarded as corrupt.—Ed.

21 *Apa*stânu occurs in the *Periplus,* §§ 14, 41, and 54; in *Report on Kêdâ,* p. 131.
classification and titles, and of ceremonies regulating admission (to which your correspondent briefly refers), it embraced also some notice of the several qualifications required and duties performed.

R. M.

A CASE OF SAMADH IN INDIA.

BY MONIER WILLIAMS, D.C.L., BODEN PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT AT OXFORD.

It may interest some of your readers if I give a brief account of a case of Samadhi which has recently occurred in the district of Kaira (Khejra), in Gujarat. The particulars were furnished to me by Mr. Frederick Sheppard, the energetic Collector, in whose camp I stayed twice during my Indian travels. Permit me, however, to introduce the narrative by a few remarks about sacrifice, immolation, and self-torture, all of which were once common in India.

In what may be called the Brâhmanical period, which succeeded the Vedic period of Hinduism, human sacrifice must have prevailed. This is sufficiently evident from the story of Sūnahèpha in the Atareya-brhâmasa. It is even believed by many that the sects called Śākta (or Tāntrika) formerly ate portions of the flesh and drank the blood of the victims sacrificed at their secret orgies. Human sacrifices, however, were probably rare, while the sacrifice of animals became universal. The first idea of sacrifice seems to have been that of supplying the deities with nourishment. Gods and men all feasted together. Then succeeded the notion of the need of vicarious suffering, or life for life, blood for blood. Some deities were believed to thirst for human blood, and the blood of animals was substituted for that of men. One of the effects of Buddhism was to cause a rapid diminution of animal sacrifice. It is now rarely seen except at the altars of the goddess Kāli, or of forms and near relations of Kāli (such as the Gṛrmā-devatās (village mothers), and at the altars of the tutelary deity Ayenār,1 and at devil-shrines in the south. I myself saw very few animals sacrificed even to the bloody goddesses, though I took pains to visit them on the proper days.

Other forms of immolation were once common in India. The Thugs maintained that they sacrificed their victims to the goddess Kāli. Now that Thugism has been suppressed by us, a good deal of dātārā-poisoning is practised by the same class of people. The killing of female infants once prevailed extensively in the Panjāb and Râjputāna, owing to the difficulty of providing daughters with suitable husbands, and the immense expenses entailed by nuptial festivities.

2 Again, in former days self-immolation was common. Many immolated themselves at the great car-festivals, voluntarily throwing themselves under the enormous wheels, not only of the car of Jagannāth at Puri, in Orissa, but of other idol-cars also.

I found similar cars attached to every large pagoda in the south of India. Some of them are so large and heavy that they require to be supported on sixteen wheels, and on a particular day once a year they are drawn through the streets by thousands of people. Every now and then persons are crushed under the wheels; for our civilization has tended to the increase of religious gatherings among the natives, by creating facilities of communication, and the best government cannot always prevent accidents.

Self-immolation in other ways was once extensively prevalent. Arrian, it is well known, describes how, in the time of Alexander the Great, a man named Kālānōs—one of the sect of Indian wise men who went naked—burned himself upon a pile.2 This description is like that of the self-cremation of the ascetic Sarabhānga in Bāndganya iii. 9. There are some sand-hills in the Sātmūra range dedicated to the god Śiva, supposed as Mahākāla to delight in destruction—from a rock on which many youths have precipitated themselves, because their mothers, being without children, have dedicated their first-born sons to the god.

With regard to the immolation of the faithful wife (commonly called satt) who followed her husband in death, and burned herself on his funeral pile, everywhere in India, I saw scattered about in various places monuments erected over the ashes of satts; and everywhere such monuments are still regarded with the greatest veneration by the people.

Happily we put a step to this practice in 1829, though we had previously sanctioned it under certain regulations, believing that we ought not to interfere with an ancient religious custom. In one year an official report of 800 widows burnt was received at Calcutta. Between 1815 and 1829 the average varied from 300 to 600 per annum.

We have also prevented the burying alive of lepers, and others afflicted with incurable diseases, which was once universally prevalent in the Panjāb, and common in some other parts of India.

Of course, leprosy in India, as in other Eastern countries, is a kind of living death. Lepers are excluded from society, and can get no employment; and they often gave themselves up of their own accord to be buried alive, the motive simply being

1 The son of Śiva by Mohini, also called Hari Hara.—Ed.

2 Ind. Ant. vol. VI. pp. 245-6, 334-5; and Pintarch's Alexander, 66.—Ed.
a desire to be released from physical suffering. This was called performing samaddhā (Sanskrit—
śamaddhi, suspending the connexion between soul and body by religious abstraction).

Sleeman describes how he once knew a very respectable Hindu gentleman who came to the
river Narmada, attended by a large retinue, to perform samaddhā, in consequence of an incurable
disease under which he laboured. After taking leave of his family, he entered a boat, which con-
veyed him to the deepest part of the river. He then loaded himself with sand, and stepping into
the water disappeared.

In most of these cases the laudable humanity of our Government in preserving human life has
given rise to fresh evils and difficulties.

In the first place, population is increasing upon us in a degree which threatens to become wholly
unmanageable. Then, widows never marry again; not even if their boy-husbands die, leaving them
widows at the age of six. A woman is supposed to be sacramentally united to one husband, and be-
longs to him for ever. Every town, every village, almost every house, is full of widows, who are
debanded from all amusements, and converted into household drudges. They often lead bad lives.
Their life, like that of the lepers, is a kind of living death, and they would often cheerfully give them-
Ise up to be burned alive if the law would let them.

Only the other day in Nēpāl, where our supremacy is still barely recognized, the widows of
Sir Jang Bahādur became saitis, and burned themselves with their husband.

Then, again, the increase in the number of girls who cannot find suitable husbands is now causing
much embarrassment in some districts; and even the lepers, whose lives we preserve, involve us in
peculiar difficulties. These unfortunate creatures often roam about the country, exacting food from
the people by threatening to touch their children.

Here and there we have built leper-villages—
rows of cottages under trees, devoted to their use;
and we make the towns contribute from local funds
to support them, while charity suscites the miserable
pittance they receive.

As to the practice of self-torture, this cannot be
entirely prevented by our Government, but it is
rapidly dying out. Formerly, it was possible for
devotees—with the object of exciting admiration,
or extorting alms, or under the delusion that their
self-torture was an act of religious merit—to
swing in the air attached to a lofty pole by means
of a rope and hook passed through the muscles of
the back. Such self-inflicted mutilation is now
prohibited. Yet, even in the present day, to ac-
quire a reputation for sanctity, or to receive
homage and offerings from the multitude, or under
the idea of accumulating a store of merit, all sorts
of bodily sufferings, penances, and austerities,
even to virtual suicide, are undergone—the latter
being sometimes actually perpetrated out of mere
revenge—as its consequences are supposed to fall
on the enemy whose action has driven the de-
ceased to self-immolation.

I saw a man not long since at Allahābād who
has sat in one position for fifty years on a stone
pedestal exposed to sun, wind, and rain. He
never moves except once a day, when his attendants
lead him to the Ganges. He is an object of wor-
ship to thousands, and even high-caste Brāhmaṇs
pay him homage.

I saw two Uṛdhva-bāhus, one at Gayā and
the other at Banāras,—that is, devotees who hold
their arms with clenched fists above their heads
for years, until they become shrivelled and the
finger-nails penetrate through the back of the hands.
Another man was prostrating himself and measur-
ing every inch of the ground with his body round
the hill of Gūḍarhān when I passed.

Two attempts at samaddhā occurred in Mr. Shep-
pard's district. A devotee announced his inten-
tion of adopting this extraordinary method of
securing perfect abstraction and beatitude, and was
actually buried alive in the neighbourhood of a
village. His friends were detected by the villagers
in pouring milk down a hollow bamboo which had
been arranged to supply the buried man with air
and food. The bamboo was removed, and the
interred man was found dead, when his friends
opened the grave shortly afterwards.

The other attempt is still more recent, and I
will conclude this communication by giving Mr.
Sheppard's own account of it, almost in his own
words:—"As I was shooting near my camp one
evening, a mounted orderly came up with news
that a Bāhāt had performed samaddhā that after-
noon in a neighbouring village, and that there
was much consequent excitement there. Not
having a horse with me, I directed the orderly
to ride off to the village (picking up my police
escort as he passed through my camp) and to dig
up the buried man, taking into custody any persons
who might endeavour to oppose the execution of
my orders.

"On returning to my camp, I ordered the apprehen-
sion of all those who had assisted in the samaddhā, and soon afterwards received a report
that the man had been actually buried in a vault
in his own house, but had been taken out alive.
He was, however, very weak, and died the follow-
ing morning. It was then reported to me that the
limbs, though cold, had not stiffened, and the
people—ready, as of old, to be deceived, and always
inclined to attribute the smallest departure from
the ordinary course of events to supernatural agency—declared that the Bhāt was not dead, but lying in the samādhi trance. There was, however, no pulse, and as it was clear that, even if the supposition of the villagers was correct, medical treatment would be desirable, I sent the body in a cart to the nearest dispensary, distant some six or seven miles, and in due time received a certificate of death from the hospital assistant in charge of that institution, together with a report of a post-mortem examination of the body, which showed that death had resulted from heart-disease.

"Meanwhile I visited the village and ascertained the following facts:—The deceased was a man in fairly comfortable circumstances, and with some religious pretensions. It was well known that he aspired to a still higher reputation for sanctity, and that, with this view, he had for several months been contemplating samādhi. The proper date for this rite had been finally settled, after many solemn ceremonies and the due observance of fasting, prayer, and charity.

"On the afternoon fixed for the samādhi he assembled the villagers, and told them that he had been imparted to him in a vision that the Deity required him to pass six weeks in religious abstraction, and that he felt compelled to obey the divine command, and to remain in the vault prepared for him during that period. He then produced and worshipped a small earthen vessel containing the sacred Tulaśi plant, and afterwards carefully planted therein twenty grains of barley, telling the villagers to watch for their growth, as it had been revealed to him that the grains represented his life. If at the end of the six weeks the grains had sprouted, the villagers were to understand that the Bhāt was still alive. He was then to be removed from the vault, and worshipped as a saint. If, on the other hand, germination had not taken place, they were to understand that the Bhāt was dead also, and the vault was in that case to be permanently bricked up, and the Tulaśi planted over the grave.

"After giving these directions, the devotee recited some mantras and entered the vault, bidding farewell to the world, and declaring his belief that his life would be miraculously preserved. The vault was then roofed over with boards, and plastered thickly with mud. About two hours after this event, he was removed from the vault by the police under my orders, and placed in the verandah, the house itself being locked up.

"After ascertaining the above particulars, I caused the house to be opened, and then discovered that a gross attempt at imposture had been practised. The grave was about three feet deep, being a hole dug in the floor of the inner room of the house.

The wall of the room formed one side of the vault. The roof over the latter was a clumsy structure, and had been partly demolished to allow of the removal of the devotee. As usual in India, the only light admitted to the room was through the door, and the unsubstantial nature of the roof was not likely to attract the attention of the villagers. But I satisfied myself that the occupant of the vault might, with great ease, have demolished the covering which was supposed to shut him off from the world.

"The vault itself was somewhat dark. I entered it in order to ascertain how much space had been allotted to the occupant. I found therein the rosary of the deceased, and the chaplet of flowers which he had worn before his self-immolation. There was sufficient room for me to sit in tolerable comfort. On one side of the vault I felt a small wooden plank apparently let into the wall, and on obtaining a light I found that a trap-door about a foot square had been ingeniously contrived to communicate with the other room of the house. The trap-door was so hung as to open inwards, towards the vault, at the pleasure of the inmate. On going into the outer room, into which communication had thus been opened, I found that a row of the large earthen jars, which Horace would have called amphorae, and which are used in India to store grain, had been arranged against the wall. The trap-door into the vault was effectually concealed by them, and the supply of air, food, and water to the impostor within, thus cleverly provided for. The arrangement was neatly contrived, and was not likely to have attracted suspicion. Had the Bhāt been a strong man, and in good health, he might, without any danger to life, and with only a minimum of discomfort, have emerged triumphantly after his six weeks' samādhi, and have earned a wide reputation. But the excitement and fasting were too much for him."— Athenaeum, August 4th, 1877.

ARUṆĀD YAVANO MADHYAMIKĀM.

Mr. Carlyle’s and General Cunningham’s remarks on pp. 201–205 of Vol. VI. of the Archaeological Survey Reports induce me to state that the oldest and best MSS. of both the Mahābhāṣya and of the Kāśikā Vyāli on P. III. 2. 111 read अष्टमकोमी मध्यमिकाम (and not मध्यमिकाम). A marginal note in one of the MSS. of the Mahābhāṣya states that Mādhya mīkā kāga was a town (नगर); Nāgajyānta on P. VI. 3. 37 likewise says मध्यमिकाम नगरी; and in the Gaṇaratanamahādeśi we read गनरात्मक मध्यमिकाम नगरी, तत्सि अंगे मध्यमिकाम. I leave it to General Cunningham to decide whether this correct reading Mādhya mīkā is of any
value for the interpretation of the legend on the coins found by Mr. Cardeley, and whether the ancient city of Nāgarī may originally have been called Mādhyaṃkā. To me it would seem that the Maṣṭhamālya of the coins might well be the oblique case of a feminine noun in ā, equivalent to a Sanskrit form मनोकामाः.

Later writers have freely copied Kātyāyana's Vārttika on P. III. 2. 111, and in some cases also Panini's instances. The author of the Praśāda (a commentary on the Prakṛti-kāśikā) quotes अर्थायां: संकेतम्, the same instance we find in the Jaiminīya-mahāvyākhyā of Abhayānandin, who instances besides अर्थायां: मनोकामाः; and in the Śabdāṅg-vārāhini, another commentary on the Jaiminīya-vārāhini, we read अर्थाः: संकेतम्. But the most interesting instances are no doubt those which Hema-chandra in his Sanskrit grammar gives for his rule यथा हेमचन्द्रपरम्: संकेतम्.

According to the late Dr. Bhabha Dājī, Hema-chandra lived 1088-1172 a.d., and Siddharāja reigned some time during the first half of the 12th century (Lassen, vol. III. p. 567).

F. Kielhorn.

HALLE MAKKALU.

From inquiries lately made I find that the Morasu Holiyars are the Halle Makkalu—old (adopted) sons—of the Morasu Wākligas.¹

"In former times" the Morasu Holiyars had the following privileges:—

(i.) Carrying the Wākliga bride's box in which her trousseau was placed;

(ii.) Washing the feet of the Wākliga bride and brides-groom;

(iii.) Assisting to carry to its grave the body of a deceased Wākliga;

(iv.) Partaking of the pīṣāda, i.e. the food prepared on the third day after death, and of which, as a rule, only members of the family can partake.

Of these four privileges the first is now the only one universally admitted and exercised. Individual Wākligas deny that the Holiyars exercised all these privileges, but a very little cross-examination soon brings out that the denial is confined to the privileges being exercised with regard to the individual and his own relations; that he is aware the Holiyars are said to have had these privileges in former times, and believes that here and there even now they occasionally exercise them. This is only what is to be expected. Each individual tries to make the most of his own family, and denies any relationship with a lower caste. There is sufficient evidence to prove that the Morasu Holiyars are affiliated to the Morasu Wākligas.

Why this took place I have been unable to discover, but a more than ordinarily intelligent head-man said that he thought the Holiyars had been adopted because they assisted the Wākligas when they first came to the country. The Morasu Holiyars are the only Holiyars who weave cloth.

What is the meaning of Morasu? I think it must have been the old name of that part of the country where the Morasu Wākligas are to be found.

Among the Wākligas of Māsūr the following appellatives are to be found:—Morasu, Hali, Gaṅgādikar, and Nonabā, and the same appellatives are to be found among the Holiyars. Now the Gaṅgādikar and Nonabā Wākligas evidently derived their respective appellative from the old name of that part of the country where to this day they are to be found, in the last-named numbers. The Gaṅgādikar Wākligas are chiefly in the south and west of the Māsūr district, and this part of the country was formerly called Gaṅgāvalī. In the same way the Nonabā Wākligas are found in the west of the Tumkur district, which part of the country was formerly known as Nonambavāḍī. Reasoning by analogy, the ancient name of those parts of the country where there is an appellative common to both Wākligas and Holiyars ought to be the appellative. The Morasu Wākligas are to be found principally in the Bangalor district, the Halle Wākligas in the Hassan district. Perhaps some of the readers of the Antiquary in these districts could help in clearing up this point.

I can add little or nothing about the Konāgar Holiyars. The term Konāgar is applied by the Kannada-speaking people to the Tamil-speaking camp followers of regiments. I saw an old man the other day at Tyamondale, Nelamangla Tālukā, who said he was a Konāgar Holiya: he came up to this part of the country with the commissariat elephants. He eats with the Holiyars of this country, but he told me that among the Holiyars of Madras there is a sub-division which corresponds to Halle Makkalu. They are called Pulikutti pariahs of the Vellālas. He would not eat at the houses of any of this sub-division, but they would in his. Some of your Madras readers ought to be able to say if the old man is right or not.

J. S. F. Mackenzie.

Bangalore, 9th May 1878.

NOTE ON THE ORISSA HYPERTHRAL TEMPLE.

After the notice of the remarkable temple discovered by the late Sir John Campbell in Orissa had appeared in the Antiquary (ante, page 19), I met with the description of a somewhat similar structure in General Cunningham's Archaeological Reports, vol. II. (for 1864-5).

It was found among the ruins of Khajuraho, an ancient site in Bandelkhand, between Chhatrapur and Panna, which in more recent times was the capital of the Chandel Rajputs, who flourished from the 9th to the 14th century.

By the present inhabitants the building is known as the Temple of the Chaon particle Yogi, or "64 female demons," and consists of a massive oblong enclosure constructed of granite and open above, the length of which is 102 1/2 feet, and the breadth 58 3/4 feet. The exterior is simply ornamented with three broad flat horizontal mouldings, but round the inside are 64 cells or niches, 22 on each side and 10 at each end (exclusive of the entrance and a larger cell opposite), each cell 36 1/2 inches high by 28 3/4 broad, intended apparently for the reception of an image which no longer exists.

At what period the Yoginis were worshipped, why their number is fixed at 64, and what place they hold in the Siva theology, is not clear. It may even be doubted whether they belong to any of the recent forms of superstition with which we are acquainted. The temple at Khajuraho bearing their name is evidently of greater antiquity than the neighbouring buildings. It is the only one constructed of granite, all the others being built of a light-coloured fine sandstone, quarried hard by, and it is the only one not placed due north and south—all pointing to a different age and a distinct race of worshippers.

On these points, however, we may hope to be further enlightened shortly. A late letter from General Cunningham states he has discovered a third example of the same kind of structure, which he is now engaged in describing,—viz. a circular cloister containing the 64 Yoginis, with several other statues, most of them accompanied by inscriptions, which will doubtless indicate their precise character.

WALTER ELLIOT.

MR. HENRY BLOCHMANN.

Oriental literature has sustained an irreparable loss by the death of Mr. H. Blochmann, Principal of the Muhammadan College at Calcutta, and for many years the active Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Cut off at the early age of forty, ere he had attained the full maturity of his powers, he has left behind him a rich store of early gathered fruit, the earnest of an abundant harvest never to be garnered. Mr. Blochmann's acquisitions in Arabic and Persian, and the accuracy and soundness of his knowledge, marked him out for a teacher. In early life his desire to become personally acquainted with the East led him to enlist as a soldier; but arrived in India his scholarship soon became known, and he was appointed to a subordinate position in the college of which he died the chief. In this office he had peculiar opportunities of extending his knowledge, and he was indefatigable in turning them to account. He enjoyed the society of learned Musalmans, and the stores of public and private libraries were at his command. They were well used. Few men had a more intimate acquaintance with Muhammadan life, and none surpassed him in his knowledge of Arabic and Persian MSS. A living catalogue, it was seldom that an inquiry about books was addressed to him in vain. The pages of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal attest the activity and diversity of his researches. Literature and lexicography, coins and inscriptions, in turn engaged his attention. But two subjects he made peculiarly his own—Persian prosody, the difficulties and mysteries of which he has done much to unravel; and the life and reign of the great emperor Akbar. The translation of the A'is-i-Akbari, the Institutes of Akbar, is Blochmann's magnum opus, and on this his reputation will mainly rest. He has published a large portion of the Persian text, but unhappily only one volume of the translation has appeared. It is greatly to be hoped that the MS. of the remainder is in a forward state of preparation, for who would venture to take up the pen which his hand dropped? The translation of a Persian book into English may not seem a great and arduous work to those who have no knowledge of the original text. But this book deals with intricate and technical subjects, and is written in a style which native writers consider as obscure and difficult. With all his knowledge, and with the great sources of information at his command, there are passages which Mr. Blochmann could not interpret, and he has shown the manliness and honesty of the true scholar in saying so. In this translation he has inserted a series of memoirs of the great men of the days of Akbar,—a paean, in fact, of the Mogul Empire, comprising more than four hundred names. This was entirely his own compilation, and it supplies a most interesting and instructive series of pictures of the life and manners of the time.—JOHN DOWSON. (The Academy.)
BOOK NOTICES


The late Lord Strangford, condemned by his father to the diplomatic career in which the latter had risen to eminence,—for which the son seems to have had a taste—consoled himself with philological studies more extensive and profound than those of any other Englishman of his day not being a professional scholar. Fate or temperament prevented him from ever embodying the results in anything that could be called a book; but fortunately his widow is fitted by her own talents and acquirements to select and edit the present volume, which with the two published by Bentley in 1869 are enough to show what he was and might have been.

The volume under review contains notes and reflections upon almost every language under the sun, of which a couple attacking the "Dog Persian" of the Government of India will perhaps be the most interesting to our readers. But the special value of the work consists first in the intense scorn of theorism and acrimonious which pervades these miscellaneous selections as thoroughly as if they formed a single treatise written for the express purpose of keeping philological and etno-

lingual sciences from running off the rails; and secondly in the astonishing wit and humour of almost every sentence.¹

One cannot close the book without thinking how much happier and more useful might have been the career of the noble writer—noble more by nature than by race—if the lines had fallen for him in places a little further East; and if, instead of the cramping, disheartening influences of a diplomatic chancery, he had grown up under those of early power and responsibility, which form the best men of the Indian service.


Professor Tiele states that the time for writing an elaborate history of religion has not yet come. He does not pretend to supply more than outlines, mere "pencil-sketches," helpful towards the full picture which will in due time be drawn. This "little work," as he modestly calls it, contains an introduction and five chapters. It traverses an immense extent of ground, without seeking to describe with minute accuracy any part of it. We are very far from accepting all the Professor's inferences from facts, or even all his supposed facts; but the work supplies evidence both of extensive reading and of careful reflection.

Professor Tiele belongs to the advanced school of "liberal" theologians. He does not believe in Revelation—at least in the sense in which the term is usually applied to religion. In all religions we trace, according to the professor, only a process of development or natural growth. He thus comes to enunciate, especially in treating of the faith of Israel, opinions which violently conflict with the belief of nine-tenths, or more, of Christendom. The professor is, of course, aware of this; but he goes on in serene self-confidence, making one bold asseveration after another, hardly condescending to refute his opponents, or even to supply evidence of the truth of his own positions.

We intend to enter into no contest with Professor Tiele. We simply bring under the notice of our readers the views of a good representative of a certain school. Besides, our author is professor of the History of Religions, and on his own special subject he deserves an attentive hearing.

He holds that the earliest religion has left but few traces behind it. It was followed by Animism, or the worship of spirits. This stage is represented by the polydemonistic tribal religions, which, among civilized nations, were soon developed into polytheism resting on traditional doctrine. Nomistic religions followed—that is to say, systems grounded on sacred books, and superseding polytheism by pantheism or monotheism. Out of these, again, sprung the universal religions—Buddhism, Christianity, and Mahommedanism—"which start from principles and maxims."

Leaving the reader to form his own opinion of this nimble generalization, we follow Prof. Tiele into his account of Animism. This is a belief in the existence of spirits, of which the powerful become objects of worship. When the spirits take up their abode in any material object, which thus becomes endowed with power, we have Fetishism. Animism is unorganized polydemonism. It does not exclude belief in a supreme spirit. It is accompanied by a belief in magic, which seeks to obtain power over the spirits by spells. Fear is the ruling power in all Animistic worship. The spirits and their worshippers are alike selfish.

¹ The very device on the cover is a philological joke, being the writer's signature Russianized, "Astrangfoor," with an initial off for the benefit of the Asiatist, who would not otherwise have got round it. It reminds one of that Bombay hilliard-marker who, having to score for a gentleman...
Anism has little or no moral character. Its doctrine of a future state contains no idea of recompense—i.e. of punishment or reward.

