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THE ORACLE OF HUBAL.

BY THE REV. J. D. BATE, M.R.A.S.

It is still a moot point whether the vow of 'Abdul-Muttalib, grandfather of Mahammad, to devote one of his ten sons, meant that the son should be devoted to Allah or to Hubal, and whether the devotement meant that he should be slain in sacrifice or merely that he should be dedicated to the office of priest. As no monograph, that we know of, has ever been published giving a detailed account of this curious idol of the pre-Islâmic Arabians, we have thought that some notes, gleaned from a variety of sources, might serve as a contribution to the subject.

But there is the usual discordancy between authorities. Some points, however, seem clearly agreed upon in reference to the matter. In the first place, all writers agree that the idol was an importation; and the fact is used to explain how image-worship came to supersede, in the Hijaz that 'Religion of Abraham,' which, according to the Islamic creed, was the ancestral religion of that territory. The man who is credited with having thus first introduced idolatry there is 'Amr b. Luha', called by Sale 'Amru,' and by Burckhardt 'Ammar.' He is said by Burckhardt to have been of the tribe of Qassai, and by Osborn to have belonged to the Banu Khuzâ'a. Shahrazâd and most Arabian authors assert that prior to the ascendency of the Khuzâ'aites in the Hijaz the One only God was worshipped at the Ka'ba, and that Hubal was imported by their chief 'Amr b. Luha'. The point, however, is not one on which they all agree. Thus, Wâqidi states that Hubal was the chief representative idol of the Kinânâ tribes; and that it was anciently called the idol of Khuzaima, the supposed father of the Kinânâ and some tribes related to them. These more ancient worshippers of Hubal were nomadic tribes, and lived to the west of the Sacred Territory, and on the high road that leads to the north. Al Fâsi also dissents from the common view, and calls Hubal emphatically an idol of the Quraishites. He says that the idols imported by 'Amr b. Luha' were three—viz., Al Khala, (which was worshipped to the south of Makka), Nahîk (also called Mahâdîzir), and Muta'm. The general opinion, however, credits 'Amr b. Luha with having introduced the idol among the worshippers at the Ka'ba. The unsoundness of this opinion we have shown elsewhere, where we prove that the idolatrous institutions of Makka were ancient in his time.

This man 'Amr, or 'Amru, flourished at the commencement of the third century of the Christian era, and was king in the Hijaz, on which account the term 'Mâlik' is also applied.

4 Bate, *Origin and History of the Ka'ba* (a work that will appear shortly).
to him, and frequent allusion is made to him in the Arabian historians. There is difference of statement as to the place whence the idol was brought. Azrâk says that Amrû imported it from Hyt in Mesopotamia. Abu'l-Fida, however, tells us that it was brought from Balqâ, in the province of Damascus, in Syria. According to the Morâcid-al-ittilâ, Balqâ is situated between Damascus and Wâdil-Kora; and is the locality of the ancient Moabites, to the east of Judæa, near the Dead Sea. De Percival remarks that the name 'Balqâ' recalls that of Balak, the son of Zippor, king of the Moabites. At the time of Amrû's visit, the district was occupied by Amalekites—viz., by the Ba:n Sâmaidâ, or Ba:n Amâla-al-Amâlik. This man made a journey into Syria, and on his return he passed by Mâ'a by, the town of Moab or Areopolis, in the district of Balqâ, where he saw the people worshipping images. He asked the meaning and object of the homage thus rendered, and was informed:—'These are our gods, formed in imitation of the celestial bodies; and of human figures. When we ask of them victory, they give it us; when, in times of drought, we ask for rain, they send it; wealth, they bestow it; in danger they accord us their succour. In short, all the prayers we address to them are heard and granted.' "How well," exclaims the learned Pocock, "does the name of the idol, which may be derived from the Hebrew šâvu'al, 'breath,' 'wind,' 'puffing,' 'vanity,' suit such a figure as this?" 'Amrû, however, was much rejoiced at this intelligence, and asked that one of the idols might be given to him. They gave him Hû b L; and he carried it away to Makka, and placed it in the Ka'ba. Such is the rendering given by Pocock to the expression ʿala' zahrul-ka'ba, used by Shahrashtâni, which Pocock translates, 'Ad posteriorii (esse etexteiur) Caabe partem.' He explains that some writers relate that some of the images were within the Ka'ba, and others round about it. But De Percival renders the phrase, 'sur la Caba,'—an expression that can have but one meaning—the one given it by Sayyid Ahmad Khan who records that this idol was 'placed on the summit of the Ka'ba.' It seems a curious circumstance that the idol should have been placed in such a position; yet we learn on good authority that prior to its attaining the honour of supremacy among the idols of the Ka'ba, it passed through a term of probation—standing for a considerable period outside the Ka'ba, patiently awaiting admission. The information of Dr. Crichton regarding this point seems rather 'mixed.' Speaking of the fate of Hubal on the occasion of Muhammad's conquest of the city, he says, —'Mounted on the shoulders of the Prophet, Ali pulled down the great idol of the Khozaizes from the top of the Ka'ba.' If it was on the outside of the Ka'ba at that time, it must have been degraded after its promotion. Yet the statement of Muir is tantamount to the same thing: he speaks of Hubal as having been on that occasion 'in front of the Ka'ba, as the tutelary deity of Mecca.' As the matter was 'referred to the arrows of Hubal within the Ka'ba,' and those arrows were 'thrown in front of the image,—there seems to be some oversight here. Sprenger, who gets the information from Waqidi, says, that after the time of Qussai at least, this idol stood behind the Ka'ba over a well.' The only well there in our day is Zama'm. Dr. Sprenger calls attention to a fact that is adverse to Abu'l-Fida's theory as to the Syrian origin of the idol. He notes that the inhabitants of Syria and Arabia Petraea had, long before the time of Amrû, embraced the Christian religion.

It is not improbable that this particular idol was chosen by Amrû for the Ka'ba, for it was supposed to have the power of giving rain,—the great desideratum of Arabia. The king

---

8 Pocock, Specimen Historiarum Arabum, p. 92 (edn. Oxford, 1806); Osborn, Islam under the Arabs, p. 75; Syed Ahmed Khan, Historical Geography of Arabia, p. 54.


11 De Percival, Histoire des Arabes, tome I, p. 224.

12 Numm. xxii. 10; Josh. xxiv. 9.

13 De Percival, Histoire des Arabes, tome I, pp. 223, 224; Ibn Khaldun, fol. 12, 130; Osborn, Islam under the Arabs, p. 75.

14 Pocock, Specimen, p. 97; De Percival, Histoire des Arabes, tome I, p. 224; Osborn, Islam under the Arabs, p. 75.

15 Pocock, Specimen, p. 97.

16 Pocock, Specimen, p. 75; Osborn, Islam under the Arabs, p. 75; Sprenger, Life of Mohammed, p. 7.

17 Bate, The Well ZANZAM (a work that will appear shortly).

18 Sprenger, Life of Muhammad, p. 77.


20 Irving, Life of Mahomet, pp. 30, 151 (edn. Lond. 1876).

21 Sprenger, Life of Muhammad, pp. 56-7.
who had thus imported the idol proceeded to engage in worshipping it and offering sacrifices to it—exercises in which he was followed by his compatriots. H u b a l became eventually the chief among the idols of the K a’ba,—the presiding god in the temple, and the principal deity of the Quraishtes, who were the guardians of the temple,—the man to whom it was eventually indebted for its promotion being the same man that had introduced it from Syria. This pre-eminence of H u b a l was evinced by the fact that in front of it the casting of lots with arrows took place. Its exaltation to this supremacy among the idols of the K a’ba took place probably at the time when that sanctuary of the Banî Quraish came to be the pantheon for the whole of Arabia. If so, we have here a noteworthy exemplification of the truth of the proverb, ‘Facilitas descensus Averni,’ for the degeneration of the endless congersies of tribes in that immense country from the Religion of Abraham’ to fetishism in some of its coarsest forms must have taken place within a mere fraction of the lifetime of one man,—‘Amr bin Lu’lu’ to whom it owed its elevation to the supreme status among the idols, being said to have been the first to introduce idolatry among his fellow-countrymen. The historian Masa’di gives specimens of the manner in which the Jushamite poets admonished him to uphold the religion of Abraham. He records that their admonitions were all in vain,—he imported idols without number into the Sacred Territory. De Percival, however, shows that idol worship in the Hijaz existed long before this time; and he is of opinion that the crime of which the Musalmán authorities accuse Amr is that he first introduced into the K a’ba images already held in veneration by the Arabs. Such a fact would help to remove the difficulty of making out how, if Hubal was the first idol introduced into the K a’ba, it can be understood to have been elevated to supremacy among the idols there. There is no doubt that in subsequent times it was chief. It is important, however, to qualify this by saying that it was chief among what might be termed the moveable or adventitious idols of the K a’ba,—for an exception must always be made in favour of the Black Stone, which has from time immemorial been the fixed and permanent idol of the K a’ba. Wâqidi, speaking of the dignity of Hubal, says that it ‘received almost as much homage as the Black Stone.’ This could never be second to Hubal or any other idol,—being a bond-fide bit of the celestial paradise, which is destined to escape the final conflagration by returning bodily, on the Day of Resurrection, to the place whence it came.

H u b a l, whose name is sometimes spelt ‘Hebal’ and generally ‘Hobal,’ was a huge image made of red agate (Arab. ‘aqiq) in the shape of an old man with a long heavy beard. One of his hands having by some accident been broken off, was replaced by the Quraish by a hand of gold. In connection with this idol there are seven arrows of the kind that were used by the Arabs for the purpose of divination. There is no agreement among writers as to whether, ordinarily, it was the custom to place the whole seven arrows in one hand, or in both, or whether they were not rather placed in front of him, and therefore between his hands, but not in either of them. De Percival says that they were consecrated to the idol and kept near it (‘près d’elle’). The arrows that were kept for this kind of ceremony were, like those with which the Arabs were wont to cast lots,—that is, they were without heads, points, or wings; and they were distinguished from other arrows by the technical designations Axlâm (pl. of salâm or zulam) and Qidāh (pl. of qidā) ‘arrows of divination.’ These curious arrows were kept in the temple

---

Footnotes:

84 Arnold, Islam and Christianity, p. 36.
85 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
88 Spranger, Life of Mohammad, p. 57.
89 De Percival, Histoire des Arabes, tome 1, p. 234.
91 Bato, The Black Stone (a work that will appear shortly).
92 Spranger, Life of Mohammad, p. 1.
93 Burton, Pilgrimages to El-Medineh and Meccah, vol.
96 Poock, Specimen, p. 98.
97 De Percival, Histoire des Arabes, tome 1, p. 265; and II, 210.
99 Syed Ahmed Khan, Customs of the pre-Islamic Arabians, p. 12; The Christian Remembrancer (Jan. 1885) p. 118.
of the idol in whose presence they were consulted.\(^{40}\) Seven such arrows as we have described were accordingly kept in the Ka'ba.\(^{41}\) There was inside the Ka'ba a hollow or cavity in which were preserved the offerings and other treasures belonging to the temple: the image of Hubal was situated over this hollow.\(^{42}\)

Sale says that though seven arrows were kept for divination before this idol, yet in actual divination three only were made use of.\(^{43}\) On one of these were written the words—'My Lord hath commanded me;' on another—'My Lord hath forbidden me;' and the third was blank. If the arrow containing the first of these inscriptions was drawn, it was deemed an indication of the Divine approval of the enterprise concerning which the oracle had been resorted to: the arrow containing the second inscription indicated the reverse of this; but if the blank one happened to be drawn, the arrows were mixed and thrown over again till a decisive answer was obtained by one of the others appearing twice out of the three throws.\(^{44}\) Though it is usually a most unsafe thing to differ with Sale, yet it is not easy to escape the suspicion that there is some slip in the account he thus gives. If three arrows only were used, how came there to be so many as seven?

It is not sufficient to reply that seven was the perfect number, for we shall presently see that each of these seven arrows bore an inscription indicating that it was designed for actual use in divination. Besides, in the case of 'Abd u'll-Muttalib, now under consideration, it is expressly said that six arrows were used,—in pairs, it is true; but still six, and not three.\(^{45}\) Now, besides Hubal, there was another idol at Tebâla which was much venerated among the Arabs and was used for exactly the same purposes as Hubal, and consulted by means of the wingless and unpainted arrows.\(^{46}\) It was called 'Zul'l-Khalasa.' This is the form given it by De Percival. It is also spelt by Arabian writers Zâ'l-Khalasa, Zâ'll-Khalasa, Zâl-Khalasa,—this last being the form most commonly used. The form applied by De Percival to the idol is not very commonly so applied—it being not usual to prefix the relative pronoun to any but generic names. The most usual designation for the idol is 'Al Khallasa,' and for the temple 'Zul'l-Khallasa,'—the name being by some attributed to the fact that the tree called 'Khalas' (a kind of clinging tree, like the vine) grew in the locality. The temple was also called 'Ka'batu'l-Yamâma' or 'Al Ka'batu'l-Yamaniyya,' from its geographical position; and 'Al Ka'batu'sh-Shâmiyya,' because its door faced the north (Syria = Shâm). The temple belonged to several different tribes, among which were the Bani Khatha'm, the Bani Daus, and the Bani Bijila. This idol, Al Khallasa, was eventually demolished by command of Muhammad after his conquest of Makka.\(^{47}\) In consulting it three arrows only were used, on each of which was written one of the words 'Command,' 'Prohibition,' 'Delay.' The correspondence both in number and in sense, of these two sets of oracles, suggests the possibility that Sale may have overlooked the distinction between the two idols.

Among the pagans of pre-Islamic Arabia, there were ordinarily seven arrows used in consulting the oracle of Hubal.\(^{48}\) On these arrows were written certain fixed responses, from which some sort of oracle could be gathered in any matter whatever that might be referred to the idol. On each of the arrows of Hubal was inscribed one of the following seven terms,—'The price of blood;' 'Yes;' 'No;' 'It is yours;' 'Assistant;' 'Stranger;' 'Water.' The arrows were thrown into a bag, and drawn by an official of the Ka'ba specially charged with that duty, for which he received one hundred dirhams and a camel. The technical designation of this official was Sâhib al-Astâm or Sâhib al-Qiddâ 'Master of the Arrows' (= Master of Divination, or 'The Diviner par excellence'). Generally speaking, the oracle was consulted before anything of moment was undertaken—domestic, commercial, political. As examples we may mention the circumcision of a lad, the fixing of a child's paternity, going

\(^{40}\) Sale, Prel. Disc. p. 90.

\(^{41}\) Ibid.


\(^{46}\) De Percival, Histoire des Arabes, tome II. p. 310; D'Herbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale, Art. Acâh; Reinhardt, Monumenta Musulmanica, tome II. p 14.


\(^{50}\) De Percival, Histoire des Arabes, tome I. p. 262.
to war, concluding a treaty, starting on a journey, entering a state of matrimony, ascertaining the guilty party in a murder, tracing a person's genealogy, and such-like. Before the operation of drawing the arrows began, the applicants had to offer to Hubal the following petition:—O divinity, the desire to know such or such a thing has brought us to thee. Make us to know the truth. Having consulted the oracle, persons were expected to take action upon the information or advice thus received.

The question as to whom this idol Hubal was supposed to represent, elicits information of some interest. The learned Dr. Pocock, whose Specimen Historiae Arabum has not yet been surpassed as the ultimate authority in critical questions relating to Arabia and Islam, derives the name of it from the Hebrew הושע hōbba'āl or הושע hōbbel,—and, by ignoring the vowel-points, suggests the appropriateness of הושע hōkol, 'vanity.' Among the Arabs, Hubal appears to have had a double character, in which respect he resembled the Syrian idol Ba'al (properly, Ba'āl), who was regarded both as the founder of the Babylonian empire, and as the Sun personified as a deity. The opinion that Hubal was the same as the Babylonian or Syrian idol Ba'āl or Bēl, or synonymous with it, is in fact supported by the testimony of the Arabian authorities, who relate that it was originally brought from Syria or Mesopotamia. Of course, the Arabic writers do not maintain that Hubal was identical with Ba'āl: they admit, however, that it was an astronomical deity, which Ba'āl also is believed to have been,—whose designation, by the way, like that of 'the sun' among ourselves, always appears with the article—Hubal. Further, Herodotus (and after him, Rawlinson), held the opinion that Hubal was 'the Jupiter of thearians.'—presumably because he was believed to have the power of sending rain.

Once more, Pocock mentions that this idol is supposed by some to have been the one known in Arabian literature as 'the Image of Abraham,' which was among the idols demolished by Muhammad when he 'cleansed the Ka'bah' of idolatry in the eighth year of the Hajira. This was the opinion of Abu'l-Fida, who expressly states that the image of Abraham occupied the chief place in the Ka'bah, and that he was represented by Hubal. Hisham says that among the images and pictures that covered the walls of the Ka'bah was a figure of Abraham in the act of divining by arrows. If this was not Hubal, there were more deities than one who divined by arrows; and if it was, how happens it that this image was inside the Ka'bah, and the image of Hubal outside? It has to be borne in mind, however, that much of this, though it is all of it from the best sources, is in great measure conjectural.—Hubal remains a mystery as to the actual identity of the idol, its history and origin, and the etymology of its name, no satisfactory knowledge exists.

We may add that this practice of divining by arrows was followed not only by the Arabs, but also by the ancient Greeks and other nations of ancient times. It is, moreover, particularly mentioned in Scripture: for example, in Ezek. xxi. 21—23 we read,—

'The king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination. He made bright his arrows, he consulted with images, he looked into the liver. At his right hand was the divination for Jerusalem,—to appoint captains, to open the mouth in the slaughter, to lift up the voice with shouting, to appoint battering-rams against the gates, to cast up a mound, to build a fort. And it shall be unto them as a false divination in their sight,—to them that have sworn oaths:


Arnold, Islam and Christianity, p. 27.

Pocock, Specimen, p. 98. The curious reader may follow up the subject in Lenormant, Chaldean Magic and Sorcery, pp. 133-4 (edn. Lond. 1877) and his Letters Assyriologiques, tome ii, pp. 164-175.


'Made bright his arrows,—that is, as the Vulgate has it, mixed them together or shook them (preparatory to throwing).
but he will call to remembrance the iniquity, that they may be taken.'

The allusion to Babylon recalls the statement that it was from Mesopotamia that the idol H v b l was imported into Makka. 66

The comment of Jerome on this passage is in remarkable agreement with what we are told of the custom as it existed among the ancient Arabs. He writes,—'He shall stand in the highway and consult the oracle after the manner of his nation, that he may cast arrows into a quiver and mix them together, being written upon or marked with the names of such people, that he may see whose arrow will come forth, and which city he ought first to attack.' 67

The superstitious practice of divination was forbidden by the author of the Qur'ān. Thus, in Sūra v (Madā), we read,—

'Ye are forbidden to make division by casting lots with arrows: this is an impiety.'

---

**INDO-SCYTHIAN COINS, WITH HINDI LEGENDS.**

BY EDWARD THOMAS, F.R.S., &c. LONDON.

When editing James Prinsep's *Essay*, in 1888— I was unable to add to his early lists of "Indo-Scythic and Hindū link-coins," or to advance beyond his highly suggestive readings of the "second series of imitations from the Arākro type." 68

Since that period, however, I have never lost sight of the subject, and have lately had time to re-examine my old notes and facsimiles and been favoured with the additional advantage of referring to the recent acquisitions of Sir E. C. Bayley and Mr. A. Grant. In like manner, I have been permitted to study, somewhat at my leisure, the large accumulations in the British Museum, which now include the old India House Collection. From these combined sources I have been able to compile the subjoined list of coins, which will, I trust, materially assist my fellow numismatists in their more ample and extended investigations in situ.

One of the most curious results obtained in this direction, however, is the discovery of no less than four several tribal designations of the Indo-Scythians after their apparent establishment in India, which I must refer to in some detail, before I proceed to describe the coins themselves.

---

I.—THE SAKAS.

The Sakas seem to have formed a part of the Indian body-politic in olden days, that we find them noticed in three several passages in the *Mahābhārata* associated with various other tribes of more or less uncertain origin and geographical location. 69 *Maṇu*, also gives them a place in his restricted survey of more central lands* and the *Viśēṣa Purāṇa* pretends to define their serial succession, in relation to other apparently contemporaneous dynasties—to the effect that "after these [the Andhras] various races will reign; as, 7 Abhīras, 10 Gardhabhilaś, (Gardabhās), 16 Sakas, 8 Yavanās, 14 Tushārās (Tukhās), &c. &c.

Then "Pauras will be kings for 300 years. When they are destroyed, the Kailakī Yavanās will be kings."
This is not the place to follow out, at large, any of the curious coincidences, even this bare outline might suggest. But to revert to our numismatic documents, the number of monosyllabic names in this series is singularly significant, in pointing to a Non-Aryan or Turanian and quasi-Chinese system of nomenclature.

II—KUSHANS.

Mr. H. Rawlinson considers that the capital of the Kushans, in the time of Alexander, was located at Nishāpūr—the then classical Xoiron. If so, this section of the tribe must have already moved downwards from one of their acknowledged centres at Kushan (Kabushān) on the Atrek—near which the first Arsakes established his new citadel, at Asakābad (Arsāk)7.

We need not seek to follow the progress of the leading camps in their southern course, but may accept the main results, so far as their records on Indian soil extend. Their local inscriptions range geographically from Pinjār, in the Yusafzai country, to the celebrated tope of Manikvāla, and to the eastward, as far as Mathurā on the Jumna.8

Their aboriginal race and their language, in its adapted forms of writing, are also of the highest importance in the present enquiry. As to the former, modern testimony, severed from antiquarian tendencies—distinctly points to a simple identification of the Kushans with the Uighurs11 ("Kaotchah rendu par Ousigour"). If we may accept this evidence as retrospective, many of the difficulties still surrounding the decipherment and interpretation of the coin legends will disappear. But, on the other hand, there is still much that is necessarily vague and obscure in this direction.

The Rev. J. Edkins, an acknowledged authority under the Chinese aspect, tells us:

"The Turks of Ilī live in large cities, and have flourishing silk manufactures. They represent the Weigurs of the middle ages, who, in their literature, employed, first a

writing not yet deciphered; then the alphabet taught them by the Nestorians (and communicated afterwards to the Mongols), and last the Arabic."18

From all that we can gather by the juxtaposition of imitative coin legends, it would seem that the first official effort towards the creation of a special alphabet commenced, in this case, with a reproduction of the old Greek capital letters which had become fixed quantities, in so many of the mechanical traditions of the Eastern mints. The next onward movement seems to imply a parallel resort to the small capitals, or current Greek-hand, which was more likely to appeal in facility of expression to the everyday transactions of a people who were only learning to write—the adoption of the Greek alphabet, in the first instance, by these untutored races must necessarily have been encouraged by the fact that the official language of their neighbours, the Parthians, was simply Greek, the use of which so largely intruded upon the language of the Romans in their eastern dominions.

It is in this state of transition that we have to encounter the stray marginal legends of our coins couched in an unknown tongue—which we have still to seek to interpret.19

III—GADHIA BRANCH.

The designation of this section of the Scythic tribes seems to coincide, on the one part, with the opening portion of the name of Gondophares the ronos theponos of the early Christian writers14 and the synonymous Guda theponos of the Semitic version on the Baktrian coins.20 On the other hand, the sept appellation appears to have been preserved in the conventional form of the Gadhia-pysa of later times. So, also, Gadhia itself is affirmed to have been a cognomen of Vikramāditya,21 and in like manner we have traces of the name in the traditional Gond-gurk, on the Indus,22 and may possibly extend identifications from other sources.

---

17 The Sakari seems to have been a recognised dialect in India. See Muir, Sans. Texts, vol. ii., pp. 63-69.
IV—Shanda Branch.

The last of the Scythian tribes we have to notice is the Šaṅqās or Khāṅqās, for the initial is legitimately convertible into ṣ—kh.

It is a matter worthy of notice, in this place, of how largely these intrusive races clung to the group of lingual or cerebral letters, which are understood as specially belonging to the Tartar languages. Bishop Caldwell stated the case, in the first instance, in the following terms: "None of the lingual consonants has ever been discovered in any of the primitive languages which are related to Sanskrit."

Mr. Norris, in deciphering the Scythian tablets of Darius at Behistun, placed upon record his conviction "that the sounds called cerebral are peculiar to the Tartar or Finnish class of languages; that the really Indian languages are all of Tartar origin, or at least that their phonetic and grammatical affinities are Tartar."

Professor Benfey conceded that the mute "cerebrals have probably been introduced from the phonetic system of the Indian aborigines into Sanskrit."

Dr. Bühler, on the other hand, contends at some length against these conclusions, as also does Mr. Beames. These objections are stated in full in Dr. Caldwell's 2nd Edition, but they do not seem to have altogether carried conviction to his mind. Mr. John Muir has collected and criticised with his usual fairness, all that has been advanced for and against these varying theories. His résumé will be found in the volume II. of his Sanskrit Texts published in 1871.

To return to our Tribal question: I find the solution in this instance ready done to my hand in Professor Wilson's translation of a portion of the Mahābhārata (Bhuma Parvan), which he incorporated in his edition of the Vīshnus Purāṇa. The passage is to the following effect, the speaker being supposed to be Sanjaya:

"Next hear from me, descendant of Bharata, the names of the inhabitants of the different countries. They are the Kūru, Pāńchālas, Śālvas, dwellers in the Madra thickets, Sūrasenas, &c. * * * (the list continues in irregular order) Avantis, Aparakuntis, Goghnatas, Mandākas, Shāndas." Professor Wilson remarks the more usual reading is Khāṅqās, one MS. has Pargas.  

COINS—VASU-DEVĀ.

No. 1.—Gold.
1. Cunningham, Numismatic Chronicle, vol. VI., o. a. (1843) Plate I., fig. 2;  
2. Trière de Numismatique (Paris), Plate LXXX., figs. 10-11;  

Obverse. King standing to the front—with a full suit of bossed armour. The right hand casts incense into a small Scythian altar, in the background is seen a decorated trident, the left hand rests on a standard adorned with flowing pennons. Marginal legend, in Greek, a more or less imperfect rendering of the conventional standard inscription of PAO NANO PARÓXON; Hindi legend in the field, to the right Bh, to the right 20. and to the left 20.

Reverse. Seated figure of Parvati with a Roman cornucopia in the left, and a paśu or noose in the right hand. Scythic monogram (No. 160 Ariana Antiqua) to the left: to the right, in imperfect Greek ΑΡΔΟΚΡΟ, And-Ugra (Arda-Nārī).

I—Śaka Branch.

No. 2. Gold B.M. Me Shaka.
Obverse. The usual type of the erect figure of the king.
Below the arm ṇ, me, outside the standard ṣr, Shaka.
Reverse. The usual device, with traces of debased Greek letters. The legitimate Sanskrit ṇ does not find a place in these legends, the mint authorities following local speech, seem to have recognised nothing but the ṇ, ṇh.

Pa-Shaka.

No. 3. Gold. B. M. Unique.
Obverse. Usual device. Below the arm ṇ, pa.
Outside the standard ṇ, Shaka.
Reverse. The usual seated figure with OPAOX.
Bhri Shaka.

No. 4 B.M. Gen. Cunningham's collection.

Obverse. Below the arm ṛ Bhri. Outside the spear ṛ Shaka, with traces of Scythic letters on the margin.

Reverse. As usual.

Mr. Theobald has a second specimen with this name.

Bhu Shaka.

No. 5. Gold. Unique? India Office collection.

Obverse. Below the arm ṛ Bhu. Outside the spear ṛ Shaka.

Margin. Scythic legend. Below, to the right of the figure ṛ bhī or ṛ tī?

Reverse. Seated female, with a cornucopia and Scythic monogram. Margin, legend in Scythic or corrupt Greek?

Sayam Shaka.


Obverse. Below the arm ṛ Sayam. To the left ṛ Bh. Outside the spear ṛ Shaka.

Some specimens have ṛ ch in lieu of bh.

Reverse. The usual figure with Scythic legend.

Senam Shaka.


Obverse. Below the arm ṛ Senam.

Outside the spear ṛ Shaka. To the left ṛ Bh.

Reverse. As usual.

There is always a degree of doubt, in these perpendicular legends, not only as to where the top vowel should come in, amid the down line or group of consonants, but likewise what the circular flourish of the vowel itself should stand for, the more frequent ṛ, or the less common ṛ? the ṛ is definite enough in the coin legends, which is not always the case in some of the Mathura Inscriptions. 22 I have assumed that when the vowel is placed over the first limb of an open consonant it implies ṛ. But this theory is quite open to correction. General Cunningham in 1843 read the name, on this class of coins, as "Sīta Pālaka or Sīta-maka" 22

22 J. R. A. S. vol. V. S. (1871), Professor Dowson's article, p. 123 and Plates 1, 2, 3.

22 Numismatic Chronicle, vol. VI. o. a., p. 22, Plate figure 3.


22 J. A. S. B. 1883, p. 17.

The ṛ, ṛ, however, on the large number of specimens now available, seems to be cut more or less flat on the lower limb, which converts it preferentially into ṛ, ṛ; the previous interpretation, moreover, took no note of the obvious amṛṭa at the foot of the name. The ṛ, ṛ of the Ginnar Bridge Inscription so far assimilates to the ṛ t, that its lower limb is curved, but the curve of the ṛ in the same series is much more pronounced; covering, indeed, nearly three-fourths of a circle. 22 Some objection might be taken to the indifferent use of the two forms of ṛ for one and the same consonant, but in the Mathura Inscriptions this apparent inconveniency seems to have been altogether disregarded. 22

II—KUSHAN BRANCH.

No. 8. Very common.

Prinsep's Essays, Pl. xxii, fig. 13, p. 227 and Pl. xxx. fig. 19, p. 376.

Ariana Antiqua, Pl. xvii, figs. 27-28, p. 427.

Obverse. The name on these very numerous mintage may be variously rendered from the earliest ṛ kadi, to an apparent ṛ kadi—the old Persian ṛ kadi, king, lord?—and onwards to ṛ kida, or ṛ kida. The earlier renderings might be doubtfully associated with the celebrated Panjab king Hōdi. 22

Beyond the spear ṛ kūshā. The ṛ ṛ in these instances takes the form of the Allahabad and Kutia types of ṛ, rather than the severe Asoka form noticed in No. 7.