Over a large extent both of Asia and Europe the Aryan, and perhaps the Semites, were preceded by Turanian races, whose religion was purely Animistic, and under the influence of a belief in magic. The religions of America exhibit Animism at various stages. Those of Mexico and Peru reached the extreme limit of Animism, and would probably have risen above it if the Spanish conquest had not checked their development.

This outline of Prof. Tiele’s views regarding the lowest existing form of religion, out of which all the higher forms, according to him, have proceeded, must suffice for the present. We may simply mention that he touches on the religions of the Chinese, of the ancient Egyptians, of the Babylonians and Assyrians, of the Phoenicians, of the Israelites, Islam, Brahmanism, Paganism, the systems of the Letto-Slavs, the Germans, the Greeks and the Romans.

Our author is always suggestive; but he is frequently startled by his cool dogmatism. Take one example:—“The Egyptian religion furnished to Roman Catholic Christendom the germ of the worship of the Virgin, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, and the type of its theocracy.”

Let us add, however, that this is one of the most unguarded assertions in the volume; it is not a case of ex uno disce omnes.

M.


It is not easy to bring a work which

“With extensive view

Surveys mankind from China to Peru”

within the exclusively Oriental scope of the Indian Antiquary, and Professor Whitney’s lectures, though necessarily not exhaustive in detail, deal with the general features of speech and writing, so far as at present known to science. In sucha work, however, it is impossible for the writer to avoid devoting some of his most important chapters to the languages of the East. Moreover, the Orientalist—proudly conscious that “in his father’s house” the science of Comparative Philology was, if not born, at least weaned—may fairly claim not to be considered a meddler if he occasionally notices the progress of this now independent branch of knowledge. We cannot better support this claim than by quoting Professor Whitney’s own words:—“Stripped of all exaggerations, and making due allowances, the Sanskrit is still the mainstay of Indo-European philology; it gave the science a rapid development which nothing else could have given; it imparted to its conclusions a fulness and certainty which would have been otherwise unattainable.”

The closely printed table of contents of the volume under review occupies two pages and a half of small type.

It will easily be inferred that no abstract of it worth reading could be crowded into these pages; and we must therefore be content with noticing its most salient features. First of these, as might be expected from its place of birth, is an extreme independence of thought and expression. Professor Whitney is “nullius addictus in rebus jurari,” and no amount of respect will induce him to give the least quarter to what he holds to be errors. For example, though most fully acknowledging the services of Bopp to his science, he does not hesitate to hold up that writer’s studies upon the Malay-Polynesian and Caucasian languages as “a striking example and warning,” and an utter caricature of the comparative method” (p. 245, note); and his discussions with Professor Max Müller, while too well known to be repeated here, are really a higher compliment to the German scholar than the servile reverence with which he is sometimes treated in England.

If Professor Whitney had thought fit to take a classical motto, it would certainly have been “Hypothesis non fingo.” For him the science which he prefers to call “linguistics” (he considers the term “comparative philology” already outworn) is still in its youth, if not infancy; and he denounces most strongly the practice of drawing hasty conclusions, and of inferring affinities from arguments often delusive in themselves, and still more frequently based upon a petitio principii. The theory of a common origin of the Semitic and Aryan (in his terminology—Indo-European) languages seems to him to have as yet no basis at all; nor does he less object to the term “Turanian” and the signification usually attached to it—the former as too local and narrow, the latter as too wide, and including in one class languages and races whose affinities are not yet sufficiently proved, or even investigated.

Whether his specific conclusions be accepted or not, it is sufficiently obvious that this is the right frame of mind in which to approach the subject. In Asia, particularly, we have suffered extremely from the habit of talking as if the Aryan immigration was a thing as well understood as the English conquest; and the absurdity and mischief of such hasty generalization is not now for the first time reproved in these pages. It is satisfactory, at least, to know that whatever assistance we may hereafter obtain from beyond the Atlantic
will be rendered by scholars trained to take nothing for granted.

In the meanwhile, the work under review may safely be recommended as a text-book fully equal to any that we possess, and especially suited to those students, sufficiently numerous in Anglo-Indian society, who are striving to make up in the leisure hours of manhood for time wasted by themselves or their teachers in youth. It is, though much larger, more simple than Mr. Peile’s little hand-book of Philology, which lands the beginner rather too abruptly among such terrible words as “agglutinative” and “analytic;” and it is written in a style always clear, and sometimes, where the dignity of the subject requires it, arising to eloquence. Take, for example, the fine passage (p. 221) describing the rise to importance of the European races and tongues. It has, besides, not only a good index, but an exhaustive analytic table of contents, most useful to the student. At the end of the book, indeed, Professor Whitney seems to leave his safe ground, and to abandon for a moment, when contemplating the future, the reserve and caution which characterize him in dealing with the past.

He expresses (with many saving clauses, it is true) an idea that English may yet become “a world language,” by which we presume that he means, if not the universal speech of civilized man, at least one as generally intelligible as Hindustani is in a great part of India. And, with a view to this glorious future, he thinks that we should seriously consider the phonetic reform of our orthography. If other proof were wanting of the baselessness of such a dream, it would be found in his own work. He states expressly that it is in the opinion of literature, and of the cultivated classes, that the hope of preserving one common language to England and the United States must be based. Of those classes we could find no more competent representative than himself; yet so far has the disintegrating influence of altered circumstances and of separate national life gone, that the English reviewer cannot help remarking, here and there in his work, differences of expression, at which, indeed, we have no right to censure, but which indicate that the thing which has been shall be, and that English must submit to the fate which has already overtaken Greek and Latin. The most striking instance is the use of the word “doughfacedness” as an example. This may have been introduced half in jest, to recall the flagging attention of the class. But its mere presence in this book is significant; and if we go further, to such a work as General Sherman’s Autobiography, which may be taken as fairly representing the speech of educated Americans, we shall find similar new expressions in every page. It is to be hoped that when the American language does become a separate tongue, its literature will contain many works as useful as Professor Whitney’s.

**EARLY RECORDS OF BRITISH INDIA; A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH SETTLEMENTS IN INDIA, AS TOLD IN THE GOVERNMENT RECORDS, &c., &c., BY J. TALBOYS WHEELER, LATE ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA IN THE FOREIGN DEPARTMENT, &c. (Svo, pp. 301.) LONDON: TREDEN & CO., 1873.**

Mr. Wheeler, he tells us in his preface, “was originally employed to report upon the records of the Home Department in Calcutta, and intended to confine his extracts to the papers preserved there. As, however, he proceeded with his task,” he found that it was not enough for him; the papers of the earliest period had been destroyed by a storm in 1737, or in the sack of 1756. In Madras, however, he found a more perfect and valuable series of documents, and has already given the substance of them to the world in three volumes, under the title of “Madras in the Olden Time,” of which the part of the present volume relating to the affairs of the coast appears to be a judicious condensation. With Bombay he does not appear to have any acquaintance, and contents himself with giving a few extracts from Mandelslo, Fryer, and Khan Khan, the only authorities upon the early affairs of that Presidency of whose existence he appears to be aware.

Although, therefore, Mr. Wheeler speaks of his volume as compiled from original and half-forgotten sources, it is obvious that a good deal of it is already before the world in one form or another. Perhaps the most interesting extracts are those from the records of Bengal of the period following the battle of Plassey; the Company’s negotiations with the Râja of “Meckley” (Manipur); their refusal and subsequent acquisition of the Divâni, and their disputes with the second Nawâb of their own creation, Mir Kâsim, and the massacre at Patna. Upon this last subject Mr. Wheeler quotes “the journal of a gentleman at Patna” and “the journal of an English prisoner at Patna,” but very provocingly denies us the name of either diarist, and leaves us to guess even whether they are identical (the entries extracted are for different days). He also gives extracts from the diary of

---

1 The last named, fully enough, is brought in under the head “Madras under the Moghuls.” Khâš Khâsh was condemned by Mr. Wheeler, and without a hearing (in his History of India), as a “type of the flatteners who flourished during the Moghul period.” Now that Mr. W. can read some portions of Khâš Khâsh’s invaluable history in Prof. Dowson’s version, he withdraws his condemnation (p. 110, note, and conf. Ind. Antiq. Vol. VI, p. 331). If we compare his quotation p. 110 ad not with the version he abbreviates from in Elliot and Dowson’s History, our p. 353, we may form a fair idea of the freedom with which he treats his originals.
Dr. Fullarton, whom he calls "the sole survivor of the massacre," which is hardly correct, as the doctor was confined apart from the other prisoners, and was not even a witness of their fate. The 10th chapter is interesting for some quotations from the minutes of Mr. Verelst, which show the commencement of the science of internal administration in Bengal. Verelst, as Mr. Wheeler truly observes, was a man very much ahead of his time. He administered with considerable success the districts of Bardwan, Midnapur, and Chittagong, which with Clive's jdyher form the earliest territory of that youngest Presidency which has since so much outgrown its elder sisters. His remarks upon points of principle can in few instances be contradicted even now; and if they appear to us to be verbose and full of platitudes it must be remembered that Verelst was laying the foundations of a system, and was forced to dilate up on what a modern writer may safely take for granted. Mr. Wheeler does not mention, but our readers will not be sorry to know, that Mr. Verelst, after holding the highest offices in days when the pagoda-tree daily quivered to its root under English hands, retired from the service a poor man, but acquired the fortune he well deserved along with the hand of an heiress.

After Verelst's papers no extract in the Bengal section of the work under review is so curious as one from a memorandum submitted, in 1746, by a Colonel James Mill to the Emperor Francis, consort of Maria Theresa, urging him to the conquest of the Lower Provinces. Colonel Mill says Mr. Wheeler, had been twenty years in India; and his memoir is an appendix to "Bois's Affairs in Bengal." We would like to know more of the man who, at so early a date, planned a conquest which was only forced upon the Company by stress of circumstances. "It is a miracle," he says, "that no European prince with a maritime power has ever attempted the conquest of Bengal. By a single stroke infinite wealth might be acquired, which would counterbalance the mines of Brazil and Peru. The policy of the Moghuls is bad; their army is worse; they are without a navy. The empire is exposed to perpetual revolts. Their ports and rivers are open to foreigners. The country might be conquered or laid under contribution as easily as the Spaniards overwhelmed the naked Indians of America. A rebel subject, named Aliverdi Khán, has torn away the three provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa from the Moghul empire. He has treasure to the value of thirty millions sterling. His yearly revenue must be at least two millions. The provinces are open to the sea. Three ships with 1500 or 2000 regulars would suffice for the undertaking. The British nation would cooperate for the sake of the plunder and the promotion of their trade. The East India Company should be left alone. No company can keep a secret. Moreover, the English company is so distracted as to be incapable of any firm resolution."

Reading these spirited sentences, and admiring the grasp of his subject displayed by the writer, we cannot enough regret that Mr. Wheeler vouchsafes so little information about him, and wonder whether he had no share in the realization, by his own nation, of his splendid dream. Or is it possible that our author has been deceived by a fabrication of some pamphleteer writing after the event?

The extracts relating to Madras have apparently, as already mentioned, appeared in a former work of Mr. Wheeler's, which is probably in the hands of those interested in the subject. The most interesting are those relating to the internal government and social life of the settlement; in particular the will of a young writer named Davers, dated 1720, and a letter to the Court of Directors dated 14th October 1712, respecting the trade in English woollen cloths.

So far Mr. Wheeler's extracts—by far the most important part of the work. The connecting text is by no means so valuable. It contains little new information, and is written in a jerky, slippahed style, painful to read, and often puzzling to make out the meaning of. To take, as an example, the first sentence in the book,—"The three English Presidencies of Madras, Calcutta, and Bombay were founded in the 17th century, during the reigns of Charles the First, Oliver Cromwell, and Charles the Second." Now, any one reading this and new to the subject would suppose that a Presidency of Madras was first established during the reign of the first-mentioned monarch, one of Calcutta under the Commonwealth, and one at Bombay under the "Merry Monarch," Bombay being consequently the junior Presidency. But Mr. Wheeler must know that there was no such thing as a Presidency of Bombay until 1667, when that of Surat, the oldest permanent establishment of the English nation in India (founded in 1612), was transferred to the island acquired by the English crown as part of the dowry of Katharine of Braganza, and subsequently granted to the Company, to be held "as of the Manor of East Greenwich," for a yearly rent of ten pounds in gold. Our author's references to authorities, too, are amazingly scanty, and his Index illusory—as a help, at least, to the systematic reader.
SOME Sàntàls believe that after death they at once enter another world, while others imagine that the spirit hovers about near the place where it left the body. Others, again, fancy that the spirit is born anew in another person. In proof of this they tell the following story:

Once a lad of five years old was presented with a bracelet by his mother. While out one day shepherding, he took off this bracelet and hid it in the hollow of a tree. Soon after he got home he fell ill, and died without mentioning what he had done. His spirit entered a woman in the same village, and in the course of a year he was born again. When he attained the age of five, he recollected that during a former sojourn in the world he had hidden a bracelet. He mentioned the fact to his mother, and begged her to accompany him to a certain spot. At first she refused, saying it was all nonsense; and that she had never given him a bracelet. However, afterwards, upon his repeated entreaties, she consented to go with him; and, sure enough, upon arriving there, the boy at once found the bracelet where he had deposited it. His former mother, happening to see it, claimed it as having belonged to her dead son, but the boy declared it was his own, and so it was concluded that the boy had been born a second time.

The Sàntàls also believe that our spirits very frequently change their abode, entering at will into the bodies of men or of animals. A favourite resort of the departed spirit is in the body of the large red lizard. Cows and buffaloes, dogs and pigs also become abodes of the spirits. Very quarrelsome people are said to be possessed with the spirit of a dog. It is supposed by some that the spirit of a man leaves the body in the form of a lizard. In proof of this the following story is told:

One day a man fell asleep, and becoming very thirsty his spirit left the body in the form of a lizard to obtain water from a pitcher close by. It so happened that just as the lizard entered the pitcher the owner of the water covered it, not knowing what had happened; consequently the spirit could not return to the man's body, and he died. While his sorrowing friends and relations were making preparations for burning the corpse, some one uncovered the pitcher to get water. The lizard immediately escaped, and returned to his abode in the body of the dead man. At once the man arose, to the great astonishment of the by-standers, and asked them why they were weeping. They answered that they thought he was dead, and were preparing to burn his body. The man told them that he had been down a well to get some water to drink, but had found it difficult to get out again, and that he had just returned. The truth now dawned upon their minds that the well was the pitcher of water, and that, on account of its having been covered, the man had not been able to escape, but that as soon as he did escape he recovered.

The people say that if they push wood into a fire with the feet they will have to suffer the penalty of having their feet burned in the next world. And if they see a piece of grass or straw on a man's head they immediately remove it, or they will have to carry large bundles of grass on their heads hereafter.

In the next world there will be nothing but hard work, their principal occupation being to grind dead men's bones day and night in a mortar, using the stalk of the castor-oil plant as a pestle. They will have but one chance of getting a little rest—that is, the men, if they can chew tobacco, can sometimes beg for a few minutes' respite under the excuse of preparing their tobacco. When the taskmaster calls them to return to their work, they say, "Wait a moment, Sir, I have not quite finished preparing my tobacco." Then they make pretence of rubbing it to a powder in the palm of the hand (mixing a pinch of húng with it, to give it pungency) as vigorously as possible, but as soon as the taskmaster turns his back they will again prepare it very slowly. In this way they manage to prolong their rest. But woe to those who cannot chew tobacco or smoke the hukhát! For this reason every Sàntál makes a point of learning the practice in this world. Women who have children can also obtain a little rest, under the plea of feeding them. When told to return to work, they say, "Oh! wait a few minutes longer, Sir, my child is very hungry," while really the child is but nestling in her bosom.
But sad is the lot of poor women who have no family! When a man's ser (two lb. weight) is completed—that is, when his allotted time on earth is past—the king of death sends his messengers to convey him to his presence. He employs certain beetles as his spies. The beetle plucks out a hair from the head of his victim, and if it is not white with age he will wet it and roll it in white ashes, and then, showing it to the king, will say, "The owner of this hair is a very old man. Your Highness, is it not time you sent your messengers to fetch him?" The king, not wishing perhaps to call such a one just yet, takes the hair, washes it, and says, "Take the hair back to the owner; he may remain a little longer, his ser is not yet completed."

When a Santal dies, all his possessions are placed by his bed, and some rupees too, if any are in the house, as it is supposed he will have to buy everything in the next world; and as he will have to provide himself with all kinds of necessaries he must take his weapons also with him, so his bow and arrows are carefully laid by his side.

If anyone should enter the next world in a human form the inhabitants of that land would devour him. A child was in great trouble, they say, at losing his mother. Every day he visited the place where her body had been burnt. The Sun (the Supreme Being of the Santals), seeing the boy's grief, asked him whether he would like to see his mother again. So he took him up, telling him not to speak or to show himself, or he would be devoured. He placed him in a hole, which he covered up so that the boy could see without being seen. Presently his mother passed by and began to sniff, saying to her companion, "I smell a man, where is he?" The Sun said to her, "You must be mistaken, how can there possibly be a man here?" The woman having left the place, the Sun asked the boy if he had seen his mother, to which he replied, "Yes, please take me away, I have seen quite enough." From that day he never again longed for his mother.

The Santals are mortally afraid of a certain class of women, believing that after death they are always on the watch for men. They are supposed to lick their victims to death, filing off the flesh with their rough tongues. When any of these women die, the survivors stick thorns into the soles of their feet, thus rendering them lame and powerless to pursue their victims, as they suppose. All whose bodies are properly burnt and whose bones have been thrown into the river Da m d ā (the Santal sacred river) become good spirits, the others become demons. The funeral pyre, which is always placed near water, consists of a large heap of wood, upon which the body is placed; then the eldest son, or the nearest relative, sets fire to the wood, having first placed the torch near the dead man's mouth. If the hand or the foot move during the burning, it is a sure sign that others of the family will soon be called away. To propitiate the king of death, frogs are thrown on to the burning pile, and sometimes small images of clay in the shape of a man are placed beside the corpse. If the body is not consumed quickly, it is pierced with a spear or chopped in pieces with an axe. It is said that misers burn very slowly, but that generous men are quickly consumed. So, to avoid such a disgrace, the body of a rich man is smeared over with ghi and oil, to expedite its combustion. After the body is consumed, search is made for the collarbones. These are washed in turmeric water and deposited in a new earthen jar, and then taken to the Damud. When the ceremony of throwing the bones into the river is completed, all the relations assemble at the village of the deceased to offer sacrifices to his memory. Goats and sheep are killed, and a feast is prepared. Several questions are asked of the departed spirit, such as "Are you angry with any of us? If so, please forget it. Did any one injure you in your lifetime? If so, accept these sacrifices and forgive the offender." Then the sacrificer addresses the other spirits in these terms: "We consign the departed to your care, make him one of yourselves. We have now done our part, let us go in peace."

THE LATE F. W. ELLIS'S ESSAYS ON SOUTH-INDIAN LANGUAGES.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

Sir,—In the Indian Antiquary, vol. IV. p. 219, you reprinted a letter I communicated to the Athenæum on the Tamul Mss. in the India Office Library, in which, among a few remarks introduced incidentally regarding that eminent Orientalist, the late F. W. Ellis, of the Madras Civil Service, I stated that he had written essays on the Tamul,
Malayalam, Telugu, and probably the Canarese languages, of which the third only—that on Telugu—had been preserved, having been printed by Mr. A. D. Campbell in his Telugu Grammar, about 1816, with the author’s permission.

I have lately discovered the proof-sheets of the second and third of the above treatises, among some papers brought from Madras, which fell into my hands when examining the books of the College of Fort St. George. Mr. Ellis was the first Principal of the Board of Superintendence of that institution, and printed such papers as he published before his death at the college press. It was among a heap of corrected proofs and manuscript that I discovered these papers when I was a member of the Board.

The essay on the Malayalam language seems well worthy of preservation, and I beg therefore to offer it to you for publication in the Antiquary. The Telugu Grammar is too rare to meet with that it is worthy of consideration whether the third essay may not be reprinted also. I therefore submit it likewise for your opinion.

I made many inquiries for the Tamil treatise which doubtless was the first of the series, but I could obtain no tidings of it. Among the fragmenta disiecta, however, I found two MS. books filled with rough copy of a Treatise on Tamil Prosody by Mr. Ellis, and abounding in extracts from the Southern poets, which were probably connected with the missing essay. These I showed to the late Rev. T. Brotheron, a distinguished Tamil scholar, who stated that he “thought they would be very useful if published. . . . We have no separate English work,” he added, “on Tamil prosody, that I am aware of.”

The difficulty will be to find a competent editor. The MS. occupies upwards of 100 pages of foolscap in the rough, and is apparently unfinished.1

In addition to the enumeration of Mr. Ellis's writings given at pp. 229-21 of vol. IV., I should specify his paper, “On the discovery of a modern imitation of the Vedas,” in the Asiatic Researches, vol. XIV., pp. 101.

WALTER ELLIOT.

DISSERTATION ON THE MALAYALMA LANGUAGE.

BY THE LATE F. W. ELLIS.

The country of Malayalam, lying on the west coast of the Indian peninsula, is, according to the Keralaspati, divided into four Khandam or provinces. The most northern, commencing at Gokarnam and extending southward to Perumbula, near Mangalore, is called Tulu-rājyam, the kingdom of Tulu: from Perumbula to Pudupattanam, near Nilgiravanam, the country is called Kāparājyam; thence to Kannemī, near Kollam (Quilon), lies Kērajārājyam; and thence to Kannakērrājyam. The Malayalam, or more properly the Malayālam, is at present the language of the two last provinces. It is spoken likewise in Kāpa, but in this province and in Tulu, which constitute the district on which, in recent times, the name of Kanara has been imposed, the Tulu, a distinct dialect, though of the same derivation as the Malayalam, prevails among the aborigines, and a variety of tongues among the Haiga, Konkarā, Kannada, Telugu, and other tribes who have long colonised the country. There is a certain variation in dialect between the language of Kērajām and Māhuīkām, and, indeed, in the several adīs into which they are divided, but none of sufficient importance to require particular notice: in the latter province affairs of state are conducted in the Tamiḻ language, which is there, consequently, much more prevalent than in the former.

The Malayalam is, like the Kōjun-Tamil, an immediate dialect of the Śen-Tamil; it differs from the parent language generally in the same manner as the Kōjun; it differs from the Kōjun in pronunciation and idiom, but more especially in retaining terms and forms of the Śen-Tamil which in the former are obsolete. But its most material variation from its cognate dialects is that, though deriving from a language superfluously abounding in verbal forms, its verbs are entirely devoid of personal terminations, the person being always indicated by the pronoun. It is this peculiarity which chiefly constitutes the Malayalam a distinct tongue, and distinguishes it in a peculiar manner from all other dialects of Tamil origin. (See Note A, p. 237.)

The Malayalam is written in three different characters, namely the Ārya, the Kolīḷuttu, and the Varūḷuttu, or, as it is called in the more southern districts, Malayālam Tamil. The Ārya, a variation of the Grantham, has the same number of letters as the Nāgarī, and is derived immediately from the Tamil alphabet; in this character all books, whether Sanskrit or Malayālam are written, correspondence conducted, and business transacted. It is considerably varied in the form and mode of writing in different parts of the country: to the south of Calicut it is written square and distinct, and then, with the exception of a few characters, approaches nearer to the Grantham; as written to the north of Calicut, however, its variation from its primitive

---

1 I shall be happy to place these papers at the disposal of any Tamil scholar who will undertake to edit and publish them within a given time.
form is very considerable; the angles are rounded, and the vowel signs and compound consonants more irregularly connected, so that a person acquainted with Grantham, and consequently able to read the square Aryam character, can scarcely decipher the round hand. As the Grantham was originally formed for writing the Sanskrit only, all letters purely Tamil, and consequently not found in the Nágari, were rejected, but these have been necessarily restored in the Aryam, and retain nearly their proper Tamil form: these letters are ṝ, ṣ, and ṭ only used as a final, or in connection with ṛ. Separate forms, which do not exist in the Grantham, have also been devised for the finals ṝ, ṣ, and ṭ, on account of their frequent occurrence.

The Kōlḷūṭtu is, as its name imports, the writing of the palace, kōḷḷa in Tamil being equivalent to the Hindustani term darbār; in this character all grants, patents, decrees, and, in general, all papers that can be considered records of Government are drawn up. While Kāralam was independent these papers were in the Malayāḷam; but in Māhākām, the country at present under the dominion of the Travankor Government, Tamil is, and always has been, used for this purpose. The Vattēḷḷūṭtu, the clipped or abbreviated letter, is the writing of the forum; conveyances, bonds, legal instruments, and generally, all transactions between man and man, necessary to be recorded, are written in this character. The two characters have each the same number of letters as the Tamil Alphabet; the forms of the letters are nearly the same in both, and are either variations, all angles being rounded, or, as the name of the latter imports, abbreviations of the Tamil.

1 The Tamil character, though perfectly competent to the expression of the language to which it belongs, is incapable of representing with precision the sounds and combinations of sound of the Sanskrit. To remedy this defect, the Brāhmans, on their establishment in Southern India, had but two methods at their option—to introduce the Nágari, if it then existed, or to invent a new character. They preferred the latter. (An error.) They analyzed the Tamil characters, and supplied the symbols wanting by recombining the lines and curves of which they were formed. The alphabet thus constructed they called Geṟaṭṭu h a m, which, derived from grath, 'close-skirt,' among other significations means 'a collection of words, a writing,' and is synonymous also with the term sādraṁ, 'a science,' or 'a treatise on any science.' The Sanskrit language is by Tamil writers, whether Brāhmans or Sūdras, always called vaṭṭa maṁ, 'the northern speech,' but it is universally known by its appropriate epithets Sanskrit and Gīrvaṇa; if, however, a Tamil Brāhmaṇ is asked, in what language a Sanskrit book is written, his answer will invariably be 'in the Grantham,' alluding to the character, and conceiving that language to be the language of their ancestors and of their own country. Hence the mistake of Europeans who speak of the Grantham language and the Grandonico lingua, and among others of Ziegenbalg, who in general is accurate, who in a letter to La Croze, "Bramhamanum ignarum proprionem est Grantham, neque unum Bramhamanum ipsii nāmaṃ alter vocat." In the dissertation prefixed to his Sanskrit grammar, entitled Siddhāntyam, p. 7, Panjinu asserts the Grantham is written by Brahmanas, who say they can not read it. But it is somewhat surprising that he should have found any difficulty in procuring the explanation of a document written in a character so generally known. A transcript of a letter in the Vattēḷḷūṭtu taken from the preface to Van Rheede's Hortus Malabaricus is engraved in the Alphabeta Grandonico-Malabaricum, where it is ridiculously called 'infinim scrivendi genus,' because not applicable to writing the Sanskrit, but no explanation of the character is given. Vide p. 12. [See Ind. Ant. vol. I. p. 229.]
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but they differ from each other and from the Tamil very materially in the mode of joining the signs of the vowels to the consonants, and in the manner of writing. (Note B, p. 287.)

To exhibit with precision the difference between the Malayāḷa and the Śina and Kōḏuṇ Tamil, I shall make the following comparisons:—Of terms derived in the two modern dialects from the pure or ancient Tamil; Of words derived from the Sanskrit; Of the declension of the noun; Of the conjugation of the verb; Of idiom. This arrangement will comprehend every variation, whether in the pronunciation or forms of words, in the idiom, or in the use of terms by which those which are obsolete in one dialect are retained in another.

Comparison of terms in the two dialects derived from pure Tamil.

Like the other dialects of Southern India, the terms of the Malayāḷa might be arranged under the three principal classes of Tattam, pure Śina, and Sanskrit, Tattvādavam, Sanskrit derivatives, and Śīnāvatam, native terms, and the latter might be again subdivided into Tamil Tattam, pure Tamil, and Tamil Tattvādavam, Tamil derivatives. In the Dissertation on the Tattam, the Tattvādavam terms of that language are distributed into classes, according as they are derived direct or through the medium of the several Prākrits; of the latter there are few, if any, in Malayāḷa, and the former do not abound. Those which occur may be more properly referred to the Tamil than the Malayāḷa; thus śīna, the sign Leo, becomes in Tamil, by the necessary substitution of k for h—the latter not being found in the language, śīna, and in Malayāḷa śīna and chinā; thus, also, vrisha-
The peculiar letter ı (or x') is generally pronounced in the districts to the south of the Coleroon; this conversion in Malayāla is very arbitrary: for example, they say ƙə, 'below,' but, in a compound form, ƙə dələ, 'in the last year.'

The occurrence of this letter is generally the cause of some variation in all the 'Tamil' dialects, an idea of which may be given by a single etymology: poḍula (pron. poḍ'ula) in pure Tamil signifies 'time,' and the prefixing to this term of the demonstrative particles ƙə, 'this,' a, 'that,' and ɛ, 'what,' forms the temporal adverbs ṭuṇp oḍula, 'now,' ṭuṇ mənpuḍula, 'then,' and ṭuṇ poḍula, 'when,' according to the Southern pronunciation ṭuṇ poḍula, &c.; in Köjun Tamil these words become respectively ṭuṇa, ṭuṇa, and ṭuṇ poḍa, and in the Malayāla ṭuṇa, ṭuṇa, and ṭuṇa.

Comparison of terms in the three dialects derived from the Sanskrit.

The Malayāla being written in a character accommodated to the expression of the Sanskrit, the sounds of tattavam terms are more accurately represented by it than they can be by the Tamil alphabet. In the mouth of Brahmaschā of either tongue the pronunciation of words of Sanskrit origin is equally correct; but, as the written must always influence the spoken language, the Šadras of Malayālam pronounce these with greater propriety than those of the Tamil countries, as the following terms will show:


Vil  Vili  Vili  a bow.
Malai  Malei  Male  a hill.
Kajutei  Kajutei  Kajuta  the neck.
Olādu  Onnu  Onnu  one.
Irādu  Rādu  Rānda  two.
Mūndu  Mānū  Mānū  three.
Attan  Achchan  father.
Maranda  Maranda  Maranna  forgotten.
Irundu  Irundu  Irunu  being.
Aṇdu  Aṇju  Aṇju  live.
Kareinā  Kareinā  Kareinny  dissolved.
Nāṅ-gal  Nāṅgal  Nāṅgal  we.
Pugal  Pugātēi  Pugalcha  praise.
Kēkkudu  Kēkkiruddu  Kēkku to hear.

These observations are exemplified by the following terms:


Vil  Vili  Vili  a bow.
Malai  Malei  Male  a hill.
Kajutei  Kajutei  Kajuta  the neck.
Olādu  Onnu  Onnu  one.
Irādu  Rādu  Rānda  two.
Mūndu  Mānū  Mānū  three.
Attan  Achchan  father.
Maranda  Maranda  Maranna  forgotten.
Irundu  Irundu  Irunu  being.
Aṇdu  Aṇju  Aṇju  live.
Kareinā  Kareinā  Kareinny  dissolved.
Nāṅ-gal  Nāṅgal  Nāṅgal  we.
Pugal  Pugātēi  Pugalcha  praise.
Kēkkudu  Kēkkiruddu  Kēkku to hear.

For the Declension of the Noun.

In comparing the declension of the noun, I shall observe the grammatical arrangement of the Šen Tamil, both this and Köjun Tamil have a variety of forms to the several cases, from which I shall select such as serve to show their connection with the Malayāla. There are some peculiarities in the declension of nouns in the high language, which it will be necessary to explain to account for this variety, and to show in what the modern dialects differ in this part of grammar from their being pronounced without the laryngeal compressions when initial, and with it when medial and final.

The Tamil ƙ is generally but not uniformly represented by Mr. Ellis as ƙ, but ƙ is its usual representation; that symbol is substituted throughout the paper.—En.
The Śēn Tamil has two primary forms, the nominative and the oblique, the latter derived from the former variously according to the termination; the oblique form has its appropriate grammatical use in the superior dialect, but in Kōdun Tamil it serves only as a genitive; in both, however, the terminations of the cases are added either to the nominative or oblique form, in the former at pleasure, in the latter under certain restrictions.

The term I have selected for the following comparison has its nominative form Vil, its oblique form Villin, and the variations of the fifth or genitive case in Śēn Tamil are—1st Villadī, 2nd Villidu, 3rd Villanaḍu, 4th Villindu, before words in the singular number; 1st Villa, 2nd Villina, before the plural number. The variations in Kōdun Tamil are—1st Villin, 2nd Villināḍu, 3rd Villinādu, without discrimination before singular and plural. The Malayālma takes its genitive from the third form of the Śēn Tamil, expunging the penult a, converting the final u, as usual, to o, and, according to the rules of Tamil etymology, substituting r with the sound of d for that letter after a final u; villināḍu thus becomes villinde, pronounced villinde. The variations of the other cases from their prototype, where they exist, might be similarly traced, but they are too minute to render this necessary.

### Śēn Tamil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. S.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>1.Ab</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>3.Ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vil. Pl.</td>
<td>Villane - gaje</td>
<td>Villinā - gaja</td>
<td>Villukku - gaje</td>
<td>Villināḍu - gaju</td>
<td>Villinādu - gajal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kōdun Tamil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. S.</th>
<th>A.</th>
<th>1.Ab</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>G.</th>
<th>3.Ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Villu-Villugal</td>
<td>Vilel - gaje</td>
<td>Villinā - kaḷal</td>
<td>Villukku - gaḷal</td>
<td>Villināḍu - kaḷāda</td>
<td>Villinādu - gaḷal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ma. Tamil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a bow, bows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Malayālma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a bow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 4, though written, has in pronunciation, as is usually the case in Malayālma, the sound of g.

The fifth case or second ablative of the Śēn Tamil is supplied in the Kōdun and Malayālma by particles: the more general use of this case in the high language is to indicate motion from a place, and to compare the qualities of things, for which in English the prepositions from and than are employed, and in the latter sense the causal form is occasionally used in both dialects, where it is more generally expressed by the verbal form kaṭṭilum, meaning 'though shown,' preceded by an accusative; as, Kōdun, Idai kaṭṭilum ada nālli; Malayālma, Idai kaṭṭilum ada nālli, literally, 'though this be shown that is good.' The first meaning of this case is expressed in Kōdun and Malayālma Tamil respectively by the gerunds nādu-nam, 'standing,' after the seventh case.

The pronouns in each dialect are declined nearly as the nouns: the Śēn Tamil, as in the nouns, has one or more oblique forms to which the causal terminations are added. The following comparison will show the variations of the three dialects:

### Śēn Tamil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Plu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>Nān, Nām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl. form</td>
<td>Ėn, Ėm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>Ėnnei, Ėmmei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>Ni, Nīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl.</td>
<td>Un, Nin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>Unnei Ninnei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>Tān, Tām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl.</td>
<td>Tan, Tam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>Tannei, Tammei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin ipse or the English 'himself,' is so used also in Kōdun Tamil; but more generally in that dialect the plural number of this pronoun, and both the singular and plural in Malayālma, usurps the place of the second person singular in addressing those to whom the speaker owes respect or reverence. The demonstratives M. avan, P. avai, N. adu, 'that man,' 'that woman,' 'that thing,' evan, ieva, iau, 'this man,' &c.; evan, evai, iau, 'which men,' &c.; abound. It is curious to trace a like aberration of the human mind, through correspondent periods, in countries so distant.

* The Latin and Śēn Tamil reject with the sternest rigidity the discrimination of persons by adulatory phrases; in all the modern dialects of these languages such phrases...
and the general interrogative dr, ‘who? which?’ with the usual changes, are common to the three dialects. The demonstrative letters e, ‘that’, i, ‘this’, i, ‘what? which?’ when they precede a consonant, are sometimes, as in Tamil, short and double the following consonant, and sometimes long; when they precede a vowel they are always long, as in Telugu, and require the letter y to be inserted before the vowel.

Comparative Conjugation of Verbs.

The several forms of the verb in pure Tamil are derived from the crude root by a method extremely artificial, and, as respects the permutation of letters, refined to the last degree of nicety; this artifice and this minuteness pervade and govern the variation of the verb in the Koḍun and Malayāḷma dialects, though the rules which direct them, and the reason on which they proceed, can be learned only from the grammarians of the Śen Tamil. Hence the only distinctions in the verbal systems of the three dialects are, as in the noun, that the Koḍun Tamil selects one from the many personal terminations, and that the Malayāḷma rejects them altogether. The pure Tamil has three indefinite tenses for the three times formed from the root; the definite tenses and, to use an expression of European grammar, the moods of the verb, except the imperative, infinitive, and subjunctive, are supplied by auxiliaries; the third person of each tense is declined through the three genders; each tense has an indeclinable participle, which becomes declinable by affixing the first demonstrative pronoun in the three genders; and a gerund of most extensive use serves for all times, and for every person, until the suspended sense is closed at the close of the sentence by the conjugated verb in its proper form: this is the idiom of the verb in every dialect of the Tamil. The Malayāḷma from this extensive scheme selects for its present and future the third persons neuter of those tenses; the former with slight change, the latter without alteration; and the gerund, with or without alteration, for its past. The gerund is either the same as the past tense, or another form is borrowed from the many it assumes in the parent language; the present and past participles are retained, the future being supplied, as is frequently the case in Koḍun Tamil, by a compound.

In Tamil there are three classes or conjugations of verbs, principally distinguished by the variation of the gerund and past tense. The rules for each, as far as connected with the formation of the Malayāḷma, I shall explain. In the first class the gerund is formed simply by the duplication of the consonant of the final syllable, which is always either gu, ṣu, or ṅu preceded by a short syllable; this is the root, which serves for the imperative; in the present tense it is followed by a single g, and the third person future neuter is formed from it by the addition of us, the preceding a being lost. In the second class the gerund is formed by the elision of the a, with which the root invariably ends, and the substitution of i; the present and future forms are the same as in the former class, unless the imperative ends in double k, in which case it is double also in the present. The third class requires da to be added to the root to form the gerund, but it is duplicated, or changed to adu, udu or udu (udu), under the general rules for permutation, according to the letter in which the root ends; when the d is duplicated in the gerund, or when the root has a final a, the present requires a double k, and the third person future is formed by adding ki to the root; in all other cases the characteristic letter of the present is a single g, and the future is formed by us.

The application of these rules to the two dialects of the Tamil and the Malayāḷma is exemplified and explained in the following synopsis:

Derivation of the Malayāḷma Present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śen Tamil</th>
<th>Koḍun Tamil</th>
<th>Malayāḷma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Class.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pugu, enter</td>
<td>Pauguṇḍrama—Pāguda</td>
<td>Pāgunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padu, suffer</td>
<td>Pāḍuguṇḍrama—Pāḍuda</td>
<td>Pāḍunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pērō, obtain</td>
<td>Pēṟuguṇḍrama—Pēṟuda</td>
<td>Pēṟunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Class.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṭṭu, tie</td>
<td>Kaṭṭuguṇḍrama—Kaṭṭuda</td>
<td>Kaṭṭukunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikku, remove</td>
<td>Nikkuṇḍrama—Nikkuña</td>
<td>Nikkunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Class.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sēy, do</td>
<td>Sēyuguṇḍrama—Sēyuda</td>
<td>Chēyyunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koḍu, give</td>
<td>Koḍuguṇḍrama—Koḍukaṇṭu</td>
<td>Kōḍukkunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAḍi, sīte</td>
<td>Kaḍiṅkuṇḍrama—Kaḍiṅkuṇḍa</td>
<td>Kaḍiṅkunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari, know</td>
<td>Ariṅkuṇḍrama—Ariyuṇḍa</td>
<td>Ariyunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōl, take</td>
<td>Kōḷuṅkuṇḍrama—Kōḷuṇḍa</td>
<td>Kōḷunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil, stand</td>
<td>Nikkuṅkuṇḍrama—Nikkuṇḍa</td>
<td>Nikkunu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the present tense the Malayālma differs from the Kōḍūn Tamil in the final syllable only, the present participle being formed by changing the final -u to a, as "nīkkūnam, 'removing;' &c.; this in Sōn and Kōḍūn Tamil respectively is "nīkkirūda, nīkra. In forming the past tense the Malayālma makes no alteration in the two first classes, the third of the third class assumes the colloquial form of Kōḍūn Tamil, the fourth is corrupted by an easy permutation of consonants, and the last is formed by the usual change of d into n: the verbs which take these corrupted forms constitute the greater number in the language. It will be observed that the various terminations of the gerund, which in the parent language depends on the primitive form, or artificial preparation of the root, are invariably followed in the Malayālma: this agreement is constant even in anomalies. In the future tense of the Malayālma there is no alteration.

The variation between the two dialects, produced by the default of the Malayālma in personal terminations, will appear from the comparison of the past tenses of the verb nīkkūrāl, or nīkkummu, 'to remove.'

Sōn & K. Tamil.

Malayālma.

English.

Nīkkirūna
Nīyrikkirū
Nīkkirūnā
Nīkkirū
Nīkkirūru

Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū

Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū
Nīyrikkirū

As simplicity would appear to indicate originality, the defect of the Malayālma verb in personal terminations, to cursory consideration, would seem to declare this to be the parent of the Tamil dialects: the superior richness of the Sōn Tamil in tenses, in the variety of idiom, and in the artifice of language, arising possibly from superior cultivation, affords no refutation of this notion; for cultivation will soon exalt a subordinate dialect above its neglected parent. But analogy sufficiently demonstrates that such has not been the general progress of human speech, and there is no reason to believe that the Tamil dialects constitute an exception; as far as history can ascend, language will ever be found more artificial,
more fertile in terminations, more abounding in inflections, and more copious in terms, in proportion to its antiquity; and during the last fifteen hundred years every progressive change in language, either from desuetude or intermixture, in Asia as well as in Europe, has invariably tended to reduce this exuberance. Throughout every dialect, from the confines of China to the shores of the Atlantic, the ancient structure of language has been gradually dissolved; the cases of nouns have either been reduced or entirely obliterated by the substitution of prepositions; the many moods and tenses of the primitive languages have disappeared, and the various incidents of action are now expressed by a few terminations and a multitude of auxiliaries; and the desire to vary the recurring monotony of a modern sentence compels the employment of a curious circumlocution, instead of permitting the more elegant recourse to correlative terms. The perfection of the Sûn Tamil, therefore, not the defects of the Malayâlma, indicates the parent of the dialects of Southern India. This deduction is confirmed by the fact that in the higher style of composition the Malayâlma still uses, though sparingly, the personal terminations of the original language: the extracts I shall hereafter make will afford many instances of this, and the following short example from the invocation to the Râmâyana will, therefore, for the present be sufficient:

"Vishnu tum मदयुगानाचतिर्थम बलद कौण
Krishnaṁ दम पुराचकर्तिवेव वामी चोनेन,"

"I have related the whole of the wonderful history of Vishnu, reverencing Krishnan, the ancient lord."

"Vâmi chônê, literally, 'I have told reverencing,' is in the Kôdun Tamil, the form of the first person past of the verb वânta, 'to tell,' in colloquial Malayâlma it would be ânta chôtti."

Comparison of Idioms.

All that belongs to the comparison of the idiom of cognate dialects may be included in the examination of the construction of sentences and the use of terms. The language of verse in the Malayâlma dialect differs much less in idiom from the pure Tamil than the language of prose; the rules of prosody are the same, and there is sometimes so near a coincidence that the Malayâlma will become pure Tamil by the change of a few letters; but the reverse does not obtain, for no verse of pure Tamil could be made Malayâlma without an entire change of its terms and structure.

This I shall presently exemplify, but first give the following specimens of Malayâlma prose, distinguishing the Saṅskrit words by a variation of type, and adding such remarks as may tend to elucidate the idiomatic difference of the two dialects.

Extract from the Kârolityâta, Ārya Brâhmanâra nyâdhyâkyâ</image>
have confidence.' In the foregoing extract this word occurs twice, once in the active form, utracu, and once in the causal, utrappeceu, and in both cases retains the radical signification, to convey which in Malayalam it is not necessary that it should appear in a compound form.

To exemplify further the differences here noticed, and to enable the Tamil or Malayalam scholar to compare the two dialects, I add another extract from the Köral śātāthi, with an interlined translation into Tamil. The figures refer to the variation of the two languages noticed in the remarks.

A summary of the history of the prosperous Śankarachārya.

"It is in this wise. He became incarnate in the province of Köralam, in the Dēsam called Kālaśī, to the south of A śi ν vā, in the Iłam of the place of his birth, called Kaipalle, in the 3501st year of the Kaliyugam (A.D. 400—too early), in the month of August, and under the Lunar constellation Śravaṇam; within the age of thirty-eight years he established everywhere the Śrīma sect, having travelled through every quarter; returning he departed this life and ascended to the joys of Heaven from the Mountain in the front of the holy place of Mahādeva in Śrīśvātārī in Köralam; at that time the age of the holy man did not exceed thirty-eight years. Thenceforth in the four provinces of the kingdom of Köralam the four castes of Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, have obtained salvation by observing that which should be done and that which should not be done as taught by the prosperous Śankarachārya, the chief teacher of the world, and by no other means."

Similar variations are common in all languages; they have been too frequently overlooked by grammarians; and the principles of etymology, therefore, capable as this science is of precision, and leading as it does to the most interesting results, are still too obscure to invite research, too indefinite to inspire confidence. He who shall conquer these difficulties which the absurd speculations of the idle or the ignorant have thrown in his way, and establish etymology on the firm basis of truth and reason, will suggest to the philosopher new and important speculations on mankinde, and open to the historian views of the origin and connection of nations, which he can derive from no other source. The European etymologist must not, however, content himself with extending his researches to the Latin, the Greek, or the Teutonic only, nor must he amuse himself and mislead his readers by theories founded on fancied resemblances to Hebrew and Arabic roots: for with these languages neither the ancient nor modern dialects of Europe have any radical connection. It is in India that he must seek the foundation of etymology, being assured that it is on this alone that any durable structure can be erected. It is not intended here to enter further into this subject: that the assertion is generally true will be now admitted by many, though the extent to which it is true is known but to few. A single instance may illustrate it. By what possible interchange of letters can bis, though the connection in meaning is evident, be derived from duas or, rather, how can any radical connection between them be shown? The real etymology of the word bis can only be known by reference to the Sanskrit, and by the application of rules which govern the permutation of letters in the Prakrit. The crude form, frequently used in composition, of the word meaning two in Sanskrit is das, composed of the radical letters d, s (which before vowels changes regularly to v or w), and i: when this crude noun is declined, das is substituted for it, and its proper form, therefore, in the nominative dual feminine is das, which in Prakrit, in which this word has also several other forms, becomes rasa, and in Latin duas. This establishes the natural connection between das and duas. In some instances das loses its first letter, as in the word meaning twenty, which, formed from it by the suffix sti, is not dasasthi, but visasthi (cognate). One of the leading canons of permutation in the Prakrit is vakṣayor abhāsām, 'between us and br there is no difference,' and in these dialects the letter is constantly substituted for the former, visasthi becoming under this rule, and by the omission of the nasal and of the final syllable, bis. From the crude noun das is derived the adverb dere, twice, the final aspirate of which is substituted for s, so that the primary form, das: also under certain rules in composition, is dere. Hence the derivation of bis is clearly indicated, and there can be no doubt but that it is formed, first, by dropping the d of das, which then becomes vis: secondly, by changing s into t, whence bis. To prove that twice and br are not only of the same derivation, but the same as bis, would now be superfluous."
Remarks.

1. The compound tarasaḍa, which in Malayālma signifies, not generally the town or district, but the actual 'place of birth,' is not, as far as I am aware, used in either dialect of the Tamil; the terms, however, of which it is formed are tarsa, signifying 'the sanctuary,' and dāya, as a verbal root, 'to move'; the whole implies, therefore, 'the place where the head first moved.' The first member of this compound is used neither in Köduṇ Tamil nor Malayālma, and it would be impossible, therefore, for any person acquainted with these dialects only to trace its derivation. 2. Ilun, used in this extract as synonymous with sagraḍam, 'the residence of Brähman,' means in Tamil simply 'a house.' 3. Chittu-śāyara, 'the month when the sun enters the sign Leo'; it is compounded of the terms ēśa, corrupted from the Sanskrit śāka, 'the sign Leo,' and the Tamil śāy, 'the sun'; but, as it cannot be so used in Tamil, it is rendered by the name of the month, Āvasiṇḍam, with which it corresponds. 4. Vayamunam, the last term, or in the oblique sganna, might have been used in the Tamil version instead of ule, but it would savour of the high dialect. 5. Viṣṇam properly signifies 'conquest,' but here 'a journey, travel'; kuṇḍal signifies in Tamil, 'to take away,' but in this place kāṇṭal, which has nearly the same sense, must be used for it. 6. Tippata, from ti, 'fire,' and pāta, 'covering,' is employed in Malayālma when speaking of the decease of persons entitled to respect; but, though the terms from which it is derived are Tamil, this compound does not belong to that language, the Sanskrit devṣaṇam, 'the act of God,' being generally used in this sense. 7. This Sanskrit word is used only in high Tamil, and it is rendered here, therefore, by another, of the same derivation, more commonly received. 8. Aluvaṇam and aṇjital with the dative both mean 'to reach, arrive at'; they are derived from the same root aļ, which in Malayālma takes the affix iļ, and in Tamil ḫa, converted, according to the general rules of grammar, with the final l to ḫa; it would be better Tamil to use in this place aļal, also from the same root, 'to repair to, to obtain.' 9. Kūṇal, the gerund of kōḷal, 'to take,' may be used in Tamil, also, with the meaning of the propositions 'by,' 'with,' but the termination of the regular case is generally preferable. 10. Kurivanda and tāvanda both signify in Tamil 'lessered,' but the latter only can be used in the sense here belonging to kurivāṇa, 'inferior.' 11. Parisuham, of Sanskrit derivation, is not used in either dialect of the Tamil. 12. Pinnu has the same meaning in Tamil, but it is here superfluous to the sense. 13. This Sanskrit derivative from the root labha, 'gain, profit,' cannot be used in Tamil. 14. Atra is a Sanskrit adverb, and cannot be used, therefore, in Tamil. With these exceptions and a few dialectic permutations of letters, the Malayālma in the preceding extract and its Tamil version are word for word the same.