The letters to the right hand of the standing figure near the small altar vary extensively, and no very definite classification can be arrived at at present.

III—GADAHA BRANCH.

No. 9. Gold, rare, unpublished. Coins in B. M.

Obverse. Below the arm, a name very similar to those found on the coins classed under No. 8. There is, however, this marked distinction that an ṛ, is inserted, in the central line, below
the त k and above the द d, which would make the name appear as जिरे kirda, or करे kardi. Outside the spear are the letters indicating the tribal name, which read न Gaddaha.

Letters to the right of the standing figure on a line with the small altar ग्रह kshap? The ksh is formed by joining the k to the sh in line, and the cross of the k serves for its own definition, as well as the joint discrimination of the sh from an ordinary श, p. In some cases these letters seem to read Kshadan.

Reverse. Seated female figure, as usual. Monogram. No. 169 Ariana Antiqua. Letters to the right न yantra?

IV—Shandhi Branch.


Obverse. Below the arm ि Shandhi.

Outside the spear न Bastā?

To the right of the standing figure ज, न, ल, g, &c.

Reverse. As usual. No. 11. Gold. Rare.

Obverse. Below the arm ि Bhadra.

Outside the spear ि Shandhi.

Reverse. As usual.

V—Lower Gupta Branch. Nāra (Gupta).

The subjoined later Gupta coins may seem somewhat out of place in this Scythic series, but they bear upon the general system of the perpendicular definition of the Hindi alphabet in loco, and No. 13 has to be introduced, as a new piece, by a reproduction of its already published direct prototype.

Ariana Antiqua. Pl. xviii. 22 (3 coins in the British Museum.)


Obverse. King standing, to the front, with Garuda standard to the right, and bow in the left hand, general device similar to those of Samudra Gupta's but greatly deteriorated in artistic execution. Below the left arm न Nāra, between the left legs न gu.

Reverse. The usual type of Pārvati seated on lotus leaves.

Marginal legend. बिल्दित्या Bīlḍītīya.


Observe. Similar devices to No. 12. Below the arm, inside the bow न Vishnuk.

at the bottom द, gu at times न, h.

Reverse. The usual device. Legend न चण्ड्रभारम् Sīr Chandraṇītīya.

Since writing the above I have discovered a new coin of a Scythic chief, entitled Pu, and bearing the tribal designation of Mahi. Pao was seemingly a common name enough among central Asian peoples. It is mentioned by De Guignes as the appellation of the Hun "Chef des hordes d'Orient," called Liou-chi, the father of the great Liou-Yuen-Hai, in the 3rd century A.D.22 So also, we find a Pou-za, son of Chikien-kikin, of the Hooi-ke race, in A.D. 629.23

With regard to the tribal name, or subsectional nomenclature of the horde,24 which is clear and definite on the coin, in old Hindi characters, as Mahi—several possible identifications present themselves among the race lists of the Mahābhārata— ranging from the Mahāvasu and Suhmas to the eastward,25 Māhikas or Māhisas to the south,26 and Māheyas, who were supposed to be settled on the Mahi river in Mālwa26 which last seems to afford the most probable association in the present instance.

It would be a great point to be able to establish this latter connection, in coincidence with the strong Scythic element generally prevailing on the Indus and the Western coast.

Of course, there is no pretext for making the reference to the Māheyas, or other previously cited races named in Indian records, to imply that they were in any way co-existent in their new homes with the "great war" of the Pandus, &c. But, as regards the text of the Mahābhārata

separate tribe has its peculiar name—Book XI, e. viii, sec. 2. (Bohn's edition vol. II, p. 245). See also Philby, Book vi, cap. 19.

23 Ibid. vol. II, p. 166 N. 8. 8; and also Vishnū Purāṇa itself, Book IV, cap. xxv, vol. IV, p. 220.
itself, modern criticism discovers so many vital after-incorporations, that we need scarcely regard a few extra Barbarian nations thrown in at hazard by later revisers, as meaning anything more than that the authorized version was written-up to the knowledge of the day! And it has, in this sense, a meaning which has preserved to modern enquirers a fresh geographical circle, from whence to test the location and possible date of the intrusion of these alien tribes into India.

Mahi Brach. Pu Mahi.

No. 11. a Gold. Unique. British Museum.

Obverse. The usual standing figure of the king with trident and small incense altar on his right: the left hand rests upon a standard with flowing pennons.

Legend below the arm, $Pu$; outside the staff of the standard $Mahi$.

Margin. Scythic legend?

A RÁṢHTRAṆUṬA GRANT FROM MYSORE.

BY LEWIS RICE, M.R.A.S.

The accompanying grant, dated Śaka 735, was found at Kaḍabha in the Tumkur District of Māsīr. It is engraved on five copper plates, about $\frac{3}{4}$ inches by 5, strung on a metal ring which is secured with a seal 2 inches in diameter, bearing the device of a human figure in a sitting posture, with the hands held up on each side of the chest.¹

Old traditions, as in the chronicle of the Kongudeśa,² indicate the rule of Rāṣhtraṅuṭa or Raṭṭa kings in Māsīr in very early times, before the rise of the Gaṅga power; and during their ascendency over the Western Chālukyas in the 9th and 10th centuries, their dominion must have extended to this country. But, so far as I am aware, none of their grants have hitherto been found here.³

The present inscription is in the Pārvada Hāḷe Kannada character and in the Sanskrit language; but in describing the boundaries and witnesses Hāḷe Kannada is introduced. The four forms of I are more frequently and systematically used than in any specimen which has come under my notice.

¹ The figure bears a general resemblance to the one on the Khārpatan plates (J. Æt. Soc., vol. III, p. 209), but the attitude and details are not the same.
² Med. Jour. l. and s., vol. XIV.
³ The inscription given in Plate xxvi. of Burnell's South Indian Paleography, a transcript and translation of which will be found at p. lvii of Mysore Inscriptions, is.


Finally, to recapitulate our recent acquisitions—we have five definite Scythic tribal subdivisions, and no less than eleven names of kings or military chiefs located in India, more or less unknown to history, of whom the following is a preliminary outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śaka's No.</th>
<th>Me.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>3 Pa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>4 Bhri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>5 Bhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>6 Sayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>7 Senam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kushan</td>
<td>8 Kidara (Kady) Hodi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaḍaḥa</td>
<td>9 Kirda, or Kardi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaṇḍhis</td>
<td>10 Bāsānma or Bāstān.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>11 Bhadri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahi</td>
<td>11 a. Pu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grant is one made by Prabhūta-varṣha, living at Mayūra-Khanda, on the application of Chāki Rāja, of the village of Jālamāṅgalam in the Iḍigūr district, to a Muni named Arka Kirtti, on behalf of the Jaina temple of Silāgrāma on the west of Mānya-pura. The reason for this donation was that the Muni had been successful in removing some adverse influence of Saturn (Śanīvarṣaṇḍa) from a prince named Vimaladitya, governor of the Kunuṅgil country, who was a son of Yaśovarmma and grandson of Balarvarma of the Chālukya family, his mother being the sister of Chāki Rāja, the sovereign of Gaṅga-māṇḍala.

The locality of the grant is evidently, from the names, in the Karnāṭaka country, but I have not been able to identify it with any of the places bearing the same name in Māsīr. Possibly, from the source whence the grant has been produced, Kunuṅgil might be the modern Kunigal,⁴ but this is only conjecture. Mayūra-Khanda, it is said,⁵ may be Morkhana, an old hill-fort in the Narīk district.

¹ In the grant, it is called Janaendra-bhavana, but this is no doubt a mistake for Jinaendra-bhavana.
² The same place however was suggested by me for Konikal of the Ambora inscription. Ind. Ant., vol. VIII, pp. 89, 96; vol. IX, p. 304. Ind. Ant., vol. VI, p. 64.
Mānyapura would naturally suggest Mānya-khetā, the Rāṭṭā capital of other grants, identified with the modern Mālkhed in the Nizam's territory: but it does not appear that Mānyakhetā is ever described as Mānyapura, while, on the other hand, Mānyapura is the name of a large city and residence of the Gaṅga kings in the 8th century, situated near Chāmrājanagar in the south of Maism, the site of which is known on the spot as Manipura. The Jainas were in former times settled in great numbers in that neighbourhood, and are still numerous there: whether this is the case around Mānya-khetā or Mālkhed, I am not aware.

The interest of this inscription in connection with the Rāshtrakūṭas is confined to the genealogy of the kings, and the date; for nothing of historical importance is related of them, except apparently an invasion of some island by Dhāravarsa, which is only referred to in general terms. The succession is thus given:

1. Govinda Rāja.
2. Kakka Rāja, his son.
3. Inda Rāja, son of the last.
4. Vairamegha, son of Inda.
5. Kāṁsēvāra, Akālavarsa, his uncle.
6. Prabhūtavarsa, son of the above.
7. Dhāravarsa, Vallabha, his brother.
8. Prabhūtavarsa, II, son of the last, ruling in Saka 735.

On comparing this list with Dr. Bühlcr's pedigree of the Rāṭhors, it will be seen that the first three correspond, Kakka being his Karka, and Inda his Indra. But the fourth king, here called Vairamegha, is there Dantidurgavi or Dantisvarma: while the fifth, whose name is here said to be Kāṁsēvāra, with the title Akālavarsa, is there simply Kṛishṇa.

The sixth, Prabhūtavarsa I., is with him Govinda. The remainder correspond, but the date of the grant is three years beyond the latest year assigned by him to the second Prabhūtavarsa. Not only so, but it is apparently one year later than the date of a grant by his successor. This however may be due to the well known difference of two or three years which prevails between different parts in reckoning the Śaka years.

In regard to the relations at this time subsisting between the Rāṭṭas, the Chālukyas, and the Gaṅgas, it would appear that they were friendly also, that although Chāki Rāja is styled the Adhirāja or supreme king of the entire (ākēṣha) Gaṅga country, yet that he applied to the Rāṭṭa king to make the grant. Either therefore the village given was in purely Rāṭṭa territory, or if it was in the Gaṅga territory the grant of the latter was subordinate to the Rāṭṭa king. Of any Chāki Rāja among the Gaṅga kings no previous record has been found. But at the time of this grant their succession is not clear, while of the Rāṭṭa kings it is stated that Dhāravarsa overcame the impetuous Gaṅga who had never been conquered before, and that Prabhūtavarsa or Govinda released Gaṅga from his long and painful captivity, and sent him to his country. But when Gaṅga nevertheless in his great pride opposed him, he conquered and swiftly fettered him again.

In Saka 735, the date of the present grant, or five years after these statements, the Gaṅga king was evidently free and on the throne; and not long after, the attention of the Rāṭṭas must have been occupied in establishing their lost ascendency over the Chālukyas. The members of the latter family here named perhaps belonged to some subordinate branch.

But as a further reference to the Rāṭṭas, the application of whose titles was unknown to me when translating the Merkara plates, I would now offer the following revised reading of the passage in that inscription describing the gift:


---

5. Ind. Ant., vol. VI, p. 70.
7. That this was a case numeral was pointed out by Dr. Burnell, S. Ind. Pal., p. 57.
8. Sattari is the Prākrit form of saptari. See Glossary to Jacobi's Kalpa-sūtra.
The village named Badageppe, situated in the Edenā Seventh of the Pūnād Ten Thousand, which (the king) named Avinīta had given to Vandanandi Bhattāra, disciple, &c. &c., of the Desika-gaṇa and Koṇākunda-anvaya, the minister of Akālavarsaḥ, favourite of the earth, in the year 388, the month Māgha, Monday, the asterism being Svāti, the 5th of the bright fortnight, having obtained, the gift being also (confirmed) by Avinīta Mahādhīrāja, presented the charming (village) to the Śrī-Vijaya Jina temple of Talavanagnagara; having assigned twelve karṇḍugas in each of the six associated villages, the ambātī, the tala-vrīttī in Talavanapura, twelve karṇḍugas in Pogarigele and twelve karṇḍugas with enjoyment of the royal rights in Pirikere.

The grant was therefore one made by the minister of Akālavarsaḥ, with the sanction of the Gaṅga king Avinīta. Now it scarcely admits of doubt that Akālavarsaḥ must have been a Raṭṭa monarch and from the silence of the minister regarding his own name, and the absence of all particulars as to himself and his sovereign, it may be conjectured that this Mantri was in exile in the Gaṅga territories. And if from the fact that nearly all the Govindas, and only the Govindas, among the Raṭṭas were called Praḥūtavarsaḥ, it may be inferred that the relations between the peculiar titles and certain names of the kings of that line were constant, Aka-

lavarshā would indicate a Krishṇa Raḷaja. But this is the name of the Raṭṭa king whose son Indra was destroyed by the Chālukya king Jayasimha on the first invasion by the Chālukyas. On such grounds this event might be placed early in the 5th century.

With regard to the Pūnādu Ten Thousand, it may be pointed out that it corresponds with the Padi-nāḍ, or Ten Nāḍ country of the 16th century. The name survives in the existing Hadināḍu, now corrupted into Hadināru, a village on the Kabbiṇi river not far from its junction with the Kaveri, and the scene of the romantic adventure to which the royal family of Māisur trace their origin.

Pūnādu, Punnādu or Punnāṭa, as it is variously written, seems also to be indicated by the Pannuta in Lassen’s map of Ancient India according to Ptolemy; and by the Pannata of Colonel Yule’s map of Ancient India, “ubi coryllas.”

Since writing the above, I have through the kindness of Mr. R. Sewell seen a grant of the Punnatha Raḷajas which must belong to early in the 6th century. In it their succession is thus given:

1. Kāyappa Rāṣṭravarmanma.
2. Nāgadatta, his son.
3. Singa Varmanma, son of the last.
4. His son (not named).
5. Skandavarmanma, son of the last.
6. Ravidatta, his son.

The addition to the first name may point to a suzerainty of the Raṣṭrakūṭas. But from other inscriptions we know that in the time of Skandavarmanma the Punnāḍ kingdom was annexed to the Gaṅga dominions by Avinīta who married the king’s daughter.

Transcript.

   Jaya-lakṣmī-saṁālīna-
   gita-dakṣa-daḥṣiṁa-hūri-bhujaṁgaḷaḥ
   otsav-otpādana-parami.

---

13 This seems to be bha in the fac-simile; but as that gives no intelligible meaning I have read it cha.
14 In the original it is Jindakke, which literally means for the Jinawar (da); but it seems more probable that it is a mistake for Jindagakke.
15 And this in the Gujarāt branch as well as in the main line.
16 The Kanneśvara of the present inscription may be reconciled with Krishna.
17 Mysore Inscriptions, Yelandur Inscription, No. 175.
19 I ndisch e Alterthumskunde, vol. III.
20 Dr. Smith’s Atlas of Ancient Geography.

pa-saṅhāta-parād-pābhyudaya-kāraṇāh para-rishi-brāhmaṇa-bhaktī-tātparyya kuśalaḥ samasta-gaṇ-a-adhi-dhvāgo vihāya-sarvva-jok-ā-nirūpama-sthira-bhāva-ni(r)jita-

ri-maṇḍalaḥ yasyemam āsit || jītvā-bhūpāri-varggan-naya-kuśala-tayā yena rājyaṁ kṛitaṁ yah khaṇṭe Manvādi-mārga-stuta-dhavaḷa-yaṣa-nā-kvachid-yāga-pürvvaḥ saṅgrāme yasya sēśhī-

sva-bhuja-karabala-prāpītayā Jayaśri yasmin jāte sva-vamśobhodya-dhavaḷatām yāta dān arkkā-tejāḥ ā-

sāv Indrāja-nāmadheyaḥ tasya putraḥ sva-kula-lalāmyayamāḥ māna-dhano dhāna dhānā-

2a. tha-jan-āhlādanakara-dāna-nirata-maṇo-vṛttīḥ himakara iva sukhakara-karaḥ kulāchala-sam-

dāya iva sudhā-dhāra-gaṇa-nipuṇaḥ himaśaila-kūṭa-tata-sthāpita-yasa-stambhān līkhitā-

neka-vikaṇa-gaṇam āgha-saṅgāta-vinasaka-surāpāga yasya sad-yaśo-viśādatām gīyantva
taraṅga-prabhata rāvair-vvahati-jana-mahītā || asau Vairamegha-nāmadheyaḥ tasya pitṛvyayaḥ brīdaya-padm-

āsanatha-paramesvara-sīrā-śīrakara-nikara-nirākṛita-tamo-vṛttīḥ sa-viśeṣhayā yasa
traya sāmraddhayena virchītasya chaturthajā-jok-odaya-samānayan kṛita-yuga-śaṅkar i na nivit-

yasya yasaḥ-puṣjām iva virājāmānaḥ || pradagda-kājagara-dhāpa dhūmaḥ pravardhāman-opachayār-payodāḥ yasa-

ājirah-sva-chchha-sugandha-toyai śīchanti siddh-odta-kūṭabbaḥgāḥ || na-cchedaṁ rūpaṇyānti prajobbhāvha bhavodbhavo bhāviyā

gautaram avaiṁ yasya sthitaye svayam tat kalpātamānaiva cha bhāvayātī || tārā-γa-

ṇaḥ ānunāta-kūṭa-koti-tātapitāṁ jvāla-dīpikānām mohantyā rastrā-svabheda-bha-

vaḥ niśityayāḥ paurājan niśāyām || adhāra-bhūt-āham idam vyātītayā śārdhate

ch-āyam atiprasaṅgaḥ yasya-avākāśārtham itiṣa prithviṁ śūtvā bhūteti ca me vi-

tarkaḥ || vihītra-patākā-sahasra-sanchhāditaṁ upari-paricharaṁ-bhayāt lokā-

ka-chādāmaṁinā maṇi-kuṭṭīma-saṅkrānti-prabhipūma-ryājena svayam avatīrya

2b. paramesvara-bhakti-yuktena namakrayamāṇam eva virājāmānam prahata-pushkara-mandra

ninād-ā- karṇan-odit ānuרgaṁ śā-gaɐvda-ārambha-kila-janit-otsav-ārambhāḥ mayūraṁ prārabdha

vṛttī na-

ntāntaṁ dhūmavēla-līlā-āgata viśālni-janāṁ karata-kaśayā-taya-sa-bhava-prak-

ṭana-kuśala-śāmi-vadān-ṅaṁ-nartan-āhbhita-paurā-vaṃs-jan-chātānāṁ samasta

siddhantā-sa-ga-

ra-pāraga-muni-śata-sukujā deva-kuḷam āsit Kannēvaṇam-nāma-svā-nāmadhey-āṅkita asā

v Akāla-varṣa iṁ vihāyaṁ tasya sūnuṁ ānata-ṛi-pa-makura-maṇi-ga-karaṇa-jāla-ranjaṁ

pāda-yaṅgara-kaṇha-mayāṅka-prabhābhasita-simhāsaṁ-opāntāṁ kāntā-jana-katka-kačch-

ta-padmarāga-didhit-visara-sumbhata-kusumam-rasa-ranjita-nī-sa-dhāvaḷa-vyāpā-yamāna

chārū-chār-

mara-vichāya-viḥāITERAL-pājya-rājyābhishek-āntar-aikaiśvarya-sukha-samānbhava-ṣthi-

tih niś-turagam-āka-viṣayānītia-raja-lakṣmi-sanātho mahānātho yaḥ kalpānghripaḥ āsau

sas eva chintāmaṇīr-itī-dhruvaṁ yaṁ vadyante ardhinaḥ nitya-prītyā-prāptārtha-sampad āsau

Prabhūta-varṣa itī vi-

24 In the original kalpaṁghripaḥ.
3a. saṅga-sukhodrek-odita-romāccha-yojitena sva-bhu-jādhamāla-dalita-samasta-gaṭita-muktāpala vi-
sara-virājīt-āribala-hasti-hāst-āspālana-danta-kōṭi-gaṭita-gaṅi-krītena virājāmanāḥ tripura-
hara-vṛishabha-kakud-ākār-omnata-viṅga-āṁsa-tata-nikata-dodhāyamāna-chaṁa-chāmara-chayaḥ phena-piṇḍa
pāṇḍrā-prabhā-odita-acheh-hvinā vṛtten-āpi chaṭur-ākireṇa sit-īpatren-ācheh-hādita samasta-digviva-
ro ripu-jana-hridaya-vidāraṇa-ārūpaṇa sakala-bhūtal-adhipatya-jaṅkhī-īḷam-utpādayatā pra-
hata-pada-dhakā-gambhira-dhvanena ghanāghanā-garjaj-ānukarīṇa asyāchito-vinoda nirgamaṁ svā-
kīyāṁ saṅchajatāṁ para-nṛpa-cheto-vṛtthiṁ dātum ivo vairā-vilopa-prakāṭita-rājya-chi-
turāṇaṁ-kharā-khur-ottitaṁ-pāṅsā-patāla-maṅṣita-jalada-saṅchaya aneka-matta-dvipa-karaṭa-taṭa-gaṭita-dāna-chaṁa-pratāna-prasamita-mahī-
parāgaḥ || yasya śri-chapal-odayāḥ-khurtarāgraś-āśā-samaspāḥanāt nīrbiḥmaṇa-dvipa-yānapā-
tra-gataya ye saṅchala-ochhetasah tasmān eva sāmeṣya sāra-vibhavaḥ sa tāja-rājaṁ raṇe bhagānā moḥavaśāt svayaṁ khalu diśaṁantaṁ bhajante 'rayaḥ || idaṁ kīyād-bhūtaṁ atra samyak sthātum mahāt-saṅkaṁ ati udgaura svasya-vakāsam nakaroti yasya yaśo diśaṁ bhiṭṭi vibhedanāṇi || anavaraṇa-dāna-chaṁa-varṣh-īganaṁ tripta-janatāṁḥ Dhā-
rā-co壮大 iti jagati-vikhyātās sarvva-joka-vallabhataya vallabha iti || tasy-ātmajā niṣa-bhu-
3b. ja-bala-samāṅita-paramnṛpa-lakshmi-kare-dhrita- dhavaḥ || ātapatra - nāla - pratikūla - ripu - kula charaṇa nibadha
khalakahāyamāna-dhavalā-śrīnghala-rava-badhīrīkṛta-paryanta-jāno nirupama-guna-gaṇa
ākṛṣṇana-saṁā
ḥādita-maṅsa-sādhu-janena sadā-samvīyamāna-śāśī-vaśāda-yāga-rāśir āś-āvashtadha-ja-
na-manaḥ-parikalaṇa-trigunīkṛta-svaṅkhy-ānushāṇo nishtī-karttavyaḥ Prabhūta-varsha śrī-
prthvih-vallabha-rāja-dhīrāja-pramāsvarasya praṇardhamāna-śrī-rāja-vijaya-saṁvatsaresu varṇa-
no āturu Chājugyā-anvaya-gagana-tala-hāriṇa-lāṁchhanamāna-śrī-Bala-varmmana-nandradra-
sya sunu sva-vikramāvajjita-sakala-ripu-nṛpa-śrīnābhā-sākhar-āchchita-charaṅa-yog-
o āhau sarvām-sāmaṁ abhīṣeyo rājā-vyārajata-tasya-putrā su-pṛthvī kula dipika
iti purāṇa-vachanaṁ avitadham iha kuryvan aitaraṁ dhi-rājamano manojāta iva maṁiṁ jana-maṁ-stalajjaṁ rāva-chaturas chaturā-janārayaḥ śrī-samāṅgita-vaśālava-vakshā-athalo ni-
trām-āśābhata asū maḥatma || kamal- ochita || sad-bhujāntara śrī-Vimaladityā it-
ti pratīchānam kamanīya-vapur vīlāsināṁ bhramad-akshil bhīmarāj-āśī-vaṅka-pradmaṁ ya r-
prachāḍamam-karaṅālā-dalita-ripu-nṛpasa-karīghatā-kumbha-muktā-muktāpala-vikrītī-ruchī-
raṇ-abdhī-kānte-ruchī-parīta-nīka-kāla-triṇaṇḍaṁ śītikanthā iva maṁiṁ maṁiṁ-āmodyāmāna ruchīra

4a. kṛttir aśaḥ. Gaṅga-maṅḍal-ādhibhūta-śrī-Chāki-Rājasya bhagīneyaḥ bhuvn-prakāṣatay-asmī Ku-
numgīl-nāma-desam asyāś-parāngūkhā Manu-mārgena pālayati sati śrī-āpānīya Nandī-saṅgha-punnāga-vṛkṣa-mūla-gaṇe śrī-Kītyāčāryānvaṁ bahushv ācāryyosv
atikrā

**In the original kapalochita.**  **These names have been filled in afterwards in a rude manner.**
May it be well! Of widespread fame, holding the Lakshmi of victory in the strong embrace of his powerful long right arm, adorned with a sword whose flashes like a full-blown flower lit up all the points of the compass, by his power and valour having destroyed the groups of great enemies, the one clever one in three generations, his two lotus feet weighed down with the crowns of the lines of kings of countries subdued by him in acquiring the dominion of the world, was Govinda Raja.

His son, in his youth delighting his relatives by the union of the qualities of kindness, generosity and bravery, an Agasty in drinking up the ocean of all learning and science, walking in the path pointed out by Manu, a moon in the clear sky of the Rakuta kula, a sun to the lotus the face of the learned, adorned with a cluster of pleasing qualities, was named Kakkara Raja.

The words in this line, from polo, have been rudely engraved over the original description, which has been beaten down.
his birth obtaining prosperity and glory for his own line, a bright sun in giving, he was named Inda Râja.

His son, an ornament to his race, his honour, his wealth, ever desiring to bestow gifts rejoicing the hearts of the poor and helpless, like the moon in giving pleasure, like the chains of mountains able in bestowing streams of nectar; having set up the pillar of his fame on the slope of the Himalaya mountains written over with his many victorious qualities; in having purified himself from all sin, a Gaṅgâ whose sounding waves are the voices of the multitudes of people singing his widespread glory; was named Vairamegha.

His uncle, the Paramēsvara, seated on the lotus of whose heart had dispelled all darkness by the light of the moon on his head, the greatness of whose glory was such that it was like a fourth world to the three worlds united, or like a hundred Kritayugas, the clouds formed by the fragrant smoke arising from whose burning of aloes moistened with sweet perfume his own abode and the places inhabited by ascetics. 'Let none else obtain this,' thus methinks did Brahma from desire ordain in past ages, and that it should not happen in future ages except during his lifetime. Like clusters of stars the bright lamps he placed on all the high places deceived the people of the city, making them doubt whether it was night or whether the day had dawned. 'I am the support of all,' thus in the past, and yet it grows; perhaps to provide room for him was the earth in long continuance made wide of old. The sun, through fear of moving through the upper regions covered up with a thousand flags, under pretence of seeing his reflection in the jewelled floor, having descended and shining low as if in obeisance through reverence for Paramēsvara; the peacocks, hearing with delight the sounds of the tramping and trumpeting elephants, and thinking that the rainy season had commenced, beginning to rejoice and dance; the young women of the city, with their attention fixed on the movements of the dancing girls on the south-east displaying with the sprouts of their hands the sentiments of love and passion; the line of a hundred Munis who had traversed all the ocean of the Śiddhânta:—his was like a house of the gods. Thus celebrated was that Akâlavarsa, whose own name was Kannāvāra.

His son, whose throne was illuminated on all sides by the rays from the toe nails of his two lotus feet which were irradiated with the brilliance from the jewels in the crowns of prostrate kings, maintaining a state suitable to the great wealth obtained at his coronation, being fanned by châmaras whose whiteness was tinged like safflower by the lustre from the rubies set in the anklets of the beautiful women who held them, a great king who was the husband of the Lakshmi of victory won by the triumphs of his own single horse, he who is the Kalpa tree, he whom petitioners truly call the Chintâmani, daily acquiring by love whatever he desired, thus famous was Prabhuta varsha, the head jewel of the kings of the earth.

His brother, Dhāravarsa, favourite of earth and fortune, great king of kings, supreme ruler, bearing in his arms a flashing sword which had destroyed all the hostile kings, like a tiger in having slain his mighty enemies and taken possession of all lands, by his merit bearing the burden of the government of many countries; glorious—with a chest as broad as Himâsaila, a jewelled floor on which royal fortune might rest—with the hair on his body standing up with ecstasy from contact with the high bosoms of the cunning fair ones who embraced him—and with the sounds of the groups of the elephants in the enemies' forces striking their tasks with the swinging of their trunks, adorned with clusters of pearls scattered by the blows of the sword in his hand; groups of beautiful châmaras fanning his shoulders, which were as high and round as the hump of Śiva's bull; all points of the compass covered by his white umbrella, brilliant as the white foam of the ocean, bound yet appearing square (otherwise, skilfully shaped); rejoicing his heart—with the terror with which he filled the minds of hostile kings from the sport which he gave to fortune in the government of all countries,—and with the deep sound of the beaten pada and dhakka (drum) resembling the thunder of the clouds; distinguished by the royal sign that his mere moving was to give a sufficient display of valour to the minds of

---

39 Kâlâguru is said to be a kind of aloe wood, cp. the same, used as incense.
foreign kings; the dust raised by the hard hoofs of whose horses formed groups of clouds which were laid by the streams of nectar from the foreheads of his numerous rutting elephants. When moved by fortune, by the charge of the lines of his prancing horsemen the hostile kings were scattered and went in boats to the island, with minds full of alarm, on his approaching there also, forsaking their glory and kingdom, with the distraction of defeat in battle, they fled alone to the farthest regions. As if saying 'This world is too small: to stay here is too confined: sufficient room cannot be obtained here,' his fame burst into all the points of the compass. From satisfying the people with the increasing showers of his daily gifts was he called Dhārāvarga, and from having the lordship of the world, Vallaḥha.

His son, whose attendants were deafened with the noise of the clanging of the white chains bound to the feet of the lines of hostile kings holding in their hands the rods of the white umbrellas taken by his own power from the Lakshmi of foreign kings, of clustered fame resembling the pure moon from association with the good whose hearts were rejoiced with hearing of his unequalled good qualities, by satisfying the desires of the hearts of the people trebling his own virtues, doer of the right, was Prabhūtavarsha, favorite of earth and fortune, king of kings, supreme ruler. During the years of whose victorious reign:

The son of Śrī Balāvarma Narendra the moon in the sky of the beautiful Chālukya race, his two feet worshipped by the crowned on the heads of all the kings subdued by his own power, was named Yaśovarman.