The near coincidence which I have stated to exist in the idiom of measured language, and the agreement of the rules of prosody in these dialects, may be exemplified by the translation of a verse from the Malayālma into pure Tamil, retaining the terms, their position, and the measure.

From Elut'Achchan's translation of the Rāmāyaṇam.

Nāṁmaṇṇa ṃerāṉ ṃāṇavāṇa ṃāmāḷkāḷ
Nāṃmuṇkaṇ 니 껷 lhukum _CARTIramaṭṭu oru
Vānmuku ṃkani ṃrēṣṭhaṇa ṃkaiya ṃvāla ṃāhā ṃmuni
Tāṇ 421maṇa ṃvam ṃtarik ṃruṣṭi ṃppēkum
vāṇikkunën.

Translation into pure Tamil.

Nāṁmaṇṇa 521erāṉ ṃāṇavarāṇa ṃāmāḷkāḷ
Nāṃmuṇkaṇ 521ulika ṃvāmāṇaṭṭei ṃvālaṛṭṭu oru
Vānmuku ṃkai ṃrēṣṭhaṇa ṃkaiya ṃvāla ṃmuni
Tāṇ 821varam ṃtāruṇa ṃvēkku ṃudilum
vāṇikkunṛṇ.

Translation into English.

"For the purpose of composing the Rāmāyaṇam, equal to the four Vēdams, the four-faced deity caused his gifts to flourish in the mind of a Vālmiki; this great Muni thus became the chief of poets; may he ‘bestow on me ‘endowment and I will ever reverence him.’"

Vagamunam, ārāshkam, and māhā, derivatives from the Sanskrit, though often used in colloquial language, are not received into high Tamil, and would not by choice be admitted into metric composition, for Tamil poetry is nicer even than the English in selection of expressions; the elegance only is lost, the sense being exactly retained. I doubt much if the derivation of the term ṃuṇama could be traced by any person, however well versed in Malayālma, unless he were acquainted with the parent language: it is a compound formed of the terms ṃull, 'four,' and mārē, in its primitive sense signifying a word, in its secondary senses 'doctrine, the Vēdam,' by a grammatical rule of Sōn Tamil, before m changes to n, whence the compound ṃuṇamaṇi, the four Vēdams; ṃuṇamaṇkā is similarly formed. The translation as it stands cannot be assigned to either dialect of the Tamil, the terms noticed precluding it from ranking as Sōn Tamil, and others, as well as its structure, removing it from the Köduṇ; the fourth term of the first line, for example, radically signifies 'to prepare,' and is here appropriately used in this sense, but in Köduṇ Tamil it is restricted to the preparation or dressing of food. The language
of Malayālāma poetry is in fact a mixture of Sanskrit, generally pure, with Sōn and Koḻuna Tamil.

In this verse not only the laws, but even the license, of Tamil metre are observed. It belongs to the Aṣṭavṛt or Kalitruttam of Tamil prosody, and its common measure is four feet, thus expressed by the usual marks (--- --- --- ---), the first syllable in the first, second, and fourth foot, and the two long syllables in the third foot, being at pleasure resolvable each into two short. This rule is strictly observed in this verse, the first syllable of the fourth foot being resolved in every line, as are the first syllable of the third foot in the second line and the first syllable of the second foot in the third and fourth lines; in translating into Tamil I have followed not only the law of this species of verse, but have been able to preserve even the quantity of the syllables, except in the third foot of the last line, where a syllable is resolved, though not so in the Malayālāma. According to the strict laws of Tamil prosody, the fourth syllable in the third foot of the second line (bhāumbhaṭte) ought to be long, being preceded by a long syllable and followed by a double consonant; for a similar reason every syllable in the fourth foot of the last verse (eṇaikkunnaṇ) ought also to be long, but in the several species of verse classed under the general term Viruttam it is an allowed license to shorten such syllables when followed by double consonants or a nasal and consonant of the same-class; this license the Malayālāma also assumes, and it is retained, therefore, in the same places in the translation. The rules by which the length and shortness of syllables and initial rhyme are governed are the same in both dialects.

In rendering this verse into Tamil the second term of the last line (māma) has been omitted; this term is the sixth or genitive case of the pronoun of the first person in Sanskrit, and cannot be used in Tamil, as declined or conjugated forms from the Sanskrit are not admissible into that language. They are not admissible, also, in Malayālāma prose, but in verse they are often used with such profusion as to give it the appearance of that fanciful species of composition called in Sanskrit Maya-pravṛttam, and in English 'macaronic verse,' rather than the sober dress of grammatical language: often, indeed, the whole verse is pure Sanskrit, connected or concluded by a few words of Malayālāma. The following stanza will exemplify these peculiarities: in the two first the grammatical forms of the Sanskrit are intermixed with terms of Sanskrit and Tamil derivation; in the last nearly all the terms are Sanskrit.

A stanza from the Vyavahāra Samudra: a treatise on law.

Atṭipéru niraṅg' oruvanōj' oruvan jannam ēkan disāyām
Driẖṣṭanmār āru pēr und' alukiyā vidhī yānu kēlpunjaṇa ēāstram
Sajjīkā bandhu putran narapati likhitam tatra sambandhi
Yēnu'itham chōllaijāvar ēliga kēllōjā dhātri-chānnam

"At the place where one takes from another the Jannam, or proprietary right in the soil, by the water of the Atṭipéru obligation,

"The prescribed law is, that, according to an excellent rule, six descriptions of persons should be present;

"People of pure caste, relations, a son, the prince, a scribe, and persons connected with the parties;

"Unless such as are here mentioned be present, a portion of land must not be purchased."

an attempt to relieve one of the writers I have mentioned, Paulinus, from the consequences of a note to one of the articles of the Asiatic Researches (see "Dissertation on the Language and Literature of the Indo-Chinese Nations"). In the general intent of this note, and in the facts it states, I agree; but I much doubt whether Paulinus is to blame for the substitution of the Tamil termination "di" in his Sanskrit Grammar, in the place of the regular Sanskrit suffix "di," or whether this be anything more than a typographical error. It is shown in this note that this substitution, for "di," takes place in many other instances wherein Paulinus could not have been misled by the resemblance of the vernacular dialect, and I have had occasion to remark that it is universal in all works printed in the Ārya character at the Propaganda press. In this character the mute "i" and "t" resemble each other so nearly that it is not at all surprising that they should be mistaken by a compositor ignorant of the language; but the fact would rather appear to be that the "fount" was without the latter letter. The work of Paulinus to which I refer is the Siddhārthasa, seu grammaē Sanscritoāmac, in which Sanskrit terms are written in the Ārāya character only, not in the Latin, and in which the substitution noticed invariably takes place; I have never seen his other work, Vyakaranā, sc. referred to in the text of this dissertation, (See Note D. infra, p. 267.)
with each other, each retaining its own form and idiom. In the present instance the verse, as in Malayālma, follows the rules of Tamil prosody, the first syllable of poṣṭiḥ, dat, etc., though in Sanskrit invariably long, becoming short because preceded by an unconnected short syllable. Sanskrit metres of all kinds are, however, often composed in Maṇi-pravālam.

The Malayālma has never been cultivated as an independent literary language, nor does the Tamil literature, notwithstanding the length of time the country was subject to the kings of Śērām, appear to have been extensively known here, or at least has not survived that dynasty. This is the more extraordinary as some of the earliest and best of the Tamil works were composed in Śērām. This remark, however, applies more to Kēraṉam proper than to Mūrākam or Travekkam; the residence of the Śērām Viceroy was in this province, and a knowledge of pure Tamil has always been more prevalent here than in the northern districts.

Pārāśurāma, as it is fabled in the Keraṭapati, of Mayāra Varma, as stated by other, and probably better, authority, in endowing the Brahmaṇa with land, condemned them to perpetual inactivity, and indolence and luxury are now the proverbial characteristics of the Nāmaṃvāraś. The following stanza contains a short satire on them, which at the present day they certainly deserve, and which probably is not inapplicable to their character as formed at an early period by the extraordinary institutions of the country:

Indra-vajra Viśāla

Prātibhāyaśaṃ pārivaśa yadavī
dattām abhyumāgam aṁ全面建成 yappam
Mūrākam antā vyaktataḥ bhogā
dhavrīṇā jasama sojama manyā

"In the morn the milk and rice, then rice gruel, after the table is removed (if) and the body adorned, then the eating sweet cakes, and after dalliance (if) the enjoyment of Śūdra women! The life of the Nambūris, methinks, is an excellent life."

I have introduced this stanza partly on accounts of the contrast it forms with those previously quoted; this verse is a species of Maṇi-pravālam, the construction and metre of which are entirely Sanskrit, and so are all the terms except the few printed in Roman, which are of Tamil derivation, though here strictly subjected to the laws of Sanskrit grammar; thus duṇī yappam are both Tamil terms, the former being the gerund of duṇula, "to eat," the initial vowel with the final of the preceding word being changed by the Sanskrit rules for Sandhi to ə, and governing the following substantive, yppam, 'a cake,' —a mode of construc-

*This verse enumerates the Gundaṭākamas or eight attributes of the Deity.
tion admissible in Sanskrit, but incompatible with the Tamil idiom, the proper collocation being appam ugni.

It is, however, generally true that the Sanskrit has ever been the language of science and literature, as far as science and literature have existed in Malayāḷam; but even in this language no composition of any importance is referable to this country, with the exception perhaps of the works of Saṅkarāchārya, though these can scarcely be ascribed to Malayāḷam, as it is certain that he left the country at an early age (the Saṅkaravijaya says when only eight years old), and there is no reason, notwithstanding the positive assertion of the fact in the Kērāḷottattu, to believe he ever returned to it. In the Tamil countries there has ever been a contention for preëminence of knowledge among the Brāhmaṇas and the inferior castes; when the former established themselves in Southern India they found a native literature already existing, which, though they introduced the language and science of the north, they were compelled, during their long contest with the Jains, to cultivate in their own defence. The Tamil was used, both by Brāhmaṇas and Śūdras, in commentaries on the Vēdams (Note F) and original compositions on theology; one of these, the Turaṇḍot, was adopted by Rāmānuja Chārya as the foundation of a new sect, and the authors of it, the holy Ājīvār, all of them Śūdras, are now worshipped by the Brāhmaṇas, his followers, as saints. In many of the temples of Śiva also the presiding pontiff is a Śūdra, the officiating priest Brāhmaṇa. Nothing of this kind has ever taken place in Malayāḷam; the worship of Śiva and his attributes has generally prevailed, undisturbed by innovation, from the first establishment of the Nambūrīs until the present day, and, notwithstanding those extraordinary institutions, which, by making the women of all castes, excepting those of a very inferior order, common to them, has in effect populated the country with their race, these Brāhmaṇas, as such, have kept themselves haughtily distinct from their descendants, and preserved with jealous circumspection all their prœminent privileges.

Under these circumstances it was scarcely to be expected that the Nambūrīs would cultivate the Malayāḷam; religious or philosophical controversy (as applied to India either epithet is correct)

has in all times and in all countries been the great instigator to literary emulation, and, as this stimulus was altogether wanting, the neglect of the Brāhmaṇas is easily accounted for, and the non-existence of a native literature in a dialect but one removed from a highly cultivated language ceases to be surprising. There exists in Malayāḷam, as far as my information extends, no work on language, no grammar, no dictionary, commentaries on the Sanskrit Amarakośa excepted. The principal work in prose is the Keraḷottattu, which is also said to be translated from the Sanskrit, though the original is now nowhere to be found. The poetical compositions, some few detached poems perhaps excepted, are all translations from the Sanskrit; these in fact constitute the whole of Malayāḷam literature, and among them will be found all the works of note in the original language. Tradition attributes the composition of the whole of these to one man, of whom the following account is given:

The customs of Malayāḷam permit but one male in every Brāhmaṇical family to marry, whose descendants maintain the caste, the progeny of the rest belonging to the tribes of their respective mothers: it hence follows that great numbers of Brāhmaṇa women remain unmarried, and—as they are strictly precluded from participation in the license of the Nāyār and Chēzhas—in celibacy. As an entire community of other women is allowed, there thence arises a peculiar distinction between the Brāhmaṇa and the Śūdra: the former knows his father, the latter does not: a Brāhmaṇa without a father must be born of an unmarried female of that tribe, whose celibacy ought to have been inviolate; he is considered, therefore, illegitimate, and has scarcely an assignable place in society. Elutt Achet, or 'the Father of Letters,' was a Brāhmaṇa without a father, and on that account has no patronymic. (Note G) The difficulties with which he had in consequence to struggle gave him an energy of character which it is probable he would not have possessed had his caste been without biomiṣ. The Brāhmaṇas envied his genius and learning, and are said to have seduced him by the arts of sorcery into the habit of ebriety, wishing to overshadow the mental powers which they feared. The poet, however, triumphed on his habits, though he could not abandon them, and, in revenge against those whom he considered the

sidered as his true history; but it is noticed in the Kuraḷottattu, where it is stated that, in consequence of the refusal of the Brāhmaṇas to attend his mother's obsequies he burned her in his own house, which has since become a general practice throughout Malayāḷam. This story is incompatible with that which represents him as quitting the country while yet a child and never returning, and is rejected as a calumny by the Smṛtas, as those belonging to the sect founded by this teacher are commonly called.
cause of his debasement, he opposed himself openly to the prejudices and the intolerance of the Brāhmaṇa. The mode of vengeance he chose was the exaltation of the Malayāḷa tongue, declaring it his intention to raise this inferior dialect of the Tamil to an equality with the sacred language of the gods and Rishis. In the prosecution of this purpose he enriched the Malayāḷa with the translations I have mentioned, all of which, it is said, he composed while under the immediate influence of intoxication. No original compositions are attributed to him.

This story, though obscured by the mist of fiction with which the Indians contrive to envelop every historical fact, shows with sufficient distinctness that the Nāmbūrīs have discouraged the cultivation of the Malayāḷa. Their success in this respect is to be ascribed to the influence which the peculiar institutions of the country give them over the minds of the inferior castes, and to this cause the neglect of Tamil literature during the supremacy of the Chērām kings is in all probability referable, as it could not have been introduced without endangering the existence of the mental tyranny which it was the interest of the Nāmbūrīs to maintain.

The Râmāyāṇam, from which the preceding quotations are made, and which is one of the numerous works attributed to Ėḷuṭṭ Aṭchān, is not translated from Vālmiki, but from the Adhyātanaka Râmāyāṇam, attributed to Ėṭvarā himself, and said to have been revealed for the entertainment of Pārvatī. The Vayuvahāra Samudra, from which I have taken a single extract, professes, in the commencement of the work, to have been collected from Nārada and the other Rishis; but after a short exposition of the legal constitution of courts, of the rules of evidence, and of the eighteen titles of law, as usual in other law-books, it is confined exclusively to the local usages of Malayāḷam, which are often in direct opposition to the Súrūlīś. The language of this work is sometimes entirely pure, and sometimes so intermixed with declined and conjugated terms from the Sanskrit as altogether to lose its native idiom.

NOTES BY DR. BURNELL.

Note A.—Mr. Ellis has gone too far in deriving Malayāḷam from the Śen Tamil; for it is now pretty well certain that the latter is, to a great extent, an artificial, poetical dialect, though it has preserved some old forms.

Note B.—Mr. Ellis's derivation of these alphabets is not correct, and he afterwards appears to have given it up (see Modr. Jour. vol. XIII. pt. ii. p. 2). For the present state of the question see my Elements of South-Indian Palaeography (2nd ed.), pp. 33-52. The final forms of e, l, and l are merely the ordinary forms of the letters combined in a peculiar way with the vowel vīrtā.

Note C.—Mr. Ellis's transcription is very irregular and full of uncorrected misprints; as far as was possible, it has been here restored to the orthography as settled by Dr. Gundert and other scholars. In a few instances it has been doubtful what words he intended.

Note D.—The people of Malabar (even in reading Sanskrit) substitute t for 4, and ñ for ū, in certain cases: e.g. taṃdl is pronounced taṃdl.

Note E.—It seems that Mr. Ellis was wrong in supposing that the Tamil Mani-pravālam compositions are recent; one is quoted in a work of the 11th century A.D.

Note F.—I have never seen, or even heard of, Tamil commentaries on the Vedas.

Note G.—Ēḷuttachchan lived in the 17th century; there is no reason for supposing that he was a Brāhmaṇa female's illegitimate son; he was certainly an Ėḷuttachchan (or schoolmaster) by caste.

The above dissertation is of remarkable historical interest, for (taken with the essay on Tēlugu) it proves that before 1816 Mr. Ellis had already foreseen the possibility of comparative philology, not only as regards the so-called Aryan tongues, but also in respect of the druviyan. Now it was not till 1816 (so Brunet says, and I must take his assertion, for I cannot refer to the original) that Bopp published his Conjugations System, which was the beginning of comparative philology in Europe. Ellis could (considering the means of intercourse available in those days) hardly have seen or heard of this work at all, for he died early in 1819. He must then, in future, be considered one of the originators of one of the most remarkable advances in science in this century. His unfortunate end—he was poisoned by accident—prevented his doing much, for he was only forty when he died, but he cannot be robbed of his due fame by the success of others more lucky than he was.

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

MODERN AVATĀRAS OF THE DEITY.

Most readers of the Indian Antiquary must be aware that the great leaders of religious movements in India are believed by their followers to be descents (Avatāra) of portions (avatā) of the Deity. The Hindus are generally ready to acknowledge that Christ Himself was an Avatāra. The god supposed to be most addicted to these descents is, of course, Vishnu.

When I was in Gujarāt a man named Kuvéra
with the Italian police. He lived somewhere in Tuscany, and was called by his followers "David the Saint." This man gave himself out to be Christ descended upon earth. He chose twelve apostles, and surrounded himself by a large number of disciples, who built for him a kind of half hermitage half church, on the summit of Monte Labro. His followers are called Lazzarists.

Perhaps the most interesting instance of alleged Ávâdra is that of a celebrated Brâhmanical saint or ascetic (sannyâsa) named Dattâtreya—supposed to have lived in Central India about the 10th century of our era. He is believed to have been a manifestation of the Hindû trinity inhuman form. Portions of the essences of Brahmâ, Vishnî, and Śiva became united, and descended, it is alleged, in his person. Many temples dedicated to his honour are scattered over the Maratha Country. I saw one much frequented by pilgrims at Wâi, near Mâhâbaleshâvar. It contained the image of a man with three heads. I observed that many persons were worshipping with apparent devotion at the shrine. I spoke to one or two of the most intelligent, and questioned them as to the precise nature of their creed, but could get no satisfactory reply. Dattâtreya is the name of a well-known sage mentioned in various Sanskrit writings, as well as in modern vernacular books; but any information about his worship as at present conducted in different parts of India would be highly interesting. Whether it is possible to furnish any trustworthy details of his real history may be doubtful, but legends about him still current among the people might be collected, and if collated with earlier legends would be full of interest. An account of other modern reformers or revivalist leaders who claim, or are believed by their disciples, to be partial Ávâdras of the Deity, would also be acceptable as illustrating the present condition of the Indian mind.

Again, can no one improve our knowledge on the subject of animal worship, plant worship, pebble worship, and the existing state of such superstitions in India? I have been told that there is a temple in Bengal dedicated to a cat. Are cats in that part of India believed to be pervaded by portions of the essence of Deity? Has any one seen actual pûja performed to a cat? Many interesting articles on Indian folklore and religious life have appeared in the columns of the Indian Antiquary. May they be continued! I would not undervalue the good work done by those scholars who are devoting themselves to the deciphering of inscriptions, but the whole life of a people is not inscribed on these ancient monuments.

I appeal to all readers of the Indian Antiquary—especially to all who are, or have been, resident in
districts of the Marāṭhā Country and Central India, and in districts not much frequented by Europeans—for assistance in throwing more light on the religious idiosyncrasies of our Indian fellow-subjects.

Monier Williams.

_Oxford, September 1878._

ADDITIONS TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTE

NO. XX. (supra, page 176).

In further illustration of the use of miniature or toy pottery in prehistoric times, Canon Greenwell, in his very elaborate work, _British Barrows_, describes "very diminutive vessels of pottery an inch high" found in Yorkshire barrows (p. 317), and again observes, "toy weapons and implements are sometimes found in barrows, and commonly in Denmark" (p. 361). Dr. Ferdinand Keller, in his work on _The Lake Dwellings of Switzerland and Europe_, translated by J. E. Lee,—a complete repertory of all that is known on the subject,—estimates the number of earthenware vessels found at Möringen, on the Lake of Zug, at several hundreds; "the smallest are only as big as a walnutshell, and have been used as children's play-things, or as vases for perfumes" (p. 175). Some of the vessels figured (plates 24, 30, 88) perfectly correspond with archaic Indian forms, with round or pointed bottoms; and earthen circles or rings for supporting or keeping them upright, which are so abundant in Indian cairns, are equally numerous in the lake-dwellings.

The remarks in the 'Note' under review, that handles to cairn-pottery are a feature very rare in Europe will not hold good, at least as regards the lake pottery, in which handles are rather the rule than the exception in the lake-remains on both sides of the Alps. Vases with four short legs have also been found (Lake Dwellings, plates 106, 151), and vessels on four short feet have been discovered by Canon Greenwell in British barrows (pp. 88, 89). It may be added that rude clay figures of animals are found in the lake-dwellings (plate 158), as well as in Nilgiri cairns and the site of old Troy; and further, with respect to the strange custom of disjointing bodies for burial, Canon Greenwell's researches show that bodies were very frequently laid in the barrows piecemeal, and Colonel Meadows Taylor remarked the same appearances in cairn burials in Central India.

In the 'Note' the _svastika_ is mentioned as first appearing on the pottery of archaic Greece and the Hissarlik relics, but it must now be pushed back to probably earlier times, for it has been found stamped on clay remains in a lake-dwelling on the Lake of Bourget, in Savoy, together with the stamp or seal with which the impressions were made; the seal is a clay cone 1½ inches long; a copy of the bottom, taken from plate 161 of Dr. Keller's work (see page 339) is annexed; the stamps and impressions are in the French Exhibition now open. This ubiquitous symbol must now also be extended to America, for a 'counter' or 'roundel,' either of bone or horn, has been discovered in one of the low mounds near St. Louis, U.S., on which within several concentric circles there is "a regular croix gammée," or _svastika_; hence the remark in the 'Note' that the _svastika_ is unknown on Mexican remains may any day be set aside.

_London, 3rd August 1878._

M. J. W.

THE FIRE-ARMS OF THE HINDUS.

To the Editor of the "Indian Antiquary."

Sir,—The letter from Mr. Sinclair (ante, p. 231), and the previous communication from Bābū Ram Dās Sen to which it refers, raise an old question respecting the use of fire-arms at an early period by the Hindus. In support of what Mr. Sinclair has observed with regard to the absence of trustworthy evidence of the knowledge of fire-arms (in which we use the term) in India in the early times referred to,—that is, before the use of gunpowder in Europe,—reference may be invited to an article on the subject in the _Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal_, 1876, Vol. XLV. Part I. No. 1, where, at page 43, ancient Hindū fire-weapons are noticed. There seems every reason to believe that they were missiles carrying fire, discharged by ordinary mechanical appliances.

R. M.

THE TELEPHONE.

Sir,—I beg to suggest, through the medium of your valuable journal, a Gujarāt word for the newly invented 'telephone,' and hope it will meet the approval of the students of philology.

The word is ૮૮૧, from Persian جذاب meaning far, and جذاب from جذاب to speak. The word literally means _speaker from a distance_, and is coined on the analogy of ૮૮૧ ("telescope"), which literally means _observer from a distance_. Like ૮૧, the word ૮૧ I trust will be equally acceptable to the Marāṭhā, Hindustānī, and Persian languages, and also to the vernaculars of Bengal and Madras if they can allow the infusion of the Persian element in them.

Sorānī Kāvāni Khabātī.

_Malabar Hill, September 25th, 1878._
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BÓYA.

The Bóya in the interesting Chalukya grant published by Mr. Fleet, ante, p. 189, is a Telugu term adduced by Mr. C. P. Brown in his Telugu-English Dictionary. Bóya, or its fuller form Bóyada, is explained by Kṛta, Śābara, and Ma-taṅgasādriya, ‘a forester, a mountaineer.’ Mr. Brown knew also the form Bóyīju (the shorter form being Bóyi), which he explains as follows—

“Bóyīju, a Boyid or mountaineer; this title was borne by some chieftains, as Avaro bōyīju, Māra bōyīju, Gōṇlaprōti bōyīju.”

F. KITTEL.

Esslingen (Württemberg), 30th August 1878.

A CHRONICLE OF TORAGAL.

Sir,—At Ind. Ant., Vol. V., p. 33, under the title of A Chronicle of Toragal, I published a translation of a Canarese document, part of which was evidently drawn from some copper-plate grant or stone-tablet inscription. This part of the document commences with the words “May it be well! Reverence to Šaṁbu, &c., p. 34, 1, 20, and extends to the end of my translation.

I have not yet met with the original inscription; nor have I as yet been able to satisfy myself as to the identity of king Jāyaśēkaṛa, the maker of the grants recorded in it.

But I find that a translation of the same inscription is given by Mr. Wathen as No. 5 of his Ancient Inscriptions on stone and copper, at Jour. R. As. Soc., Vol. II., p. 390, and Vol. V., p. 173. He calls it ‘Mr. Munroe’s Dānapatra,’ and states, ‘It was taken, I believe, from some ancient building in the Karnāṭaka, and was translated by the late Mr. Munroe, of the Madras Civil Service.’

This Mr. Munroe is probably the Sub-Collector of Shūảngpur, who, with Mr. Thackeray, the Political Agent and Principal Collector of Dāhwar, was killed in 1824 in the insurrection at Kīttār. (See Mr. Stokes’ Historical Account of the Belgo District, p. 81; there, however, the name is spelt ‘Munro.’) If so, the temple from which the inscription was taken, must be somewhere in the Belgaum, Dāhwar, or Kālkī, Districts.

The translation given by Mr. Wathen agrees substantially with mine. But mistakes are made in it in respect of many of the proper names. Thus, notably ‘Pōvali’ is written instead of ‘Pāvali,’ and the name of the king is given as ‘Jāyaśēkaṛa’ instead of ‘Jāyaśēkaṛa.’ I have no doubt that the names, as written in the copy supplied to me, are correct. The details of the date,—Sālīvāhana-Sāka 1008, the Kṭhayā samkṣetara; Sunday, the tenth day of the bright fortnight of the month Pūsha or Pausha; under the Bhrana ṇaghatra; at the time of the sun’s commencing his progress to the north,—are given correctly in the translation published by Mr. Wathen.

J. F. FLEET.

20th July 1878.

HIWAN THSANG’S ACCOUNT OF PULIKESĪ II.

AND MAHĀRĀSHTRA.

The kingdom of Mo-ho-la-ch’a (Mahārāshtra) is nearly six thousand li (1200 miles) in circuit. The capital, towards the west, is near a large river; its circumference is thirty li. The soil is rich and fertile, and produces abundance of grain. The climate is warm; the manners are simple and honest. The natives are tall, and haughty and supercilious in character. Whoever does them a service may count on their gratitude; but he that offends them will not escape their revenge. If any one insults them, they will risk their lives to wipe out that affront. If one apply to them in difficulty they will forget to care for themselves in order to fle to his assistance. When they have an injury to avenge, they never fail to give warning to their enemy; after which each puts on his cuirass and grasps his spear in his hand. In battle they pursue the fugitives, but do not slay those who give themselves up. When a general has lost a battle, instead of punishing him corporally, they make him wear women’s clothes, and by that force him to sacrifice his own life. The state maintains a body of dauntless champions to the number of several hundreds. Each time they prepare for combat they drink wine to intoxicate them, and then one of these men, spear in hand, will defy ten thousand enemies. If they kill a man met upon the road, the law does not punish them. Whenever the army commences a campaign these brave march in the van to the sound of the drum. Besides, they intoxicate many hundreds of naturally fierce elephants. At the time of their coming to blows they drink also strong liquor. They run in a body, trampling everything under their feet. No enemy can stand before them. The king, proud of possessing these men and elephants, despises and slighted the neighbour kingdoms. He is of the race of the Te’si-li (Kṣatriya); his name is Pulikesi (Pulikēśi). His ideas are large and pro-

1 It is greatly to be regretted that no trace can be found of Mr. Wathen’s copper-plates. Inquiry has been made in vain for them, and it is feared they have shared the fate of all others in private hands—been lost or

2 Was this Vāsapidra now Bālāmi—Ind. Ant. vol. V. pp. 68, 71.
found, and he extends widely his sympathy and benefactions. His subjects serve him with perfect self-devotion. At present the great king Śrīla din̄ya carries his victorious arms from the east to the west, he subdues distant people and makes the neighbouring nations fear him; but the people of this kingdom alone have not submitted. Although he be often at the head of all the troops of the five Indies, though he has summoned the bravest generals of all the kingdoms, and though he has marched himself to punish them, he has not yet been able to vanquish their opposition. From this we may judge of their warlike habits and manners. The men love study, and follow at the same time the teachings of heresy and of truth. There are a hundred convents, which contain nearly five thousand devotees, and where they study alike the greater and lesser vehicles. They reckon a hundred temples of the gods; the heretics of various sects are exceedingly numerous.

Within and outside the capital are raised five stūpas. In all these places the four past Buddhas have sat, and in performing their exercises have left the marks of their feet. These monuments were constructed by king Wu-peon (Aśoka). They are other stūpas in stone and brick, but they are so numerous that it would be difficult to mention all.

A short distance to the south of the town there is an ancient convent, in the middle of which is seen a stone statue of Kuan-tsou-tsoat-p'ua (Avalokiteśvara Bōdhisattva). The effects of his divine power are manifested in secret: those who apply to him obtain for the most part the objects of their vows.

On the eastern frontier of the kingdom there is a great mountain which shows summits heaped one upon another, chains of rocks, peaks in double rank, and scoured crests. Of old there was a convent there, which had been formed in a gloomy valley. Its lofty walls and deep halls occupied large openings in the rocks and rested against the peaks; its pavilions and its two-storied towers were backed by the caverns and looked into the valley.

This convent had been built by the Lo-khan 'O-ch'e-lo (the Arhat Āchāra). This Arhat originally belonged to Western India. His mother being dead, he watched in what class of beings she should be re-born. It appeared that in this kingdom she had received the body of a woman. The Arhat speedily went thither with the object of

converting her and to assist her as circumstances might require. Having entered the village to ask alms, he reached the house where his mother had been born. A young girl took some food and went to give it to him. At the same instant milk escaped from her breasts. This proof of her relationship did not seem to him a good omen. The Arhat related to the young girl the history of her previous life, and she saw at once the holy fruit of Buddha. Touched by the goodness of her who had brought him into the world and fed him, and thinking with emotion on the result of the actions of her previous life, he caused this monastery to be built in thankfulness for his great blessings.

The Vihāra of the convent is almost a hundred feet high. In the centre is raised a stone statue of Buddha of nearly seventy feet. It is surmounted by seven stone caps which are suspended in the air, without any apparent attachment. They are separated from each other by an interval of about three feet. According to the old accounts of this country they are upheld by the power of the vows of the Lo-khan (the Arhat). According to some people this prodigy is owing to the efficacy of his supernatural powers; and according to others, it is due to the potency of his medical knowledge. But we have inquired in vain into its history: it is impossible to find the explanation of this marvel. All round the Vihāra the rock walls have been carved, and on them are represented the events of the life of Aja-ta (the Tathāgata) in all the places where he filled the rôle of a Bōdhisattva, the happy omens which indicated his elevation to the dignity of Arhat, and the divine prodigies which followed his entry into the Nirvāṇa. The chisel of the artist has figured all these circumstances in their most minute details, without omitting one.

Outside the gates of the convent, to the south and to the north, right and left is an elephant in stone. I have heard say by the people of the country that at times these (four) elephants give vent to terrible roars that make the earth tremble. In old times Ch'iu-nou-p'ua (Jina Bōdhisattva) often stopped at this convent.

On leaving this kingdom he (Hiwan Thasang) travelled about a thousand li (200 miles) to the west, crossed the river Nai-mo-tho (Narmadā), and arrived in the kingdom of Po-la-kie-ch'ou (Barugachhēva).—Mémoires de Hiwan Thasang, liv. xi., vol. II. pp. 149-153.

---

3 This is Harshavardhana of Kanatji, of which Hiwan Thasang's account has already been given, ante, pp. 196-202.
4 The Maha-dhāra and the Hinayāna.
5 Vide ante, p. 197, n. 8.
6 This seems to refer to the Ajanta Rock Temples.
7 Rather Atharva, vide ante, vol. IV. p. 174; vol. VI. p. 9; and Archaeol. Surv. of W. India (vol. II.), Edmonds and Koch, p. 84.
METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE MAHBĀHRATA.

BY J. MUIR, D.C.L., LL.D., PH.D.

(Continued from p. 207.)

ABILITY NECESSARY FOR ACQUIRING KNOWLEDGE.

Maḥābhārata, ii. 2845; x. 1787; ii. 1945.

No teaching e'er a blockhead shows
What's right, what's wrong, or makes him sage;
No child in understanding grows
Mature in sense with growing age.
The wise who proffer learning's boon
To stupid men, their labour waste:
Though filled with juices sweet, a spoon
Their pleasant flavour cannot taste.
But able men, though taught in haste,
Truth, right, and wrong, can quickly learn.
The feeling tongue and palate taste,
And flavours sweet and sour discern.

GOOD PRACITICED BECAUSE IT IS DUTY.

Maḥābhārata, xii. 5966. (Compare xii. 1327.)

'Tis not for gain, for fame, from fear,
That righteous men injustice shun;
And virtuous men hold virtue dear;
An inward voice they seem to hear,
Which tells this duty must be done.

EFFORT, NOT SUCCESS, THE TEST OF GOODNESS.

Maḥābhārata, v. 3313.
The man who toils with all his strength
A high and righteous end to gain,
May fail,—but has not wrought in vain:
His merit gains its meed at length.

DISREGARD OF GOOD ADVICE.

Maḥābhārata, v. 4343.
That self-willed man his foes delights
Who, ill advised, the counsel slighted,
Of those sage friends who wish him well,
And how to help him, best can tell.

NECROLOGY.

It is quite probable that the masterly Annual Review of the Hindustāni language and literature which appeared with great punctuality during the past twenty years will no longer be published, as its gifted and experienced author is now no more. M. Héloïsède Garcin de Tassy died on the 2nd of September, in his 55th year; he was a member of the Institute, President of the Asiatic Society of Paris, professor in the school of living Oriental languages, and member of the principal learned societies of Europe and of India; a Knight of the Legion of Honour, Commander of the Order of St. Jacques of Portugal, Cavalier of the Pole Star of Sweden, &c., &c.

When the French Asiatic Society was established in 1821, under the presidency of the great Orientalist, Baron Silvestre de Sacy, M. Garcin de Tassy acted as its Secretary, and afterwards contributed valuable papers to the Journal. His services to Oriental literature are well known. From his published writings and translations it appears that he was not only well acquainted with Hindi and Urdu, which he taught in his capacity of professor, but also with Arabic, Persian, and Turkish; indeed specimens of all these occur in his La Récitique et la Prosodie des Langues de l'Orient musulman, as well as in his Allégories, récits politiques et chants populaires, &c., but he appears to have devoted himself chiefly to the first mentioned two languages. Thus he wrote a history of the Hindi and Hindustāni languages, edited and translated the works of Wall, a celebrated poet of the Dokhan, as also the Adventure of Kamrup and the Chronicle of Shīr Shāh, Sultān of Delhi. He wrote Rudiments, Creations and Dictionary of the Hindi and Hindustāni languages, &c. He produced a French edition of Sir W. Jones's Persia Grammar, edited and translated the Persian text of Farid u'd-dīn Attar's Mantīq ut-tair, or 'Language of Birds,' and based thereon his work on the philosophical and religious poetry of the Persians. His Islamism according to the Korān appeared in 1874, but some of his older works, e.g., the Memoir on the Musulmān Proper Names and Titles, his edition and translation of the Bāy o Bahār, or 'Garden of Spring,' &c., have lately been republished.

M. G. de Tassy had absolutely no rival on the continent in the special branch of Hindi and Urdu literature, and the vacuum left by him can be neither easily nor quickly filled. E. R.

NOTES.

The Sun Worshippers of Asia.—This is the title of a lecture by Chas. D. Poston, the materials for which were collected during an official visit to India. It is a neat little volume of 106 pages, and, while it does not pretend to give more than a brief review of the ancient Persian creed, it contains sufficient information for all practical purposes. We would commend its perusal to all who desire to become acquainted with the religion of Zoroaster. It is published by A. Roman & Co. of San Francisco.

The Revue Politique et Littéraire announces the discovery by M. de Gubernatis of several unpublished translations in Italian of Sanskrit writings, including two cantos of the Iśāmīyānī by Marco della Tomba, a Capuchin missionary, who resided in Bengal and Nepāl from 1738 to 1770. M. de Gubernatis was charged by the Minister of Public Instruction to publish a part of these translations for the meeting of Orientalists at Florence in September.—Trübner's Literary Record.
TRACES OF A DRĀVIDIAN ELEMENT IN SINDHI.

BY REV. GEORGE SHIRT, M.R.A.S.

Much has been done of late years to elucidate the nature and structure of the Sindhi language; but the labours of those who have written with authority—among whom Dr. Trumpp stands "facile princeps"—still leave a large and most difficult field open for further investigation.

It is quite true that Sindhi is a daughter of the Saṅskrit language, but at the same time it must be borne in mind that it is not altogether of pure blood. The essential parts of its grammar are undoubtedly of Saṅskrit origin; but one very important property—its use of pronominal suffixes—connects it with the Irānian languages, though it far outstrips them in the use of them. Most of the words that are from Saṅskrit we can easily trace to their source, and the same may be said of the words brought in from Arabic and Persian by the Muhammadans; but when all the Saṅskrit, Arabic, and Persian words have been eliminated there is still a large residuum of such words as Mr. Beames, in his Comparative Grammar, calls deshiṣṭa so large, in fact, that it would almost be possible to compose a discourse and use only this class of words. Whence have these words come? There can, I imagine, be little doubt that they are a remnant of the language spoken in Sindh before the Aryan immigration, which probably drove the Drāvidian part of the ancestors of the Brahuis to the hills, and incorporated some of the inhabitants of Sindh into its lowest caste. If so many pre-Saṅskrit or deshiṣṭ words are to be found, it becomes an important and interesting question whether Sindhi grammar shows any traces of a similar influence. I believe such traces are to be found.

1. Every word in Sindhi must either end in a vowel or a very slight nasal. This vowel is a very short one, and is hardly perceptible to foreign ears—at least Englishmen and Persians generally fail to pronounce it. The existence of such a thing becomes palpable enough when a Sindhi speaks English, unless great pains have been taken with his pronunciation. He cannot tell you that he has studied in the Government school without pronouncing the last two words Governments ākilla. The following Sindhi sentence will illustrate my statement:—Mūḥ tāṇuṣā anjāni kīyo, 'I entered into an engagement with him.' Here we see that each word ends in either a nasal or a very short vowel; and if sentences were to be accumulated a thousand fold the result would be the same, without a single exception. Bishop Caldwell, in his Comparative Grammar of the Drāvidian Languages, makes the following statements:—"In grammatical written Telugu every word without exception must end in a vowel; and if it has not naturally a vowel of its own u is to be suffixed to the last consonant. This rule applies even to Saṅskrit derivatives... Though this u is always written, it is often dropped in pronunciation. In modern Canarese a similar rule holds... The Tamil rule with regard to the addition of u to words which end in a consonant accords with the rule of the ancient Canarese." On the same authority I learn that this vowel is extremely short, as it is in fact in Sindhi, where, however, it may be ā, i, or ā. The principle is apparently one and the same both in Sindhi and the Drāvidian languages: but it is all the more remarkable that in Sindhi it has survived the combined influence of the Aryan, Irānian, and Semitic tongues.

2. There are some neuter verbs in Sindhi which perform the office of passives, though they are not constructed upon the same principle as passive verbs in Sindhi generally are. The passive voice in Sindhi is formed in the same way as it is in Saṅskrit, only that Sindhi makes j, not y, the sign of the passive; but this is merely following out a general law in the language, as y in Saṅskrit becomes j in Sindhi. The following verbs, however, are exceptions to the general rule:

   - pirpāṇa to be found, to be obtained.
   - jdpāṇa to be born.
   - dpāṇa to be washed.
   - mdpāṇa to be measured.
   - khāpāṇa to be expended.
   - dhdpāṇa to be satisfied.
   - chhpāṇa to be touched (by any polluted thing).
   - dhdpāṇa to issue (as milk from the breast).

1 Dr. Caldwell's Comparative Drāvidian Grammar, 2nd ed. p. 17.
In this list it will be noticed that p is the consonant immediately preceding the infinitive termination ṁ, and not j, as is usually the case, notwithstanding that some of the roots are Sanskrit. This p I believe to be connected with the Dravidian root po, ‘to go,’ which may be used in that class of languages to help to form the passive voice. That p should have this meaning would be strictly analogous to the supposed meaning of the Sanskrit y, and to the use of šudan in Persian, which of old meant ‘to go,’ as does the same word in Baluchi, an ancient sister of Persian. Hindustaní passives, it need hardly be mentioned, are formed by the use of jātā, ‘to go.’

3. Sindhi dislikes double letters, except that it is the same consonant that is doubled, or one of the double letters be a liquid. A comparison of the following Sanskrit words with the same in a Sindhi dress will exhibit this dislike—

**Sanskrit.**
- állā (áṭmā)
- strī (śrī)
- vastā (vāṭā)
- prāṇī (pṛāṇī)
- tvartā (tṛāṭā)

**Sindhi.**
- álā (áṭmā)
- sīrī (śrī)
- vāṭā (vāṭā)
- pīrānī (pīrāṇī)
- tīrānī (tṛāṇī)

This tendency is illustrated in the modification which some English words undergo in passing into Sindhi, e.g.

**English.**
- school

**Sindhi.**
- isīkūla

This dislike to double consonants is very marked in the Dravidian languages, though it is only fair to confess that it is not by any means confined to them: it is, however, decidedly non-Sanskritic.

4. The postpositions used to serve the office of case-terminations are, as Dr. Trumpp shows, beyond a doubt from Sanskrit; but I believe it will be found upon examination that they were made to fit a Dravidian mould. Khe is the sign of the dative, and is from the Sanskrit kṣīte; but suppose the Dravidian ku or khā (for Sindhi is fond of aspirates) to have been known before the Hindus brought kṣīte, it is easy to understand that in the struggle of these two forms for existence the resultant was ḫā.

Again, the sign of the ablative is ḍā, though khā is frequently used, being a compound of ḫā and ḍā; but this ḍā is traceable to the Sanskrit ablative termination ḍā. Still in Brahuí the sign of the ablative is én or én, and, as Brahuí has a large and important Dravidian element in it,—scarcely anything else, in fact, in its grammar,—it is not likely that it owes its ablative termination to any Sanskritic influence whatever. It is therefore, I think, highly probable that the Hindus found some such affix as én or én already doing duty for their ḍā in the Indus Valley; and so their dental was displaced by a nasal—an operation probably requiring some little effort on their part, but natural enough to the sons of the soil.

5. The following words will, most of them, I believe, show their parentage to be unmistakably Dravidian:

**Sindhi.**
- pīrānī to obtain
- solānī to divulge
- kūrā old
- kaṇā pungent
- kuḍānī to leap
- khōtānī to dig
- mānī a stool
- kānādī a ladle
- tārī a stake
- venā abuse
- orāṇī, ārāṇī unfathomable
- tirānī to open (as a flow.

**Dravidian.**
- pārīñ to obtain
- sālīñ to divulge
- kīrī old
- kārī pungent
- kūdī (do.)
- kōtī (do.)
- māpī (do.)
- kānā (do.)
- tārī (do.)
- vēl
- ārā (Tamil)
- tirāpī (do.)

6. The following list of words which are neither of Sanskrit, Irānian, nor Semitic origin, and yet are common to Sindhi and Brahuí, is interesting:

**Sindhi.**
- manjāndī midday
- kupārī skull
- pīnī calf of the leg
- khūrī heel
- thūnī elbow
- thūmī garlic
- khārī a hamper
- gothrī bag
- dhāgī a kind of cow
- ojhīrī tripe
- kākārī cotton-seed

**Brahuí.**
- manjan
- kōpēri
- pinnī (leg)
- kūri
- tōt (ektē)
- khārī
dhāgī
do.

**Brahuí.**
- manjan
- kōpēri
- pinnī (leg)
- kūri
- tōt (ektē)
- khārī
dhāgī
do.
Sindhi.

Brahui.

rāmbī  a chisel  rāmbī
dhvā ḍacloudiness  jūc (mист)
lā ḍa mountain pass  lāk
ārānā ḍa anxiety  ārānā
ṭāvārā ḍa chirping of birds  tāwār (voice)
ḥāṭbā ḍa Salvador of cores  ḍābār
bhōlā ḍa monkey  bolā
gāṅgo  ḍa dumb  gāṅ
dhāṅgo  ḍa dumb  gāṅ

This list might easily be extended, but it is already long enough for our purpose.

7. It remains for me to try and account for these apparent traces of Dravidian grammar and words in Sindhi, and for a certain almost common vocabulary in Sindhi and Brahui. A glance at the map will show that the Brahuis and Sindhis are close neighbours,—their borders, in fact, touch each other,—and imagination might easily be tempted to lay hold of this fact as a sufficient solution; still, if it did, it would be wrong. The English and Welsh have been equally close neighbours for centuries, and on the borders of the two countries there have been many people who spoke the two languages, yet the vocabularies of these two nations will afford no such common meeting-ground as is to be found in Sindhi and Brahui. Moreover, the Brahuis and Sindhis have had little intercourse with each other for centuries—one being a fierce marauding people; and the other tame and peaceable, given to the gentle arts of trade and agriculture.

There is another point in connection with the Brahuis which ought to be mentioned, though it will not furnish us with the explanation we are in search of. In some parts of Sind there are scattered members of the Mari tribe of Brahuis, but these are neither numerous nor influential, and they have left their mother-tongue for the language of the country.

If the grammatical points noticed above are Dravidian, and the first list of words be from the same source, it cannot be that Sindhi has received them through the Brahui language; for these laws do not obtain in Brahui, neither are the words of the first vocabulary to be found in that language.

They are a pure inheritance of the Sindhi people; and I believe they point to the fact that the Indus Valley was a home to some part of the Dravidian race before the Aryan immigration.

Masons' Marks from Old Buildings in the North-West Provinces of India.


The accompanying notes and sketches of masons' marks to be seen on stones of the ancient buildings of the districts through which I have marched during a recent tour may perhaps be of interest to some of your readers.

Without searching through the many volumes that have been written on Indian antiquities, to which I cannot refer whilst in camp, it is not easy to say whether these marks have ever been described or figured before. I may perhaps be going over the ground which in this respect has already been explored more carefully than I can pretend to attempt to do. But even if the work has been done before, the information may be contained in volumes to which all of your readers have not ready access, and the present notes may perhaps, therefore, be considered worthy of a place in the Indian Antiquary.

The subject has not, I am aware, escaped the attention of General Cunningham, of the Archaeological Survey of India. In his paper on the ruins of Sarnath (published in the Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. xxxii.) the existence of these marks is noticed, and in his instructions to his Assistants (published in vol. III. of his Reports) is the following paragraph:—

"The stones should also be carefully examined for masons' marks, which are seldom absent from old buildings, and which, if numerous, will serve to give a tolerably complete alphabet of the characters in use when the structure was erected."