His son, reverenced by kings, as if to make good here the old saying "a good son is a light to his family" shining with wisdom in every aspect, like Mānmatha enshrined in the hearts of women, skilled in war, protector of the skilful, of a broad chest embraced by fortune, that great one shining with such glory; of good wide-spreading arms worthy of Lakshmi, having the celebrated name Śrī Vimalāditya, of a lovely form, of a lotus face in which the bees, his eyes, quiver about with joy, a luminous whose own rays spread a light like that of the ocean caused by the brilliance of the pearls scattered from the foreheads of the elephants of hostile kings cut down by his terrible sword, possessing a brilliant fame like that of Śiva causing joy by its greatness, the sister's son of Śrī Chākī Rāja the sovereign ruler of the entire Gābgamaṇḍala, while, as if saying 'I am a light to the world,' governing the country called Kūnagil without incurring disgrace and in the way of Manu:—

When many Āchāris in the line of Śrī Kītāchārī of the auspicious Nandisaṅga and Punnāga-vrika-gra-mūla-gaṇa had passed away, there was Kūvilačārī, whose feet were revered by the company of Guptagupta Munis united in penance. His house-disciple, whose body was the offerings of the people who did him reverence, famous for his own gifts with which he gratified the learned, was the great Muni named Vijayakirtti. The wide-renowned high Muni, Arkačārtti, took upon him his discipleship but not his desires.

To that chief muni, on removing the painful influence of Saturn from that Vimalāditya, the Vallaḥhendra, on the application of Chākī Rāja, residing in Mayūrakhandi in his victorious camp, gave the village named Jālamāṅgala, situated within the Ingū district, the years sara, tikhi, muni (785) of the Saka king having passed, on the 10th of the bright fortnight of the month Jēsḥthā, in the constellation Pushya, Monday, presented for the temple of Jinendrā at Śilagrāma, the ornament of the western side of the great Mānyapura.

On its east, south, west and north are the well-known villages Svastimāṅgala, Bhellinda, Guḍḍanūr and Taripā. These four define Jālamāṅgala which is situated in the middle of the four villages. Again its boundaries:—

From the north-east angle, looking south, coming down east of the rising and falling ground within the hollow of the ēppē trees, the *uti plants; coming straight to the Kodeyāḷi cultivation, the field and the tamarind tree; thence going down, the angle of the Bidārā tank. Then west:—on the south of the tiger path [pér oβeya] the big waste, the boundary stone, the big shelter at that angle; then going straight to the tāygaṇḍ of the Nāymanī tank.
Then north—the elephant cashew-nut tree on the west of Bellagere, some plants, the elephant tank, the grazing land, the boundary stone, the angle of the Puligâra tank. Then east—to the tall betel plants, the grass plain, the brazier's stone, the boundary of a field, a tamarind tree, a circular tamarind tree, cultivated ground: thus coming, it joins the angle on the north-east.

Given with the witness of Râcha-malla gâmuṇḍa, Śīra, Gaṅga-gâmuṇḍa, Mâraya, Belgere Oḍeyar, the Modabège Seventy, the whole of Kunaṅgil. Obeisance.

That which has been given with pouring of water, that which has been enjoyed for three generations, or maintained for six generations, such may not be resumed, nor the gifts of former kings. To make a gift oneself is easy, to maintain another's difficult; but of making a gift or maintaining another's, the maintaining is the most meritorious. Whoso resumes a gift made by himself or by another, shall be born a worm in ordure for sixty thousand years. The property of the gods is a terrible poison, a secret poison: poison kills one man, the property of the gods (if usurped) kills sons and grandsons.

PÚJYAPÁDA AND THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE JAINÈNDRA-VYÁKARANA.

BY K. B. PÁTHAK, B.A., BELGAUM HIGH SCHOOL.

In the tenth volume of this journal, pp. 75-79, Dr. Kielhorn has contributed a paper on the Sanskrit Grammar called Jainèndram. After reviewing at some length the text of the work as preserved in the commentaries of Abhayarāṇi, Śrutakīrti, and Sômadêva, the learned Doctor proceeds to deal with the interesting question, who was the author of the work? He finds that Sômadêva attributes it to Pújya-páda; and his own opinion is that Pújya-páda is an honorific epithet, and that we are to understand by the term, "Mahâvira, the last of the Jinas, to whom the title Jînèndra is applied—most infrequently." It may not be foreign to the subject to mention here that Samantabhadra applies this title indifferently to almost all the Jînèndrakaras.

In order to prove that Pújya-páda is no other than Vardhamâna himself, Dr. Kielhorn next quotes at length a tradition, which represents Mahâvira as having revealed the science of grammar. I may remark here that this and similar other traditions, so often met with in Jain literature, which represent everything under the sun as śāstra-sūkta-sūkta, can hardly have any pretensions to historical importance. Sakalakîrta, a writer of the 13th century, tells us, in his life of Mahâvira, that the dialects, Mâgadhî and Ardha-Mâgadhî, flowed from the lips of the last Jina! And Ekasedhî-bhâtâraka says in his work on architecture, that the Śilpaśîstra was, for the first time, revealed by Mahâvira to the last of the Gopâddharas.

Dr. Kielhorn, however, seems to admit tacitly the worthlessness of such traditions, when he abandons the Tîrthankara, and feels it necessary to "look for an ordinary human author of the work." He then fixes upon Dêvandâra, another name given by Sômadêva and Śrutakîrta, as the author of the Jainèndram.

I now propose to settle the question by the light of the Jaina literature of the Karnâtaka. To arrive at a satisfactory conclusion on this point, we have to answer three questions:—(1) whether there was any author named Pújya-páda, who flourished in Southern India; (2) whether he wrote the Jainèndram; and (3) whether he was known by any other name.

In answer to the first question I would first point out that it is a custom among the Karnâtaka Jaina poets to praise their illustrious predecessors in the prakâṣita of their works. The importance of these prakâṣita, from an historical point of view, can hardly be exaggerated. In some cases they are as important as inscriptions. Now the poems that have appeared since the beginning of the 8th century A.D., as a rule open with verses praising Pújya-páda. Arhaddâsa says:

\[\text{I have adopted the Canarese form of names ending in निरू।} \]

नायकनाकाचूलनाथसरर्रोः:
समजनाराध्य वृद्धवालसृः
प्रतिप्रतिप्रति गुणदातरसृः
समजनाराध्य मूर्ति वृद्धवालसृः—Muniyervatakârya, I.10.

Indrabhûti, in his Samayabhâshana, deplores the decline of the Jaina faith:

स्वग्ने गते निकारांति नमायं च योगिनि
प्रमः स्वमत्तचारिष्यो बुधः दाटिहिः: || 3 ||
I now proceed to answer the next question, did Pūjya pāḍā write the Jainēndram? There is a Sanskrit work called Dharma-pāriksa, composed by Amītagati. It must have been written some time after the star of Buddhism had ceased to shine, and Brāhmaṇism had revived under Śaṅkara's rāya. It was extremely popular with the Jainas, by reason of its attacks on Brāhmaṇism; and it was rendered into Canarese verse by Vṛttavīla in the 13th century. In the prakṣastī of this Canarese Dharma-pāriksa, we are told—


bharasaṁ bhavy-āśyārādhita-para-kālamāṁ Pūjya pāḍāṁ vṛśṭiṁ dirāṁ

"Pūjya pāḍā, the chief of ascetics, whose lotus-like feet were worshipped by a multitude of good people, and who was the pride of all learning, composed quickly the Jainēndram which, as it were, shining, wrote a commentary on the grammar of Pāṇini, and explained the Tatvārthā by comments; [he] achieved a reputation, [by] writing a work on the great science of spells and enchanted instruments for the protection of the world,"

From this it is clear that Pūjya pāḍā' was the author of the Jainēndram. And from an inscription at Lakṣmēśvar, we learn that Śrī-Pūjya pāḍā was a native of Raktāpura, or Alaktakapura, and flourished in Śaka 651, in the palmiest days of Jain literature.

The last question, whether Pūjya pāḍā was known by any other name, still remains to be answered. Sūmadeva attributes the authorship of the Jainēndram, in one place to Pūjya pāḍā, and in another to Dēvanandī. Now these two contradictory statements made by...
one and the same writer may be accounted for by supposing either that they must be due to carelessness on the part of Sômâdeva, or that the author of the Jainéndram may have borne two names, Pûjyapâda and Dèveanandi. The latter supposition turns out to be the correct explanation, as we learn from a pavâvâli:

\[\text{Pavâvâli:} \quad \text{\begin{tabular}{c|c}
| \text{Bhavné} | \text{Bhavné} |
| \text{Bhavné} | \text{Bhavné} |
| \text{Bhavné} | \text{Bhavné} |
\end{tabular}}\]

To support my conclusions still further, I give below the names of some authors, who mention Pûjyapâda, with dates.10

(Pûjyapâda, Sâka 651)
Abhayanandi, 700

THE DATE OF MAHÂVÌRA’S NIRVÂNÀ, AS DETERMINED IN SÃKA 1175.

BY K. B. PÂTHAK, BELGAUM HIGH SCHOOL.

In the second volume of this journal, p. 140, in quoting several different authorities as to the date of the Nîrûpa of Mâhâvîra, Vîra, or Vardhamâna, the last of the Jaina Tirthânkaras, the editor remarks that the Jainas of Mâisâr place it 607 years before the era of Vikrama. He suggests, however, that this is a mistake for the Sâka era. And I propose to show now that, with the difference of 605 for 607 years, this suggestion contains the correct truth, and that the resulting date of B.C. 527 is the one given in the Jaina books of these parts for the event in question.

The mistake arose in the misinterpretation, by the native commentator, of a well-known passage in the Trîlokâsâra, which says:

\[\text{Pavâvâli:} \quad \text{\begin{tabular}{c|c}
| \text{Bhavné} | \text{Bhavné} |
| \text{Bhavné} | \text{Bhavné} |
| \text{Bhavné} | \text{Bhavné} |
\end{tabular}}\]

Six-hundred and five years, joined to five months, having passed away since the \text{nirûpa} of Vîra, the Sâka king \text{(was born).}"

This is the literal rendering of the text as written by Nêmichandra. But the commentator, Mādhavachandra, takes the expression \text{Sagarâja} in the sense of Vikramâraka-Sakarâja. In the text itself there is nothing to warrant this view. And the misinterpretation, which has puzzled many oriental scholars,1 is not countenanced by the numerous Canarese commentaries on the Trîlokâsâra, which are found in the Jaina \text{basion.} I shall transcribe below a passage from a work on \text{Srîvakâdchâra}, or the conduct of the laity, which calculates Vîra’s \text{nirûpa} according to the Sâka era, and enables us to arrive at 527 B.C. as the date of that event. This exactly coincides with the view of the \text{Svētâmaras} of the north, who place the event 470 years before Vikrama.

Like the Jainéndran, the Trîlokâsâra is regarded as an authority by the Digambaras of Delhi and Jaipur, although Nêmichandra flourished in Southern India 200 years later than the illustrious Pûjyapâda.

In the passage in question we are told that 1780 years from Vîra had elapsed when this work on \text{Srîvakâdchâra} was established for worship, on the fifth day called the \text{Srîtopachâmi}, in the bright half of Jyēśhinâ, in the Parâdhâvâ \text{sâvatsâra.} And we read further on that the Sâka king was born 605 years after Vîra. Now, deducting 605 from 1780, we get 1175. And the author says expressly that the year in which his work was worshipped was the Parâdhâvâ \text{sâvatsâra.} By the Tables in Brown’s \text{Carnatic Chronology}, the Parâdhâvâ \text{sâvatsâra fell in Sâka 1174.} And Mr. Fleet, in his \text{Dinasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 69}, has quoted an inscription in which the Parâdhâvâ \text{sâvatsâra is allotted to Sâka 1175,—for 1174, according to Brown. Hence it is evident that 1780 years since Vîra’s \text{nirûpa} had passed away in Sâka 1175, the Parâdhâvâ \text{sâvatsâra. Con-}

10 See Mêghachandra’s \text{Srîvakâdchâra}, Mêghachandra’s commentary on the \text{Svâdhiśâsâra}, and an inscription at Térâvâ, which will be published shortly.

11 Pampa-Râmâyana.

1 e.g. Burnell, 86.—\text{Ind. Palaeography, p. 72.}
sequently, the "ornament of the Nāthakula" attained mōkṣa 605 years before the Śaka era. The Śvētāmbaras place this event 470 years before the era of Vikrama. And the difference between the two eras is 135 years. And

\[470 + 135 = 605\] (before the Śaka era)
\[605 - 78 = 527\text{ B.C.}\]
\[470 + 57 = 527\text{ B.C.}\]

I have omitted the fractions, as they do not affect my general conclusions. I have thus proved that the Digambaras of the Karnāṭaka are perfectly at one with the Śvētāmbaras on this important point.

I must say just a word in regard to the Śrāvakācārā. It is called Māghaṇandi-Śrāvakācārā, because Māghaṇandi wrote the first chapter. The remaining chapters, however, were composed by different authors whose names are mentioned. At the beginning of the fifth chapter, Māghaṇandi himself is thus praised:

"नोकरे नरमन्यानंसकाठी नारायणि
ब्रह्मविसुन्नस्वस्तिते बलिपातिं
But the question of the authorship of the Śrāvakācārā has no bearing whatever on the date of Mahāvīra himself.

Transcription.


* An additional ra is inserted here by mistake.

* This is the only instance in which the old Canarese ḫ occurs in this passage.


Māghaṇandi-Śrāvakācārā, Chap. II.

Translation.

And in the period of this Tīrthakarā Vardhāmāna, there flourished the Kēvalī named Gaṇṭhama, Sudharma, and Jambūnātha; their time was sixty-two years,—62. (Then) there were five Srutakṛtaḥs named Nandi, Nandimitra, Aparājita, Gōvādhana, and Bhradabahu; their time was a hundred years,—100. And (then) there were eleven masters of the ten pūras, named Viśākha, Prōṣṭhi, Kaṭatriya, Jaya, Nāga, Siddhārtha, Dhṛitiṣeṇa, Vijaya, Buddhīla, Gaṅgādeva, and Sudharma; their time was a hundred and eighty-three years,—220. And during the period assigned to this Tīrthakarā, there flourished also Subhadra, Yaśōbhada, Yaśōbhava, and Lōhabha, the four masters of the āchārāṅga; their time was a hundred and eighteen years,—118. Thus the whole period, including the time of Gaṇṭhama and others, was six hundred and eighty-three years. And on the Srutapaṇḍhāramī, in the bright half of Jyeṣṭhā, in the Paridhāvī saṅvatsara, being the thousand and ninety-seventh year from the time of the masters of the āchārāṅga, this work on the conduct of the laity was worshipped. Thus [from Vīra] there were a thousand seven hundred and eighty years,—1780. The time which the era of Viravāmi (will) yet (continue) is nineteen thousand two hundred and twenty years,—19220

* The whole period of Vīra's era, therefore is 19220 + 1780 = 21000 years. Conf. वीराज्यप्रमीतं भक्तकान्ते हिंसिकां सह संस्कृतानि—Trīśkaḍa.
THE WHOLE DUTY OF THE BUDDHIST LAYMAN.

A Sermon of Buddha.

BY THE LATE PROF. E. C. CHILDERS.

The Sermon I have selected bears in the Pali canon the name Sigalovada or "the admonition of Sigala," but it is popularly known to South Buddhists by the descriptive title of Gihirvina, or "the Layman's Rule of Life," because it deals with the moral conduct of the Buddhist layman, as the Vinaya, or ecclesiastical code, deals with the conduct of the Buddhist monk. It was translated thirty years ago by the famous Wesleyan missionary Gogerly, but his version is only known to the fortunate few who have access to that rare work, the Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1847. My own translation is a new one, made from a collated copy of the Pali text and commentary. I have been able to correct a great number of errors in Gogerly's translation; but I have pleasure in saying that on the whole I have found it a material help, and I have not hesitated here and there to adopt a rendering of his which struck me as an unusually happy one. I have endeavoured to be strictly literal, though in a few places I have somewhat varied the wording in order to preserve the spirit of the original. I have also omitted a few unimportant repetitions of formal phrases belonging only to the framework of the sermon, and not affecting its substance.

The Sermon.

Thus I have heard. On a certain day Buddha dwelt at Rajagaha in a grove called Veluvana. And the same day the young householder Sigala rose early in the morning, and went forth from Rajagaha, and standing with wet hair and streaming garments, and clasped hands uplifted, worshipped the various quarters, the east, the west, the south, the north, the nadir, and the zenith. And Buddha rose early in the morning and put on his raiment, and taking his bowl and robe went to Rajagaha to seek alms. And the Blessed One beheld the young householder, as with streaming hair and garments and clasped hands uplifted he worshipped the various quarters, and beholding he thus addressed him:

Wherefore, young man, dost thou rise betimes, and leaving Rajagaha, with wet hair and streaming garments dost worship the various quarters, the east quarter, the south, the west, and the north, the nadir and the zenith?

Master, my father, when he lay on his deathbed said to me, My son, do thou worship the quarters. Honouring, therefore my father's words, reverencing, revering, and holding them sacred, I rise early in the morning, and going forth from Rajagaha, with wet hair and streaming garments, and clasped hands uplifted, I worship the various quarters—the east, the south, the west, and the north, the nadir and the zenith.

Not thus, young man, should the six quarters be worshipped according to the teaching of holy sages.

How then, master, should the six quarters be worshipped? May it please thee, Master, so to teach me thy truth that I may know how the six quarters should be worshipped according to the teaching of the holy sages.

Hear then, young man, give heed to my words, and I will speak.

And the young householder Sigala answered, Even so, Lord; and thus the Buddha spoke:

Young man, inasmuch as the holy disciple has forsaken the four polluting actions, inasmuch as he is uninfluenced by four evil states to commit sin, inasmuch as he eschews the six means of dissipating wealth, therefore freed from fourteen evils, and guarding the six quarters, he walks victorious over both worlds; for him this world is blest and the next also, and on the dissolution of the body after death he is reborn in heavenly mansions.

What are the four polluting actions forsaken by him? The destruction of life is a polluting act, theft is a polluting act, impurity is a polluting act, lying is a polluting act—these four polluting actions are forsaken by him.

And what are the four evil states that tempt men to sin? Through partiality men commit sin, through anger men commit sin, through

---

1 From the Contemporary Review, Feb. 1876. We have omitted most of the author's own remarks as not required in these pages.—Ed.

2 From the Pali Tripija, or the Three Baskets; which.

areVinaya, Sutta and Abhidharma—Monastic discipline, Discourses, and Metaphysics. The sermon here translated is taken from the Sutta Pitaka, which consists chiefly of moral discourses.
ignorance men commit sin, through fear men commit sin. But inasmuch as the holy dis- ciple lives uninfluenced by partiality or wrath or folly or fear, therefore these four evil states tempt him not to sin. Whoso from partiality, wrath, folly, or fear is tempted to pervert justice, his glory shall fade like the waning moon. But whoso, untempted by these, refrains from perverting justice, his glory shall be made full, like the glory of the increasing moon.

And what are the six means of dissipating wealth? Strong drink, young men, and theatre-going, and evil companions, and dicing, and wandering about the streets at night, and idleness—these six bring a man to poverty.

There are six evils, young man, in being addicted to strong drink, poverty, strife, disease, loss of character, shameless exposure of the person, and impaired faculties.

Six evils attend on him who wanders about the streets at night. His life is in danger, his wife and children are unguarded, his property is unguarded, he falls under the suspicion of frequenting places of evil resort, false rumours circulate concerning him, and sorrow and remorse follow in his train.

Six evils wait upon him who thirsts after worldly amusements. He is ever crying, Where is there dancing? where is there singing? where is there music? where is recitation? where is conjuring? where is public shows?

Six evils wait upon the gambler. If he win, he begets hatred; if he lose, his heart is sorrowful. His substance is wasted, his word has no weight in a court of justice, his friends and his kinsmen despise him, and he is looked upon as ineligible for marriage—for men say, A gambler is unfit to support a wife.

Six evils attend on him who associates with bad companions. Every gambler, every libertine, every cheat, every rogue, every outlaw is his friend and companion. Six evils attend upon the sluggard. He says it is too cold, and does not work; he says it is too hot, and does not work; he says it is too early, and does not work; he says it is too late, and does not work; he says, I am hungry, and does not work; he says, I am full, and does not work; and while he thus lives, ever neglecting his duties, he both fails to acquire new property, and that which he possesses dwindles away. Some friends are only been companions, some are hollow friends; the true friend is the friend in need.

Sleeping after the sun has risen, adultery, revenge, malevolence, evil communications, and avarice—these six things bring a man to ruin.

He who has sinful friends and sinful companions, who is devoted to sinful practices, the same is ruined in this world and the next.

Gambling, debauchery, dancing and singing, sleeping by day and wandering about at night, bad companions, and avarice—these six things bring a man to ruin.

Woe to the dicsers, to them that drink strong drink, that go in unto their neighbour's wife: whose follows wickedness and honours not the wise, he shall fade like the waning moon. He that drinks strong drink is needy and destitute, ever thirsting with unquenchable thirst, he plunges into debt as one plunges into water, and will quickly bring his family to nothing; he who sleeps by day and rises at night, who is ever full of wine and whoredom, is unfit to maintain a family.

Poverty overtakes him who says, 'Tis too cold, 'tis too hot, 'tis too late, and neglects his work; but he who, performing his duties, recks not a straw for heat or cold, his happiness shall not decay.

There are four, young man, who, seeming to be friends, are enemies in disguise—the rapacious friend, the man of much profession, the flatterer, and the dissolute companion.

In four ways the rapacious man may be known to be a false friend:—He enriches himself at your expense; he expects much in return for little; he does what is right only under the impulse of fear; and he serves you from self-interested motives.

In four ways the man of much profession may be known to be a false friend:—He boasts of what he meant to do for you; he boasts of what he means to do for you; he is profuse in unprofitable compliments, but in the hour of need he protests his inability to serve you.

In four ways the flatterer may be known to be a false friend:—He asserts when you do wrong; he assents when you do right; he praises you to your face; and speaks ill of you behind your back.

In four ways the dissolute companion may be known to be a false friend:—He is your friend if you follow after strong drink, if you
wander about the streets at night; he is your companion in theatre-going, he is your companion in dicing. The rapacious friend, the insincere friend, the friend who speaks only to please, and he who is a companion in vicious pleasures—recognizing these four to be false friends, the wise man flees far from them as he would from a road beset with danger.

These four, young man, are true friends—the watchful friend, the friend who is the same in prosperity and adversity, the friend who gives good advice, and the sympathizing friend.

In four ways the watchful may be known to be a true friend:—He protects you when you are off your guard; he watches over your property when you are careless; he offers you an asylum in time of danger; and when work has to be done, he gives you the means of doubling your wealth.

In four ways the friend who is the same in prosperity and adversity may be known to be a true friend:—He confides to you his own secrets; he faithfully keeps yours; he forsakes you not in trouble; and he will lay down his life for your sake.

In four ways the good counsellor may be known to be a true friend:—He restrains you from vice; he exhorts you to virtue; he imparts instruction, and points the way to heaven.

In four ways the sympathizing friend may be known to be a true friend:—He grieves over your misfortunes; he rejoices in your happiness; he restrains those who speak ill of you.

The watchful friend, the steadfast friend, the good counsellor, and the sympathizing friend—recognizing those four to be true friends, the wise man cleaves to them as the mother cleaves to her infant son.

The wise man endowed with righteousness, shines like a flaming fire. He who gathers wealth as the bee gathers honey, his wealth shall accumulate as the ant's nest is built up; and with wealth thus acquired he will bring no dishonour upon his family. Let him apportion his property into four, and so let him cement friendships. With one portion let him maintain himself; with two let him carry on his business; the fourth let him treasure up, it will serve him in time of trouble. But in what way does the disciple of holy sages guard the six quarters? Know, young man, that these are the six quarters. Parents are the east quarter, teachers are the south quarter, wife and children are the west quarter, friends and companions are the north quarter, spiritual pastors are the zenith, and servants and dependents are the nadir.

In five ways, young man, a son should minister to his parents, who are the east quarter. He should say I will support them who have supported me, I will perform their duties, I will guard their possessions, I will make myself worthy to be their heir, and when they are gone I will pay honour to their memory. And in five ways the parents show their affection for their son. They keep him from vice, they train him in virtue, they provide him with a good education, they unite him to a suitable wife, and in due time make over to him the family heritage. And thus is the east quarter guarded and free from danger.

In five ways the pupil should honour his teachers, who are the south quarter: By rising in their presence, by ministering to them, by obeying them, by supplying their wants, and by attentively receiving their instruction. And in five ways the teachers show their affection for their pupil. They train him up in all that is good, they teach him to hold fast knowledge, they instruct him in science and lore, they speak well of him to his friends and companions, and protect him from danger in every quarter.

In five ways should the wife, who is the west quarter, be cherished by her husband. By treating her with respect, by treating her with kindness, by being faithful to her, by causing her to be honoured by others, and by furnishing her with suitable apparel. And in five ways the wife shows her affection for her husband. She orders her household aright, she is hospitable to kinsmen and friends, she is a chaste wife, a thrifty housekeeper, and skilful and diligent in all her duties.

In five ways should the honourable man minister to his friends and companions, who are the north quarter. By liberality, courtesy and benevolence, by doing to them as he would be done by, and by sharing with them his prosperity. And in five ways do they in turn show their attachment for their friend. They watch over him when he is off his guard, they watch over his property when he is careless, they offer him a refuge in danger, they forsake him not in misfortune, and show kindness to his family.

In five ways the master should provide for
the welfare of his servants and dependents who are the nadir. By apportioning work to them according to their powers, by supplying them with food and wages, by tending them in sickness, by sharing with them unusual delicacies, and by granting them occasional relaxation. And in five ways do they in return testify their affection for their master. They rise before him and retire after him, they are content with what is given them, they do their work thoroughly, and they speak well of their masters.

In five ways should the honourable man minister to his spiritual masters, who are the zenith. By friendly acts, by friendly words, by friendly thoughts, by giving them a ready welcome and by supplying their temporal wants. And in six ways do they show their affection in return. They restrain him from vice, they exhort him to virtue, they are kindly affectioned toward him, they instruct him in religious truth, clear up his doubts and point the way to heaven.

Parents are the east quarter, teachers are the south, wife and children are the west, friends and companions the north, servants and dependents are the nadir, the zenith are spiritual pastors: let a man worship these quarters, and he will bring no dishonour upon his family.

The wise man who lives a virtuous life, gentle and prudent, lowly and teachable—such a one shall be exalted. If he be resolute and diligent, unshaken in misfortune, persevering and wise, such a one shall be exalted. Benevolent, friendly, grateful, liberal, a guide, instructor and trainer of men—such a one shall attain honour.

Libemality, courtesy, benevolence, unselfishness, under all circumstances and toward all men—these qualities are to the world what the linchpin is to the rolling chariot. And when these qualities are wanting, neither father nor mother will receive honour and support from a son. And because wise men foster these qualities, therefore do they prosper and receive praise.

When Buddha had thus spoken the young householder Sigala addressed him as follows:—It is wonderful, Master! It is wonderful, Master! 'Tis as if one should set up again that which is overthrown, or should reveal that which is hidden, or should direct the wanderer into the right path, or hold out a lamp in the darkness—so that they that have eyes to see shall see. Yea, even thus has the Blessed Lord made known the Truth to me in many a figure. And I, even I, do put my trust in Thee, and in thy Law and in thy Church—receive me, Lord, as thy disciple and true believer from this time forth as long as life endures.

MISCELLANEA.

NOTES.

1. CORRUPTIONS OF ENGLISH.—Kallaf = Club. Kallab and gallab for the English club are not uncommon in India, and in the North the word ghar, house, is ordinarily added. The accent in kallab and gallab is usually on the first syllable. In Lahoo Kallaf ghar is common for "the Club." Here b becomes f. See Ind. Ant. 1837 XI, p. 297 for a similar change.

Saffina = Sub-pusa is very common in the Panjab Courts and in haird and 'avat one often meets with at as *f*$w. Here the b and p are changed into f.

Ajtart = Registry, is a curious corruption, and one constantly in the mouths of Panjab chupdris, e.g. ek ajtart hai, "it is a registered letter."

Gudalt-kalht, or either separately, used for an English baby's napkins, and frequently by ayahs and English ladies in Northern India. The two words mean precisely the same thing. Gudr is Hindi, meaning a ragged quilt, a ragged garment, a rag, and kalh is, I am nearly sure, a corruption of "clout," which is defined by Ogilvie as "a rag, a piece of cloth for mean purposes." Kalh is used only as above, and never to designate any kind of native garment.

Sanhtar—centre—a main street in a Cantonment Bazar. Sanhtar is also used for the Chauk or Central point in a Bazar, whence the principal streets diverge, and this seems to have been its original sense, whence its application extended to the main streets themselves. Natives generally divide the streets in a Cantonment Bazar into santhara, kichda and galt, or main streets, lanes and alleys. Sanhtar is not known in towns, outside Cantonments, and corresponds to the kichda or street, but as a matter of fact the broad streets of a Cantonment Bazar do not exist in a native town, and hence probably the invention of the word sanhtar to distinguish them. It is very common and its sense beyond dispute; e.g. 'vak duare sanhtar mein rahl hai, he lives in another street.'

R. C. Temple.

1. Is it not rather a corruption of cloth?—Ed.
REVISED TRANSLATIONS OF TWO KSHATRAPA INSCRIPTIONS.

By Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hörnle.

My enquiries connected with the Bakhshali MS.¹ which is written in the so-called Gāthā dialect, lately led me to re-examine the Kshatrapa Inscriptions. On doing so, I discovered that some of the points in them which hitherto have remained obscure are at once cleared up, when those documents are taken as written in the “Gāthā.” At the same time I also found that in some places they are still misread and mis-translated. Accordingly I venture to submit herewith revised readings and translations of two of the Kshatrapa Inscriptions,²

The first Inscription treated in this paper is the Nāśik Inscription, West’s No. 17.³ It was first read and translated (in 1853) by Dr. Stevenson in the Journal of the Bombay Br. R. Asiatic Society, vol. V, pp. 54 ff., afterwards by Prof. Bhandarkar in the Transactions of the International Congress of Orientalists, of 1874 (pp. 326 ff.), and, as already mentioned, by Prof. Bühler in the Report of the Archeological Survey of Western India, vol. IV, pp. 99, 100.

REvised Reading.⁴


¹ See Proceedings of the As. Soc. of Bengal for August 1892.
² This paper was written and, indeed, was already in type, when I learned that Prof. Bühler had lately read the Nāśik Inscriptions from beautiful new impressions. Dr. Burgess kindly supplied me with MS. copy of Prof. Bühler’s revision, and the references to the latter which I have inserted are based on them. It is necessary to explain this, as in many cases my emendations agreed with those of Prof. Bühler. In the main object of this paper, however, which is to point out the fact that these records are written in the so-called Gāthā dialect, I have not been anticipated.

NEW TRANSLATION.

May it be well! By the son-in-law of King Kahharāta Satrapa Nahapāna, the son of Dīnka, Ushavāda, who gave (as alms) three hundred thousand cows, gave gold to build a sacred bathing place on the river Bārākā, gave sixteen villages to the gods and Brahmans, fed a hundred thousand Brahmans every year, presented (the means of marrying) eight wives to Brahmans at the sacred bathing place of Prabhāsa, presented quadrangular rest-houses at Bharukaccha, Daśapura, Govardhana, and Sūrprārge, made gardens, tanks, and wells, placed sacred ferry-boats on the rivers Ibā, Pāradi, Daṇama, Tāpi, Karavēṇa, Dāhanukā, provided on the bank, on both sides of those same rivers, places for the distribution of water to those who assembled (for the purpose of crossing), and presented in the village of Nānagālote thirty-two cocoanut trees, worth a thousand (kāraṇi Drainas), to the congregations in Pūṇītakāvya, Govardhana, Suvānāmarke, and Sūrprārge, (who are in the habit of) frequenting Rāmatirthe,—on the mount Tirāṣma in Govardhana, out of religious principle, this cave has been caused to be made as well as these cisterns. And by the command of the noble Lord I went, in the rainy season, to deliver the Uttamabhadra who was best by the Mālayas, and those Mālayas, at the mere noise (of my approach) fled away

Journal Bombay Br. R. Asiatic Soc. vol. V, No. IV, pp. 510; Mr. West’s eye-copy, ibid., vol. VII, p. 50; and the facsimile of the new impression in Arch. Survey of Western India, vol. IV, pl. 111.

⁴ The anusdrdras and double consonants within brackets are not in the original. All or some of the emissions of the anusvāra may be due to the Gāthā character of the record. All Prākritic elements are in italics.
⁵ From the new impression read—l. 1, causwāra, for kāsvāra; l. 2, Nānagālote, for Nānagālote; l. 3, mīhāgāra, for ṛgāhāgāra; for ṛgāhāgāra; for leṇa, for leṇa; l. 4, utamabhadra, for nākha.
and were all made subjects of the Uttamabhadra Kshatriyas. Thence I went to the Pashkars, and there by me ablutions were made, and three thousand cows were given as well as a village.

As regards the language of this Inscription, it is usually said that the first portion is Sanskrit, while the latter part is a mixture of Sanskrit and Prakrit. This description is not quite correct; the first portion is not exactly Sanskrit; forms like bhujapayitroid or ubhato are certainly not Sanskrit, but Prakrit (or Pali).

Again, the latter portion, if Prakrit, is, at all events, a very peculiar sort of Prakrit, seeing that it admits the vowel ri, the conjunct consonant ksh and other peculiarities unknown to the ordinary Pali-Prakrit, but distinctive of Sanskrit. The fact is, the Inscription is composed in one kind of language throughout, and that language is the so-called Gathà dialect, one of the distinctive features of which is a curious mixture of Sanskritic and Prakritic elements. The only peculiarity of this Inscription is, that in the earlier part the Sanskritic element predominates, but in the latter part the Prakritic. This will be seen at once by a glance at my revised text, where I have distinguished the Prakritic elements by printing them in italics. I employ the term “Gathà dialect,” as a mere matter of convenience, being the name hitherto generally used. The term is, however, a misnomer, since it has become known that the dialect, or rather language, is employed not only in verse, but also in prose writings of the Buddhists. I cannot here further enter into the question of the Gathà dialect; but the subject will be found fully discussed in the Introduction to my edition of the Bakhshali Manuscript which will shortly be published by order of the Panjab Government. I shall, however, in the course of the following remarks, point out most of the Gathà characteristics that occur in this inscription.

In the first line Ushnavadda, I suppose, is a Prakritic form of the Sanskrit visahbadatta. In devatabhya, we have an instance of the characteristic Gathà disregard of the ordinary Sanskrit rules of sandhi, according to which it should be devatabhya. Another instance occurs, lower down, in parshabhyah for Sanskrit parshkabhya. Of course, where the omission of sandhi coincides with a pause, and serves as a sort of interpunctuation, no stress can be laid on it as a mark of Gathà usage; for a similar practice may be met with in Sanskrit writing. But it is different with cases like devatabhya, parshabhyah, which occur in the midst of the flow of a sentence. The case is still more striking, if the omission of sandhi occurs in the middle of a compound, as in the third line, in devatrisathitgera, which, by the Gathà standard is quite correct, but which according to Sanskrit rule should be devatrisathitgera.

The meaning of the first line is clear, with the exception of the compound swarrasthokathakarena. Professor Bhandarkar translates it, “he presented gold and constructed flights of steps,” treating it as a devaksa-compound; it lit. “by the maker of presents of gold and of steps.” This would be a curious juxtaposition of work done, and “daksaharena” would be, I imagine, a rather undiomatic expression. Dr. Stevenson’s translation, “he established for the presenting of gold a holy place on the river Barphid,” is possible; but Prof. Bühler’s version, which I have adopted, is undoubtedly the most probable; lit., the phrase means “who made a Tirtha by the gift of gold.” Bhujapayitroid is a Prakritised form of the Causal verb, very common in the Gathà; the Sanskrit would be bhujapayitroid.

In the second line, there are again three instances of sandhi, or rather disregard of sandhi, characteristic of the Gathà. We have brahmabhya ashta for Sanskrit brahmabhya’shta; again the hiatus in the compound tadagadapana for Sanskrit tadagodapana; lastly ubhato tiran for Sanskrit ubhayatanus tiran. Professor Bhandarkar, under the impression that the record is in Sanskrit, naturally was staggered by the anomalous form ubhato, and hence he proposes to substitute ubhaya, forming a compound with tiran. The original, however, Dr. Stevenson read devatabhya after Lieut. Brett’s copy. The latter is a true Gathà form, and, therefore might be genuine.

* See, e.g., the excellent edition of the Mahabuddha, lately published by M. Smaat.

* In this Prof. Bühler agrees with me. In the Veda, daita is said to occur for datta. Or daita might have been “purified” by Bishabhaha.

* Prof. Bühler reads devatabhya, but in the impression the top of the letter and vowel sign are chipped.
which has very clearly to, affords no ground for such a correction; and as the record is not in Sanskrit but in Gāthā, there is no need for it. This line, indeed, is particularly full of marks of the Gāthā characteristic of confusing the cases, the accusative being used for the locative kīre. Another instance occurs, lower down, where we have the accusative vārṣād-ratvaḥ “in the rainy season”, for the locative vārṣārdato (Skr. vārṣāhartau). In the Mahāvastu and Lalita Vistara there are numerous examples of this confusion, those of substituting the accusative for the locative being particularly frequent.11 Again the two words chatusālā and āvasadaha, the Sanskrit forms of which would be chatusālō (as given in Prof. Bhandarkar’s Note 4) and āvasātha, are spelt in Prākritising fashion.12 In the ancient Prākrit, as mentioned in one of Chaṇḍa’s special rules, the aspirates were occasionally softened.13 Both Dr. Stevenson and Prof. Bhandarkar read āvasātha, but in defiance of the original which unmistakably has āvasadaha.

The meaning of the first portion of this line is clear; but I am inclined to agree with Prof. Bühler, that “only one kind of building is intended by the whole compound chatusālā āvasadaha-pratisāraya.” The second portion has puzzled Prof. Bhandarkar, whose interpretation seems to have been adopted by Prof. Bühler. They divide the passage, from Ita to kareṇa into three separate words, Ida-Purṇā-Dāman-Tāpi-Karabeud-Dāhanukā and nāvā and punyatārakareṇa, taking nāvā as the instrumental singular of the Sanskrit word nau, and “Dāhanukā as an error for “Dāhanukanā. Their difficulty, however, only arose from the persuasion that the record was in Sanskrit. If we remember that it is in Gāthā, all difficulty disappears. Nāvā14 is simply the Prākrit-Pali equivalent, of the Sanskrit word nau, the whole, nāvā-punyatārakareṇa, forming one compound; and “Dāhanukā is the accusative plural used for the locative Dāhanukanā, after the Gāthā fashion, of which other instances have been already noticed. The meaning of the word punya is somewhat obscure. Dr. Stevenson translates the phrase punyatārakareṇa, “he placed, charitable ferry-boats,” and Prof. Bhandarkar similarly, “he charitably enabled men to cross.” Prof. Bühler translates it somewhat differently, “he established, for the sake of religious merit, ferries.” I take punya to be used here in the same sense “sacred,” as before in punyatīrthe, lit. “maker of a sacred ferry of boats.” The ferry-boats are called sacred, because they were set apart for a special sacred purpose, viz., to carry pilgrims across. The act of providing them was, of course, an act of religious merit, but no more so than the other acts specified in this record. The words etāśān cha nādāna ubhato tirān Prof. Bhandarkar has omitted to translate; perhaps by a mere oversight, for there is no difficulty, whatsoever in them. He translates sābhā-prapākareṇa by “he constructed Dharmasālas and endowed places for the distribution of water”; construing it as a dvandva-compound. So also Prof. Bühler, who translates: “he has erected rest-houses (for travellers) and places for the (gratis-sous) distribution of water.” But the compound may be explained much more simply as a common tatpurusha, meaning “watering-places for the assemblies,” i.e., for those assembled to cross over the rivers by the ferry-boats which Ushavatā had provided. Of these “watering-places” he had naturally provided one on each side of the river, for the use of all those who wished to cross from either bank.

The third line opens with a very long and complicated sentence, in which we have clearly three distinct sets of names, with distinct grammatical references. Rāmatīrthe stands in immediate relation to charakā, “wandering to Rāmatīrtha”; Nākāgola stands in immediate relation to Nākāgola; and Pīḍīkāsāda, Govardhana, Suvarṇamukha, Śrīprārāga stand in relation to varhābhyaḥ, “the congregations in those four places.” The meaning of the whole is, that Ushavatā

11 E.g., Mahāv. p. 35, l. 14, antākāraḥ; ibid., p. 220, l. 9, dharanīḥ; Lal. Vist. p. 369, l. 1, Bhagyākasaḥ; ibid., p. 467, l. 14, nāvānā.
12 Pali: chatusudda, Prākrit: chatusūtā; like chatusvajra, Skr. chatusvajraḥ. Prof. Bühler, in his notes, also mentions both Sanskrit forms, by way of emendations.
13 See my edition of Chaṇḍa’s Grammar of the Ancient Prākrit, the Prākrita Lokahavan, III, II, and my notes on the Bharhut Stūpa Inscriptions, Part I, No. 5. (Ind. Ant. vol. X, p. 119.) Thus we have Madhvā for Madhava, udhā for udā, Maphādva for Mahādeva.
14 See Childers’ Dictionary. The word occurs in the acc. sing. nāvā, in the Gāthā of the Lalita Vistara, p. 354, line 6. It also occurs in the Jaina Prākrit, see Weber, Bhagavata, p. 419. Prof. Bhandarkar’s difficulty about the singular number of nāvā, of course, disappears under this view of the text; for nāvā, being a mere stem in a compound, can have either a singular or plural meaning, according to circumstances.
gave thirty-two cocoanut trees, situated in the village of Nānaṅgola, to the congregations resident in Piṅḍūṭakāvāda, etc., who were in the habit of going to the Rāmatīrtha. These cocoanut trees are said to have represented a capital of one thousand Kārīhāpapānas. I suppose their annual produce was devoted to the objects of those Parshads. There may have been some special (religious or other) use to which it was applied. The word nāḍīgēra has greatly puzzled Dr. Stevenson and Prof. Bhandarkar who read it nāṇḍīgēra and nāṇḍīgēra respectively; but the other form nāḍīgēra, in which the same word occurs in No. 16 of the Nāsik Inscriptions, at once suggests its identity. It is simply a Prākritising form of the Sanskrit nāḍīkele or nāḍīkēra or nāḍīkēra, and the Pāli nāḍīkēra or nāḍīkēra or nāḍīkēra. The softening of unaspirated consonants, especially of k, is not uncommon in the ancient Prākrit; Čaṇḍa has a special rule regarding it, and gives the examples niṭṭhāgā = Sanskrit niṭṭhakāra, egam = Sanskrit egam. The Gāthā form of the name Śṛṇgāra, for Sanskrit Śṛṇgāra, shows the same softening of k. Prof. Bhandarkar thinks that we must read charaka for charaka; but the original has very clearly charaka, and there is no need to assume an error, seeing that charaka gives a very good sense; it qualifies parshabhīya with reference to Rāmatīrtha, “the Parshads going to Rāmatīrtha.” In Sanskrit we should expect the accusative Rāmatīrthaḥ; but the substitution of the locative for the accusative is very common in Gāthā. Prof. Bühler’s view, I think, does not materially differ from mine, except that he constructs Rāmatīrthaḥ with Śṛṇgāra, “at Rāmatīrtha near Śṛṇgāra.” He translates: “who has given, in the village of Nānaṅgola, one thousand as the price of thirty-two cocoanut trees (destined for the benefit of) the Charaka congregations at Piṅḍūṭakāvāda, Govardhana, Suvārampukhā, and at Rāmatīrtha near Śṛṇgāra.” The main difficulty is as to the meaning of the term charaka. It may mean, as Prof. Bühler notes, either “congregations of (wandering Brahmans) students,” or “assemblies of Brāhmaṇas studying the charaka śākhd.” The former meaning appears to me the more probable. There were Brahmans schools at the four places mentioned, the students of which, according to a common practice, used to visit the, at that time apparently famous, Thīrtha. Rāmatīrtha cannot have been very far from any of those four places. There are some more Gāthā forms in this clause. Both Dr. Stevenson and Prof. Bhandarkar read parshabhīya (given also in Prof. Bühler’s notes, as an emendation); but the original has parshabhīya (without d), and this requires no alteration, as it is a true Gāthā form. Strictly it should be parshabhīya (Pāli parisābī), but the Gāthā is not particular about the length of vowels in inflection. On the characteristic disregard of sandhi in parshabhīya and devātītau I have already remarked. But devātītau itself is a Prākritising Gāthā form for Sanskrit devātīta; the corresponding Pāli form is devatītau or devattū, Prākrit battī, and compare the Gujarati battrī and Sindhī bārī. There is another Gāthā form in the disruption and inversion of the compound in grāme Nānaṅgola, which in Sanskrit would be Nānaṅgolagrāme. Instances of this practice are not uncommon, in both the Lalita Vistara and the Mahāvastu.

The second clause of the third line is plain. But I do not think my predecessors are correct in constructing dharmātmaṇḍa as agreeing with Uṣhavaddēna, “by the benevolent (or charitable) Uṣhavaddēna.” There are two objections to this construction. In the first place, if the writer had meant to express what they assume, it is not likely that he would have separated the two words so widely; but secondly, what is much more conclusive—the same expression dharmātmaṇḍa again occurs in the Inscription No. 19 (West’s No. 4) (the last word of the
the first line), where it is impossible to construct it with the person named (Indrāgūdatta); for the latter is in the genitive case, while dharmātmanā is in the instrumental.

I think, therefore, that dharmātmanā must be taken as an independent phrase, in which apparently the motive of the act of excavation is intended to be expressed: "moved by religious principle."

I am inclined to think that it is probably a Buddhist technical term in this, or a similar, signification. The word podhiyo (Marāṭhi podhi or podi) is the Prākrit equivalent of the Sanskrit protho “an excavation;" the feminine prothi or prothikā would mean "a cistern;" hence the Prākrit podhi(plural podhīyo) and podhiyā; both forms occur in Inscription, West’s No. 1 (do podhiyo and ekā podhiyā).

The change of the dental surd th to cerebral sonant dh is not without analogues in Prākrit, e.g., padhama "first" (H. C. I, 55), for Pāli pabhama, Sanskrit prathama.

In the third clause of the third line Professor Bhandarkar reads bhattārakā āṇatiyā where the final a of bhattāraka is uninterpretable. The original, however, has very clearly bhattārakāṇātiyā as a compound, and its division is indicated by a subscribed a under "kā." The compound, therefore, must be divided bhattāraka āṇatiyā or āṇatiyā ("by the command of the noble lord"), which is perfectly correct. Āṇatiyā or āṇatiyā is the Sanskrit āṇapti, the Pāli āṇati, (or āṇatīyā).

The following is Prof. Bühler’s note on this word: "The a of āṇatiyā stands below the line and is a correction which only causes confusion. It ought to be either bhattārakāṇātiyā or bhaṭṭāraka āṇatiyā, i.e., bhattārakāṇapti."

The inscription, however, has quite correctly bhattārakāṇātiyā, and the subscribed a is not meant as a correction, but as a help to the right division of the compound. Such subscribed letters are not uncommonly met with in MSS. where they serve to elucidate the sandhi. We have another instance in this very Inscription in siddham where m is subscribed. In the Skandagupta Inscription on the Junagadh rock many examples occur; e.g., in line 2, in sauvat Sripare the t is subscribed, to avoid the complicated sandhi kasevachchtripare.

A similar instance occurs in the Rudradāma Inscription, on the same rock, in the 7th line. śat chatvāri with subscribed t. In our present Inscription the second t of deśatāsītānālīgera should be subscribed, and the compound must be read deśatāsītānālīgera (not deśatās inālīgera, as Prof. Bühler apparently reads). For the latter form, deśatāsītā, there is no support in either Sanskrit or Prākrit; and it may easily be understood that in such rock Inscription the "subscription" was not always done accurately. Instances of inaccurate subscription occur in the Skandagupta Inscription, in lines 9, 17, 21.

The word varṣā-ratuṇā is again a Prākritising Gāthā form; ratuṇā being, as already suggested by Prof. Bhandarkar, the equivalent of Sanskrit ruttu. In the ordinary Pāli-Prākrit the vowel r of this word changes to w (Pāli vata, Prākrit vutā or vū or vūt H. C. I, 141). The Gāthā use of the accusative for the locative has already been noticed.

The last clause of the third line has been altogether misunderstood by Dr. Stevenson and Prof. Bhandarkar. They were misled by a gap which occurs between Mālaye and hi rudhān, into thinking that a portion of the Inscription was lost. Accordingly they read Mālaye and Hirudhān as two words, of which they make the former to be the name of a place, constructing it (apparently as a locative singular) with gato’emi, while they make the latter the name of a person called Hirudhā of the Uttamabhādra race of Kahatriyas. But the fact is that nothing is lost, and that the words must be divided Mālaye rūdhān "beset by the Mālayas." Reading Mālaye rūdhān not only produces the correct form of a word, but also completes the sense of the sentence; for in the next line we are told that the Mālayas fled at the approach of Ushradāta who was sent to the rescue of the Uttamabhādra. In this view, I find, I am supported by Prof. Bühler.

I have followed my predecessors in taking Uttamabhādra as the name of a Kahatriya race which, as Prof. Bühler notes, in the singular number refers to the chief of the race, and in the plural to the members of the race generally. This undoubtedly is a common usage with regard

---

38 Professor Bhandarkar himself saw this in translating that Inscription. But he gets over the difficulty by arbitrarily changing the reading to the genitive dharmātmano, so as to agree with Indrāgūdattāsa; though

44 See the photographic facsimile in Burgess’ Archaeological Survey of Western India, Vol. I, Pl. XV.
to such names; but I do not know that the existence of a Kshatriya race called Uttamabhadra, has been otherwise verified. This being so, might not Uttamabhadra be the name of a place, and Uttamabhadra Kshatriya mean “the Kshatriyas of, or resident in, Uttamabhadra?”

The abutation mentioned in the fourth line was performed in Pokhārāni. This word looks uncommonly like pokharāni, and I cannot help thinking that it is really nothing else but a Gāthā form of it. The reference is evidently to some well-known place of sacred tanks to which Usāvakāta went after his victory to pay his “thank-offerings.” There are several places of this sort, known under the name Pokhar, the best known that near Ajnir, which is suggested by Prof. Bühler. The name is spelt with the dental n which though it would be anomalous if the record

**Revised Reading.**


**New Translation.**

On the 5th (day) of the dark half of (the month) Bhūdrapadā in the 127th year of the king, the great satrap, Lord Rudrasena, [the son] of the king, the great satrap, the gracious Lord Rudrādāma, the grandson of the king, the great satrap Lord Jayadāma, the great-grandson of the king, the great satrap Lord Jayadāma, the great-grandson of the king, the gracious Lord Chāhṭana—this memorial of the munificence of Tuṅgota, the son of Pratāpaṭhaka, the grandson of Kharapraṇa has been erected by his brothers.

The old translation is very unsatisfactory; it is greatly confused throughout, and in some respects altogether wrong. To mention, first, some of the minor points of confusion, which

---
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were in Sanskrit, is not so in the Gāthā; the same peculiarity occurs in prāṇīdēna, bhadrakāṃchaśaśvāmi-Chāhṭana, for Sanskrit prāṇīdēna, bhadrakāṃchaśaśvāmi-Chāhṭana. The facsimile has tni, not tni as in Prof. Bhandarkar’s Text. The spelling utamabhadra with one t does not make the word Prākrit. Even in acknowledged Sanskrit Inscriptions a homogenous double-consonant is not always written in full; thus in Skandagupta’s Inscription at Gīrṇā, the last word in the seventh line is spelled pravṛtiḥ for pravṛtiḥ; in the 14th line we have 6ūtāchānārā for 6ūtāchānārā, et passim.**

I now proceed to the Jāthal Inscription, of which a facsimile, Nāgarī Transcription and English translation has been given by the late Mr. Bhaṭ Daji in the *Journal of the Bombay Asiatic Society*, vol. VIII, pp. 234, 235.**

**Mr. Bhaṭ Daji’s Transcript.**


**Mr. Bhaṭ Daji’s Version.**

In the year 127 Bhūdrapada in the 127th year of the king, the great satrap Lord Rudrasena, [the son] of the king, the great satrap, the gracious Lord Rudrādāma, the grandson of the king, the great satrap Lord Jayadāma, the great-grandson of the king, the gracious Lord Chāhṭana—this memorial of the munificence of Tuṅgota, the son of Pratāpaṭhaka, the grandson of Kharapraṇa has been erected by his brothers.

perhaps are due to mere carelessness. The epithet Bhadrakāṃchaśaśvāmi is given to Rudrānāsya whereas, according to the text, it belongs to his father Rudrāśaṇa; the latter’s name moreover is

---

**32** Prof. Bhandarkar reads obhiśekaḥ krito, misled apparently by two strokes which are shown in Mr. West’s copy between obhiśeka and krito. But these strokes could not be the sign of the *obhiśeka*, but of the numeral two, meaning “he made two ablations.” Their genuineness, however, is very doubtful, as the new impression has no lines after obhiśeka, nor any room for them.

---


**34** See also Burgess’ *Archaeological Survey of Western India*, vol. I, pp. i, 43.

**35** lit., “the good-faced,” benign.
simply given as Rudra instead of Rudrasiha, as the text has it. Rudrasena is also said to be the "grandson" of Jayadama, while the text calls him his great-grandson.

In the translation the date is given as the seventh day; the reason of which I am somewhat puzzled to understand, seeing that in his Nagrai transcript Mr. Bhau Daji gives the date correctly as the 5th, as the facsimile clearly has it. The only explanation that occurs to me, is, that he may possibly have divided bahala and sa into two words, and taken the letter (sa) as an abbreviation of saptae "seventh." There would then be, however, a discrepancy between the date in words and in figures, and bahala would be uninfected. However, as he gave no explanation of this point in his translation, his reason for translating 7th may have been a different one.

Mr. Bhau Daji constructs the genitive of the royal names as dependent on sttra "the tank of Raja, etc." which causes the genitives following sttra to remain unconnected and unintelligible. But it is plain from the whole context that the first genitives are connected with varshe, "in the year of the king, etc.", while the genitives belonging to sttra are contained in the names following it. The date 127, of course, is not the year of the reign of Rudrasena, but of the era of his reign.

To sttra Mr. Bhau Daji gives the meaning "tank." There are two objections to this translation. First, the predicate, utthavita, belonging to it, and which means "erected," shows that the object referred to cannot have been a "tank," but most probably the "stone-pillar" itself on which the inscription is borne. Secondly, to judge from the Peterburg Dictionary it is very doubtful whether the word sttra has the meaning of "tank" at all.

The last line, as Mr. Bhau Daji translates it, mentions the brothers of an individual who is the grandson and son of two men who are named, but the individual himself is not named. This would be a very extraordinary proceeding, and certainly one which has not been found in any other inscription. It is evident that the name of the individual must be contained in the letters which precede the name of his father. Mr. Bhau Daji reads those letters manasagotra, and makes this (apparently) the name of the family (or perhaps, the place), to which the unknown individual's father belonged. In his reading, however, he has omitted one sa (or rather sas, as the facsimile has an anusvara over the second letter); for the text has manasasasunagotra, which I think would make it impossible to translate in the way Mr. Bhau Daji has done. But the two letters which he transcribes sasun, are clearly not sasun in the facsimile but rather sutu.29 We have therefore manasasunagotra. This I would divide into two words, and read manas with sttra29 as a compound, sttranamun, i.e., "memorial of the munificence" (lit., "honouring of his sttra"). Sttra is properly "a kind of expensive Soma sacrifice extending over many days," hence it comes to mean "liberality" or "munificence" generally. It might possibly be here used in its proper sense. Sttra is the correct spelling; here it is spelled sttra, after the Gatha fashion, which is apt to interchange the sibilants. In sttanagotra, I think, we have the name of the individual, whose sttra is commemorated. As the name must be in the genitive, I think, the following letter must be taken with it and read syn. There is an indistinct mark under the letter, which Mr. Bhau Daji takes to be the vowel a; but it is more probably the remnant of a subscribed ya; the whole letter, accordingly, is say; and the whole word is Taunagotra "of Taunagotra." I omit one tu, because I think it was most probably repeated by the carelessness of the writer.30 There is absolute evidence of the inscription having been incised with much carelessness; e.g., in the fourth line we have Kukapasya, instead of Kukrapasya; in the fifth line we have kahasya instead of kahutrasya. If the writer was careless enough to omit syllables, he was also likely to add them where they were not required.32 Next follows the name of the father of Tunagotra, which Mr. Bhau Daji reads supanaubhaka; but as "sa" is not part of the word; the second consonant is not nd, but nd;33 and after it there is a lacuna.

29 At all events, whatever they may be, they are certainly not two sa; for the sign for as occurs about twenty times in the inscription and is very different.
39 Mr. Bhau Daji reads qoq, but the facsimile has no anusvara; to which an anusvara must be supplied, but that makes no difficulty, as the inscription is written in the Gatha, which is careless about anusvaras.

31 If it is genuine, it might be the expletive particle in; or, of course, the name itself might be Tunagotra.
32 As I have not seen the original, it is just possible that these mistakes may be due to the copyist.
33 The facsimile has clearly t; the letter is precisely the same as in the last word utthavita.
of one letter, which was probably \( r \), as the space is small. Hence I read the whole name \textit{Pratārathaka}. Then follows the name of the grandfather \textit{Khara}. Finally the "brothers" of \textit{Tūngotra} are named as the persons who erected the memorial; the reading is \textit{bhidrībhiḥ} "by the brothers" (not "with the brothers"). Mr. Bhānu Dajji reads \textit{bhidrībhiḥ}; but the facsimile shows no initial compound; we have a similar omission of the conjunct \( r \), in the second line, in \textit{papautrasya} for \textit{papautrasya}; such omissions are not unknown in the Gāthā. The last word is doubtfully read \textit{uṭhavīḍaṇa} by Mr. Bhānu Dajji. There can be little doubt that it must be read \textit{uṭhavīḍāṭi}. The last line is not very well preserved, which easily accounts for the loss of the final \( i \), and the apparent similarity of \textit{sā} to \textit{sād}. \textit{Uṭhavīḍāṭi} stands for \textit{uṭhavīḍāṭi}, according to a well-known practice of Pāli sandhi.\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Uṭhavīḍa} is a thoroughly Pāli-Prakrit form; the Sanskrit would be \textit{uṭhāpaḍita}; but in both Pāli and Prakrit the long \( a \) may be shortened,\textsuperscript{26} and the softening of \( p \) to \( v \) is already known to the ancient Prakrit.\textsuperscript{27}

Besides the Pāli-Prakrit forms, already noticed incidentally, there are some others in this inscription which show that it is not written in Sanskrit, but in the so-called Gāthā dialect. Thus we have the un-sanskritic sandhi \textit{rājya maḥā} (line 2), \textit{rājya maḥā} (line 4).\textsuperscript{28} Again in the first line we have the Pāli genitive singular \textit{bahułasa} (or \textit{bahuḷasa}, for Sanskrit \textit{bahuḷasya}) ; so also in the last word of the same line \textit{Kshatrapasa} (or \textit{Kshatrapaśa}) for Sanskrit \textit{Kṣatrapasya}. It is true, the last letter, according to the facsimile is doubtful; but, at any rate, the traces shown in it suggest \( s \), not \( sya \) as Mr. Bhānu Dajji transcribes.

The end of the second and third lines is not well preserved. I would suggest that the last letter of the third line is not \textit{bha}, but a badly drawn \( s \) (compare \textit{sadvī}, the first word in the same line); and that originally it had a \( va \) subscribed, which is now lost;\textsuperscript{29} further that this \textit{sadv} was originally followed by the letter \( m \) (or \textit{mī}), of which however nothing remains except the superscribed large curve of the vowel \( f \) (or \( i \)), and which the copyist has represented as attached to the foot of the letter above it in the second line. This letter in the second line is the letter \textit{pa}, badly drawn by the copyist, but clearly required by the word \textit{Kṣatrapasya}, which is the last of the second line, and of which the letter \textit{tra} is altogether lost. The last word of the third line, then, is \textit{svād} or \textit{svāmī}, or if two letters be missing at the end of that line, it might have been \textit{svāmisya}. Another way to fill up the lacuna would be to supply \textit{bhadraramukha} at the end of the third line, and \textit{svāmī} at the beginning of the fourth line; but this would not explain the curious letter, last but one, of the second line.