Sketches of the masons' marks are not, however, to be found in General Cunningham's account of Sarnath above referred to, nor have I been able to find any notes or sketches of them in his well-known volume on the Bilsa Toper, or in the published Reports of the Archaeological Survey. Whilst marching about, I hope by degrees to qualify for the grade of Honorary

---

1 See a paper by Mr. Walhouse, ante, vol. IV. pp. 302-303. — Ed.
Assistant to the Director General in his valuable efforts to collect information regarding all matters of antiquarian interest scattered over India. I have therefore observed his instructions, and now send you the result.

Masons' Marks at Sarnath.

The first group of sketches on the accompanying plate contains some of the marks to be seen on the sandstone blocks of what is known as the "Dharnek Stūpa," at Sarnath, near Banaras. These interesting remains have often been described, and chap. III. of Fergusson's History of Indian Architecture contains two engravings of the stūpa.

Wilford, in As. Res. vol. ix. quoted by Fergusson, gives the tradition that the stūpa was erected by the sons of Mahāpāla, and destroyed or (as suggested by Fergusson) interrupted, by the Muhammadans in 1017, before its completion (History of Indian Architecture, p. 68). General Cunningham, on the other hand, infers from the characters of an inscription found within the stūpa that the building belongs to the sixth century of our era. Perhaps the marks, some of which appear to be letters similar to those of the Bihās inscriptions, may be of help in determining the question of the date of the work. The outer facing of the building has in many places been stripped off by decay, or by Muhammadan iconoclasts, leaving exposed the solid blocks of sandstone of which the lower part of the stūpa is built.

It is on these inner blocks that the masons' marks, here figured, are found. Each stone has most probably on one of its sides a mark of some sort or other, made by the mason or the contractor, for ready recognition, after the stone was quarried or shaped. Only such marks as are on the outside faces of the stones exposed are to be seen; and those now noticed do not, perhaps, represent one-thousandth part of the marks on the stones composing the building. The same marks recur often, suggesting that the stones on which they are cut are the work of the same mason. The characters or symbols are generally about four inches in length, and from two or three inches in breadth. The sketches in the accompanying plate show them in the position in which they are seen in situ, but many of them were most probably inverted at the time the stones were placed in position. Thus Nos. 1 and 4 of the Sarnath series are evidently the same symbol, one or other of which has been turned upside down.

A rough attempt has been made to group the marks according to classes: thus Nos. 1 to 7 show the triangle, a favourite masons' mark, and one which can easily be cut with a chisel on soft sandstone. These marks are, if I remember right, the most common at Sarnath.

The next group, comprising the marks from 8 to 18, consists of symbols formed of rectangles. In most of the remaining marks two symbols will be noticed, as indicating, perhaps, that two masons shared in the working of the stone.

The most noticeable of the marks are those figured at the commencement and at the end of the Sarnath group (No. 1). Thus, Nos. 1 to 4 (No. 4 being No. 1 inverted) will be found to resemble the symbol of Drāmas given in Fig. 6, pl. 32 of Cunningham's Bihās Topes.

No. 49 is the well-known svastika, a favourite symbol on Buddhist remains. And here it may be noticed, on parenthesis, that M. Bertrand, the Director of the National Museum at St. Germain-en-Laye, recently sent me a model of a small altar found in the Pyrenees on which is the svastika exactly similar to No. 49.

No. 50 is probably intended to represent the Buddhist sacred tree; whilst No. 51 is perhaps meant for the platform and tree so common on Buddhist coins. On a visit lately to Ajudhia (Faizabad) I obtained a large number of these coins, the rough tree symbols of which bear a resemblance to the marks given at No. 51.

In Nos. 52 to 61 several of the letters found in old inscriptions will, I think, be recognized. Thus 52 and 53 are the t (turned sideways) of Aśoka's edicts, as given by Prinsep at p. 58, vol. II. of his Essays on Indian Antiquities, edited by Thomas. The second symbol of No. 54 is the n of the same alphabet.

No. 55 is also an n from the same plate of Prinsep. The first figure of No. 56 is v, but the symbol is inverted on the stone.

It may be noticed that this letter resembles the symbol of Mahādeva to be seen drawn in many places in Banaras, and which Mr. Camp-

---

* The Pāli letter ಃ.—Ed.

* No. 8 may possibly be ॐ, and No. 14, ॐ;—see vol. 7, p. 394, note, fig. 8.—Ed.
4. MASON'S MARKS. — ATALA MASJID, JAUNPUR.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bell of Islay found at Ajuddhia—see Jour. As. Soc. Beng. January 1877. In a paper in the same journal, I have noticed the resemblance between this symbol and the marks found on many of the monoliths of Europe.

No. 57 is the η of the alphabet of Aśoka's edicts (with the horizontal lines considerably lengthened) as given by Prinsep in the volume above quoted. No. 58 is the j used in what Prinsep calls the alphabet of the Western caves, but turned with the right side down. No. 61, a rough cross, will be found figured in Prinsep, in one of his plates of the Manikya inscription and relics.

The triangle and upright, the last of the two symbols in No. 60, and the lower one,—the circle with a line through it,—in No. 61, resembling the Greek Φ, may both be found in the letters of the inscriptions given in the plates of Cunningham's Bhilai Tope. Practised eyes, and readers who have other books of reference at hand, may perhaps be able to recognize other letters and symbols among the marks herein given.

A further and more careful examination would doubtless show many more marks on the stones of Samath than I have been able to notice here. At Jaunpur, as will be seen from the other groups on the plate which accompanies this paper, the marks are much more elaborate and varied.

At Jaunpur.

From Banaras I marched to Jaunpur, and there I had an opportunity of examining and noting some of the masons' marks on the buildings for which the ancient capital of the Sharki kings is celebrated.

A description of these buildings, illustrated by plans and engravings, will be found in Ferguson's Indian and Eastern Architecture, book VII, chapter iv.; and General Cunningham, in his Archaeological Reports, vol. III. notices the "Jaunpuri Pathan" Architecture under his sixth group of the Muhammadan period.

The chief buildings now remaining are the fort (partly demolished), containing a small mosque and other buildings, a bridge which in 1871 withstood one of the most extraordinary floods on record, and the Juma' Atallah and Lal Darwaza masjids.

The masons' marks figured in the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th groups on the accompanying plates were found on the pillars and stones of the cloisters adjoining the masjids.

The peculiarity of these buildings is the mixture of two styles of architecture, Hindu and Muhammadan, regarding which Ferguson, at p. 520 of his work noticed above, remarks as follows:—"The principal parts of the mosques, such as the gateways, the great halls, and the western parts, generally are in a complete arcade style. Wherever, indeed, wide openings and large internal spaces were wanted, arches and domes and radiating vaults were employed; and there is little in those parts to distinguish this architecture from that of the capitals... But in the cloisters that surround the courts, and in the galleries in the interior, short square pillars are as generally employed with bracket capitals, horizontal architraves, and roofs formed of flat slabs, as was invariably the case in Hindu and Jaina temples. Instead of being fused together, as they afterwards became, the arcade style of the Moslems stands here, though in juxtaposition, in such marked contrast to the trabate style of the Hindu, that some authors have been led to suppose that the pillared parts belonged to ancient Jaina or Buddhist monuments which had been appropriated by Muhammadans and converted to their purposes."

This view, Ferguson adds, was advanced by Baron Hugel, and has since found supporters in Mr. Horne (Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. XXXIV.), and in the Rev. Mr. Sherring in his Sacred City of the Hindus. Ferguson, although he admits that the Muhammadans may have utilized some Jaina or Hindu buildings, holds that at least nine-tenths of the pillars in the mosques were made at the time they were required for the places they now occupy. Cunningham, on the other hand, seems to differ from Ferguson on this point, and to support the views of Baron Hugel and his followers.

At page vi, vol. IV. of the Archaeological Reports General Cunningham refers to an inscription on one of the pillars of the Atallah Masjid, "which is known to have been originally a Hindu temple converted to Muhammadan use by Ibrahim Shah Sharki between the years 1403-1440 A.D."

The masons' marks which I have now to notice may perhaps be of some use in determining the class of buildings to which the stones utilized by the Muhammadans for their mosques originally belonged.

Commencing with the marks on the Juma'
Masjíd (2nd group), I would draw attention to No. 1, in which I think may be recognized a rough representation of the Buddhist tree and platform, with the cobra erect to the right of the tree. These marks were noticed on a stone building built into the gateway of the Jumá Masjíd. On the block a figure had been carved, but the carving had been partly defaced and the figure turned inwards.

In 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, also the Buddhist tree may, I think, be traced in the rude symbols. But 5, it is true, is not unlike the trident of Śiva, and the accompanying circle may perhaps be intended to represent a Mahádeva. But I have, in the first instance, suggested the tree, as the conventional renderings of the tree on Buddhist coins obtained recently at Ajudhia are not unlike the markings here figured.

No. 7 is the svastika again, similar to the markings on the Buddhist Stūpa at Dhamek, Banaras. This symbol was, I understand, originally Buddhist, but was eventually adopted by the Hindus and Jains, so the stone may have been the work, I suppose, of either a Buddhist, a Hindu, or a Jain. In 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, may be recognized, I think, attempts to represent the cobra.

In No. 8 the cobras are intertwined in the well-known form of the caduceus, and cobras in this position are to be found carved on a stone at the Nága (or Cobra) well at Banaras. In 8 and 9 the symbol has been turned upside-down, the original position of the stone having been altered on its being placed in situ.

The circles of 13, 14, 15, 16, and the symbol on the right-hand side in No. 8, represent perhaps the Mahádeva and Yoni. In the double triangles of Nos. 17 and 18 will be recognized the favourite masons' mark, or Solomon's seal. The other marks do not call for special notice, save that there is apparently no absence of any attempt at written characters as opposed to symbols.

The tree and leaves or buds as in Nos. 19 to 23 are common enough. The only marks bearing any resemblance to letters are those of 24 to 27.

Taking next (group 3) the marks on the stones at the Lál Darwázá Masjíd, the most remarkable is the combination of symbol No. 1, in the third series,—the triangle,—then a spearhead, then the snakes intertwined, and lastly what would seem to be the representation of a bow and arrow. The svastika appears again in Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, the tree in No. 7. Nos. 8 to 15 seem to be intended for leaves or buds. No. 16 is quite a new symbol, of a somewhat elaborate type.

The stones of the Atála Masjíd are much richer in marks (group 4). But many of them are of types already noticed (see the second page of the plate).

The familiar triangle recurs in Nos. 1 to 4. No. 7 is undoubtedly intended for the snakes. No. 8, which I at first took to be intended for the same symbol, is perhaps meant for a bird.

A peculiar Buddhist symbol similar to that on many coins found at Ajudhia will be seen in the centre of Solomon's seal of No. 44. No. 30 is the sacred goose, perhaps.

In 39 will be seen the cobra surmounted by the Buddhist symbol noticed in the Dhamek markings.

NOTES ON THE KANPHÁTÁ YOGÍS.

BY G. S. LEONARD, SAIJPUR.

The acknowledged head and guide of this religious sect of Yogí is said to have been one Gorakhor Gorakhnátha. The sect was originally designated by the name of Náthas, or leaders, from their founder, Adináthá. The name Adináthá means 'a leader or guide,' from whom most of the succeeding párs of this order had the agnomen of Náthas affixed to their proper names. In Upper Hindustán this word Náthji is used to denote indiscriminately a spiritual guide of any order, just as Gurú and Áchárya are used in Bangáli and Saískrit. In its theological sense it is restricted to a Saiva preceptor, as the surname of Gosain is confined to the professors and guides of the Vaishnavá faith. It was, however, gradually extended to a cognomen of the deity Śiva, whether worshipped in the form of a human statue, or that of his more common prototype the liña or phallus, as the emblems of Badrínavátha, Sambhunátha, Pasupati-nátha, and the equally far-famed liña of Somanátha.

The Kánpháthás were afterwards denomi-
nated the Gorakhpanthās, or followers of Gorakhnātha, the renovator of their creed and doctrines,—in the same manner as the disciples of Dādu, Kabir, and Nānāk were designated by the apppellations of Dādūpanthīs, Kābirpanthīs, and Nānākpanthīs. Gorakhnātha, the acknowledged founder of the order, is recorded in a Sanskrit treatise on Yoga philosophy, called the Hathādīpikā, by Ātmārām, to have been the eighth in succession to Adinātha, the originator of the sect, and to have transmitted his doctrines in Sanskrit to posterity. The names of the leaders of this sect are thus given in the treatise:—Śrī Adinātha, Matsyendrā, Sambhara, Anandabhairava, Chandrangi, Menā, Goraksha, Virupāksha, Velasayana, &c.

Gorakhnātha, according to the authorities of this sect and the Bēkhtas of Kabir, is reckoned to be one of the nine eminent teachers of the Yoga system; and he is still more conspicuous than the others from his having left written documents of his faith and precepts in some works of his composition in original Sanskrit, which no other of his sect had done either before or after him. Dr. H. H. Wilson has given a list of thirty teachers of this faith from the Hathādīpikā cited above, and fixed the date of Gorakhnātha in the fourteenth century, by assigning only the space of fifteen years to each of his successors (vide Wilson's "Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus" in vol. XVII, p. 190, of the Asiatic Researches). In the Bēkhtas of Kabir, however, printed in the Hindi and Hindustâni Selections by Captain Price, there occurs a distinct in a controversial dialogue between Kabir and Gorakhnātha which makes them contemporaries at the commencement of the fifteenth century, and states that Gorakhnātha was the son of Matsyendra, and grandson of Adinātha.

The word kāññphātā literally means 'ear-split,' and is, like naktī, 'nose-clipt,' a vernacular term of reproach, applied contemptuously to this sect by the victorious Muhammadans, who in the same way made use of the epithet hindū, 'black,' to the inhabitants of this country, and called every one kāfar, or 'infidel,' who professed a faith different from their own. The practice of boring holes in the ears (karna-bhedha) is an essential religious ceremony among the Hindus of all castes and tribes in general, but the custom of making a slit in the cartilage of the ear, and inserting rings or cylinders made of horn, agate, or glass in the perforated part, as necessary for the initiation of a disciple, is an institution originating with Gorakhnātha, who for this reason is styled the founder of the Kāññphātās. This practice was borrowed from a custom prevalent among all classes of yogīs of suspending rings to the ears, in imitation of the Jainas and Buddhists, who in their turn had derived it from Śiva, the lord of the yogīs, who is often represented in a posture of deep meditation with similar rings pendent in his ears, as in an image in the Dumar Lēpā at Elura, or in the vestibule of the Elephants' cave. These rings, called mundra, from the Sanskrit word mundras or circlelets, which from their immense size painfully distort the cartilage of the ear, have often been made objects of ridicule by the Muhammadans in their popular songs. Hence Kabir, although a convert from Muhammadanism to Hindu Rāma-worship, does not omit the opportunity of deriding the earrings of Gorakhnātha while discussing with him his religious opinions and principles; a tetra-stich in the Bāgh-o-Bahār also accuses the Kāññphātās, and all other classes of yogīs and hermits, of cupidity and greediness, notwithstanding their professions to the contrary.

The Kāññphātās are mentioned in Lalla Lāl's Tables of Hindu Sects and Tribes as having originated from the yogīs and jāngams of the Śiva faith, and this statement is corroborated by the account which Dr. Wilson has given of them in his "Sketch of the Hindu Sects" in the Asiatic Researches, vol. XVII.

The devotees of Śiva (perhaps the only remnants of ancient yogīs in India, except the Pāramāṇas of Śankarachārya's Vedantism) are religious recluses from the world, and wholly devoted to abstract meditation. The Kāññphātās are of the same persuasion, with this difference between them and other Śivas, that, while all orders of Sanyāsīs are at liberty to visit holy places and perform distant pilgrimages, the Kāññphātās are constrained to remain within their mathas, or monasteries, and sometimes are even closely confined in their gubhas, or cells, for intense application to meditation. A reference to this peculiarity occurs in the Hathādīpikā, and is thus translated by Dr. Wilson:

"The Hatha-jogi should dwell in a well go-
verned and properly regulated country, which is fertile and free from disturbances, within a solitary cell within the precincts of a matha or sanctuary.

A Kāṇḍātā is not allowed to lead a solitary, independent, or vagrant life, like the Paramhānas or Pārībrajākas of the Vedic religion, or that of a mendicant as enjoined by the Sūtrī śāstras. He is strictly prohibited, according to the Hathādisākka, from having communication with the wicked, from sitting beside a fireplace, from walking in by-ways, from early baths and fasts, and from all bodily austerities and penances enjoined in the śāstras. In contradistinction to the practices of the Kāṇḍātās it may be mentioned that early baths, and sitting by the fireplace, as also offering oblations to fire, are positive injunctions of the Vedas, and are extensively practised by Hindus, and a large number of itinerant and vagrants Sanyāsīs of other sects. The main object of the superiors or heads of a Kāṇḍātā monastery, is the attainment of spiritual perfection in the close recess of his solitary cell; while the chief employment of the novices is the practice of acts of charity and benevolence to every one within the circuit of their monastery.

The religion of the Kāṇḍātās, as professed by their founder and preceptor, Guru Gorakhnātha, is similar to that of all other Śaiva sects—the monotheism, otherwise called Brahmanism, of the Upanishads and Vedanta philosophy, which was widely propagated afterwards by its great champion, the venerable Sāṅkarāchārya, and his disciples, Anandagiri, and others, and now upheld by the Brāhma Somaj of Calcutta. The only authentic account we have of Gorakhnātha's religious teaching and principles is contained in the religious debates (goshti) held between him and Kabir, and preserved in the Rekhta verses of the latter, published in the Hindi and Hindustani Selections.

SANSKRIT AND OLD CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Esq., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 253.)

No. XLVIII.

At Ind. Ant., Vol. VI., p. 91, I published (No. XXXI. of this Series) a copper-plate grant of the Western Chalukya king Vinayaditya. My transcription was made from No. 3 of the photographs of copper-plate grants at the end of Colonel Dixon's Collection. The photograph was on too small a scale for a lithograph facsimile to be prepared from it. But this want has now been supplied through
the kind assistance of the Rev. T. Foulkes of Bengal, who obtained the original plates on loan from the owner of them, and transmitted them to England. This has enabled me to give the details of the plates, and to correct and complete my transcription and translation of them.

Mr. Foulkes does not give the name of the owner of the plates; but states that he is the astrologer of the temple of the god Harīhara at Haribari, and, though the grant was made to a member of the Vātasya gotra, that he belongs to the Kāśyapa godra. It is not known where the plates were found, or how they came into the possession of the family that now owns them.

The plates are three in number, about 10½" long by 4½" broad. They have very decided raised rims to protect the writing. The inscription commences on the inside of the first, and ends on the inside of the third, plate. The ring had not been cut when the plates were received in England; it is about ½" thick, and 4½" in diameter. A facsimile of the seal has been given in the Plate at p. 253 (No. 5) above; it is slightly oval, about 1¼" by 1¾", and has the representation of a boar, facing to the proper right, in relief on a countersunk surface.

The grant was made by Vinayaditya himself, at the request of the king of the Aluvas, and seems to have been made to celebrate a victory over that family. It is dated in the fourteenth year of his reign, on the day of the full-moon of Kārttika, when Śaka 616 (A.D. 694-5) had expired.

**Transcription.**

**First plate.**


danāśrī-āgra-śvārāntaṁ

[II*] vanāṁ vupah [II*] Śrīmatāṁ sakala-śvāruvamāna-mānavaya-sagotraṁ Hārītī

dūptā-nāṇāṁ


[6] śnāna-pañā


[9] prātiḥ(ṭi) śvārāha-

[10] bha-mahārājas-tasya-śvānma(tma) jas-samanta-saṁsakta-sakal-ōttarāḥ-śvāran Śri

[11] Harśhavardhīnāḥ-śvārāha-paramāṇu-śvārāh Śatya-

[12] śrīya-śrī-prātiḥ(ṭi) śvālabbha-mahārāj-ādhīrāya-paramāṇuvā-rat-priya-sū-

[13] tasya Vikramāditya-paramāṇuvam-bhūṣṭārakasya mati-sāhāya-sāhāsa-mātra-sa-

**Second plate; first side.**

[14] madhigata-nīja-vanīśa-saṁciti-chitā-nāja-śvārāhaya vinvādhī-śrīsita-saṁtama-mukha-


[16] kara-vimāla-kula-paribhava-vājaya-śvārāh Śaṇkra-śrīvaśyā-

[17] Kāṃch-śrīparasya prabhāva-kuṭilē(ḷi)sā-duleśi(ṭi)Śrī-Chōla-śrīvaśyā Śaṇkra-śrīvaśya-

[18] dharā-tū(ṭa)ya-māna-māna-śrīmī

[19] gasya an-ānyā-samavāna[ta*-]Kāṃchāpaśi-maṇi-kuttā-kuk̤a-śiva-salilābhisheka-śrīpā-


[21] raṇijāyā Bālī(ḷi)nuśeōkharasya-śvāva Sēnānī(ṇi)ś Divāya-balān-ati-samuddhātam

trainijāy-Pallava-

1 These two letters, ṛbhi, are an unnecessary and unmeaning repetition.

2 It is somewhat doubtful whether it is intended, or le.

But, collating all the other passages in which this name occurs, I find the rule to be that, when the vowel of the first syllable is o, then the vowel of the second is e, and when the vowel of the first syllable is e, then the vowel of the second is o, in later times, e.

3 Here, and in djādassayati, l. 23, and vijajāpanayā, l. 26, and jāy-ṭō, l. 41, the vowel ı is irregularly attached to the top stroke of the ı, instead of to the centre stroke, in the usual manner, as in mahārāj-āḥārīrājī, II. 22-23.

4 The upper part of the k has not come out in the facsimile. A few similar instances of imperfect letters, and of a failure of the Anusāra to appear in the facsimile, will be found further on.

5 In the facsimile, the top stroke of the 闼 has run up into the Anusāra, so as to read like śrīt, instead of śrītā.
Hail! Victorious is the body, which was that of a Boar, that was manifested of Vishnu, (as, as in No. XXIX, at Vol. VI., p. 87)!

The son of the great king Śrī-śilankaṭṭha, whose body was purified (as, as in No. XXIX,)—was the great king Śrī-śilankaṭṭha.

Translation.

Kṛttivarṣa, the favourite of the world, (as, as in No. XXIX.)

His son (seus) Satyārāya, the favourite of the world, the great king, the supreme king, the supreme lord, (as, as in No. XXIX.)

His dear son (seus) Vikramaditya, the supreme lord, the venerable one,—who acquired (as, as in No. XXIX.)
His son, Viṣṇu-āditya-Satyaśraya, 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 (κ.κ., as in No. XXIX.), (ους) like Ḍhṛṣṭa, on account of his being the refuge of kings, and by whom the Pailavas, the Kāśmīrīs, the Kāraṇajas, the Haibhāys, the Vīḷas, the Malavas, the Chōḷas, the Pāṇḍyas, and others, were brought into a similar state of servitude with the Āḷūvas, and the Gaṅgas, and others, who were hereditary (servants of 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 Kāraṇajaputra in the neighbourhood of (the city of) Hārēśhapura, on the day of the full-moon of (the month) Kārttika, at the request of the illustrious king of the Āḷūvas, the village of Kīru-Kāgāmāśi, in the Ėdevolal division in the Vānayāsi district, is given by Us, with the right of enjoyment, and free from all opposing claims, to Īsānāśarmā, who is thoroughly well versed in the Vēdas and the Vēlāyas, the son’s son of Śrīśarmā, who performed the Śoma sacrifice, of the Vatsya gōtra, (and) the son of Māraśarmā. (Also there is given) a (partly) cultivated and (partly) uncultivated field on the west of the village of Per-Gāgāmāśi. And the boundaries of that field (are):—On the northeast, (the hamlet of) Pūlivatu in the boundaries of the village of Sīrīgōdū; coming thence, (the village of) Karvasurigōla; thence (the village of) Perbut; thence (the village of) Ālgirē; thence (the village of) Ālgola; thence (the village of) Niṭṭakāḷi; thence, going to the east, (the village of) Nēgilēlē; thence (the village of) Kṛunpakere; thence, turning to the south, (the village of) Arakatātu."

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. And it has been said by the holy Vyaśa, the arranger of the Vedas:—Land has been enjoyed by many kings, from Sāgara downwards; &c. It is a very easy thing to bestow a grant oneself, &c. He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, &c. This charter has been written by Śrī-Rāmapūṇyavallabhā, the Great Minister who is entrusted with peace and war."

No. XLIX.