\textbf{NOTICE OF A BUDDHIST TOPE IN THE PĪṬṬĀPUR ZAMINDARI.}

\textbf{BY SIR WALTER ELLIOT, K.C.I.}

The recent discovery of the Stūpa at Jaggayyapeta, the inscriptions from which were described in the \textit{Indian Antiquary} vol. XI, p. 156, furnishes another proof of the hold taken by the Buddhist faith in the Doab of the Kṛishṇa and Godāvari. I desire now to place on record a similar example which fell under my observation some years ago, but which might otherwise come to be overlooked.

In 1848 the late Sir Henry Montgomery, who had been employed on special duty five years before in Rajahmundry, having told me that some curious relics had been found near Pīṭṭāpur by the Zamindar, I at once applied through the Collector for information about them. In reply Mr. Forbes sent me a report by the native head of police, from which I gathered the following particulars:—In the beginning of 1848 Rāja Veṅkaṭa Sūryarāṇa, Zamindar of Pīṭṭāpur, having occasion for some bricks in a work he was then constructing, directed them to be taken from a ruined structure near the village of Timavaram. In the course of the excavation the workmen discovered five stone vessels with covers of the same material

\textsuperscript{25} Perhaps it might be \textit{pāṭhāhakā} "the lord of Pāṭṭa."

\textsuperscript{26} See Childers' \textit{on Sandhi} in Pāli in \textit{Jour. R. Asi. Soc.}, vol. XI, p. 112. No. 60; \textit{sadvī}, \textit{bhākasiṇi} for \textit{tāsam chāin} (Kashī, p. 29, \textit{ṣītra 8}; \textit{ed. Smarci}).


\textsuperscript{28} Mr. Bhānu Dajji reads \textit{rājya maḥā}, misled by the prejudice that it must be Sanskrit; but the facsimile has \textit{rājya}, a kind of sandhi, not uncommon in the Gāthā.

\textsuperscript{29} This is the well-known form on the Kṣatrapa coins.

\textsuperscript{30} Possibly the Pāli form \textit{sadvī} stood here.
each containing a small crystal box or casket. The latter contained each a splinter of precious stone (ruby, emerald, &c.), a small pearl, a bit of coral and a piece of gold leaf. An inventory was made of the whole, and they were sent to the Zilla Court, in conformity with the regulations for Treasure Trove. On the expiry of the prescribed period of six months they were claimed by the Rája, who at my request presented them to the Madras Literary Society, from which they were afterwards transferred to the Government Central Museum. I intended to have published a notice of this transaction in the Journal of the Literary Society, and caused a lithograph to be prepared for the purpose, but having been sent to the Northern Sarkára on special duty, where I remained five years, the matter was overlooked and the management of the Journal, which had been under my care, passed into other hands. The consequence was that the illustration appeared in the next number, where it stands at page 225 of Volume XIX, without any explanation whatever to show what it means.

CHINGHIZ KHÁN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

BY HENRY H. HOWORTH, F.S.A.

(Continued from vol. XI., p. 223.)

XVIII.

Before describing Chinghiz Khán's campaign in China the Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shí inserts one or two curious notices which we will now illustrate. One of them refers to the Shaman Kokochi or Kukjn whom we have previously mentioned as taking an active part in proclaiming Chinghiz as Khakan. It tells us that Munlik, of the tribe Khuankhotadai, had seven sons, the fourth of whom, Kokochi, was a sorcerer, and was surnamed Tep-tengri (i.e. one who can mount in the air to heaven). In the Arabic text of Abulfaraj, though not in the Syriac, the incident about Chinghiz Khán's being named by the Shaman is mentioned, being no doubt derived from the Jehán Kuskar. The Shaman is here called a distinguished prince, and we are told the name he gave his patron was Jingiz Khán Tübl Tengri, in which his own appellation, which it will be noticed, is here given as in the Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shí, is confused with that of Chinghiz himself. Rashidu'd-dín says that Kukjn's people credited him with the power of mounting up to heaven on a dappled grey horse; he adds that they called him But Tengri. In regard to the claim to mount in the air, Colonel Yule has collected some curious facts. Father Ricold reports that "there are certain men whom the Tartars honour above all in the world, viz. the Baxitáké. They are usually acquainted with magic arts, and depend on the counsel and aid of demons; they exhibit many delusions, and predict some future events. For instance, one of eminence among them was said to fly; the truth however was (as it proved) that he did not fly, but did walk close to the surface of the ground without touching it; and would seem to sit down without having any substance to support him." Sanang Setzen reports similar feats, including restoring the dead to life, turning a dead body into gold, penetrating everywhere as air does, flying, catching wild beasts, reading thoughts, making water flow backwards, eating tiles, sitting in the air with the legs doubled under, etc. As Colonel Yule says, these are the very kind of performances which the old legends assign to Simon Magus. He made statues to walk; leapt into the fire without being burnt; flew in the air; made bread of stones; etc. etc. In regard to the name But Tengri, it is curious that the Tukin or Turks of the 6th century are reported to have worshipped a spirit which they called Pò Tèn-gù, meaning God of the Earth (? God of heaven). Von Hammer suggests that this Po Tengri is no other than the But Tengri of Rashidu'd-dín, Mirkhavend and Khuandemir, which Abulghazi gives as Tangrining-Buti.

To revert to the Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shí, we read

1 The accompanying plate is a reproduction of the one in the Journal of the Literary Society.
2 The subject was incidentally referred to, but without any particulars, in a subsequent Volume.
3 i. e. Bakhshis.
5 Confidential.
6 Abel Remusat, Recherches sur les Langues Tartares, p. 297.
7 Abdalghazi, p. 88 and note 1.
that Tep-tengri and his six brothers were truculent persons, and on one occasion assaulted Khazar, Chinghiz Khân's brother, who complained to him about it, but Chinghiz replied, "Once you boasted that no one could contend with you, how then did you permit them to illuse you?" Khazar went out much distressed at this answer. We are told he shed tears, and did not see his brother for three days. Tep-tengri then went to the Great Conqueror, and said that the Spirit had revealed to him the will of heaven, which was that he, Chinghiz, was first to reign over the nations and after him Khazar, and if he did not put Khazar aside he might become dangerous. Chinghiz set out the same night to seize his brother. Meanwhile Guchu, who, as we have seen, was an adopted son and protégé of hers, informed Kholon, the mother of Chinghiz, who had married Munlik the father of Tep-tengri, of what had occurred. Having harnessed a white camel in a kibitka she set out, and at night arrived at Khazar's camp at the very time when Chinghiz had taken off his brother's cap and belt, and tied his sleeves, and was questioning him. On seeing his mother Chinghiz was much confused and afraid. She descended from the kibitka, unbound Khazar, and gave him back his cap and belt, then with rising anger she sat down, and crossing her legs took out her two breasts and placed them on her knees, and said: "Do you perceive? These are the paps which you have sucked. What crime has Khazar committed that you should destroy your own flesh and blood? When you were a child you used to suck this breast. Khachiun and Ochihin could neither of them suck it. Khazar alone could suck both my paps and ease my breast. Therefore it is that the mind of Temujin is gifted, while Khazar has strength and skill in shooting. Whenever the peoples have rebelled he has subdued them with his bow and arrows. Now that the enemy is destroyed, Khazar's services are no longer needed." When Chinghiz saw that his mother's anger was cooled down, he said, "I am afraid, and I am ashamed," with these words he left. Afterwards, unknown to his mother, he deprived Khazar of some of his people, leaving him only 1400 households. Kholon was sorely troubled when she heard of this, and shortly after died.

Jebke, who had been attached to Khazar as we have seen, went to the country of Barkhajin. This saga is apparently reported nowhere else.

The Altan Topchi and Sasang Setzen, without detailing the cause report the quarrel between Chinghiz and Khazar. The latter author says that Khazar united in a revolt with the Dologhon Khongkhotan (i.e. with the seven brothers of the tribe Khongkhotan mentioned in the Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi). Both the Altan Topchi and Sasang Setzen report that Chinghiz sent an army under Subegetai in pursuit of his brother, and report also Chinghiz Khân's instructions to him, but in different language. The former says that Chinghiz addressed the troops as follows: "You, my soldiers, who are like herds rushing forwards headlong. You who are like the precious stone which decks the front of a moon-shaped head-dress. You who are like a cairn of stones. You who are strong and manly; who are like a cane brake, a trench girdling me about. You, my obedient soldiers, listen:—In your everyday life behave like two year old calves, but in attacks on the enemy sweep down like hawks. In games and feasts be playful as young stallions, but in battle attack the enemy like falcons.

* * * Imitate the hungry tiger and the fierce badger. Be watchful like the cautious wolf on a sunny day, and patient as a black raven on a dark night, constant and jealous as a queen.*

Subegetai Baghatur replied—"We will pursue with all our might and fulfil your commands. May we have in all things the luck of our commander." He thereupon set out and overtook Khazar, to whom he said,—"To depart from friends is to become the prey of strangers. To part from relatives is to sacrifice oneself. To leave a large family is to make oneself an orphan. A small nation may overwhelm a large family when dispersed. You may perchance find subjects, but not relatives." Khazar, we are told, approved of these words.

Sasang Setzen reports Chinghiz Khân's speech on this occasion thus: "You, my faithful army leaders, each one like a moon at the head of an army. You like the ornament of a head-dress. You the pink of honour. You, inflexible
as stone, and you my army who environ me like a wall, and whose files are like a field of reeds, hear my words:—In times of peaceful play, be united like the fingers of a hand; but in times of war, pounce like a falcon which is over its prey. When at sport rove about like flies, but in the day of battle rash down like an eagle which is striking its quarry. What we can do or not do the future will tell. Whether we shall accomplish it the tutelary spirit of our ruler will inform him.” He then went after Khazar, and when he had overtaken him he sent him the following message,—“He who breaks with his relatives will only have a small share of the booty. If kinsmen fall out they will be as strangers when the enemy has to be spoiled. You may get together a party, but you cannot bind them with ties of blood. You may secure subjects, but not a brother.” These words reconciled Khazar, who made peace with his elder brother. 11

This is not the only Saga reported by these authorities in reference to the quarrels of Chinghiz with his brothers. In the Altan Topchi we read how on one occasion Jingir Bukhi, of the Taijut tribe, having dug a hole in his tent, covered it with felt, and invited Chinghiz, with sinister intentions, to go and see him, saying to him, why should we strive against one another, we are not strangers. When Chinghiz set out, his mother, Ukgeleen Eke, said to him,—“Do not despise the poisonous snake because it is thin, nor make light of deceitful friends. One must not be too confiding, one must be vigilant.” Thereupon Chinghiz said to his brothers,—“You Khabatu Khazar guard the bow and arrows, and you Buke Belgetei look after the drink. You Khochigu watch the horses, and you Oitu-Ochikhu keep by my side: we do not know what awaits us.” When they reached the camp of the Taijut, Chinghiz, having entered the tent, would have sat down in the midst of the piece of felt covering the pitfall, but Ochikhu stopped him, and planted him on the edge of it. Belgetei having noticed a crippled woman cutting off the left stirrup of his horse he broke her leg, while she cut open his shoulder. A struggle now ensued, Khazar’s arrows did not miss their mark, while Belgetei, laying about him with a basin of airak or

spirit, helped Chinghiz on to the back of a white stallion belonging to Toktogakhan, the Khorchin, for which service the latter was afterwards created a terkhun. 12 Saanang Setzen also tells the story. He makes out that on this occasion Chinghiz was asked to a feast by the Taijut, Buke Chilger, with the words, “Formerly we knew not thine excellence, and lived at strife with thee. We have now learnt that thou art not deceitful, and that thy tutelary spirit is in fact a Bogda of the race of the gods. Our old hatred is stifled and gone, condescend to enter our small house.” In this edition of the story, Chinghiz, in addition to the instructions he gives his brothers to look after him, is also said to have ordered his nine örlöks to go in with him and his three hundred and nine body-guards to surround the yurt.

It also says that after Belgetei had punished the old woman who cut off the stirrup by striking her on the leg, one Büü Büke wounded his horse with his sword, while it makes the nine örlöks gather round their master and help him to mount the white mare of Toktangha Taiji of the Khorchin, whereupon a struggle began, which ended in the subjugation of the enemy. 13 While the Saga is told in this detached way by the author just quoted, the Altan Topchi links it on to another which is told as a separate incident by Saanang Setzen. To revert to the Altan Topchi, we read that after his escape from the Taijut, Chinghiz blamed Khazar for having allowed the stirrup to be cut off. Belgetei was also charged by Chinghiz with having deliberately taken him by the left hand when mounting him on his horse. He was seized and pinioned to a one horse araba or waggon. When all had lain down to sleep he moved away carrying this on his back, “and had a conference with Khazar. “Chinghiz,” he said, “punishes us unjustly, he subjugated the four foreign countries and the five peoples with the help of Belgetei’s strength and Khazar’s skilful archery.” When Chinghiz heard of their conversation, wishing to quell their pride, he dressed himself as an aged peasant engaged in selling long yellow bowls. The two brothers said to him—“Whence art thou old man, we have not seen thee before?” He replied—“I am a poor

11 Saanang Setzen, pp. 71-73.

man who sells bows.” They did not approve of his wares, whereupon he replied,—“Although my bows are not pretty, try to draw the string of one.” Belgetei took one, and tried to bend it, and attach the string, but he could not, whereupon the old man did it for him, and then handed it to Khazar, but Khazar could not draw it. The hoary old man, who was seated on a light grey horse, thenceupon put his arrow (Altan-tokhok) to the string, and shot so that it penetrated into a cliff, saying,—“Are you not brothers of the Bogdo Erdeni, Khazar the famous archer and Belgetei the strong. The proverb says it is better to fill the mouth full than to try and speak from a great height.” He then disappeared, and the brothers who were in fear said,—“In truth this must have been Bogdo Erdeni himself.”14 Seaang Setzen also tells this story, but he makes it a separate incident, and not an episode in the adventure with the Taijiut. In his account the old man offered the two brothers a long bow. They jeered him, saying,—“Ah, old man, your bow would do well enough as a snap bow to kill moles with!” He replied,—“How can you young people be so scornful before you have tried it, the old man may teach you differently.” When each had tried in vain to string and bend it, the old man changed himself in their presence into a hary and decrepit person, riding on a blind mule, and fired an arrow at a rock which he clove in pieces. Then turning to them he said: “Boasting stinks, says the proverb. You know it as well as the old man.” They then agreed that this could be no ordinary man, but an incarnation or Khabitghan of their ruler and elder brother. Thenceforward they were afraid and obedient.15

Let us now revert again to the Yuan-ch’ao-pi-shi. It reports another saga about the Shaman Kokochi or Teb-tengri, which is not preserved elsewhere so far as I know. We read that there joined him people of nine different languages, as many as were with Chinghiz Khan himself. Among others were some of the subjects of Ochigin, Chinghiz’ brother. Ochigin sent Sokhora to bring them back, but Teb-tengri beat him, and sent him back again with a horse saddle fastened on his back. Ochigin having afterwards gone in person, Teb-tengri with his brothers surrounded him, and said, “How did you dare to send men to take our people from us?” They were going to beat him, when Ochigin, growing afraid, said he ought not to have sent them, upon which they replied,—“As you are guilty you must ask forgiveness from us.” They accordingly made him crawl out backwards on his hands and knees. Next morning, before Chinghiz rose, Ochigin entered his tent, kaelt down, and related how he had been treated, and wept. Chinghiz did not speak, but his wife Bertieqjin,16 sitting up in bed and covering her breasts with the clothes, broke into tears and said,—“What does this mean? The Khuankhotan have already beaten Khazar, and now they have made Ochigin kneel down to them. If while you are still alive you assail your brothers, who are majestic as cedars, how will a people which resembles agitated grass and a flock of birds (? without much cohesion) submit to your children who are small and ungainly.” Chinghiz thereupon said to Ochigin, “When Teb-tengri comes here to day you may do what you please with him.” Ochigin went out and engaged three very strong men. Presently Munlik arrived with his seven sons, among whom was Teb-tengri. Hardly had the latter seated himself on the western side of the drink store when Ochigin, taking him by the collar, said,—“Yesterday you made me ask pardon. To-day I will try how strong I am.” While they were wrestling the cap fell from Teb-tengri’s head, and was picked up by his father, who having smelt it put it inside his coat.” Chinghiz now ordered them to go and wrestle outside. As they went out, holding each other, the three strong men who had been posted behind the threshold of the door seized Teb-tengri, broke his back bone, and threw his body to the left towards the kibitkas. Ochigin now went into the tent and delivered himself in enigmatical phrases. “Yesterday,” he said, “Teb-tengri forced me to ask forgiveness. To-day, when I wished to measure strength with him he lay down and refuses to get up. It is clear he is a person of the ordinary kind.”13

15 Seeang Setzen, pp. 73 and 75.
16 Bertie Fujin.
17 Palladino explains that among the Mongols, as with the Chinese, smilling is equivalent to kissing with us.
18 i.e., not supernaturally endowed.
Munlik understood the words, and shedding tears said—"Khán, I helped you before you began to rise, and have remained faithful to this day." While he was speaking his other six sons blocked up the doorway, and gathering themselves about the hearth began to roll their sleeves.

It was now the turn of Chinghiz to be afraid, and he rose and said—"I will go out." He accordingly went out, and was immediately surrounded by a Sanban of his archers.

Seeing that Teb-tengri was already dead Chinghiz ordered a tent to be erected over his body. He then rose and went away. The door and smoke-hole of this tent were closed. On the third day a dawn the smoke hole opened by itself, and the corpse passed out through it. Chinghiz thereupon remarked, "Teb-tengri beat my brothers, and wrongfully slandered them, on this account heaven has not favoured him, but has taken away both his body and his life."

Then addressing Munlik he said—"You were not able to control your sons properly. He wished to be my equal, for this reason I have destroyed him. If I had known these qualities of yours before, I should long ago have destroyed you as I did Jamukhu, Altan and Khuchar. But if, having pledged my word in the morning I break it at night, or having pledged it at night I break it in the morning, I shall be as ashamed of men's judgment upon me. I have already undertaken to absolve you from the penalty of death." Thereupon the anger of Chinghiz cooled down, and we are told the self-sufficiency of Munlik and his sons diminished greatly.19

The curious reference to the disappearance of the Shaman through the smoke-hole of the yurt may be illustrated from other sources. Thus Colonel Yule, quoting the Rev. Mr. Jaeschke, says,—"Our Lama50 tells us that the owner of a house and the members of his family when they die are carried through the house-door; but if another person dies in the house his body is removed by some other aperture, such as the window, or the smoke-hole in the roof, or a hole in the wall dug expressly for the purpose. Or a wooden frame is made, fitting into the door-way, and the body is then carried through; it being considered

that by this contrivance the evil consequences are escaped that might ensue, were it carried through the ordinary, and, so to say, undisguised house door!"51 Again, speaking of China, Mr. Williamson says,—"It may interest the reader to know that a small square opening on the tomb is purposely left for the more convenient ingress and egress of the spirit."52

In regard to the end of the Shaman Kokochi, or Kukju, Rashidu'd-din tells us that he became very tiresome, and used to come into the Imperial Orda, and make boastful and noisy harangues. Chinghiz thereupon ordered his brother Juchi Khazar to kill him when he came again boasting into the camp. Khazar was very strong, and when he gripped a man round the waist he could break his back like breaking a stick. He gave him two or three kicks and then killed him. His father remained sitting and picked up his cap, not knowing at first that anything was meant. On discovering the truth he still remained quiet.53 Erdmann says the same notice, but in a more epitomized form, is found in the Jihâd Kushti. Mirkhavand says, that as Kukju had secured a number of followers he began to dispute with Khazar about affairs of state, whereupon he grew angry, caught him by the neck, and threw him down so violently that he killed him.54 Rashidu'd-din says that three of his brothers became great Amir and commanders of kha-sareks, namely, Tulun Jerbi and Sugtu Jerbi, who were attached to the right wing, and Sutun,55 who was attached to the left.

The stories reported of Kukochi the Shaman in the Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi remind us that the religion of the Mongols at this time was Shamanism, that form of nature worship which is so widely spread throughout Northern Asia, which seems to have been the primitive faith out of which the various Asiatic religions of a more philosophical and rational character have developed by way of reform, and to have been further the background of much of the early religion of China, of Egypt, and of the West. It will be a convenient place to collect here such notices as we can find about the Shamanism of the Mongols. The greater portion of the race is now and has long been converted to Lamaism, the form of Bud-
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dhism prevailing in Tibet, but the Lamas were an accommodating class, and incorporated into their system a good deal of the earlier faith. In addition to this, Shamanism still prevails and prevailed much more extensively in the last century among the Kalmucks and the Buriats, while the medieval travellers have preserved some valuable notices about it. From these various sources it is quite possible to collect a fair account of the Shamanism which was professed by Chinghiz Khan and his ancestors. The supreme being among the Mongols was styled Tangri or Tegri.

As Remusat says, among the early Chinese the name for heaven, Thian, was ambiguous, and meant equally the spiritual and the material heaven—God, and the grandest of his works. This was the case also apparently with the Turks and Mongols, with whom Tangri or Tegri had apparently the same ambiguous meaning. The word Tangri is apparently of Mongol origin, and Remusat suggests that it is derived from the word tagera meaning 'elevated'. The Chinese emperors styled themselves soos of heaven, which was the style used by the chiefs of the Hijongu, who called themselves Tangri-kutu.

The Tukin or Turks of the 6th century, used to offer an annual sacrifice between the 11th and 20th days of the 5th month to the spirit of the sky. We are also told they reverenced a spirit whom they went to worship at a distance of 500 li to the west of their chief's camp. This spirit, as we have seen, they called Potengri. Michael the Syrian tells us the Seljuks before their conversion to Muhammedanism called their god Kauk Tangri, meaning the Blue God or the god of heaven. Koke means blue in Mongol, while kook in Turkish means the sky.

The Georgian history says that the Mongols placed at the head of their books the phrase Mangu Tangri Kuchundur, meaning “by the power of the immortal God.” This statement is literally true, as has been verified by Schmidts, Banzarof, &c. who found that the paizaks or natal tablets of office which have reached our day, as those found at Minusinsk in 1846, another found in 1845 at Groshovka on the Dnieper in the Government of Ekaterinoslav, and a third found in 1853 in the district of Verkhneudinsk, all of which commence with the phrase Munke tengri yin kuchundur. The same phrase, as Banzarof says, is found in the Shaman prayers, in the various yarihigs issued by the Mongol sovereigns, and in the historical works of the Mongols. The phrase tengri yin kuchundur is a translation of the Chinese sacramental phrase Poang thizm yun, by the will or grace of heaven. Carpini tells us the Mongols believed in one God, whom they held to be the creator of all things visible and invisible, and that he was the distributor of good and ill in this world. They did not offer him any prayers however, nor did they worship him with any religious rites. They called him Ito a. The Comans (i.e. the Kipchak Turks) called him K a m o r O h a m. Mandeville gives this name as Iroga. Itoa is probably preserved in the Kalmuk name for God, Bukhan At Zaaii, i.e., the Creator. Although this Supreme Being was acknowledged as the Creator and Master of the Universe, the system of Shamanism, which is in fact a form of pantheism, supplemented him by a crowd of spirits, each mountain, rock, river, brook, spring and tree having its own special spirit dwelling in it. These were not only deemed to be the authors of the various revolutions and changes in nature, but also to control the fortunes of men, and to bring them prosperity and happiness on the one hand, and disease and pain on the other. To conciliate or appease these spirits was the special office of the medicine men, who were called K a m i and B o g e by the Mongols, H I a b a by the Tibetans and S a m a n s by the Manchus. Carpini tells us the Mongols adored the sun, moon, fire, earth and air, and offered them some meat and drink before partaking themselves. They began their undertakings at new and full moon, whence they styled the moon the Great Emperor, and bowed the knees and prayed to it. They called the sun the moon's mother, since the latter derived its light from the
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former. They purified everything by fire, and when envoys, princes or others went to them it was the custom to pass them, and the gifts they brought between two fires, which was supposed to be a protection from any attempts they might make to poison, and to be an antidote to any poison they might have with them. It will be noted that this form of purification was very ancient. The Turks according to Menander worshipped fire, air, earth and water, and their priests were soothsayers or medicine men. These medicine men were noticed by Zemarchus in the Altai. They made the Byzantine officers purify themselves by passing through the fire just as the Mongols made the Franciscan missionaries and the Russian princes do so.

The Mongols, like the early Turks, paid divine honours to the sun, and we read how at the accession of Mangku Khan the princes, in doing homage to him, made a sevenfold prostration to the sun, an obeisance which was also demanded from the Russian princes. In saying their prayers they unbosomed their girdles, and threw them over their shoulders. Marco Polo says of the Mongol religion, “They say there is a High God of Heaven whom they worship daily with thurible and incense, but they pray to him only for health of mind and body. But they have also another certain God of theirs called Natigay, and they say he is the god of the earth, who watches over their children, cattle and crops. They show him great worship and honour, and every man hath a figure of him in his house made of felt and cloth, and they also make in the same way images of his wife and children. The wife they put on the left hand and the children in the front, and when they eat they take the fat of the meat and grease the god’s mouth as well as the mouths of his wife and children. Then they take off the broth and sprinkle it before the door of the house, and that done they deem that their god and his family have had their share of the dinner.”

In regard to the name Natigay given to these dolls, Von Hammer suggests that a very slight alteration would identify it with Naghusha or Nighamash, the name by which some Persian writers call the religion of the fire-worshippers, a suggestion which is surely far fetched.

The felt idols are very important elements of Shaman caste. Carpini says of them,—“But nevertheless they have certain idols made of felt, in the shape of men, and these they put on each side of the door, and below them they placed something shaped like a test, and they deemed these to be the guardians of their flocks, and that by their aid they obtained milk and fertility in their flocks. Others of these idols they made of silk and reverenced them greatly, placed them in a beautiful covered cart in front of the door, and whoever stole anything from the cart was put to death. When they made these idols they assembled all the elders, and made the figures reverently, and when they had them they killed a sheep and ate it and burnt its bones, and whenever even a boy was ill, they made an idol in this way and fastened it to his bed. They offered to these idols the first milk of all their cattle, and when they ate or drank anything they first offered them some of the food or drink, and whenever they killed an animal they similarly offered its heart to the idol in the cart as above mentioned, and left it there till the next day, after which they cooked and ate it.”

Rabruquis, who names the idols, says, "One of these felt figures was always suspended over the head of the house, and was known as the lord’s brother. Another over the mistress was called the mistress’s brother, and higher and between the two was a small very meagre one, which was deemed the guardian of the whole house. The mistress of the house placed on her left side at the feet of the bed in an elevated place a small skin of some animal filled with wool or other material, and beside it a small idol looking towards the maid servants and women. Close to the door in the women’s quarter was another image with a cow’s teat, for the women who milked the cows, and on the other side of the door among the men was another image with a mare’s teat for the men who milked the mares. When they met together to drink, they first sprinkled the image above the master of the house with the drink and after-
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wards the others in order. Thereupon an attendant went out with some food and drink and sprinkled three times towards the south while bending the knee. This was to adore the fire; then he did the same towards the east which was to adore the air; then towards the west in adoration of water, and lastly towards the north in memory of the dead. When the lord of the house was about to drink he threw some of the liquid upon the ground. If he drank while seated on horseback he poured some of it over the horse's neck or mane, and then poured some out to the four quarters of the world. In the discourse which Rubruquis had through an interpreter with the great Khan Mangu, when the latter said that his people believed only in one God, the friar asked him why therefore they made these images. The reply was that they were not images of God, but that when a rich man died or his son or wife or someone dear to him, it was customary to make an image and to reverence the memory of the dead one. This, as we shall see, was either a misleading statement on the part of the interpreter, or was misunderstood by the friar. He goes on to say that the images were dressed in very precious clothes, and placed in special carts, which were placed in charge of their priests. These priests were always about Mangu's tent, and those of other rich men. The poor, unless they belonged to the family of Chinghiz, had not any. The carts with the images preceded the camp when on the march, "like the cloud preceded the camp of Israel." These guardians selected the new camping ground, and the idols were first housed, after which the rest of the camp was pitched. On feast days they were taken out and ranged round the tent; into which the Mongols entered and did obeisance; no stranger was permitted to go in. On one occasion Rubruquis having entered was greatly upbraided for doing so. In his illustrative notes on Carpini, the Burat Lama Galsang Gomboyef, speaking of these felt penates, says, that we can still recover their names from the traditions prevailing among the Burats. The one placed in the middle of the khitka, and therefore found in the foremost part of the Khoimor, was called Dsayaghachi, i.e. the chief author of fortune. The one placed at the door was probably the Emegelji, the guardian of the herds, especially of the young cattle; he was dressed in sheep skins. Outside the khitka was placed Chandaghatu, meaning one possessed of a (white) hare. Part of his dress consisted of a white hare skin. He also was decked in other costly furs. He had the supervision of the chase and also apparently of war. Besides these there were also other gods as Khayaghnaiki, i.e. the one placed on the side wall (the door); Nokhaitu, to whom it was customary to offer dogs in sacrifice; Bars-ebugen, i.e. the old tiger, which was deemed a glutton, etc. etc. These various gods have been displaced by Buddhism, with the exception of Dsayaghachi who is surnamed Tenggeri (Heaven-dweller), and who has been incorporated into the Buddhist Pantheon.

The Russian traveller Georgispeota considerable time among the Burats, and has recorded a number of valuable details about their religion. He tells us this is substantially the same as that of the Tunguses, except among the Burats of Dauria, whose Shamanism is much mixed with Lamaism. He says they call their supreme god Oktorgon Burkhan,—and also Tingir Burkhan. The names and occupations of the subordinate gods are as complicated as those of the Tunguses. The sun (Nara), the moon (Hara), and the earth (Gasar) are the principal and best. They have more evil spirits than the Tunguses, and employ many ceremonies to exorcise them. Each Shaman has one however as his friend, without whom he is helpless. The chief of the evil spirits is called O k o d i l. They deem both male and female Shamas when dead to be holy. They have no coherent belief about the future, but they pray that God will take the dead to himself, and not let the evil spirits take them; their inferior gods they called O n g o n, and they are made of wood, naked or dressed; of felt, tin or lambskin, and often only made up of cloth. They are all made by the Shamas, who give them arbitrary names. The most usual god, who is present even in the humblest hut, is made from a piece of birchwood, a span long and about three inches broad. Its upper part is shaped something like a man's head with coral or lead eyes,

---

23 Id., pp. 223 and 224.
24 Id., pp. 236–238.
and ornamented with carved work and stumps for arms and legs. It generally stands in an oval frame of birch three inches wide, the former rim of a magical trumpet; at other times it is merely placed in a box. Sometimes it is dressed in the ordinary Buriat dress, sometimes only the face is cushioned over, and sometimes it is quite naked.

Felt or woilok gods are made as shapely as the Shaman's skill permits, some of them being stuffed like dolls. Both kinds have glass or lead eyes. Painted rag gods, which they merely call Nogit, are the most abundant. The Shaman draws with red chalk on a small rag, a span square, the outline of one or generally of three men's figures. The eyes are made of coral or of small shot. Often there is fixed on the head of such a god a small tuft of hawk's feathers.

"The lamb gods" are made from the skin of a black lamb without the feet, and where the head should be a small board is introduced shaped like a man's head, with coral eyes; sometimes the figure is stuffed, sometimes there is merely the skin.

The various gods are hung in a bundle on the west side, i.e. the left on entering the yurt; the felt and lamb gods often with strings fastened to their necks or passed through their heads. The lamb gods are placed in small four-cornered bags and thus hung up. They are always dressed in a black dress.

With the Ongons are generally hung some dedicated things, such as bunches of hair from the manes of consecrated horses, remains of the burnt shinbones of sheep which have been sacrificed, deers' hoofs, weasel and hare skins, and especially a Irykei, i.e. a piece of stiff leather, which is cut into strips except at one end, about a span square in size. As attendants on the lamb gods, which they call Imegichin, they hang small tin gods shaped like men, a finger long in size. During the summer they hang the whole bundle of gods on a post in front of the yurt on the right of the sacrificial pole (Tirgan).

When a Buriat first leaves his yurt in the morning, when he is going on a journey or returning home, he bows towards the gods, towards the sacrifice, and especially towards the sun, which he salutes at all times towards the south. He goes through similar ceremonies at feast times. Nothing of the feminine gender may, in going in or out of the yurt, pass on the west side of the hearth fire. They must also turn their backs to the fire, however near it happens to be to the gods. They hold all females to be unclean, and are greatly embarrassed when strange women approach the gods, nor will they sit down on seats or in saddles where women have sat, until they have been fumigated with smoke from the white pine. Gmelin in describing the interior of a Buriat yurt which he entered says that on the right of the entrance was a cloth sack of a square shape, on this sack was the skin of a wild animal (Ilut?), to which was attached a kind of idol called Onkhon about three inches in length, made of brass beaten very thin. The sack contained many other Onkhoons, the greater part of which were made of Chinese silk brocades, embroidered with metal thread called Solomka, and each of them had a head designed in a brown colour in which small leaden pellets were inserted to imitate eyes, some were single, others were united in threes or fours, others again having one body and several legs fastened together with bands. To the greater part of these figures was attached an Onkhon of thin brass.

Pallas, speaking of the Shaman idols which are still in use among the Kalmucks says, one class is called Onggoi by them, and consists in a kind of figures cut out of pieces of cloth, which are hold to protect the household from disease and other misfortunes, and are hung in the huts on the left of the bed, and before them are generally two lamps and a bowl of water. They generally consist of four pieces of cloth fastened upon one another, the lowest being the longest, and the others falling in steps, and represent rudely the figure of a man; to the upper-most are fastened two long bands and a quantity of floss silk of different colours.

A more important god is the one called Jmmegiljin by the Mongols and Burias, who is the protector of sheep and other cattle. He is represented by two figures, one of which
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"Among the Kalmuks this is the name of the shrub orimus."
is called his wife. They are nothing more than two flat long bolsters with the upper part shaped into a round disk, and the body hung with a long woolly fleece: eyes, nose, breasts and navel being indicated by leathern knobs stitched on. The male figure generally has at his girdle the rope with which the horses are tethered when pasturing, while the female, which is generally accompanied with smaller figures representing her children, has all kinds of little nick-nacks for sewing implements hanging to her.  

Rubruquis tells us the priests, i.e. the Shamans, abounded at the Mongol court, and that there was a leader or pontiff among them, whose tent was pitched near that of Mangu Khan. Some of them had charge of the sacred caskets containing the images, others had quarters assigned them in another part of the camp. People came to them from all parts. Some of them were proficient in astronomy (astrology), especially their leader, and they used to predict eclipses of the sun and moon, and when this was announced everybody prepared food, since it was not deemed right on such occasions to leave their houses. When the eclipse was in progress they sounded drums and pipes (timpana et organs), and made a great noise. This is precisely what the Chinese do still. When it was over, they ate and drank largely, and were full of joy. These medicine men fixed lucky and unlucky days for undertaking anything, and the Mongols would not begin a war nor engage in battle without consulting them as to a propitious season. They undertook the purification of various objects by fire, and received a portion as their due. They also purified the household furniture, &c. of the dead, and Rubruquis says that Brother Androw and his companions had to be passed twice through the fire. In the first place because they bore presents, and secondly because they had looked at one who was already dead, namely, Ken Khan.  

Rubruquis himself escaped this ordeal as he took no presents. If any animal or thing fell during the purification ceremony, it was claimed by the medicine man or Shaman. On the 9th of May they collected all the white mares, and consecrated them. At this ceremony even the Christian priests who were at Mangu's court had to join with their thuribles. On that day they sprinkled new kumis on the ground, and made a grand feast. When a boy was born, the Shamans were summoned to predict his fate, and if anyone was ill they were also summoned and sang songs, and decided whether his sickness was natural or caused by witchcraft. Rubruquis reports a curious story he heard from a European slave in the service of a Christian Mongol lady. On one occasion the latter was presented with some rich furs which had to be duly purified, and the Shamans took more than they were entitled to. Thereupon her servant, who had charge of her wardrobe, reported the matter to her mistress, who duly reprimanded the medicine men. Presently the lady was taken ill, and had severe pains in her limbs. The Shamans being summoned, sat some distance away, and asked one of her maidens (who was doubtless one of their confederates) to put her hand where the pain was, and to snatch away whatever she found. She did so, and found in her hand a piece of felt, or something else. They told her to put it on the ground, when it began to crawl about like a live animal. It was then put in some water, and was changed into something like a leech. They thereupon declared the lady had been bewitched by the person who had told her of their peculations. The latter was accordingly taken out of the camp and bastinadoed during seven days. Meanwhile the lady died; the woman who had been punished asked to be put to death also, that she might accompany her mistress, to whom she had never done any harm, but as nothing could be proved against her, Mangu ordered her life to be spared. They then accused the nurse of the lady's daughter, who was a Christian and the wife of one of the principal Nestorian priests. Her servant confessed that she had been sent by her mistress to consult a certain horse—loqui cum quodam equo,—and obtain answers from him, and she declared what she had done was to obtain the lord's favour for her mistress, and not to do her any harm. Her husband who had burnt some of the magical characters and letters she had made was declared by her to be blameless. She was put to death. Presently Mangu had a son of whom the Shamans prophesied wonderful things, but
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when he shortly after died, the boy's mother, who was furious, summoned them, and demanded an explanation. They laid the blame on the nurse, Chirine, or Thirine, who had been put to death. The outraged mother thereupon seized upon the son and daughter of the accused nurse, and had them killed by a man and woman of her household. Mangu demanded where the children were, for he declared they visited him in his sleep. When he learnt what had occurred he had the man decapitated who had killed the boy, and having hung his head round the neck of the woman who had killed the girl, had her beaten with heated scourges, and put to death. He denounced his wife for daring to put a man to death without consulting him, had her confined, and put on short commons for seven days, and would have put her to death only that she was the mother of some of his children. The Shamans professed to be able to control the weather, and Rubruquis tells us that when the cold became very great, and their remedies were of no avail, they sought out someone in the camp whom they accused of witchcraft, and put him to death without scruple. On one occasion one of Mangu's concubines having fallen ill, the Shamans said their incantations over a Teutonic slave belonging to her, which caused her to sleep for three days. On awaking they asked her whom she had seen. She mentioned several people, whom they judged were in consequence about to die, but as she had not seen her mistress, they considered that she would recover from her illness. Rubruquis says he saw the slave when she was still suffering from a headache caused by her three days' sleep. Rubruquis reports how on visiting a princess he found four swords half-drawn from their sheaths, one at the head, the other at the feet of the bed, and two others on each side of the door; while hanging from the roof was a silver chalice, which he suggests had been plundered from a church in Hungary. This was filled with ashes, on which was placed a black stone. All this was part of the hocus pocus of the Shamans. Some of these medicine men invoked spirits (demons), and assembled those who wished to have an answer from them in a tent where they placed some cooked meat. The Shaman then began to recite his songs, to strike the ground violently with his drum, and to get excited, and then bound himself. The spirit then came in the dark, and gave him some of the meat to eat and also gave him answers. On a certain occasion, as Rubruquis was told by the famous Parisian silversmith, Magister Willelmus, who was at Mangu's Court, a certain Hungarian ventured to secrete himself in the tent where this invocation was going on, whereupon the spirit stood on the outside of the tent, and shouted out that he could not enter, inasmuch as a Christian was present. He thereupon speedily withdrew as they began to search for him. All this is assuredly exceedingly like what takes place at a spiritualist seance in the middle of the nineteenth century in the superior atmosphere of London.

If fire fell from heaven upon any of their cattle or upon men, which often happened, they deemed it was necessary to have recourse to incantations for the purpose of purification. They believed that, after death men lived in another world, and tended their flocks and ate and drank and lived otherwise as men do here. When any one among them was mortally ill, they placed a spear in his tent, and wrapped some black felt about it, and no stranger was thereupon to enter, and when a rich man began to die, all left him, for no one who was present at his death might enter the ordn of any chief or of the Emperor until the succeeding new moon. The relatives and other residents in the tent of a person who died had to be duly purified after his death. This was done by means of fire. They made two fires, and planted a spear by each, and hung a cord across, upon which they tied some pieces of cloth (scissuras de bucarano). They then passed the men, cattle, and tents, which required purification underneath. Meanwhile a woman stood on either side sprinkling water and chanting songs. If any one's cart was broken, or if any one fell, they had recourse to incantations. If any one was killed by lightning everybody and everything, including the tent, beds, carts, felt, clothes, etc. had to be purified, nor could any one touch them until this had been done. Rubruquis also says that when any one was ill, a mark was put upon his tent so that no one might enter; and if it was a grandee, sentries were posted round it at some distance.
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for they feared that bad spirits or winds might enter with the intruder." 54

In regard to the Buriat Shamans, Giorgi tells us they were dressed very much as the Shamans of the Tunguses are. Of these latter he says that when a child has convulsions, or is in the habit of bleeding at the nose or mouth, whether of the male or female sex, he is deemed to be marked out or distinguished as a Shaman, such a boy is called Hudildon among the Tunguses. When two years old, he is adopted by an old Shaman, who performs certain ceremonies over him, which are a kind of confirmation. He is thenceforward styled Yukedyeren, and is taught by the old man what he knows. As a Shaman he wears the Shaman coat (Shaman), a cap (Kuru), and a doublet made of armour, and similar stockings. His chief instrument is his drum (Ningandi or Kachan), sometimes only some staves or arrows.

The coat worn by the Shamans is not like that of the ordinary Tunguses, but long and wide and made of leather. In the sleeves are gauntlets, and along the arms iron plates like splints. In front and about the neck is a wide collar, which is all hung with little metal gods (Hanen). These are also hung about the doublet (Grubtun). Across the back are three or five iron plates, to which there hang from rings, over fifty metal gods shaped like men or animals. The whole of these trinkets are known as Arkalan. Metal plates are fastened to the leggings as well as the sleeves. Sometimes there hang from the back serpents made of leather or kitaik (? silk) with coral eyes. The cap (Kuru) has its rim decorated with metal gods, and instead of a knot at the top is the figure of a large spider or rather scorpion called Ataki. From the rim of the cap there also hang stuffed snakes made of kitaik which are called kulish. 55 This was doubtless the old dress of the Shamans among the Mongols. Now it has become much simpler, the Shamans among them having a very secondary roll to the Lamas, and being now poor. Many of them have neither a Shaman’s coat nor drum, but perform their part in ordinary costume merely with a staff. Some of those in Dauria are clad in silver tissue. On the staff (hobr) there hang sometimes small bells and tin gods.

Sometimes they use a small branch of larch to which some leaves are still attached, to which they fasten a banner which they are continually moving about. This they called Yodo. 56

Giorgi tells us further that the Shamans prefer to worship in the open air rather than in their yurts, and especially favour mountain tops for their sacrifices. Some of these mountains, which they call Tailga, are deemed holy, and are not to be approached without an offering. The prayers used by the Shamans are short, and the long chants of an hour or two long, in which they sometimes indulge, consist generally either of repetitions or of an enumeration of their many Burkhans or gods, and of dead Shamans, as Burkhan-tengi or Khomley khan-tengeri, God of the heaven, defend the Empress; Burkhana khairla, God give children, Uyuch, grass, &c. Tengeri Burkha na muulu Sagaish, God have pity on the sick one. Adahun einey kheirla, bless our cattle, etc. To these ejaculations the congregation reply—Have mercy.

They use many amulets, consisting of little tin figures of gods which the Shamans sew on leather, and children who are epileptic or otherwise ailing hang them about them.

There are certain curious rules about women: thus a woman who has had three husbands may not marry again, and becomes a so-called bilbyrihime mu. A widow, when she has lost one or two husbands, can, if she likes, forewear further matrimony, and join the celebrant sisterhood. The mark of the sisterhood consists of a band a palm wide of silk, silver tissue or sammet, decked with corals worn over the shoulders. Underneath the band are three round disks, the size of a rouble; from it are also suspended coins. All the hair which falls from these devoted people is plaited into cords, which are embroidered on the bags containing the gods.

The greater part of the Shamans profess to discover thieves, and to see into the past and future, to interpret dreams, and to divine by means of the burnt shoulder-blades of sheep. They are generally paid for their services by gifts of cattle, the amount being however arbitrary. 57

54 Id., p. 237 and 238.
55 Id., pp. 258-259.
In vol. X, pp. 185ff, I published the Dambal Buddhist inscription, which records grants that were made in Saka 1017 (A.D. 1095-6), the Tuva saṅkṣetra, while Lakshmaṇa, one of the queens of the Western Chalukya king Vikramāditya VI, was governing the Padinėṭ-Agraḥāra, or Eighteen Agraḥāras, and the city of Dharmāpura, Dharmavolaj, or Dambal. And I remarked that "The Eighteen Agraḥāras appear to have been a group of towns somewhere in the north of Māṅgar or in the south of the Dhārwāḍ District; but I think that they have not yet been actually identified."

An inscription of Saka 1069 (A.D. 1147-8), the Prabhava saṅkṣetra, in the front of the temple of Jōda-Hanumanta at Nargund in the Nalugund Taluk of the Dhārwāḍ District, contains in ll. 13-15, the following verse:

Translation.

"In the excellent Jambuldvīpa, the country of Bharata is charming; in that country there is the beautiful Kantaḷa; in that region there is Belvala, the abode of extreme lustre; in that district the Eighteen Agraḥāras have wonderfully acquired beauty; (and) among them there is the famous agraḥāra that has the name of Narugunda, the pleasure-garden of (the goddess) Lakshmi."

And, in a slightly different form, viz—

Vara-Jāmbādvyapadu raṁjusvudho Bharaṭa-
ksṛtram-ā kṣṝtralo bandhraṁ-sant-ā
Kantaḷam tad-vihayadu-atiśōbh-āśpadaṁ
Belvalaṁ chittarādūṁ-ā nāḍoḥ-oppam-
baṇḍedudu Padineṇṭ-Agraḥāraṁ tad-
abhyantaradu Lakṣmiḥ-viharaṁ negarddu-
(rdu)du Narugunda-ābhidhān-agraḥāraṁ[ī] ||

TABLES FOR THE CONVERSION OF MUḤAMMADAN INTO EUROPEAN DATES, AND THE CONVERSE.

The examples given below will sufficiently explain the use of these tables. The column of Ferie (F) indicates the day of the week, counting Sunday = 1, Monday = 2, &c. and Saturday = 7 or 0.

I. To find the Christian date corresponding to any given MUḤAMMADAN date.

Rule 1.—If Table I contains the given Hijra year, take from it the Hijra and Christian years, Ferie, and days, and from Table III the Ferie and days for the given month, and also the day of the month. The Ferie for days are the days themselves, rejecting 'sevens.'

2.—If Table I does not contain the given year, take from that Table the year immediately less, and from Table II such a number of years as together with the given Hijra year, with the corresponding Christian years, Ferie, and days. Proceed as in Rule 1 for months and days.

* See Dynasties of the Kannarae Districts, p. 49, note 1.
3.—Add together the years, &c., now found. When one is carried from the decimals to days, it must also be added to the Feris, and if the Feris in adding exceed 7, the ‘sevens’ are to be rejected.

4.—From the sum deduct the numbers in Table I.

### Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Calendar.</th>
<th>Gregorian Calendar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.H.</td>
<td>A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>1074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td>1164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733</td>
<td>1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>836</td>
<td>1432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>906</td>
<td>1532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>972</td>
<td>1564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1009</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Examples

1. To find the Christian date corresponding to 29th Zilhilja A.H. 492.

   457  1064  1  347-67  Table I.
   35  33  3  349-83  " II.
   3  325  Zil-Hij.  " III.
   A.H. 492  1097  1  29

   4  1051-50  " IV.
   2  730  " IV.
   A.D. 1699  321  " IV.
   305  " IV.

   A.D. 1699, Wed., Nov. 16

2. To find the European date (N.S.) corresponding to 1st Rabi I. A.H. 1190.

   1178  1764  7  182-93  Table I.
   12  11  3  235-40  " II.
   3  59  Rab. I.  " III.
   A.H. 1190  1775  1  1

   7  477-43  " IV.
   1  366 (Bis.)  " IV.
   A.D. 1776  111  " IV.

   91  " IV.
   A.D. 1776, Sat., April 20

*Use 366 when passing into a Bissextile year.

*Use 731 when passing over or into a Bissextile year.
3. Find the Christian date corresponding to 12 Safar, A.H. 1300.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157-80</td>
<td>Table I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>158-97</td>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Safar</td>
<td>III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 1300 A.D. 1882</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>358-77</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1882, Sat., Dec. 23

II. To convert dates in the Christian Calendar into the corresponding Muhammadan dates.—

1. Find from Tables I. and II. the Christian year in the same way as the Hijra year was found. In addition to the columns in the Tables add a fifth for the Christian month and the day of the month.

2. If the integers in col. 4th be less than those in Col. 5th, subtract the former from the latter, the remainder will give the day of the Hijra year, from which the month and day may be easily found by Table III. The remainder, with the severals in it rejected, is to be added to the Feris already found. Ex. 1, 2, 6, 7.

3. If the integers in col. 4th are not less than the number in col. 5th subtract 1 from col. 1st and add 2 to col. 3rd, 10-63 to col. 4th, and 335 to col. 5th and with the several sums proceed as before. Ex. 3, 4 and 8.

Sometimes it may be necessary to go back into the second Hijra year from the date given. In that case subtract 2 from col. 1st, and add 5, 21-27, and 730 to columns 3, 4, and 5 respectively. Ex. 5.

When one is carried from decimals to days, it must also be added to the Feris, the same as in expounding Hijra dates.

Examples.

1. Find the Hijra date corresponding to 5 Oct. 715 A.D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I.</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>700</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>558-80</th>
<th>274 (Oct.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191-87</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>248-67</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 97, Sat. Safar 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Find the Hijra date = 22 Dec., 1882 A.D.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157-80</td>
<td>335 (Dec.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>158-97</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 1300 1882</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>318-77</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 1300, Fri., Safar 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Find the Hijra date = 28 March 1822.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145-60</td>
<td>60 (March)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>115-43</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 1237 1822</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>271-66</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.H. 1237, Thur., Rajab 5

4. Find the Muhammadan date = 21 January 936 A.D.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12-43</td>
<td>0 (Jan. Bia.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>310-83</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333-89</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 324, Thur., Safar 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Find the Hijra date = 16 Nov. 1099 A.D.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>347-67</td>
<td>305 (Nov.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328-57</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21-27</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>697-31</td>
<td>1061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.H. 492, Wed., Zil Hijja 29

6. Find the Hijra date = 30 Jan. 931 A.D.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6-33</td>
<td>1 (Jan. Bia.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17-70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24-06</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 319, Sun. (1)</td>
<td>Muh. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Find the Hijra date = 30 Jan. 932 A.D.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12-43</td>
<td>0 (Jan. Bia.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. 320, Mon. (2)</td>
<td>Muh. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Find the Moslem date = Tues., 26 Sept. 1882 A.D.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1281</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>157-80</td>
<td>244 (Sep.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>158-97</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1299</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>327-40</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues. 3</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.H. 1299, Tues., Zil-ka'da 13
Otherwise.

In converting Christian into Hijra dates we may also proceed as directed in the rules for the converse process, but use Tables V, VI, IV and III, instead of Tables I, II, III and IV.

**Table V.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Julian Calendar</th>
<th>Gregorian Calendar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.D.</td>
<td>A.H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>629</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>624</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>832</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>864</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>932</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1032</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1132</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1164</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1232</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table VI.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>A.H.</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>A.H.</th>
<th>Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>206-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21-27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>217-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31-90</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>228-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45-53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>239-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54-17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>249-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64-80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>251-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>75-43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>271-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87-07</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>282-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>97-70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>293-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108-33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>304-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>118-97</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>315-97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>130-60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>326-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>141-23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>336-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>151-87</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>348-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>162-50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>364-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>174-13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>376-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>184-77</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>388-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>195-40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>398-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples.**

1. To find the Hijra date corresponding to Tuesday 1st August 1882.
   A.D. 1880 = A.H. 1297 17-30 Table V.
   2 2 21-27 VI.
   Aug. 213 IV.
   1882 1299 1 252-57 III.
   Ramazan 236 III.
   16th.

2. To find the Hijra date corresponding to Monday 2nd March A.D. 996.
   A.D. 964 = A.H. 352 336-80 Table V.
   32 32 345-27 VI.
   March 60 IV.
   2 747-07 III.
   996 A.H. 352 336-80 III.
   Şafar 30 III.
   A.H. 352, Şafar 8th.

**ASIATIC SOCIETIES.**

_The Madras Journal of Literature and Science_ had for many years ceased to exist; its old supporters had left India or died out, and the Madras members of the Society had added more novels to the old library than works on Oriental literature when—some five years ago—Dr. Oppert made an attempt to revive the old Journal. The first volume was almost entirely written by himself, and this failure to find contributors might have convinced him that his attempt was futile; but he had materials of his own to print and was not particular as to the character of the papers he got to insert.

The second volume (1879), of which Dr. Oppert wrote considerably more than half, contained a long paper of his own: "On the Weapons, Army Organization, and Political Maxims of the Ancient Hindus," at which Orientalists were amused, for
the author had accepted as very ancient the Sukraaniti—a work which is well known to be a very modern one.

The Editor was more fortunate in 1880, and was able to publish in vol. III. four papers. Of these, "Hindu Law in Madras in 1714," by J. H. Nelson, M.A., and "The predecesors of the High Court in Madras," by J. Shaw,—both interesting enough papers to legal and historical readers,—seem somehow out of place in the Journal of an Oriental Scientific Society, as was also the third article—"The Madras Harbour," by W. Parkes, C.E. The only paper in keeping with the name of the Journal was one by Lieut.-Col. Brunfill—"Descriptive Remarks on the Seven Pagodas."

A fourth volume, for 1881, appeared late in 1882, and contains a 77 page continuation of Mr. Shaw's paper on "The predecesors of the Madras High Court," and a paper of 50 pages on the work of the Geological Survey in Southern India, by R. B. Foote,—neither paper being of the sort one expects. The volume, however, is redeemed by a very excellent article on 'Ilak-Tajuid (the rules and regulations to be observed by Muhammadans in reading or reciting the Qur'an) by the Rev. Edward Sell,—an article which ought to have appeared in better company.

The remaining three papers are Dr. Oppert's own. The first, which opens the volume, is on the Nitiprakāśikā, which ascribes itself, and Dr. Oppert believes rightly so, to Vaiśampāyana the pupil of Vyāsa. That passages in this work also occur in the Harivānša, Mānavadharmadhātra, and Kālandakāṣṭha, is no proof in Dr. Oppert's opinion that they have been copied. As Vaiśampāyana is also the narrator of the Mahābhārata and Harivānša, the Nitiprakāśikā must belong to the same class; and Dr. Oppert informs us it "was till now utterly unknown," and indeed is perhaps never mentioned in any other Sanskrit work. The principal part of its contents consists of the Dhanaśuddha, or science of weapons, of which he gives a translation with the text. Dr. Oppert believes on its evidence that the sañghāti and stīrmi of this work are the same as the stīrmi of the Rig-veda (vii. i. 3) and the sañghāti of the Harivānša (227. 20) and therefore that guns and gunpowder were in use in Vedic times! The same work also mentions not only saddles, bridle-bits, and stirrups, but pensions of half former pay (!)—which are surely an invention much more modern even than guns and gunpowder.

The fourth paper in the volume is one of 74 pages, (295-278), also by the Editor, on Inscriptions,—the first being one on the inner wall of Raichur Fort, in ten long lines, but which he has transliterated in 30, and refers to his own lines rather than those of the original. The translation is followed by historical enquiries about Gōre Gangaya Reddivār and king Viṭhāla, mentioned in the inscription, in which he adds some extracts from the volumes of local records kept at Madras.

In this paper Dr. Oppert has undertaken to bring to light for the first time a new line of Narapati princes of Vijayanagar, older than, and preceding, the well-known dynasty that sprung into existence at the end of the fourteenth century. In this we consider that he has not only signally failed, but that he has been guilty of most unscientifce carelessness in the deductions he has drawn from the various writings and inscriptions he has consulted. So confused and bewildering are his statements, and so difficult to follow his reasoning, that it is hard to know how to analyse it. Appended to the paper is a "Genealogical Tree of the Narapatas," flourished before us as the final outcome of all the investigations which precede it, and as now for the first time showing—what has never been shown before,—the complete pedigree of the family. In this Dr. Oppert gives us, as the essence of his "discovery," the three well-known brothers, Rāma, Tirumal (or Tirumala), and Venkata, who fought the disastrous battle of Tālikōta in 1564 A.D., preceded, four generations earlier, by another trio of brothers of the same name, each batch of three being in the same order, and the Rāma in each case being son-in-law of Kṛishnārjuna. Dr. Oppert undertakes to prove that these are not one and the same, but quite different sections of the family, and that while it is well known that the latter flourished towards the close of the sixteenth century, the former lived at the close of the thirteenth.

If this is not of itself sufficient to condemn the theory as wholly unscientifce, we turn to the text, pp. 229, &c, and find the origin of the Narapati family clearly and complacently stated. Tattamāmaraja was the great-grandson of Viṭjāla of Kalyāna, the Kālchuri, who was a descendant of the Chālukyas!! This man founded the Narapati family. His great-great-grandson was Bukka, who had a son Rāma. Among these Rāma's grandsons were, (1) Viṭhāla, who is mentioned in an inscription of A.D. 1294 at Raichur; and (2) the trio of brothers mentioned above, viz.—Rāma, Tirumala, and Venkata.

These three brothers then, flourished at the close of the thirteenth century. This very same Rāma, Dr. Oppert gravely asserts, fought successfully against a number of Mūhammadan kings or chiefs. Luckily their names are given. This is interesting, because we had always believed the historians who say that the Mūhammadan armies had not
penetrated so far south as the Southern Dekhan right at the period alluded to. The names, as no doubt rightly interpreted by Dr. Oppert, are "Faiz-Khân," "Adil Khân," "Nizám-ul-mulk," "Inád-ul-mulk," "Kutb-ul-mulk," "Vali-Khân," and "Barid." Dr. Oppert himself quotes these names from the "Narapatyijjagam," which, (p. 243), he tells us, was composed "towards the end of the sixteenth century," at the special command of Râma Râja, who was killed at Tâlikôta. Can it be possible that Dr. Oppert does not recognize amongst those names the combination of Muhammadan States of the Dekhan—the "Adil Shâhi, Nizâm Shâhi, Inád Shâhi, Kutb Shâhi, and Barid Shâhi dynasties—which overthrew the later Râma Râja of Vijayanagar and his brethren at Tâlikôta in A.D. 1564, and which dynasties were not in existence in the thirteenth century, a time when no Muhammadan had set foot armed for battle on soil so far south as the territory of the Narapatis?

On p. 243 we have the Râmarâja of the Narapatyijjagam represented as "commander-in-chief of Pratâpa-Rudra's army," a difference, again, of three centuries. Even if we suppose that Dr. Oppert has carried us back to a former Râmarâja of the thirteenth century, he does not explain how this sovereign of Vijayanagar could be a commander-in-chief under Pratâpa-Rudra,—nor how his (Râma's) brother, Tîrûmala, could "in battles fought near Penugonţa," defeat "the Nizâm" (!) (p. 244).

All this being given with the most perfect belief in its authenticity, and a dogmatic assurance which does not hesitate to rebuke such writers as H. H. Wilson for "wrong assertions" (p. 245), we can only assume that Dr. Oppert is so completely ignorant of history as to believe, either that in the time of Pratâpa-Rudra the "Nizâm" was fighting battles near Penugonţa against the kings of Vijayanagar; or that at the period of Tâlikôta (A.D. 1564) Pratâpa-Rudra of Orukal was still fighting the Muhammadans !! Nothing short of this will satisfy his text.

All this confusion arises apparently from the fact that Dr. Oppert assumes as sound basis for historical accuracy the rubbish written by a court-poet for the express purpose of bolstering up an usurping dynasty; for such undoubtedly was the dynasty of the "three brethren who were tyrants." 1

1 "Thirty years was this kingdom governed by three brethren which were Tyrants, which keeping the rightful King in prison, it was their use every year to show him to the people, and to pray at their pleasure, as they pleased. These brethren were three Captains belonging to the father of the King they kept in prison, which when he died, left his sonne very young, and then they took the government to themselves; (Cesare Fudderick in "Purchas his Pilgrimes" vol. II, p. 1784)."