This is a copper-plate grant of the Dēvagiri-Yādava king Kṛishṇa, otherwise called, as here, Kānhrā or Kaṇhrā, and also Kaṇhrā or Kaṇhdhrā. Another form of the same name is Kaṇhara; but I have not found it used in the case of this particular king.

The plates were found at Chikka-Bāgiwādi, in the Belgaum Tālkā of the Belgaum District. They are three in number, each about 7½ inches in diameter; they have raised edges to protect the writing. The ring connecting them had not been cut when the grant came into my possession; it is about ½ inch thick, and 3½ inches in diameter. The seal, of which a facsimile has been given (No. 2) in the Plate at p. 252 above, is circular, about 2½ inches in diameter; it has, in high relief on a countersunk surface, a figure of the god Hānumān, with the sun and moon. The language is Sanskrit. The characters are Nandināgiri. In this inscription the letter ‘a’ is usually distinguished from ‘ś’—by means of a small circle inside the loop of the letter; but the engraver has not always made this distinction, and in some instances, where he has, it has failed to appear in the facsimile. Thus, the facsimile reads pratibhiṁbīṁbī, 1. 2, and Pāc-āgraṇā. II. 13-14; whereas the original has distinctly pratibhiṁbīṁbī, and Bāc-āγrāṇa. On the other hand, this mark, distinctive of the

11 Or, perhaps, ‘Kālāhira’; see note 5.
12 In l. 9 of the Ahōlo inscription (Vol. V., p. 67), we have, as my revised version of it will show hereafter, Gāṅga, Ajīp-āndrā, ‘the princes of the Gaṅgas and the Allpas.’ The Āḷūvas are probably the same as the Allpas, who are mentioned again, as the enemies of the Chākayas in later times, in 1. 12 of No. 3 of my second series of Kaṇṭhamba inscriptions, at Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. IX., p. 278.
13 Or, perhaps, ‘Hārēśhapura.’
14 Or, perhaps, ‘Hārēśhapura.’
15 Or, perhaps, ‘Hārēśhapura.’
16 Or, perhaps, ‘Hārēśhapura.’
17 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
18 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
19 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
20 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
21 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
22 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
23 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
24 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
25 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
26 Or, perhaps, ‘Ālūvas.’
The Huvvalli spoken of here must be Mughatkhani-Hubballi in the Belgaum District, about five miles to the south-east of Bāgīwāḍī. Sānteya is evidently intended for the Canarese sāntēya, ‘of the market’, a common prefix to the names of villages in the Canarese country. The Sāntēya-Bāgāvāḍī of the grant is probably the modern Bāgīwāḍī, or Hirō-Bāgīwāḍī,—a market-town, and of much more importance than Chikka-Bāgīwāḍī, which is close to it. Sāntēti, at the end of the two ministers’ names, probably represents the Canarese sēfti, ‘a merchant’, and indicates the class to which they belonged by birth.

Transcription.
First Plate.

[1] || Chha || Ōm namaḥ Śivāya || Śrī-Ganpati
[2] || patayē namaḥ || Pāyām-ādyah sa vaḥ pṛtṛl ya(yad)-daṁhṛtr ā
[3] || pradbhi(bhī)hitā || aśā-iva dhṛitā ḍhaḍār harāh(rāhā)-dvīṇa-pnū
[7] || māḥ || Tasya pṛtṛ maha-tējāḥ Śrī-Kanhaṁ āḥ śrūtaḥ || yad-ājāṁ(ijāṁ)
[8] || śrīsā dhṛitā(ṭvā) bhavaṁti sukhlīn nṛpāḥ || Ya-yati jagati rājā sa-
[9] || rva-bhūpāḥ-mauli-prathita-parama-ratnā-prōḷasat-pāda-padaṁḥ || Ya-
[13] || śaśasya prithiviptaḥ || śārō-mātya-dhuri sthitō vijayatē Bt-
[14] || ch-āgra-nāḥ || saṁtataṁ Malā-khyāḥ kilā Chakkaṇcā-varanaṇaḥ pra-
[15] || khyāṭa-kṛttē(ṛttī)-bhunvī || Tasya pṛtṛ maha-tējāḥ Śrī-Kanhaṁ i-
[16] || ti śrūtaḥ || || || Yo jīvāṁ(ṛyaḥ) prithiv-īśāsyo yo rājō(ṛjō) daksinān bhū(bhū)
[17] || jaḥ || Praśaṁ(ṛyāḥ)(ṛyā)-arth(ṛṇī)-yaḥ pragriṅta-chāpō dādātō ārthāṁ-kṛipa
[18] || yā dvijēbhāyaḥ || Śrī(ṛ)-Sāmaṇaṁ-āṅgri-yug-āranatya pravardhiṛi
[19] || t-ājaśa-vibhūtī-ṛaiṇ(a)naḥyāḥ || Chha || Svasti || Eka-saptāty-uttara-śat-ā
[20] || dhā(ṛ)ka-sahasra-sāṁkhīyaḥ Śak-āvīṛ(ṛ)bhur-āvīrṣe pravartaneṇa Śaṅku(sau)nāya
[21] || sāṁvatsāraḥ tād-āṇīta(tar) gat-Āśāḥha-paunrāṇyaḥ Śaṅkha-ha vārē Pū-
[22] || rv-Āśāḥha-dhāḥ-nakṣatraḥ Vaidhrīti-yaṅgē(ṛ) itthāṁ-bhūta-pu(na)ṇya-kālē
[23] || rājā(ṛṇāḥ)|| sarba(rva)-rdā(ṛdē)-āḍāhikārī || saḥ || Malissāti-nām-āmatyāḥ(ṛyō) Mudugala-grā
[24] || mē vasaṁ(sa)n || tad-anuja(ṛna)yā sva-dēv-ārochchana-samaya Śrī-Sāmaṇāthas
[26] || dī-ṛdē || Huvvallī-śāvās-ga(grā)ṁ-ābhyaṁṭaṁ Sāntēya-Bāgavāḍī-sāṇiṇa
[27] || kō grāmē bhagavāṁ(ṛvyāḥ)-Śrī(ḥṛī)-Mādhava-dēva-puru(ṛh)āḥ sarbāḥyā dvā-trīṁśat-saṁkhyā
[28] || kēbhyō nāmō-gōṭrēbhōyō brāhmaṇāḥbhyaḥ=na(ṛ)/d-grāma-dakṣiṇa-digu(ṛ)-bhugē

Second plate; first side.

[29] || shat pāshāṇa(shat-pāshāṇa)-madritīṁ bhū(bhū)min dhāra-pūrba(rva) kam datta-
Om! Reverence to Śiva! Reverence to Śrī Gaṇāḍhīpati! May he**, the first boar, protect you,—reflected on whose tusk, the earth was upheld, and, through joy, attained, as it were, twice as great prosperity (as before)!

There was the prosperous king Simhaṅga,

born in the race of Yadu, whose fame was celebrated throughout the three worlds, like the fame of Hari.

As the moon (was created) in the ocean, so, in the ocean which is the family of Yadu, there was born from the king Simhaṅga the king who was named Jaiṅṭuṅī.

*This mark of punctuation, again, is unnecessary.*

**These two letters, va, seem to be superfluous and unmeaning.

**Vishnu.
His son was that glorious one, who is re-
nowned under the name of Śrī-Kaṇhāra,
and whose commands kings bear upon their
heads and thus become happy. Victorious in
the world is the king called Kaṇhāra; the
waterlilies, which are his feet, shine brightly
among the famous choice jewels in the diadems
of all kings (as they bow down before him); he
is the sun of the white waterlilies, which are
the eyes of mankind; he is full of affection for
Vāsu Deva, who disported himself for so
long a time in the family of Yādu.

Ever victorious is he, the hero, renowned in
the world, who has the appellation of Malla,
—the elder brother of Bīcha, and the son of
Chikkadeva,—who, filling the post of min-
ister of that eminent king, has the waterlilies,
which are his feet, always made radiant by the
jewels inlaid in the diadems of other kings;
and who is the right arm of the victorious lord
of the earth, the king, who was his glorious
son and was renowned under the name of Śrī-
Kaṇhāra. Armed with the bow, he chastises his enemies; through charity, he gives wealth to the twice-born; and he is pleasing by reason of his perfect prosperity, which
is nourished by obeisance performed to the feet of
the god Śrī-Somāṇātha.

Hail! One thousand one hundred and
seventy-one of the Saka years having elapsed in
the Saumya sausvatsara, on Saturday the
day of the full-moon of (the month) Āśādha
of that (year), under the Purva Kaṇhāravakṣata
and the Vaidhiti yōga,—at this sacred
time, while residing at the village of Mu-
dugala, he,—the minister called Mal-
īśaite, was entrusted with authority
over all the dominions of the king,—with his
permission, and at the request of the most pious
Viraṇāyaka, at the time of worshippers
his own deity, in the presence of (the god) Śrī-
Somāṇātha, gave, with libations of water, at
the village called Saṅthēya-Bāgavādi in the
Huvvalī-Twelve-villages in the country of
Kuṇḍi, which was a district subject to
his own authority, some land, marked out by
six stones and situated in the southern part of
that same village, to thirty-two Brāhmaṇas of
many gōtras, together with the god, the holy
Śrī-Mādhava. A field of the measure of one
thousand kambas was allotted for the aśgaḥpāya,
the rāghabāya, and all the other rites of the
god, the holy Śrī-Mādhava. A field of the
measure of two hundred kambas was allotted
for the purpose of feeding Brāhmaṇas in the char-
table dining-hall of the god Śrī-Mādhava.
And another field was given to those Brāhmaṇa
who dwelt at (the town of) Brāhmaṇapura,
which belonged to the god Śrī-Mādhava.
And a rice-field of the measure of two hundred
kambas, situated in the eastern part of that
same village, was given by him for the purposes
of that same charitable dining-hall. And, for
the purposes of that same charitable dining-hall,
there was given a field of the measure of one
hundred kambas on the south-western side (of
the land) of Vināyaka. Thus there was
given by him land of the measure of five hun-
dred kambas for the purpose of feeding Brā-
maṇa in the charitable dining-hall of the god
Śrī-Mādhava.

And after that, his son, the minister Chauṇ-
qisaiti, for the purpose of continuing the
religious act performed by his father, gave, with
reference to that same subject, a copper charter
to the god, the holy Mādhava, and to those
Brāhmaṇa, and thus made permanent the reli-
gious act of his father.

The gōtras and the virtues and the names of
those recipients of the gifts are now written.
(From here,—line 45,—to line 99, the in-
scription records the names, &c., of the grantees,
and the share allotted to each. It is unnecessary to
translate this portion in detail. In line 100 the
inscription continues —)

Thus thirty-two allotments were portioned
out and given to the Brāhmaṇa.

It has been said by the saintly Veda-
Vyāsa, that this (grant) should be preserved
by all future kings, precisely as if it were a grant
made by themselves, (in the words) :—"The
earth has been enjoyed by many kings, com-
mencing with Sāgara; he, who for the time
being possesses land, enjoys the benefit of it"!
He is born for the duration of sixty thousand
years as a worm in ordure, who confiscates
land that has been given, whether by him-
self or by another! (Therefore has) Rāma
(said) :—"This general bridge of piety of kings
should at all times be preserved by you,—thus

28 Krishna.
29 Sc., Simhāpa's. The construction is very bad.

30 The shares, however, if added up, amount to thirty-
four and a quarter allotments.
does Rāmacandra make his earnest request to all future princes." In (discriminating between) giving a grant and continuing (the grant of another), continuing (the grant of another) is the better; by giving a grant a man attains paradise, but by continuing (the grant of another) a man attains an imperishable state! (May there be) the most auspicious prosperity!

**MISCELLANEA.**

**SEALS FROM COPPER-PLATE GRANTS.**

(See Plates, pp. 129, 252-3.)

Besides the seals from the copper-plate grants of Vinayakadāya (alluded to above, p. 301) and of Kanharadēva (p. 303), we have given on the same plate (at p. 252) three others from the collection of Sir Walter Elliot: viz.—No. 1, the seal of the copper-plate grant of Vikramaditya I. dated Saka 532, which grant has already been given (at p. 217); No. 3 is from another Eastern Chalukya grant of Bājanāda dated Saka 944; and No. 4 is from another Vengi grant of Kulottunga-Chōradēva II. dated Saka 1056. These last two grants will be given in volume VIII. of the Indian Antiquary, with full-size facsimile plates.

An impression of a seal of Ammarāja II. of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty is given on the plate facing p. 120. A transcription and translation of the plates to which it belongs will be given early in next volume.—Ed.

**KABIR-PANTHIS AND SAT-NĀMIS.**

(Addition to the paper, ante, pp. 287-289.)

Much has yet to be learnt about the Kabīr-panthis and the teaching of Kabir, the great leader of Indian reform in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. His sayings and precepts are innumerable, and many of them have still to be translated.

The Sat-nāmis, too, are an interesting sect, and very little has yet been written about them or their leaders. Is there not more than one branch of this sect to be found in different parts of India? And if so, how do they differ?

Monier Williams.

Oxford, November 8th, 1878.

**METRICAL VERSIONS FROM THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.**

By J. Muir, D.C.L., L.L.D., F.R.A.

(Continued from p. 292)

**Broken Friendships never thoroughly cemented.**

Mahābhārata, xii. 4167.

Things well compact are hard to crack,
And broken things are hard to mend;
So shattered friendships, patched up, lack
The love that marked the former friend.

---

1 The first two seals on the second page of the plate have been wrongly numbered as 1 and 2, instead of 3 and 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abarāti, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abd-Manāf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Karim Bukhārī's Hist. de l'Asie Centrale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdu'l-lāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdu'l-lāh bin Uthman (Abū Bakr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Abdu'r-rahmān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abreha, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Hālah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abū Sufiān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyssinian kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āchāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āchāra, Atharya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhnadga Sātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-chata-bhota-pradēya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achganāthia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achyuta Vijaya Rāgahava Nai-kar, K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhāhā datta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhāyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhāikārika, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhika Somanātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhikārīja 16, 104, 107, 164, 211, 219, 220, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhyātmakas Rāmāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adi Budhā, Adidēvā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adi Graha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādil Shāhī kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādinātha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādhiopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āgaṇāpanjīta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agīma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agimīta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agni, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ago-asatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agoṇkṣātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agoṇkṣātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āgrā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āgrahāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrawāl, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahāle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āhalyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādhāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādhāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dharani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ādichhātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmadābād, personal names in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥmad Beg Ināk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aḥmad Shāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahiode table 103, 121, 185, 209-10, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ājāhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajanṭā caves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajanṭāstru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajeplā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajīṭāplā, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajīr, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajīdāpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ājūdhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēdra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ākāsavrenti, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ākānādalāmirā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akṣhepārātim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alakatkanagura, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amam Beg, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Amam Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ālapuru, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ālvā contra metre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ālīgā (f.), v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ālīġa, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altā, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḷīṭākara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḷīq bin 'Ābad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainīla, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alphabet (Persian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḷupas, Āḷuras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḷuvāy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḷvār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āḷmaraśītha, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āndīya, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amr Sayyid, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amma (E. Chalukya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammārāja II. (East Chalukya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amrāvati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amākā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānandabhārāvāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānanda Chulāsamā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānandagiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ānanda Malla, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anadapura, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantaguna-Pandion, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananta Varmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananta, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anartapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anēkāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andhrabārītas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auga-bhoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auga (f.), g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniliśa Pātha, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniśala, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animālītra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anjār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Bim Zaitd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An-vaḥiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annagunti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An∩rana-bhoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animagur, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniśa-varmā, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antaka, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anēśvara, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anu-to-lo, Andhra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anukṣthā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anūpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuvigora-vātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anurā-T Sukalī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aparānta, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apīla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Apraśa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arakaśa, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Notes 21, 40, 44, 126, 176, 192, 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arkaṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araśi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arivārma, for Harivarṁā (Gaṅga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjuna Guru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjunaśāla, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ārākā, c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Abbreviations:*
- e. = city
- g. = god or goddess
- d. = district
- k. = king
- l.m. = land-massara
- n.m. = mountain
- n. = official
- p. = river
- t. = temple
- m. = official
- n. = sect
- v. = village

The dynasties in brackets after the names of kings are given on first occurrence only in full, and then in abbreviated form.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bukka Rāya, k.</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burials</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnell, Dr. A. C.</td>
<td>223, 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrying-ground at Mangapeṭṭā</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bussahir</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canarese inscription</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinal points</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter, Miss M.</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cat-worship</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaberis emporium</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaibasa</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaitya</td>
<td>36, 103, 109, 110, 216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chakkali</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chatra</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakradhara, g.</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakravartha</td>
<td>187, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya</td>
<td>161, 164, 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya</td>
<td>164, 186, 210, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya</td>
<td>194, 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya</td>
<td>17, 17, 108, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya</td>
<td>110, 210, 211, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya-Bhima (East Chal.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya</td>
<td>103, 110, 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukyas, Early 5–7</td>
<td>209, 241, 351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukyas, Eastern</td>
<td>15, 185, 191, 368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukyas, Western</td>
<td>163, 217, 300, 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalukya Mountain</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamara</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champavati</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chānanjī</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chānukyā</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandel Parmār</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandavajja</td>
<td>153-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandavara, v.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrabhātī</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrakətī (Western Chalukya)</td>
<td>163-4, 218-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta, K.</td>
<td>22, 149, 153-5, 157, 160, 257, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragiri</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāndravajjapaṭhi</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandrikāmukī, g.</td>
<td>109, 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaoasat Yōgīl</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorodavasanaṣa</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorosa, Taittirīya</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chorosa, Vājasāṇeya</td>
<td>18, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitrapravāsa</td>
<td>33-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charvakāra, g.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chara</td>
<td>33, 249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheṣu</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chashṭana</td>
<td>259, 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitturmeyya</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitturvardyā</td>
<td>249n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaul, Chenval</td>
<td>183-4, 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chānāmāsiṭṭi</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Čhāvādas</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheda</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chentu</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chērās</td>
<td>5, 6, 21, 163, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chērām</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chet Samanātha</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhatrapur</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chheda</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhittadēva, k.</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China Kimedi, d.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhira</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhriṣṭakāthā</td>
<td>210, 214, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chivalry in S. India</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chobārī, v.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chōja</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chōjas</td>
<td>301, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chōjadēva (Chōja)</td>
<td>6, 39, 108, 111, 172, 211, 212, 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chotilā</td>
<td>9, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikkan-Bāvōli plates</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikkan-Bāvōli</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chikkanādi</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chōlā</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chūjāsamāsā</td>
<td>8-10, 14, 15, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churly</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chu-li-ya (?)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumwāl, d.</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuṭītā Nāgpur, d.</td>
<td>20, 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demaena Alexandrinus</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Conti Pomigliani'</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted burials</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper-plates, Chōja</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper-plates, Early Chalukya</td>
<td>161, 209, 241, 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper-plates, Eastern Chalukya</td>
<td>15, 185, 186, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper-plates, Kadamba</td>
<td>33, 35, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper-plates, Western Chalukya</td>
<td>163, 217, 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper-plates, Tādāva</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copperplate-grants</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da Cunha’s Chaul and Bassein</td>
<td>183-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Monuments of the English at Goa...&quot;</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sahyadri Khājgā&quot;</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toth-rič</td>
<td>2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dājetāka</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dadda, k.</td>
<td>61-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dādāpantāti</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāghesṭan, &amp;c.</td>
<td>27, 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahithali</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daityas</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakha, Fah Hian’s km.</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakha</td>
<td>244, 253, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāku, dakk, dakte, dakhka</td>
<td>215-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dākwas</td>
<td>180, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakshiṇāpatha</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damān Gangā, r.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damāruka</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damudā, r.</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāuy, l. m.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dānyāl Beg, k.</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmaneser, J.</td>
<td>57, 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darśanāya</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāsaka</td>
<td>149-51, 163-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasārathā</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasmānīs</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dastuṣra</td>
<td>179, 228, 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates, in numerical symbols</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates, in numerical words</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dateśā</td>
<td>9, 122, 238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāvanavajjī, v.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ādāyā</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days of the week, earliest use of</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Gubernatis, M.</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehi, c.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delkontu, v.</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della Tomba, M.</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della Vallic, P.</td>
<td>46-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derabhaṭa, k.</td>
<td>76, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēśa</td>
<td>16, 105, 106, 244, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Īśākhiṭārīn, o.</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēśa-kāṭa, o.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deshrakshiate, v.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deśṭha</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Tassy, Garcin: L’Islamisme</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Tassy, Auguste &amp; Littérature Hindoustanète</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Tassy, G.</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroy, v.</td>
<td>10, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deur</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēśa, Dēvāvarmā (Kadamba)</td>
<td>33-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēśa-bhūja</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēśa-bhūja</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēśa-gaṇa, a.</td>
<td>108, 111, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēśa-grāvyā</td>
<td>33, 35, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīvādā</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūtvamāpayā</td>
<td>207, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēvākṣāmaṭi</td>
<td>149, 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūtvamāpayā</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dāvarūra</td>
<td>170-1, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēva-Panchāla, d.</td>
<td>7, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dēvasmitā</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Dhamaśka, v. .................. 47
Dhamek Stūpa ................. 298
dhan ......................... 14
Dhavana, g. ................ 349
Dhanger custom ............ 46
bhau ......................... 136
Dhāraniikota ................. 21
Dhārā-pārāvaka ............. 304
Dharapāṭha .................. 66
Dharsena, k. 54, 63, 68, 70-1, 73, 76
Dhārāvarsha (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) .. 310
Dharli, v. ........................ 10
Dharmachakra ............... 233
Dhārma-mahārāja, 34, 37, 104, 105
Dharmanātha ................. 47-53
Dharmarāja, g. ............... 127
Dharmāsoka .................. 153-4
Dhātupadha .................. 57
Dhānodhar ................... 47, 49-53
Dhokalvā, v. .................. 8
Dholkher ..................... 122
dhōṭi ............................ 181
Dhrūvahata, Dhrusvahata, k. 79-81
Dhrusvasesa, k. 54, 66, 73, 76
Dhundhathu .................. 8
Dhundho Rākshasa ........... 8
Dhundūnīmall ................. 48
Dibong, r. ................... 46
Digambara Jainas ............ 22-9
Dīpavānīda .................. 149-52, 155-6
Diptavāmanin ............... 57
dīśa ............................. 65
Dīya ............................. 245
Dogana inscrip. ............. 229-9
dol-jōb ....................... 21
Dolkha ....................... 89
doska .......................... 65
Douglas's Life of Jenghiz Khola 140
Dowson's History of India ........ 182
Drasypāsugad ............... 23
Draupadi ................. 127, 137-8
Drāvīḍa, d. ................. 39, 40
Drāvīḍian ................. 130-2
Drāvīḍian Element in Sindhi 293
Drew, Rev. W. H. ....... 221
Drīṇyamapāndi (p.), v. .... 19
Duljā ......................... 66
Duperron, Anq. ............. 276n.
Durainos .................... 288-9
Durgāsaktī (Śendra) ........ 103, 110
dāräd ......................... 88
Durvinita ..................... 171
Dūṣa ............................ 68
Dhāka, o. 71, 73, 76, 81, 249, 291n. 223-3
Dutt, Miss Toru .................. 208
Duṣṭhagāmini .............. 149, 158

Deddkordagi .................. 29
Dvārkā, c. .................. 259
Eastern Legends, &c., by N. Powlett .................. 236
Ebal Khāchar ................ 13, 14
Eclipses, lunar . 19, 186, 211, 215
Eclipses, solar ............. 192, 218
Edevol (p.), e. or v. ....... 303
Elē-singa ................. 221
Ellis's Essay on the Mala-
yālam Language ...... 274-87
Elūttechan ............... 283, 286, 287
Emblems on seals 15, 33, 37, 161, 163, 186, 191, 209, 217, 245, 301, 303
Enjalāṭīnu (p.), v. ........ 19
English at Goa ............. 236
Equinox ..................... 164
Eṛeyya (Chālukyana) .... 103, 110
Eṛeyanga, k. ............... 171-2
Eṛwad or Herbad .......... 179
Eutova, T. ................... 117-8
eyebrows .................. 86
Fahian ...................... 17, 149
Fātimā ................. 93, 94
Fātimā bint Zabāık ....... 48
Ferishtah .................... 24
firearms .................. 136, 231, 239
Fire-treading ............... 126ff.
Firūznā-din, k. ........... 239
Fontenx's Mildevid et Agū-
miira .......................... 60
Fontenx, Ph. Ed. .......... 225
Fraser's Journal in the Himala-
y Mountains ............... 124-5
Fudō Sama .................. 179
Future State ............... 273-4