Dr. Burnell, from whose excellent table of the Vijayanagar dynasty (South-Indian Paleography, p. 55), the quotation just made is taken, never wrote truer words than when he issued this warning (id. Intro., p. vii):—"From the beginning of this century (when Buchanan executed the only archaeological survey that has ever been done in even a part of the south of India) up to the present time, a number of well-meaning persons have gone about with much simplicity and faith, collecting a mass of rubbish which they term traditions and accept as history. There is some excuse for Buchanan, but none for his followers; the persistent retailing of this 'lying gabble' (as General Cunningham aptly terms it) has well-nigh ruined the progress of Indian research, and caused the utter neglect of a subject that evidently promises much." This scathing condemnation of Indian traditions is even more applicable to the "historical" (!) narratives of Brahmân court-poets than to the ordinary traditions of the country. In the latter there is not even a germ of truth. In the former a studious avoidance thereof for the most part. Dr. Oppert has done nothing to assist us in the unraveling of the tangled skein of Vijayanagar genealogies, and those who wish to study the subject would do well to avoid altogether his confusing and unceremonious essay.

To this long paper he adds an Appendix on Chronology, in which he promulgates opinions which, if adopted, would lead to much needless confusion. Every one knows that the Hindus are, and have been for a thousand years at least, in the habit of dating by the elapsed year, while in civil matters European nations date by the current year. Europeans, like Dr. Oppert, conclude that the Hindus are wrong in this, and ought to conform to their ideas of chronology, or if this cannot be secured, that at least writers like Col. Warren and J. Prinsep ought to represent the Hindu chronology in their Tables on the European system. But Europeans would only introduce confusion into Indian Chronology2 were they to allow their habits and prepossessions so to influence them as to act differently in this respect from what the Hindus themselves do. Their system is really quite as rational as ours.

Warren is censured by this would-be chronologist for his "injudicious caution" in stating that

2 In 1878, the Madras Government sanctioned a proposal from C. Raghunath Acharya, Assistant in the Madras Observatory, to introduce into the Calendar a reformed system of dates based on European astronomical science, in supersession of that previously employed and founded on the "old false reckoning" of the Hindu astronomical works. This however seems to have had reference only to the commencement of the months, and perhaps the titlis. The interference of Government in matters of this kind is to be strongly deprecated. See Madras Gov. Ord. 26 March, 1878, No. 351.
the Hindu years were 'expired' ones, which, he says, "was to a certain extent the cause of all the inaccuracies to be met with in subsequent works on Indian chronology and history."—This we think needs some proof. Prinsep's note on the subject is condemned as "not accurate throughout," though the mistake seems to be in Dr. Oppert's mind rather than in the note, which means that for most ordinary calculations it matters not whether e.g. we call the present year Saka 1804 expired, or treat it as if it were the numerical of the current year, if only we regard all the others in the same way.

Dr. Oppert then gives a table of the cycle of 60 years from 1867 to 1927 according to his notions, which table is wrong throughout in the numerals of the years for the Saka and Kaliyuga dates, and is only correct in the Sawaiadarsa names as compared with the European dates. Those names he has collected from some slokas in Kamalakara's Niravasavadhu ascribed to Gargya, gratuitously informing the reader thrice in footnotes that "all the nouns in it take the nom. sing. in it."

The last paper in the volume is a List of Saura Words, collected by W. F. Grähame, C.S., and arranged by the editor. This volume has no index.

The papers with which Dr. Oppert has to such a large extent filled this and the preceding volumes of this revived Journal, show how unsafe it is for the reputation of a professedly scientific society,—one affiliated to the Royal Asiatic Society,—to leave its Journal entirely in the hands of a man who cannot command the help of scholars, and whose information and opinions are so inaccurate and uncritical. Is it not a waste of money too on the part of Government to subsidize this Journal under its present management?

The Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. VII, part ii (for 1881) has been long in the press, but contrasts most favourably with its Madras contemporary. In the first paper Mr. Nevill, Ceylon Civil Service, contests the accuracy of Sir Emerson Tennant's identification of the ancient emporium of Kalah, which was under the kings of Zabeg, the Sulżams of the Isles, with the port of Galle. He addsuce several authorities and considerations that it was probably one of the islands along the north-east coast, perhaps near Kalaputti or Kalpišiya (Calpentyn). In the notes, we think, Mr. Nevill's reasoning and theories are sometimes a little fanciful, in support of hypotheses of his own. The second and fourth papers are by M. L. Nell,—one on the observance of Kalsa, a superstition among the Sinhalese that certain parts of the body are peculiarly liable to accidents with very dangerous results on certain days of the lunar calendar; the other on a Hānigama image used in sorcery. To the latter a long and interesting note is added by the Secretary, on the charms, &c., used in the superstitions practices of the Mahādiv islanders. The third paper is by Luis de Zoysa, Mahā-nudaliyar, on the origin of the Veḷlaḍis, with fourteen of their songs, charms, and lullabies. The author shows, by the Aryan character of the words in these, and the traditions still preserved respecting their origin, that there is every reason to believe they are of Indian descent. The fifth paper is on the Mīrā Kantiri festival held by the Ceylon Mahānmadans at Colombo during the month of Jamāl-al-akhir, in memory of Mīrā Sāheb, who is esteemed a Wali by them, and who is buried at Nāḍir near Nāgaḷaṇḍam. To this the Secretary has also added valuable notes. Dr. J. L. Vanderstraeten contributes a short paper on the rearing of silk-worms in Ceylon. And lastly, S. Jayatilaka, Mahādiyar, contributes a paper on Sinhalese omens or superstitions meanings attached to common appearances, such as meeting a cow or a peacock, &c. With this part is also issued the first fasciculus of an edition of Pāṇini, by Mr. W. Gunatilaka, published with the assistance of the Society.

ON THE OLDEST ARYAN ELEMENT OF THE SINHALESE VOCABULARY.*

BY PROFESSOR E. KUHN.

Among the more prominent languages of India which have had a literary culture, the Sinhalese is the only one to which it has not yet been possible to assign a fixed place in one of the great families of language. While Rask, without adducing any reasons, assigns it a place in the Dravidian family (Singalesisk Skriiflære, Preface, p. 1), and

F. Müller in the linguistic portion of the work of the Novara, p. 203, is inclined to assume a remote family relationship to the Dravidian idioms, and in the Allgemeine Ethnographie, p. 466; even more decidedly indicates the basis of the Sinhalese as Dravidian, and Haas (Z. d. M. G. 30, p. 668) maintains at least an influence by the Tamil on the


* Cf. the same writer in the Transactions of the Philological Society, 1875-6, Part i, p. 78:--"The Sinhalese language is based on the dialect spoken by the colony from Sinhapura in Sāla, on the west coast of India, who drove into the remote parts of the island the former inhabitants, borrowing very little indeed from their language."
development of the language, any direct relation between Tamil and Sinhalese is brusquely set aside by such a scholar as Caldwell (Comp. Gramm., 2d ed.) p. 111 of the Preface). More recently the opinion that Sinhalese deserves a place among the Aryan dialects is that which has received most favour. This view, first propounded ably by Alwis (Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1883-6, p. 143-159; 1887-70, p. 1-86), has been scientifically established by Childers (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, N.S.VII, pp. 35-48; VIII, p. 131-155), and has been accepted by the inquirers in the province of Sinhalese inscriptions, Rhys Davids, P. Goldschmidt (especially in his first report on the subject, printed Int. ed. in Trübner's Record, X, pp. 21-23), and Ed. Müller—the first mentioned with a wise caution, the other two not without allowing themselves to be led into hasty explanations of some words. As a curiosity, which deserves mention only on account of the highly honoured name of its author, it may also be mentioned, that Lassen (Ind. Alterthumsk. 2d ed.) vol. I, p. 557 considered the language as entirely a Malayo-Polynesian one; the Maldivian which had its origin in Ceylon, and to which he appeals in support of this view, is however not at all Malayan, but an undoubted dialect of the current Sinhalese (though indeed perhaps mixed with foreign elements), which will probably throw more light on it than it is able of itself to do.

Of the different views expressed only that relating to the Aryan character of the language can be subjected to a critical examination; for it alone can on satisfactory ground be brought forward; all the others rest upon bare assertions. Let us first examine the subject independently of all historical suppositions. Setting aside all Sanskrit tatasmas and casual loans from the Pāli for religious and suchlike ideas, there remains in the Sinhalese of all periods and classes of literature a remarkable stock of Aryan words, among them all the numerals and a good part of the pronouns and particles. If to this be added the fact that the declension is morphologically so distinctly different from that of the modern Aryan languages of India, also that a paradigm like that given in Alwis's edition of the Siddha Sāngārā, p. 191—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing. 1. karam</th>
<th>Pl. 1. karamu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>karami</td>
<td>karamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karem</td>
<td>karamó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karamm</td>
<td>karamha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>karamm</td>
<td>karamhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. kerehi</td>
<td>2. karahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerei</td>
<td>karav</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. kere</td>
<td>3. karat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerei</td>
<td>karat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kerei</td>
<td>karei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

agrees closely enough with an Aryan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sing. 1. karimi</th>
<th>Pl. 1. karimās</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. karai</td>
<td>2. karatā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. karati</td>
<td>3. karatī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

—and finally that a whole number of derived verbal forms and participial formations have been traced back by Childers with undoubted correctness to Aryan sources, the view of a purely Aryan character of the language has certainly something uncommonly attractive about it. But the pleasing impression vanishes if we look closer into the language actually in use. Forms like those of the paradigm just quoted, while not over-abundant in the so-called Elu of the old poetry, disappear in the modern prose as good as entirely before karaned for all persons alike, and the proper formation of tenses and moods shows only a distant connection with that to which we are accustomed in the modern Aryan languages.

Here we may appropriately consider more closely the historical argument of the view in question. Its supporters, Rhys Davids and Childers in loc. cit. supra, and P. Goldschmidt in his Report on Inscriptions found in the North-Central Province and in the Hambantota District, 1876, p. 3, rightly take as their starting point the popular local tradition, that Vijaya, a king's son of Lalā, about the time of Buddha's death conquered Ceylon, and thus caused an extensive colonization of the island by Aryan settlers (cf. the succinct description in Lassen's Ind. Alterthumsk., 2d ed.) vol. II, p. 103 ff.). This Lalā, Rhys Davids looks for on the west coast of India, evidently following Lassen, who wished to identify it with the province of Lāṭa or Lāṭika, the Δακσά of the Greeks. According to the account given in the Mahādeva, however, which must be here con-

---

5 See note 2, p. 59.
6 Of loc. cit. p. 35:—"The Sinhalese is one of the Aryan vernaculars of India, and is spoken by the descendants of a people who migrated from Magadha to Ceylon at a very remote period."
7 Of loc. cit. p. 22:—"Sinhalese is now proved to be a thorough Aryan dialect, having its nearest relations in some of the dialects used in King Asiaka's inscriptions, as well as in the Mahādeva Prakrit of the Indian middle age, while it differs from Pāli in very essential points."
8 I refer particularly to the adoption by E. Müller
sidered, and from the importance of which Lassen himself (loc. cit. vol. I, p. 679, note 3) could not detract, Lāla lies undoubtedly in the neighbourhood of Vanga and Magadhā, hence Childers and P. Goldschmidt with much greater reason considered it as a division or a border state of Magadhā. We may also with Kiepert (Iahrbuch der alten Geographie, pp. 41–2) attribute the geographical homonyms to the fact of a direct intercourse between Ceylon and the Ganges region. At any rate there can be no good reason for casting doubt on the fact of such an Aryan immigration, in spite of the uncertainty of the Sinhalese chronology and the mythical colouring of the narrative in question.

However considerable may have been the number of these settlers, they are not to be compared with that immense stream of immigrants which at a former period brought the whole of the Ganges region under the power of the Aryan language. A mixed language is what might be expected at first in our case. We are at once reminded of the analogous example in Java, by which, through lexical influence of the Sanskrit on the Javanese, the oldest literary dialect of the island, the Kawi, was formed. But on a closer inspection matters will be found quite otherwise in Ceylon. The Kawi was indeed only the language of literature, which was first built up by the learned, to whom the Sanskrit, as the sacred language of their religious culture, was more or less familiar: characteristic of this is the mingling of Sanskrit words, so as to invest it with a peculiar dress. The Pāśkā dialects, which the immigrants undoubtedly spoke among themselves, would soon be exchanged for the idiom of their new fellow-countrymen, which for its part could borrow Sanskrit words only from the literary dialect. The grammar of the Kawi, like that of the popular language, remained absolutely unaffected by Aryan influences. In Ceylon, on the contrary, the true popular speech is, even in respect of the grammar itself, largely permeated by Aryan elements, and even if no certain conclusions can be drawn from these for a more exact determination of the origin, the oldest elements of the greatly preponderating Aryan vocabulary, through their phonetic relations, exhibit, as the only possible basis, an old Pāśkā dialect, which must have passed wholly and entirely through similar phonetic changes to the Pāli. The immigrants were therefore numerous enough to use the language spoken by them, not simply in their intercourse among themselves, but also to ensure to it in the course of years an extension and acceptance among the natives as a common means of communication. The indigenous population gave up almost entirely their own stock of words, and accustomed themselves to the new Aryan appellations. Only, however, so far as it was possible: the phonetic system of their own tongue had become much weaker than that of its penetrating victorious rival, and it is the after-effects of this that gave to the Pāśkā dialect its peculiar Sinhalese colouring. Such a thorough disorganization of the original phonetic system, such exceedingly strange changes of certain words, are only possible where a language has been grafted on an entirely new stock, which is not in the least prepared for its reception. The heterogeneous elements in the composition of forms complete the characteristic. Sinhalese is therefore, in spite of its preponderating Aryan aspect, a mixed speech, whose deep-laying peculiarities remain inexplicable so long as its non-Aryan element is denied.

To what linguistic family this non-Aryan substratum of Sinhalese belongs, must for the present be left undecided. That the original population of Ceylon was of Dravidian race, as Caldwell indeed more than once maintains, certainly seems evident from anthropological and ethnological stand-points, as well as from the horrible demon worship (cf. on this subject Dandris de Silva Gooneratne, in the Journ. of the Ceylon Branch of the R. As. Soc. 1885–8, pp. i–117) reminding one entirely of the Dekhan, and might find a sort of confirmation in many morphological and syntactical as well as various phonetic analogies of the languages. But, since in the word-forming elements themselves a closer relationship cannot be proved, a careful comparison of that portion of the vocabulary which cannot be explained from an Aryan stand-point with that of the Dravidian dialects is the only means of securing broader explanations in this direction. Moreover, the dialects of the wild races, or those that have become wild, in the interior, appear to have been partly influenced by the Aryan, in the same manner exactly as Sinhalese proper. Of the language of the Veddā at least this may be considered certain, according to Maxwell’s statement at the London Oriental Congress (vids Special Number to vol. IX, of Trübner’s Record, p. 21, and the remarks of Bertram F. Hartshorne, Indian Antiquary, vol. VIII, p. 320: according to the latter the language, in whose vocabulary decidedly Dravidian elements are entirely wanting, must be undoubtedly Aryan, and stand in even closer relationship to Elu).

---

* Cf. Caldwell’s Comp. Gram. (2nd ed.) p. 578.
* Cf. for the present Childers in Journ. of the R. As. Soc. N. S. VII, p. 37.

---

11 Cf. also Sridā Subhāgā, ed. Alwis, p. 55 of the Introduction. Casī Chitī’s Vocabulary of the, as it appears, very peculiar Bodhī dialect, quoted by Alwis, Journ. of the Ceylon Branch R. As. Soc. 1885–4, p. 149, is unfortunately not accessible to me.
The victory of the Aryan element had evidently taken place long before the island was won over to Buddhism by Mahendra’s successful missionary labours. What influence Pali may then have been able to have had on the language, can scarcely be ascertained, on account of their common Prakrit character. Further inquiry may perhaps succeed, by the fixing of certain peculiarities here and there, in defining the original Sinhalese Prakrit as distinguished from the Pali—it shows us for example in the Sinhalese sīga, horn, for an ancient *saṅga = Skr. śrīga, a as against i of the Pali sīga and corresponding forms of the modern Aryan dialects of the Indian Continent, including the Gipsy (Beames, Comp. Gram., I, p. 161; Miklosich, Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigenner Europa’s, vol. VIII, p. 72; cf. Hornschuch, I, 130)—but that this will ever take place to any great extent cannot yet be maintained with any certainty.  

It is certainly not in the Buddhist circle of ideas and the language of the religio-philosophical works, the literature of the higher style, that we should now as a rule look for the proofs of the Aryan character of the oldest vocabulary. It is the common round of every-day life, as it finds expression in the present language of conversation, the modern prose, so far as it does not attempt to use Sanskrit words in the place of pure Sinhalese ones, which give us the first certain standpoint in respect of the peculiarities of Indian literary languages in spite of their lesser antiquity. Afterwards, indeed, the inscriptions and the language of the old poetry, the so-called Eli, must also be brought forward and compared with great caution, and some more particular remarks on the character of these therefore will not be out of place.  

The inscriptions, according to Goldschmidt’s view, begin soon after the introduction of Buddhism. But their value for lexical investigations is not so great as could be wished just at the oldest period, on account of the small number of the remains and the frequent identity of the contents. Mistakes increase more and more from careless execution, fragmentary tradition, numerous difficulties in the details, and a deplorable lacuna between the fourth and ninth centuries. Only from the end of the tenth century is there available a material at the same time more extensive and more certain, and from amongst this the inscriptions of the end of the twelfth century published by Rhys Davids (Journ. of the R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VII, pp. 152 ff., 353 ff.) are to be noted as specially useful.

The name Eli, older Heli, is nothing but a transformation of the Prakrit I s h a l a (Sidat Sāngard, ed. Alwis, p. xxxii. of the Introduction; cf. the author of Visuddhi Mārga Sutane, ibid. p. clixii), and signifies therefore first Sinhalese in general, then old Sinhalese, and finally in a special manner the language of the old poetry (cf. Childers, Journ. of the R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VII, p. 36; Rhys Davids, ibid. p. 158) which is set forth grammatically in the Sidat Sāngard, 13 lexically in the Namāvatiya, 14 and is used now-a-days solely for poetical works. True, this language, like all in India that fell into the hands of poets and scholars, is more or less an artificial production, and its artificial character is expressly shown with the greatest distinctness by Rhys Davids (loc. cit. and Transactions of the Philol. Soc. 1875-6, Part I, p. 74 & f.). But the phonetic phenomena upon which he lays so much stress, the shortening of the vowels and the rejection of the consonantal groups, must from first to last be considered as a proof of artificiality. The principal changes caused by this and an allied tendency—as well as the reduction of polysyllabic words to a single syllable, of which Alwis (SS. p. xlvii) notes some characteristic examples,—is shared by the Eli with the popular speech, as is evidenced by an overwhelming number of the very commonest words. With much more reason Goldschmidt refers the artificial character of the later Eli—and it is to this alone almost that the available linguistic relics are to be ascribed—to the influence of the Sanskrit vocabulary, and the extremely heterogeneous adaptation of it to the Sinhalese phonetic laws. From the comparison of inscriptions of the kings Māhinda III (997-1013) and Pārapāma bāhun I (1153-1186), he shows (Report on Inscriptions, &c., 1876, p. 10) how, while in the time of the first the numerous though still limited Sanskrit (and Pali) loan words take a Sinhalese phonetic form, in the time of the latter they find an entrance into the language wholly unaltered, and he then continues:—“Shortly after that time Sinhalese literature, as far as it is now extant, must have commenced, its language carrying with it the spoils of many foregoing centuries. To these the poets and pandites added their own inventions; Sanskrit (and Pali) words artificially, but often with great skill, turned into Sinhalese, and modern Sinhalese words put back into what were supposed to be the ancient forms of them.  

James Alwis, Colombo, 1832—referred to hereafter as SS.  
13 Edited and translated by C. Alwis, Colombo, 1832—referred to hereafter as N. The use of this and of several other books which appeared serviceable for my task I owe to the kindness of Professor R. Rout, of London, who has placed at my disposal in the most generous manner the rich stores of works of reference from his library.

14 Goldschmidt in his Report on Inscriptions, &c., 1876, has endeavored to prove closer connections between the Sinhalese and the Maurya dialect of the Apsara inscriptions. Rhys Davids (Transactions of the Philol. Soc. 1875-6, Part I, p. 73) is inclined to estimate the lexical influence of the Pali as extremely small.
Hence the present Sinhalese style has come to be a strange medley of Sinhalese forms of almost all ages, of thoroughly Sinhaliised Sanskrit and Pâli words, of the same semi-Sinhalized, of unchanged Sanskrit and Pâli words, and of the random inventions of poets and pâsikas. It is this variety of forms of the same words which Sinhalese writers take advantage of to render their style elegant, although this custom very little accords with what European readers would consider good taste. In spite of this artificiality the Elu often enough makes use of the only possible true Sinhalese form, where the modern language of conversation favours exclusively the pure Sanskrit form; in such cases, especially whenever the Maldive steps in for corroboration, we think we may regard the Elu form entirely without suspicion (cf. also Hartshorne's statement regarding the language of the Vedādā, ante p. 558).

Let us now turn to a short sketch of the phonetic system.

That a Prakrit dialect of that older phonetic stage, represented substantially by the Pâli, really forms the basis of the Sinhalese, follows, as already remarked above, from the whole appearance of the genuine national words. We are constrained to refer them all back to a phonetic system in which the v vowel of the Sanskrit found its representation in a, i, u, the diphthongs ai, au, in e, o, the sibilantes s, sh, in the dental s; in which moreover the assimilation of coincident heterorganic consonants had the greatest latitude of power. Later loan words from the Sanskrit, even if they have undergone the above-mentioned phonetic changes, are at once to be recognized, especially by the presence of consonants assimilated according to Prakrit phonetic rules: thus saumudra (Elu: modern tatsuama samudra-ga) = Skr. saumudra as contrasted with the pure Sinhalese muhuda (modern muda) from *hamuda = Prâkrit samudda, or mihudra (together with the tatsuama mitra-ga in the modern language of conversation) = Skr. mitra as compared with the Elu mita = mitta, formed in a genuine Sinhalese manner.

After this preliminary observation on the Prakrit basis it is necessary first of all to determine the extent of the specific Sinhalese phonetic system. The Sidat Saṅgārā—to quote first the chief native authority—in § 1 ascribes to the old Sinhalese ten vowels: a, ã, i, iy, u, ū, e, ë, o, ò; and twenty consonants: h, g, j, f, ñ, t, d, n, p, b, m, y, r, l, v, s, h, ñ, aha (cf. the remarks of Alwis, SS. pp. lviii-lxvi, 142-146, and Table III), and this is in fact, with the addition of a, û (considered by the author as nothing but modifications of a, ò), and after deducting the (as we shall see) doubtful j, the sum of the original phonetic system. Let us now consider the vowels and consonants more in detail.

In this department, so long as we look purely at the vowels by themselves in single syllables, the remarkable preference for short vowels strikes us as a special characteristic. We may with some reason compare it with the Dravidian custom of shortening the long vowels of Sanskrit words (Caldwell's Comp. Gramm. p. 87), but with still greater justice may we infer from it a condition of language in which just as in the Tibetan a sharp distinction between short and long vowels had not generally taken place. This condition appears to have been universally carried out in radical syllables, so far as more enroaching changes did not step in: ka-naññ, y/khēde, pâkā, pres. khēde (Hemadandra IV, 222; cf. Pâli khidā = Skr. khyā, et. al. in Kuhn, Beitr. z. Pâli Gramm. p. 50), kannā = khaññ; khanade, y/khā; gama = gāma; dana = dāna; nāma = ndama; yaññ, y/yā; rada, raja, raññ, = rīz̥a; iṣa, iṣa, = iṣa; dūma = dūma, etc.; moreover the Sanskrit-Prakrit e, o, have in Sinhalese always the corresponding short sound. Secondarily, long vowels are developed through contraction after a preceding omission of consonants: aṁ (Elu) = aṁta, Skr. amrita; uḍḍ = uḍḍaya (Rhys Davids, Journ. of the B. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VII, p. 336); e = vēhi; myḍč from *mihiyā = māhika; māda from muhuda = samudra; bāna from bhavan = bhāgīnyya (Rhys Davids, loc. cit.) ; gā from geya = geza, etc.; but these lengthenings themselves not infrequently give place to still further contraction: dōla from dōla = dōhala (Childers, Journ. of the B. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VII, p. 35); il for hik(a), in the name of the month ilma, "cold month," from hikā (vide Goldschmidt's first Report in Trübner's Record X, p. 22) = ḍiśira. In suffixal syllables long vowels, hitherto inexplicable, are not infrequent, but even here, according to Childers' testimony (loc. cit., VIII, p. 143), the distinction into short and long, but observing a middle sound."

18 In the following remarks, after the sign of equation is placed, except where something else is expressly indicated, the Prâkrit original of the Sinhalese word in question, for which, on account of the similar phonetic basis, reference may generally be made to Childers' Pâli Dictionary. Moreover, wherever only the phonetics have been considered, I have not hesitated to take casual words from the poetic dialect.

19 According to Osama (Gram. of the Tibetan Language § 2) the vowels in that tongue are spoken "without any
long d of the animate masculine, as mināhā, putā, mānuma, pula, points back to an older a, just as the t of the feminine does to an older i. In the Elu prosody the prepondering shortness of vowel appears also with the condition that every syllable ending in a consonant be considered as long (Alwis, SS. p. 70, xcii, cxii, cxix).

Very extensive and multiform is the vowel change produced by a following i, e, by virtue of which the umlaut vowels a, e, i, t, o, e, are produced from a, a, t, a, o, e, the passive with original tva, of the (participial) preterite with ita, have obtained a widespread grammatical acceptance. As Childers has (loc. cit. p. 143, 148 ff.) discussed exhaustively all three cases, I can refer generally to his examples, and wish only to call attention to the fact that in passive forms like keravānd, karavanānd, tibēnānd from tabanānd, as against the regularly formed kajāvānd from kahāνānd, greater transformations have taken place, the true cause of which has yet to be discovered. Of other cases of umlaut I would also especially mention the abstract suffix sva and the suffix of possession i: devi from devinānd, vāku; gamā from gamā = gūma. In words like kil = kuf; pirui = purav; Ṛta, Ṛtira, from *kriyā = surīya, the umlaut cannot with full certainty be separated from the complete vowel assimilation, which is well attested by such examples as pilī = pātī; piri = pari; duni = dhūnu; lānu from lāhunu for lāhunā = lasu; mukhā from *mahukhā for *hamukhā, and many others. The i also, which was produced first by the weakening of other vowels, can, it seems, be produced by umlaut: madīyā = madīka; bama from *bāmīya = bāmayā (cf. seda = Skr. sākṣī); in the last example the i which gave rise to the umlaut has since disappeared, as it was removed by contraction in ṙū = lokhā and the example quoted by Childers ka = khāyā, kkhā." 

A large number of remarkable vowel changes are closely connected with certain consonantal mutations. An i, which has been produced from a cerebral or a dental, appears to have often changed a neighbouring a into o: ekala, dohā, pahalāsa = ekdāsā, dedāsa, pāchāsā; podhāsa = podhēsā; podhāsa, bolo, bëlo, brain, perhaps = *matkā, Skr. *māṣṭa, in the sense of Skr. māṣṭikā and māṣṭikāna = Pali māṣṭhalinīya. Instead of ka in Sanskrit tatasmas we find kā (Clough's Sinhalese and English Dictionary, p. 686). Of the change of consonant produced by the dropping of vowels we shall have more to say further on.

The subject of the non-radical terminal vowels will render necessary in the future a more search-

ing examination. In the oldest inscriptions the well-known peculiarly Magadhi nominative of the masculine and neuter in e appears to be pretty common (Goldschmidt's Report on Inscriptions, 25, 1876, p. 3); in Elu the u which recalls the Prakrit i is much more frequent than in the modern language, which appears to make use more of the a. Of various exceptions, like kiri = khiri, dana = jānu, vēsi = vasa, and many others, there is no lack. In the last part of a compound the non-radical terminal a is mostly dropped (Childers, Journ. of the R. As. Soc. N. S. VII, pp. 45, 47); many forms of originally dissyllabic words contracted in this manner may then have been also employed independently, and would thus have not materially increased the number of monosyllables, especially numerous in Elu (vide supra p. 566). We have already spoken above of the lengthening of non-radical terminal a and i in words denoting animate being.

In regard to the constitution of the consonant system the want of aspirates and the incompleteness of the palatal series are peculiarities which strike one immediately.

The representation of the former, whether in tenues or medie aspiratae, by the corresponding unaspirated consonants is the rule; besides this we have the separation of the aspiration from the more permanent consonantal element, and transition into simple h. The former was a special peculiarity of the Elu, and is sufficiently supported in s of the Sidat Saṅgārū by such characteristic examples as sādha, also sēdā = sādha (Skr. prādā), sahāk, also sudā, = saddhama, &c. The latter is clearly proved in the case of the popular speech by such a form as bhīria = badhīria, Mādh. bōri (Ch.); for this reason also loku = lagha (also lūhūdu) may with justice claim the privilege of nationality over the less disfigured lagu.

With the loss of the aspiration may well be classed the dropping of the h in nasal combinations: bānuma from the Prakrit form bāmuka for Skr. and Pali brahma (Hemachandra I, 67; II, 74; cf. E. Kuhn, Beitr. zur Pali-Gramm. p. 5 f.); gima = gimeha (Elu—in the modern language completely supplanted by the tattavas from the Skr. and Pali grīṣṭha-ya and gimeha-ya); suktu, hotu = weha, Mādh. hānu; in the same manner oh to o: dīka = jīka. Besides forms are freely found like bhābā for the name of the god Brahman and the Pali adjective bhāmas (E. Kuhn, loc. cit. p. 18) on the one hand, and the derived suhtu, suhe, suhte, heat, on the other, which however appear to belong more to the literary dialect.