Gaṅgādikar ................. 267
Gaṅgākundā ................. 173
Gaṅgārāhi, Gaṅgāvādi, d. 172-3
Gaṅgāvādi ................. 267
Gaṅgōdāram ............... 21
Gaṅjām ..................... 21
Gaṅjñāhī ............... 48-81
Ganīṣa ............... 197
Gaurī, g. ................. 245
Gautama ................... 232
Gauḍātī, l.m. .............. 111
Geldner and Geiger ........ 30
Gesta Romanorum .......... 31
Ghōsā .......................... 305, 306
Ghōsāsā ....................... 305
Ghātīsa ....................... 305, 306
Ghṛṭalaya, d. .............. 76
Ghuzia bint Jābar ....... 98
Gīlaka ....................... 66
Girnārgaḍh .................. 9
Girnār ins. ............... 144
Goa ......................... 236
Godevry District, by H. Morris 237
Goderi, v. .................. 20
Gokarpa, c. ................. 259, 275
Gomatesvarā ................ 172
Gomti, r. ................... 11
Gonāḍa, k. ............... 215
Gopūras .................... 7
Gorakh-Maṭhī, v. ........... 47
Gorakshanātha, 47, 49, 68, 90, 298, 299, 300

Gorakhpantīs .............. 299
Gorakhapur ................. 47
Gōrkha ....................... 89
Gōrkhalis ................... 47
Gotarniputra ............... 258
Gōtra, Agastya .............. 218, 230, 304
" Atṛtyā ................. 305, 306
" Bhūraukālā 18, 189, 190, 250, 252, 305, 306
" Daumukhiya ............... 250, 252, 257
" Dhūrāmāyaṇa .............. 250
" Gautama ................. 190, 250, 305
" Gātarna ................... 306
" Hārīta ................. 250, 305, 306
" Jāmadagnya ............. 306
" Kānya ....................... 189
" Kanvāyana ................ 107
" Kāyapa, 162, 190, 192, 250, 305, 306
" Kāyapaṇāna .............. 252
" Kauṇḍilya ................. 189, 190
" Kauṇḍinya ............... 250, 306
" Kauṇśika ............... 190, 305, 306
" Lakshmana ............... 250
" Mādhara .................. 250
INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gotra Mānavya</th>
<th>17, 34, 36, 38, 110, 162, 164, 189, 192, 214, 219, 245, 249, 251, 301</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandugalya</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūkat</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rādhākṛitä</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṃdila</td>
<td>305, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṃdiliya</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaunasakī</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrī-Vatsa</td>
<td>306, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaishāpava</td>
<td>250, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaishākīha</td>
<td>305, 306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaishākīha-Maitrāva-runā-Kaundinya</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatsa</td>
<td>164, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vātasya</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇuviṣṭhīha</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣvāmitra</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōtrīga</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govardhan</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōvinda, Gōvinda-Frābhīta-varaṇa (Rāṣṭa.)</td>
<td>210, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govind Singh</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grahavarmā, k.</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grāma devatas</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grāma-kuta, o.</td>
<td>109, 248n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grāma-mahatvara, o.</td>
<td>248 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham</td>
<td>275-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graul, Dr.</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gudhārāra, d.</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhājēvāri, g.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhāsena, k.</td>
<td>66-8, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujāra</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guṇagāṇika-Vijyādaitya (East. Chal.)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunakāmādevavarmā</td>
<td>90, 91 gauḍāhākām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundī-Koliak, v.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gunpowder</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptas</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōrjaras</td>
<td>82, 108, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurjar Kaloh</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyard's Théorie métrique Arabe</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>93, 97-9</td>
<td>Khādīja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Khādīja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Khādīj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Khātel Ārā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Khājurāha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253-4</td>
<td>Khāndarālī, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Khāndarāwal, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35n.</td>
<td>Khānāḍ-sphuṭita-jūra-ōddhāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180, 228</td>
<td>Khāndhiṇās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73, 76</td>
<td>Khānaraḥa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Khāta biṃt Hakim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Khāwallid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62, 241-251</td>
<td>Khe[dā]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284, 288</td>
<td>Khe[nā]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Khe[tā]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71, 73, 78, 81</td>
<td>Khetoji Jhālā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Khīva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288, 240</td>
<td>Khokand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288, 240</td>
<td>Khonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Khopodēśi (Bhātīgaon), s 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maháśena, g.</td>
<td>17, 34, 36, 38, 162, 245, 249, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahásenapura</td>
<td>172, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahattara, o.</td>
<td>248 &amp; n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahéu</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahéuva</td>
<td>142-3, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahéyajña</td>
<td>65, 249n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahé-yajña</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahéndra, g.</td>
<td>18, 215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahéndrapratápa, k.</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahésvara, g.</td>
<td>18, 189, 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahika (Mapika)</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahíbalí, v.</td>
<td>75-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maimmána bint Háris</td>
<td>97-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makka</td>
<td>93, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makwáná Kána</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaika bint Qa'b</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malakáta, d.</td>
<td>39-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malára, d.</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malavas</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malávah</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayáma lang</td>
<td>275-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malidata</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malá, Mallisaíthi</td>
<td>304, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallá Vája</td>
<td>170-2, 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallóháli plates</td>
<td>33, 101, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánakaviyé</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamásta</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manádáki, r.</td>
<td>60, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánála</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mánáda</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Máná-deva, k.</td>
<td>90, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandava</td>
<td>253-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándavi, v.</td>
<td>48, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mándhava, m.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manes, k.</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánghala, Mágallá, Mágga-lísvira (Early Chal.)</td>
<td>161, 182, 185, 209, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánghi, v.</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánghi (East. Chal.)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangi dynasty</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múndra</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manýa-prakúpiyam</td>
<td>284, 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manjúré</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mánádu</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manku Khán</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manphariyo, v.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manús (Sháh)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mánvya</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maqángas</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márásiñáhá, Mákásínládává (Ga.)</td>
<td>33, 101, 102, 103, 108, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maríam Qabti (Mary the Copt)</td>
<td>93, 95, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshman, J. C.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars, d.</td>
<td>259, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marúdávi, g.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marúpaúva (?), v.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mása, Áśhádáha</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Aśavyaúja</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Cháira</td>
<td>189, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jyaiśhátha</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Kártikíka</td>
<td>36, 162, 185, 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mágga</td>
<td>111, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mágga-ráha</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Phálguna</td>
<td>112, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Pushtya</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Srávana</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Vaiśákha, 215, 218, 255, 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masons' Marks</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masók</td>
<td>26, 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mákáságásádrisá</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathal, v.</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math, Dr. R. C.</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mátri-gúna</td>
<td>33, 35, 37, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mátrígupta</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mát茜yandranátha</td>
<td>47, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Polo</td>
<td>173, 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma-twan-lín</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múrras</td>
<td>142, 144, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múrra-singa</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayaládpur</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mejás</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medapáta, Mewád</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghávals, s.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mégůti tablet 103, 185, 209, 210, 247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mlítkári</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mena</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menikol, k.</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merta, c.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merkára plates</td>
<td>33, 101, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mešha</td>
<td>229-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mhowa tree</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mişčiá Kháchar</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michá Khán, k.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mídás, k.</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill, Col. Jas.</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mir jáyíj</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miśam</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Móbédás</td>
<td>179, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mód</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moggaliputta</td>
<td>153-5, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Móksha máhá púrákhad</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moreas Holíyars</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris's Godavery district</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mottoes on seals 15, 165, 169, 191, 245a, 246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moustache</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mránumi (?), v.</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrigésa, Mrigásavaráma, Mrigásavárvaríma (Kad)</td>
<td>35-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múvia</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muújívémó, v.</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muú-vákasa</td>
<td>32, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muúbídrí</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muúdága, v.</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muúhákkán-Huubájí, v.</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múguú, v.</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múguálíta</td>
<td>256-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múgúpátíta</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrúvám</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrúvá hátra</td>
<td>32, 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrúbídrí</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrúugála, v.</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múhákkán-Huubájí, v.</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múguú, v.</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múguálíta</td>
<td>256-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múguápátíta</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múhílídán</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múhámmád's wives</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múhámmád Aín Bég, k.</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múhámmád Hákim Bég</td>
<td>239-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múhámmád Tóghlák</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múháram</td>
<td>128-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múktíd-mukía</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múkkara-vasati, t.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múkkuras, k.</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múldácha</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múla Devára Chálúkya</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múla-gána, s.</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múlárá, k.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múla-sángha, s.</td>
<td>28, 111, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múla-súnras</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múlgundu, v.</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múlu Nágájáin</td>
<td>9-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múndá custom</td>
<td>45-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munapéttá burying-ground</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munipúr Pátána, t.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munói tablet</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murád Bég, k.</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murád Usbák</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munróo's Dánapatóva</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múshéika-rájya</td>
<td>275, 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muúshára, k.</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mútsávia</td>
<td>149, 158, 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mútrarekhá</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Múzáfírúdáln, k.</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykóne</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nácoléa</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nádir Sháh, k.</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafásabáshá</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágáas</td>
<td>21, 34, 40, 89, 103, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágá daíty</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágá well at Bánáras</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágádása</td>
<td>153, 156-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágá-kovil</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágána, k.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágamánáda</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágamángla plates</td>
<td>33, 101, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágániká</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágápurá, v.</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nágár, c.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Index Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nāg Hrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nagnātās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Nā马拉hana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Nākākura, Bharatāj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Māgha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Maitra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Pārvavashāhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Rikha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164, 218</td>
<td>Rōhinit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Uttarābhadrapada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nālas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Nālanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nāltā-yastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Nāmadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285-7</td>
<td>Namburis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Nānak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Nānādī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Nānāda-deva, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Nānadigirī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Nāndigachha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nāndigāma, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Nāndigīga, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Nānālipur, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nāsā śātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Nānāvāṣṭika, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251,3</td>
<td>Nānāvyāśapak (f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Nānāva deva, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Nānāsīa, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Nārakāghāra (f), v. or d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Nārānumāna, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74, 76</td>
<td>Nārāyana Yādava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Nārāyana Yādava, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Nar Bāta Beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>Narveda-ṃigāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Nārād, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Nārindaka, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Nārindā, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, 245, 291</td>
<td>nāralakṣit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189, 228</td>
<td>Nāṣaśākār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Nāṣīr-lla, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nāṭakas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Nāṭaputta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47, 49</td>
<td>Nāṭhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Nāvākāma, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 14</td>
<td>Nāvānakar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Nādeer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Nāyārichās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Nē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, 224-7</td>
<td>Negṣapatam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Nēlur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Nepāl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>Rāma Khāchar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Rāmanujāchārya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Rāmapunyavallabha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Rāma-sētān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Rāmāyana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Rām Dās Sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Rāmēvāra, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Rāmēsvaram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Rāmput Bharupur, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Raṇaparakramāṇka (Chāl.) 103, 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Raṇārudga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Raṇātāga (Early Chāl.) 103, 209, 214, 243-4, 247-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Raṇāvākrama (Early Chāl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Raṇāvākrama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Raṇāvākrama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Raṇābhūga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Raṅga-Krishna, k.</td>
</tr>
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<td>197</td>
<td>Raṅgāmattī</td>
</tr>
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<td>248</td>
<td>Raṅkāra-grāma-mahattara, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 18</td>
<td>Raṅkāra-kolī, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218, 239</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇkṛakṣas 170, 210, 218</td>
</tr>
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<td>248a</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇkṛatā, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16, 18</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇī, Dhanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇīshabbha 218, 219, 239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇ ṇhor grana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇa Malla, k.</td>
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<td>21</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇapur</td>
</tr>
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<td>81</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇeal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇalā Pīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Raṅ ṇaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇināyuka, v.</td>
</tr>
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<td>49</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇudhan, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>63</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇāva</td>
</tr>
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<td>Raṅ ṇvedaṇa JA</td>
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<td>Raṅ ṇydrī, v.</td>
</tr>
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<td>120</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161, 163, 299, 217, 241, 301, 303</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇ mūla plates, raised, or not 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Raṅ ṇ Śalā (Raṅ ṇ Śalā, ṇ), k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Raudrāsinha</td>
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<td>Bagaiyā</td>
</tr>
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<td>Rukhamāvati, r.</td>
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<td>260, 215</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
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<td>48, 50</td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siripattu, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siunaghas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siva, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivabhagapuram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivabhuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivadatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivapalita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siva-perurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivarasa, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivaramamudram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivaramakrishna, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivandhara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sivandhara, 112, 248, 252, 302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smriti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snake notions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solapur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somadeva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Someyaji Vasa Shamanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Somanatha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sonarekhra, r.</td>
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<td>Sora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spier's Eranische Alterthumskunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Bitharase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srikantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri-mad-Anahila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sriyagam-talika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sripura, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srinangan, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srinagpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Sthana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri-Thirukovadhusa, mot. 15, 245n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri-Vallabha, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srivardhana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Vishnuvardhna, mot. 185, 188, 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steel (Indian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephens, Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shkala-giri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaktivarsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shhunko, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stobart's Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoddart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone-tablets, Bhujagendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chalukya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghigla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pallava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Chalukya, 104, 111, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strangford's Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stupa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subbanya, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subramanya, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudarsana lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudatta, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suddhodana, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suhasti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sukra Acharya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sukra-Niti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulasadda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sulasamaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sun Worshippers of Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunahsepa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sundara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suparasr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surasr, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Srarahra, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surat, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surendra Vikrama Sah, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suryaparaka, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suryadasa, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suryaprasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suvanimalai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suvisakha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suvibhra, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suvabramati, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suvide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suvam (Chalikya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suvam-Mahasena, g. 17, 34, 33, 38, 162, 245, 246, 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>svasti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>svastika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svastidri, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swayambhut, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swayambhuta, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swayamvaras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svetambara, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Svetapata, s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syamantapanachakam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syenagachch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ta-an-ta-lo (Mahâ-Angdra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tadvahas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thahir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talakâda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talapata (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talapta-Toya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talavanapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talai-ripati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamachi Jâm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tambram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamralipta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjor, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanjor armoured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tantrikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapasi, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tarântâla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tođra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tatasamas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ta-thsen (Dakhan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tayab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thabit bin Qais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thang (China)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thang, m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tha-thsen, Ta-thsen (Dekhan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theodore, Bp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Therapantli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiele's History of Religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tikar, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tjliola, Similla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timur Shah, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tintalghad, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tirhatha-vasati, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tirtha-vasati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiruvalluvar's Kural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thithi, Amavasya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dañmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dvadasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dvitaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paurnamast 37, 107, 112, 186, 212, 214, 219, 252, 302, 305, 307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toduva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To-na-kio-tse-kiia Dhanaka-cheska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tooth Relic, Daunua on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torgefährliche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toramuna, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trairaja-Pathava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tragan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travarkor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trâbhuwan-dikshita, mot. 15, 245n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trichipalli, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trilochana (Kad.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trilochana-Pallava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trirumudi-Kovil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinêtra (Kad.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trinêtra-Pallava</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Vijayā ............................................. 158, 158-9
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Vijaya-kara-sāvēcātara ..................... 37
Vijayamahādīvī (West Chal.) ....... 163
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Vikramādiyā (East Chal) .................. 18
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245  
Vishnupardhana (East. Chal.) 17,  
185, 186, 191, 192, 245  
Vishnī, visesha ......................... 106, 248 & n.  
Vishnīva ...................................... 164  
Vishpanthi, s. .............................. 28  
Vishvabhū Buddha ............................ 89  
Vishvanātha, k. ........................... 22-3  
Vitabhayya, o. .............................. 259  
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Vīnātha or vīṇātha ................. 142-3, 145-6  
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Vyāhova-nāfśa ............................... 98  
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Wanjarā (Brinjārā) ......................... 8  
Wathau .......................................... 290  
Wheeler's Early Records of  
British India ................................ 271  
Whitney's Language and Study  
of Language ................................. 270  
Williams's (M.) Mod. India and  
the Indians ................................... 286  
'woots' ....................................... 196  
Wright's History of Nepal ................ 88  
Yadvās ......................................... 303  
Yadu-vanīśa ................................ 306  
Yājñavalkya ................................. 18  
Yajnopavīta .................................. 52  
Yāk .............................................. 238, 240  
Yaksha Gupṭā, k. ........................... 89  
Yaksha Mallī, k. ........................... 91  
Yāman .......................................... 41  
Yāmukha ....................................... 41  
Yamunā, r. ................................... 215, 245  
Yaustra-nukta ............................... 136  
Yapāniya, s. ................................. 34  
Yapoudak, v. ............................... 228  
Yaudheya ...................................... 258, 262  
Vṛchābā, v. ................................... 56  
Vṛcchāka ....................................... 180  
Yāwār tablet ................................. 106, 186, 247  
Yindes (Kāthmanḍā) ....................... 88  
Yodhāvaka, v. ............................... 54  
Yōga, Vaibhāṣīti ............................ 307  
Yogī-kṣemam ................................. 137  
Yogīna ......................................... 268  
Yogīna ......................................... 4  
Yāsamāti ........................................ 258  
Yuddhamalla (East. Chal.) ............ 18  
Yūdhiśṭhīra ................................. 137, 302  
Yusaṭīja ........................................ 17, 18, 33, 34, 185  
Za-Basi-Bazen, k. ........................... 235  
Za-Basi-Tawesa, k. ........................ 235  
Za-Elaśuqa, k. .............................. 235  
Za-Gafl, k. ................................. 235  
Za-Hakal, k. .................................. 235  
Zaid biṣa Ḥārīth ............................. 96, 97  
Zainab ......................................... 93, 95-99  
Zalonkemeny, E. K. ....................... 30  
Zamān Khān, k. ............................. 238  
Zend ........................................... 87  
Zulfikir ........................................ 194  
Zωrɑkλeς ..................................... 235
ERRATA IN VOL. VII.

p. 15a, ll. 14 and 40, and p. 15b, l. 12, for Chālukya read Chalukya.
p. 15b, l. 25, for 'Vyāditya' read 'Vijāditya.'
p. 16, transcr. l. 30, for chintamanir read chintamanir.
p. 16, transcr. l. 36, for uru read uru-
" " l. 40, for savvān-ār read savvānār.
p. 17, transcr. l. 54, for Alapūru read Ālapūru.
p. 17b, note 12, for this volume read Vol. VI.
p. 18b, l. 35, for Rāshtrakūṭa read head-men of countries.

p. 23a, l. 14, after require insert . . .
" l. 30, for Sonpat read Sonpāt.
" l. 33, for Kāragi read Kārangi.
" l. 53, for Mulasamghu read Mula-

sāmghu.
p. 24b, l. 2, dele comma after Bhatārkas.
" l. 3, dele comma after pāṇdits.
" l. 23, for Jattia read Jattas.
" l. 32, for Vīsamhi and Therāpanthis read Vīsamhi and Therāpanthis.
p. 24b, l. 44, for Chandrārajānūpi read Chandrārajānūpi.
p. 24b, l. 45, for prajñānāpi read prajñānāpi.
" l. 49, for nāśrama read nāśrā.
p. 29a, ll. 36, 37, for Grammar read Grammar.
" l. 52, for there [at Ajmīr] read at Ajmīr.
p. 29b, l. 2, for Governor General read for the Governor General.
p. 33b, ll. 24 and 26, for Nāgamaṇḍalā read Nā-

gamaṇḍalā.
p. 34, transcr. l. 9, dele || after saṁyuktō.
" note 5, dele ṇ after Jihvanītya, and in the last line for ṇ read ṇ.
p. 34b, l. 38, for Siddhakędāra read Siddhakędāra.

p. 36, transcr. l. 14, for saṁyukto read saṁyuktō.
" l. 16, for para-(da)ttam(ttām) read para-dattam(ttām).
p. 36, l. 19, for nupālana[m] read nupālana[m].
p. 37, transcr. l. 14, for ṡō-bhū read ṡō-bhū.
" l. 21, for dvitiyō read dvitiyō.
p. 38, transcr. l. 26, for saṁyuktō read saṁ-

yuktō.

p. 91b, l. 17, for Gaksha read Yaksha.
p. 93a, l. 38, for ombhataṇey avareham read ombhataṇey avareham.
p. 105, transcr. l. 33, for paschimānāṃ preach paschimānāṃ.

p. 106, transcr. l. 59, for Puruṣaṇa read Purvaṇa.
p. 109a, l. 35, and 109b, l. 6, for the (field called) Dēṣagramaṇaṇa read the field of the head-men of the country and the villages.
p. 110a, l. 5, for and the country and the villages read and the head-men of the country and the villages.

p. 110b, l. 14, for Jyēṣṭhalinga read Jyēṣṭhalinga.

p. 112a, l. 36, for years" having expired read years having expired."

p. 135, l. 23, for fired read filled.
" l. 34, for bullets read balls.
" l. 41, for bullet read bullet.
" l. 42, after from a bow add with unnerring aim.

p. 156b, l. 8, for Agatāśatru read Ajatāśatru.
p. 161a, l. 9, for Nērūr read Nerūr.
p. 162, transcr. l. 19, for hi(hi)may read hi(hi)may.
p. 162, note 5, for Prithu read Prithu.
p. 163a, l. 2, and 163b, ll. 6 and 16, for Nērūr read Nerūr.
p. 164, transcr. l. 12, for lakshmiṃ read lakṣ-

āmi, and cancel the word prāḥ(p)pya.
p. 183a, note 2, after Malabar add asserts that it is so.
p. 183b, l. 34, for Ṛṣṭhit read Ṛṣṭhit.
p. 188, transcr. l. 38, for mūrtyadhanāṃ read mūrtyadhanāṃ.
p. 189, transcr. l. 66, dele || after śūkla-pakṣaṃ.
" l. 68, for Vinayākasya read Vinayākasya.
p. 190b, l. 39, for Chābundaṭhībōya read Chābundaṭhībōya.
p. 191, transcr. l. 9, for va(ma)hārāja-y read va(ma)hārāja-y.
p. 192, transcr. l. 13, for adhiṃvāstāṃ read adhiṃvāstāṃ.
p. 192b, l. 16, after all accomplishments insert like the moon which is possessed of (all) its digits.
p. 210a, l. 22, for the date assigned to Pūlickēti I. read the genuineness of this grant.
p. 211, transcr. l. 17, for नम्भ= read नम्भ=.
p. 212, transcr. l. 33, for एक्षरिन्ध= read एक्षरिसन्ध=.
p. 213, transcr. l. 38, for गताऄ read गताऄ.
  " " l. 51, for पुराण= read पुराण=.
  " " l. 69, for चहमपिज्जाण रेड see below read ṣchahāpījhaṇa, and for तस्माद read तस्माद.
p. 214, transcr. l. 66, for रिम= read रिम=.
  " " l. 71, for दिन= read दिन=.
  " " l. 72-3 for रिम= read रिम=.
p. 214, transcr. l. 92, for गिरिसन्ध= read गिरिसन्ध=.
p. 215a, l. 42, for फान read फान.
p. 216, l. 27-8, for बकुलपाण= read बकुलपाण.
p. 217a, l. 16, for रिढ्योलव रेड see below read रिढ्योलव.
p. 218a, l. 18, for बासरीसंह= read बासरीसंह=.
p. 219, transcr. l. 17, or विस्तार= read विस्तार.
  p. 220, transcr. l. 18, for [कान्चि*] read कान्चि*
  p. 220, transcr. l. 26, for (r̥maṇa= read (r̥maṇa=.
  p. 229a, ll. 33, 34, for The E is the Latin AE: read The E (or rather the F) is the Latin AE
  p. 244, text, l. 2, for इम्हसान= read इम्हसान=
  p. 248, transcr. l. 1, and p. 249, note 20, for विजयपुर-वासकित read विजयपुर-वासकित.
  p. 248, transcr. l. 10, for चाँड़ा read चाँड़ा.
  " " l. 13, for: between स्वामित and अर्धा.
  p. 249, transcr. l. 31, for उर्वर= read उर्वर.
  p. 261a, transcr. l. 4, for एंघन= read एंघन.
  p. 261b, note 14, for see below read see above,
  p. 257, &c.
  p. 268a, l. 7, after (for 1864-5) add p. 416.
  " " l. 8 and 27, for Khajurāho read Khajurāho.
  p. 268a, l. 11, for चंदेल= read चंदेल.
  " " l. 37, after states add that.

Errata in Vol. VI.
  p. 315a, l. 19, for second read sacred.
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