As to the palatal series, e and naturally e appear only in later loan words. Their ordinary
substitute in pure Sinhalese words is s, which like the other s is subject to the change into k: iṣinaad, iṣinhād, from *hīsinaad, *hīsinhād (Childers, *Journ. of the R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII, p. 147); piṣanāad, piḥanāad, vāpāch; saka, haks = chakka; sīṃhānāad, vāchumb; gasa, gaha, tree, pl. gas = gachcha; gas, gahin, ghin, in pres. gachchhati; sīṇdānāad, *vāchod, pres. chhindaati; &c. Moreover, compensation is found in d, which—in view of Sinhalese d for j, to be mentioned immediately—presupposes a transition into the media: mudaṇṇad, vāmuch; da = cha (Alwis, SS, p. liv); yadiṇṇad, vud'yad; aduru = dechariya (N. v. 178, 278), which the Mald. adhira (P.), edura (Ch.), shows to be a popular form. The retention of the media j amongst the Sinhalese vocables in opposition to this universal rejection of the palatal terms is extremely curious. It is true that j is found in the older inscriptions, but almost every native word, as dina = jiwād; dana = jdnun. dīnaṇṇad, vud'ji; pres. jindāti; dunsudāya = dhanaṇṇad: vidinaṇṇad, vāvyad, pres. vijhāti, has d for j. Forms like the proper name Būjanā = Buddha-dasa, or vajjirij, which E. Müller (Report on Inscriptions, &c. 1878, p. 6) following Goldschmidt rightly derives from vaddānnaad, are correctly explained by the fact that original j was represented chiefly by d and was first restored anew as j by the gradual acquisition of later tataṣamas: indeed, in the striving after exaggerated elegance of speech it would sometimes be appropriate in cases where d alone could be correct, just as the low Germans, when they wish to speak high German, substitute a ętrepe for Treppe. Words with j = Skr. and Pali j must also be considered as more or less remodelled tataṣamas, and the rava, radd, of the Elu is indeed earlier than the raja = rjad of most of the inscriptions, as the analogous rad, fem. reada, of the inscriptions (Goldschmidt, Report on Inscriptions, &c. 1876, p. 10) and the mahā radun = mahādraja in the title of the Sultan of the Maldives (*Journ. of the R. As. Soc. vol. VI. p. 73) amply testify.

Of the cerebals f and d alone appear to maintain inflexibly their peculiar character, n, on the other hand being in modern conversation as little distinguished from ṇ as j from l (Sinhalese Grammar, Cotta, 1825, p. 4; Carter, *Sinhalese Lesson Book, Colombo, 1873, p. 8 f.). The Maldivian has distinct characters for n and l, and also distinguishes l and l in conversation with great clearness; modern Sinhalese authors regulate the use of them in writing almost entirely by etymology. Moreover, l is in many cases to be traced back to older cerebals or dental explosives: kili = kül, pili = pātī; for other examples, see above, p. 58a.

The nasals require a succinct investigation.

And here in the first place we must mention as a special peculiarity a nasal sound before the explosives of all four classes, which, following the example of Childers, we represent by n before gutturals, cerebals, and dentals, and by s before labials, and for further information respecting which Rask, *Sinhalese Skriftlære §19; *Sinhalese Grammar, Cotta, 1825, p. 6; Alwis, SS, p. liv, kri. f. 145-149 passim; Alwis, Descriptive Catalogue of Literary Works of Ceylon, Colombo, 1870, p. 235 f., may be consulted. Unfortunately all these authorities give little information as to the exact articulation, but we may infer from the plurals anh, lihn, derived from anha, lińha, by Childers (*Journ. of the R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VII. p. 46), that it is closely related to the anusvāra, i.e., to the nasal vowel. In fact, this weak nasal sound takes the place of the original consonantal nasal before explosive sounds, exactly in the same manner as the anusvāra of the modern Aryan languages of the Continent (Kellogg, Gramm. of the Hindi Language, § 14; Beamis, Comp. Gramm. vol. I. p. 296 f.). This explains the want, on which Alwis lays such particular stress, of a guttural nasal, which indeed is always conditional on a following guttural. The independent nasal palatal of the Prakrit becomes dental n: panaka = paṇḍada (Skr. paṇḍata); anu = aniti; of those due to a following palatal the typical examples are kasun = kaśchana, aśudas (Elu) = aśjana. Further weakenings of the nasal element leads to entire loss: mas = maśia, vas = vaśe, maṇḍiya = maṇḍaka, saopyanaad from sampādayati (Childers, *Journ. R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII. p. 145), saṇtapenānd, to rest, sleep (in respectful language)—according to Goldschmidt from sam + tapp = Skr. tapp; particularly in Elu: ak = aika (N. v. 39), lakā = laikā, lakara (N. v. 168) = laikādra, gatara = Skr. guṇtra, and many more: we find also in the older inscriptions sāga used throughout for saṅgha (Rhye Davida, Indian Antiquary, vol. I. p. 140). The reverse of this in the nasallization of aṇunānad from preas āṇḍati (Childers, *Journ. R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII. p. 145) is remarkable, while by an opposite process the nasal has been strengthened by an explosive in saṇḍaru = saṇāra, kiṇḍārdu = kiṇāra, &c. It is also to be noticed that through phonetic strengthening a combination nd was developed at a later period from ūd; for example, from the old singular haṇḍi (with short first syllable ?—see Alwis, SS, p. cx), which is now used as plural; a new singular form hanḍa (with first syllable long from position) has sprung, and both stand in the same relation as duṇā pl. to duṇnug (see *Sinhalese Grammar, Cotta, 1825, p. 9; Childers, *Journ. R. As. Soc. N. S. vol. VII. p. 46 f.).
The old h seems to have originally completely dropped off: ata = hattha and atē = *hatthika, arsan past pret. (strictly pres.) act. from √hri (Childers, Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII, p. 150); with a hiatus-destroying semivowel; geṣa = gea, dovened from √duḥ, pres. dohaṭi. In the oldest inscriptions two characters are found for the sibilant (Rhys Davids, Indian Antiquary, vol. I, p. 140; Goldschmidt, Report on Inscriptions, &c., 1876, p. 4); as however these interchange arbitrarily they soon became as at present a single letter in place of the Skr. ś, sh, s. Besides s interchanges often with h (Alwis, SS, § 22), and may like the latter be completely lost: aṅga with the Elu forms saṅgu, haṅgu, = *aṅga, Skr. śṛṅga; śvīc; hīsa, issa, iha, = isha, Skr. śrīrā; but maṇiḥḍa = manuṣa, pl. manuṣa, and similarly gasa, gaha, tree, = gachchha, pl. gas (cf. Singhalese Grammar, Cotta, 1825, p. 5, § 12).

There remain some more phonetic peculiarities, which could not be directly included in the review of the phonetic system.

Double consonants appear to be originally as foreign to the language as long vowels. The double consonance of the Prākrit, including the combinations of tenuis and, media with their aspirates, is usually replaced by the simple consonants. Actual gemination is to be explained in most instances either by letter borrowing or as in the case of the plural forms already cited by special grammatical processes. Original simple explosives between vowels are on the other hand in the generality of cases dropped, and are replaced by the hiatus-destroying y, v, whereby a contiguous a is exposed to the transition into i and u; a further step in the vowel change is not infrequently the contraction referred to above: muva = muhka, lova = loka, liyanaṭ, śīčiḥ, kevṛi, kevṛillā, = kolkī, nayd = ndga, awa = ata, nacara = nagara, with the derived niyari, towns, niyula = sakala, niyuru (Elu) = chakora, giya = gata, riya = ratha, kiyanaṭ to kathayati, miyuru = madhura, with maṭi = madhu (cf. above p. 538) and thence mti in m-aṭas (be, lit. honey-fly), mti-pan (honey, lit. honey-water). So also the -ya, -va, characterizing the later tatasmas—samudra-ya, vastra-va—originally arose from -ka, cf. taruva = tārakī, &c.; in the same manner also are to be explained many old tadbhasas like ofiwa = ofika-ka, ādēt for *hakad = sasu-ka, ṣeṣa, aṣe, = aṣe-kā for aṣē. As opposed to the dropping of h referred to above, it is noteworthy that in cases like ahasa = ḍhāsa, bahamā, bōnakā = bhudigneṣa, h also appears as a hiatus-destroyer.

In analogous manner the substitution of v for residual p is to be explained, in case the transition of p into b and of b into v is not preferred; cf. tabanā = ṭapayati, Pā viṭapā, iṣaṭa = kachchhipa-ka; bonavā, part. pret. pāṭ. m, to √pā; vēnava, part. pres. act. vā, to √bhā; possibly also wānava, if this is connected with āpā, āpāyata, and wēnava, if with Goldschmidt in opposition to Childers (Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII, p. 148) we venture to trace it to √pat (on π for t, cf. Hindi pānād &c. Beames, Comp. Gramm. vol. I, p. 225). The opposite to this transition of the tenuis into the media is seen in *kerulu, kervullā, which has been rightly identified by Goldschmidt with garuda (other examples of k for y in E. Müller, Report on Inscriptions, &c. 1878, p. 6).

Finally the not infrequent metathesis is to be noted: mahāṇa = samuṇa, muhuda for *hamuda = samuṛa (cf. Alwis, SS, § 14).

Into the disturbing operations which are the cause of a number of coincident phonetic laws we cannot enter further in this short sketch.

There follow now a number of Sinhalese substantives, arranged in natural order, whose Aryan etymology does not readily yield to the developed principles of well-matured inquiry. In considering these we shall make use of the list of words of the modern tongue in S. Lambrick's Vocabulary of the Sinhalese Language, Fourth Edition, Cotta, 1840 (L.), as compared with B. Clough's Dictionary of the English and Sinhalese, and Singhalese and English Languages, Two Volumes, Colombo, 1821-1830 (C.). For the Elu, besides the Nāmadaliya (N, see above p. 588), W. C. Masredy's Glossary to his edition of the Satavilisa Sandesaya (MR.) has been utilized. The Mādhī words I give as far as possible in their original spelling according to Eyraud (P.) and Christopher (Ch.).

Living existence in general: satā = sattā, Skr. sattam.

Man: maṇiḥḍa = manuṣa, pl. manuṣa; Mādh. with greater contraction niḥṇa (Ch.), in P. miou, "personne." The words for man, manly: pirimiyā, Mādh. pirimiyā, P., ferhēm (Ch.), are closely related to purinu, as proved by the Mādh. piris (P.), fūrāhu (Ch.), husband, and Elu piris, "a train, retinue." For women the modern language has not infrequently according to Rhys Davids (Transactions of the Philol. Soc. 1876-8, Part I, 19) I have replaced the italics with which Ch. represents the cerebrals by the transliteration now commonly adopted. It is far from my present purpose to go further into the phonetic relations of the Mādhī; I only remark of it that Ch. has replaced the old p throughout by f.
we have radala ("gentleman," L., "husband," "headman," "chief," C.), and its contraction rdla ("yeoman," L., "husband," "master," "lord," "a term affixed to names or titles, implying respect," C.), which appear to be connected. Bis, bise, queen, is according to Clough to be derived from abhiseka. The oft-recurring áp of the inscriptions as a designation of a high officer of state is from adhipa (vide Rhys Davids, Indian Antiquary, vol. II, p. 248: Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VII, p. 385). Kaṅbura, smith ("iron-smith"), = Pali kammadra, and is used to explain this word by Subhuti in Abhidh. v. 509. Kaṅbalta, potter, = kumbhakāra, and similarly sommaru tanner, doubtless assimilated from the Elu samwaru with samkaru = chammakāra, cf. Hindi chamār; in lokurud, smith (braizer, L., N.), = lohakāra, which as a compound is much more intelligible, has been preserved. Badrod, washerman, = rajaka. Vaddu, carpenter, = vaddāki. Vadd doctor, = veja, Skr. vaidyā. Vaddā (older vaddā) = yuddha (Childers, Journ. of the R. A. Soc. N. S. VIII, p. 131). Hord, thief = cora. Eduru, teacher, = deariya, mahand = samaṇa, bāmanu to Skr. and Pali brāhmaṇa, have already been mentioned above.

On mit, miturd, mitra-ya, friend, see ante p. 57a. The word is the same in Mald., as is seen from demitourou, "compagnia" P. (i.e., de mitourou, two friends), and rahumaitor, "friend," (Ch.); another popular word is yahala-nd, yldu-nd, in Elu (N. v. 180) without diminutive ending yahala, which may be a somewhat irregular form of a theme identical with Pali sakadra. For enemy the little altered tatasama saturday = Skr. pita in is use.

The words of Aryan origin for animals are tolerably numerous. Among cattle we have first gond, bull, ox, = goas, and with the same meaning geryd (cf. Mald. guery P., gori Ch. ox), a diminutive of Hindi gorī and its allies, which like goas itself are, as Pischel says (Bezzenberger’s Beiträgen. Kunde der indog. Sprachen, III, p. 237), to be derived from a root gur. Vadd, calf, older vasu, is of course = vašchha, Skr. vata. On daṇa = dhenu, which figures directly as a feminine suffix, Children (Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII, p. 144) may be consulted. The monosyllable mi in the compounds miharak (Mald. miṃghu Ch.), buffalo, and mih-dena, buffalo cow, is, as Children has already rightly stated, to be identified with mahika; the Elu has besides a fuller mihes, which however may also possibly be identical with the diminutive amplified modern mih-nd. Eluved, sheep, goat, = ēṣa. Īrd, pig (Mald. oure P. īrd Ch.), for *hare, = sīkrā. Otwed, camel (cf. Mald. ol,

 Castes, classes, &c.—We have already spoken of the terms for king, raja, rada, = rdā. Besides

The forms sahā and sahā answer to the Elu words saha and saha given in loc. cit.
For horse the Skr. tatsu massa = asvāja, asvayā, is now-a-days used; the popular form is in Elu as (Mald. masi, P. as, Ch.) and is retained in the compound avyādina. The mare, the second part of which children rightly trace to vāla. Balala, cat (Mald. bōlau, P. bulas, Ch.) = bīdāla. Mīyā rat = mūsika. Etd., elephant, = *hathika (cf. above p. 580), fem. atinni from older atini; we also find aitig with networthly a (Mald. however e P., eg. Ch., beside vātāna = mātāna), which is possibly also derived from *hathika. Of the terms for ravening beast the Skr. tatsu massa = av śiva (also Mald. śivag P.) and avyādina-ya have entirely superseded the popular appellations; for the latter a form more consonant with the original phonetic rules is the Elu vaga, which is clearly established by the Mald. rāg (P.), "leopard"; another word for panther, leopard, is aitigi, Elu di, = dīp, Skr. dehip. Valaha, vālaś, bear, has been aptly explained by Childers (Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII. p. 144) as a compound of vana + acha = Skr. ṭhikā, thus literally forest bear. The jackal is called ist. al. hieal = sider (Mald. hieal Ch.), with this is perhaps connected kānahil (N. v. 141) or kānahil (Subhūti, Abhidh. v. 615). The two varieties of apes indigenous to Ceylon are distinguished by the obscure rinā and by vīndu = vānara. For the deer and antelope family we have mūsa = miga and gōdā, a very contracted form of gokarṇa. Hare: hād = sasā-ka.

Birds in general, kuru, older *kurulu, = guruda (see above p. 588); the mythical bird king is called in Elu gurulu (N. v. 14). Cook: kūl = kūl, fem. kikili; in Mald. we find cōvōl, P. kōl, (Ch.), curiously enough for the fem., while for the masc. a puzzling ane (P.), hau (Ch.), is used. Monard, peacock, may be connected in some way with mora = Skr. māya; for the Mald. Ch. gives nimir. Dove: paraa = Skr. πραουά, Pali pārāpata. From kōkala come kōdil, older *kōvālu, and kēṿil (cf. Mald. kōvāl), fem. kevīl. The word for parrot, giraud, Mald. gouray, may be an irregular form of kēvăla. From kūtā, kūtū, crow, and kūvă, kūvă, with which perhaps Mald. caule (P.), kāla (Ch.), is to be connected, we might perhaps, taking balipūsha, balibhā, as a parallel case, draw the inference of the existence of a somewhat irregular ka-pūshi(ka). Hawk: ukmuad, older *ukmuad, still further connected to usad = ukmua, Skr. ukroṣā. That the old kāla was transferred to the Siamese as *asa is clearly enough proved by the Elu hasa, Mald. rūdā, goose (Ch.), = Elu rādāhāsa (N. v. 144), and Mald. adūn, duck, Ch.

(compounded with domy P., dāsi Ch., bird). For kōd, crane, the phonetic equivalent is Skr. kōkā, which indeed means a bird of the duck or goose family.

From D. H. Pereira's treatise on the snakes of Ceylon in the Ceylon Friend (see vol. II, p. 81 ff), it seems that nāyā and polāṅgā are the common terms for cobra and viper respectively. The former is clearly = nāya. In the latter I conjecture the Skr. polāṅgā, Pali polāṅgā or potaṅga, with special modification of meaning (with respect to the phonetic relations cf. supra p. 589, and the word to be noticed soon, polāṅgāyā); the word in itself means only an animal darting hither and thither with great swiftness. The female cobra is now called, according to Pereira (loc. cit. p. 85, 86) kōpina, in Elu espini, = sāpīni; the tatsu massa = sārpa-ya is also found as karu (Ch.) in Mald. For other reptiles I only mention kika, alligator, = kühāl (with evident metathesis of the vowels), gōdā, iguana, = gōdā, mājā, frog, = mājāka, and kōvā, kōvā, tortoise, = ka-kōvāka (Mald. kūvāvari Ch.).

Fish was originally mas = mācha, as the Elu mas (N. v. 83), Mald. māsa (P.), mas (Ch.), show; to avoid confusion with mas, flesh, the modern language makes use of the Sanskrit tatsu massa matya-ya; there is also a more elaborated word mālu from *mālu = mācha (cf. Hindi machhī).

Of other animals we may also mention kikara, crab, = kakara. For spider we have mālava = māka, and mākara = mākā, or Pali mākara, Skr. mākāna (Mald. mākāna Ch.), Ukund and ikund, house, to Pali ikunda, Skr. yūkta; cf. Childers Journ. of the R. A. Soc. N. S. VIII. p. 148. Polāṅgāyā, grasshopper, is undoubtedly connected with Pali potaṅga, Skr. potaṅga; the last part is however not clear to me. Bībī, wasp, = bīmara, Māsa, fly, older *māsā, *mēri (Mald. mēri Ch.), with its compound mi-māsā, honey-fly, i.e. bee, may be connected either with *māchāhāra for Pali makkha, Skr. māka, or with Skr. mākara, Pali mākara.

The names of parts of the body yield an important contingent of Aryan words. Head is bha, bha, Elu hisa (N. v. 199, MR.), = sā; I do not know how to treat clava, which is also in use, any more than I do Mald. bolle (P.), bē (Ch.). Skull: kołā = kapālā. For the hair of the head L. gives iśka, in which bē for kēha = keha. From mukha (Eulu mūsa) comes mūn, face, Elu mukha (Mald. mūn), Nalala, forehead, = mālāta Skr. lālāta (Mald. mā Ch.)?; cf. Pischel's Hemachandra 147. For eye asa = achara (cf. supra traced to the Skr. tālā and the Skr. form tītā may rest upon a mistaken Sanskritization.

21 According to Subhūti in Abhidh. v. 631 it meant the same as *īlāchchā in Pali; therefore the latter may be
is int. al. used, which have been derived from uppala = Skr. uppala and then have acquired a more general meaning of this word. Leaf: pata = patta, Skr. patta (Mald. fai Ch.); the popular use of pan or paś = paś is shown by panāla or panāla, leaf hut, ascetic's abode, and Mald. pan (P.). Flower: mola = madd (Mald. māo P.; māu Ch.). nāda, kernel, inside of a fruit, may be derived from maṇja (cf. Skr. madhyamand for the seed capsule of the lotus flower). I shall not at present enter further into the names of particular plants, though there is here no lack of Aryan terms like, e.g., rice, — sūti; mira, pepper, = marimo (Mald. mirus Ch.); lūnu, onion, garlic, from lūhu (cf. Subhūti in Abhidh. v. 595), = laśuna (Mald. in lonnumodo Ch., garlic).

World: lova = loka, in Elu often contracted to lā (cf. the Index to N. and MR. p. 75). Heaven: akasa = ākśa. Sun: īra, īru, in Elu also īru (MR. p. 100), īrī (N. v. 289), = surīga (Mald. yuṇs, īru Ch.). sunshine āśva = āśpa. Moon: kanda, saṇḍa, = caṇḍa (Mald. kuṇḍa Ch.; as regards the phonetic relation cf. Mald. kondū, koudū = Sinh. kaṇḍa, see supra p. 63a). Star: taruva = tarakal (Mald. tary P., tari Ch.). Ray: vasa, generally pl. rāṣa, to Skr. rāṣmi, Pali rāṣi, rāṣni. Etiya, light, brightness, is, according to Childers (Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VIII. p. 145), together with the tatsuśa dākya-ya having the same meaning, to be connected with Skr.-Pali dāka (Mald. dāy, P. ali Ch.). Darkness, obscurity: aṇḍura (Mald. aṇḍi P., aṇḍi Ch.) doubtless = aṇḍakhara; cf. also Pnkr. aṇḍhaka, Marāṣṭṛ aṇḍhakal, Pischel in Hemacandra I. 173, and the Hindi forms aṇḍhakal, aṇḍhārd, &c., in Bate's Dictionary of the Hindi Language, p. 22.

Rain: vasa, older vasi (N. v. 34), from vasa, Skr. vāra; Mald. vāres (P.), vāre (Ch.), belong probably rather to vēri, water. The old word for lightning must be retained in the Elu viśa (N. v. 34), Mald. vidi P. (vidāni Ch.). For the only word at present in use, as it appears, viz., vidulīya, is according to Clough's explanation s. v. = Skr. viḍyullatêt or more correctly = Pali vijjulatêt, consequently probably a word belonging originally to the poetic dialect, and which at any rate has no closer connection with Prakr. vijjulī and its new Indian cognates like bijjū, &c. (cf. Pischel in Hemacandra I. 18, Bate, loc. cit. p. 521). Giguroma, also gigur, gigur, gigiri, thunder (Mald. guggurou P., gugguri Ch.), belongs to the ṣvā, mentioned by Pischel in the Beitr. s. Kunde d. indo-germ. Spr. III. p. 297, cf. the Sinh. verb gurunawag andaravane, to thunder. Rainbow: devadāna = devadāna (but Mald. wārēnē in Ch.).

Fire: īnā, older īnī (N. v. 22), = īnī; also connected gīndā, originally perhaps fire-pos.
sessor or the like, so that the second part would be derived from ḍhāṛa (cf. also gedara with ḍh, house).

The current words for water are diya = ḍaḷa for udaka (Mald. diya, “juice or sap,” Ch.), pani = ḍāṇṭiya (Mald. ṭenē P., ēṇch Ch.), and vata, whose Aryan origin appears to me by no means impossible, in spite of an etymology being still wanting. Bubble: bubula = bhubāla. Foam: pena = phena. Sea: mūda, mūdha, for *hamudha = samudda (Mald. entirely different candone P., kadu Ch.). Here the following marine products naturally arrange themselves: ḍak, sak, ḍhanāṁ = sāṅkha; matu, pearl, = mottā; pabadu, pāvuṭu, coral, = Pali pāḍa, Skr. probaḍa. Lake and pond water, in inscriptions uvāya = sāṅiptā (Mald. sāṇa Ch.), and pokhara, in inscriptions pukāna, to pokkharinī, Skr. pukkarinī (E. Müller, Report on Inscriptions, &c., 1879, pp. 3-6). That ganiga is the common appellation for river is in the highest degree characteristic, and Kiepert has rightly given prominence to it, loc. cit. supra, 55a. For smaller rivers and streams I find oṣa, which in spite of Eḻu oṣa (MR.), oṣa (N. v. 88 pond, 90 river), I would identify with oṛa.

Earth, ground, land: bima = bhūmikā (Mald. bin P., bing Ch., = Eḻu bim, N. v. 35), and polava related to pathavā, pathavā. Island was originally dīva, as the name Dīvada, &c., and Eḻu Dīva (N. v. 222) show clearly enough; the modern language appears to prefer the longer dīvasa, and I find also noted duva, dīva. For mountain, hill, the authorities give besides kāndu more especially kola, sel, = sela, Skr. kāla; Skr. pārvata (modern tasa pārāvata-appearance) (N. v. 107) as pārvata (Mald. pārvada Ch.), Pali pābattā (in the same place) as pāva. Sand: vela = vāḍiuk, vāḍiuk (Mald. vēyi P., veit Ch.). Salt: lona = lona, Skr. lānā (Mald. lōn P., loun Ch.). For gem L. gives mēnakā, which is met with in this sense as menik in inscriptions as early as the beginning of the twelfth century (Journal of the R. As. Soc. N. S. VII, p. 161) and must be looked upon as a remodelling of Skr. māṇikya; the Eḻu word veṇa, gold, gem (N. v. 219, 221), in inscriptions gem, Journ. R. As. Soc. N. S., vol. VII, p. 166), = ratana, was however apparently at one time not popular to the popular speech. The general name for ore, metal, is lō = loka; vāḍe Clough s. v. and cf. Mald. lō, “cuivre,” P., ratulo, copper, Ch. (i. e. red ore, ḍatū = ratū), ranuvandā, “airam,” P., = ranγwandā, “bras,” Ch. (i. e. gold-colored ore, ran = raṇya). Gold was originally ran, thus in inscriptions in loc. cit. supra and Eḻu rāṇ, raṇ, raṇa (N. v. 219), (Mald. rāṇ, P. raṇ)

Ch.), a greatly contracted form of hiraśa = Skr. hiranya; at the present time, it seems, ratana, i. e. red gold, is mostly spoken of. Silver: vāḍi, in Eḻu also vāḍiya = vajara (N. v. 219), (Mald. rīhī, P. rīhī Ch.). The Pali words kadalipu and sīva are explained by Subhūti in Abhidhā, v. 458 by English “tin and lead” and Sinh. kalumbya; for tumba Clough gives the meaning “lead.” Now as tipu is clearly Skr. trapu,22 and Sinh. kulu like Pali kāla means black, it necessarily follows that tumba = tipu is the name for lead and tin alike, and the kind characterized by the epithet “black” can only be lead. This assumption is entirely borne out by the Mald., according to P. callithamara is lead, odutinama tin (Sinh. hūda, sūdu = sūda, white). The resemblance of timara to tumba is strange. Perhaps a confusion with Skr. tāmra, Pali and Sinh. tamma, copper, has taken place. Or should the reading trapu in Amaran. II, 106, gain credence from this? The word also given for lead, yamin or yam, might very plausibly be connected with iesaka, but in that case I should at present not know how to explain the m. Non-Aryan certainly is the word for iron yakāla = Mald. dagande (P.), dagāṇu (Ch.). The name for quicksilver is Aryan however; Mald. rāp (P., Ch.) = rasa, Sinh. mostly united with diya water: rahadiya, rasadiya.

Human settlements, &c., village: gama = gama; town: nāva = nāga; both of frequent occurrence in names of places. For road, street, we have: maga = magga (Mald. magu) and māna mahānā, = mahāpatha (Childers, Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VII, p. 49). Vitiya (also in Eḻu, N. v. 106) and vidiya are only remodellings, of the tasaṃ vithyā. House: gā, geya, = geha (Mald. guṭ P., gē Ch.), and in the compound already mentioned above gedara, gate, door: dora = dvāra (Mald. dora P., dura Ch.); bolt: agula = aggala. Post, pillar: kanuva = kānuka (Mald. kaṣi Ch.)

Field: kētā = hetta.

Of implements, useful articles, &c., with Aryan appellations I mention only the following:—Ship: naṇa = nāvika for nād (Mald. naṇ Ch.), Raft: boat: orwa = Skr. uḍāpa, Pali uḍupā (Mald. odi P., odi Ch.) (Childers, Journ. R. A. Soc. N. S. vol. VII, p. 45). Mast: kumbayya = kumbhaka cf. kāpaka (Mald. kubu Ch.). Net: dala = jala for jāla (cf. Mald. dae Ch.). For the cart and its parts riya, cart, = riha, haka, sakha, wheel, = cakka; nōba, nave, = udhikā for udhī; nūma, fellōe, = nemī, are the forms of the respective words which conform to phonetic laws; although at present I am only able to give them on the authority of the Elu of the Sinhalese-English volume of

22 Kālī, which has been overlooked by Childers, also confirms the correctness of the reading, doubted by him, tipu in Abhidhā, v. 1046.
Clough, and of Subhūti’s notes to Abhid. v. 373 f., yet I consider it is in every way that they belonged at one time to the popular speech. Instead of the first two new-a-day the tattasmas ratthaya (besides gala) and chakraya are current. Plough; nagula = nangala, Skr. dāngala. Axe: veya = *vaśik for vāśi. Hammer: miśita = *muthika for mūthi (cf. Mald. mūri Ch.), as the Elu form C. gives also mugra = mugara. Bow: dunna, older dunu, = dhana; with diya, bowstring, = jīya, and the compound dunudīya which appears to be no longer used in the modern everyday language, cf. Mald. dd, “string” (Ch.). Iya, arrow, I would in spite of the secondary form given by C. hiya, derive from *ihiya = *iukka for Skr. iṣuka, Pali usu. Of articles of clothing I may mention only pili, pilt, = paṭī (cf. Mald. pelā, “de la toise,” P., jēli, “cotton cloth,” = jēli “waist cloths of native manufacture,” Ch.), and kapu, cotton, probably for *kapahu = kappada (cf. Mald. capa P., kafa Ch.). Boiled rice: bat = bhatta (Mald. bāt Ch., cf. also perhaps Mald. bāte “meat,” Ch. ?) Flour: piti = pīṭha (cf. Mald. jē, “flour,” Ch. ?). Book: pota to potukha = Skr. pustaka (Mald. foi Ch.).

Time. The word for the year, avuvudda, older avurudu, Goldschmidt would derive from Skr. samvatvāra; if this is correct we must go back to an older *havarru = *sa(ṁ)varavācha for sva- vāchākara (cf. the examples given above, p. 59a of d from ch); the Mald. āhara (Ch.) is possibly a still further contraction. For month the old form is maha, masa, = māsa, which is also used in compounds like ilmasa, “lunar month,” Ch.; in the modern speech the tattasmas māsya-yā prevail. Day: dūvāha, davaasa, = dīvāsa (Mald. duvas Ch., cf. in P. eyoudaus, “le temps passé,” and pāvū duvas “le temps avenir”), and derived from this dūvāda, davaa, daytime (L.), from *davakha; cf. davakha (Ch.), Elu daval (N. v. 45), and Mald. duale (P.). Night: rō, which must be derived from a *rātī for Pali ratī, Skr. rātṛi (Mald. rō Ch., rogando, “nuict,” renegué, “il est nuit” P.). To this I add the adverbs of time: day-before, yesterday perēddī, from pera, before, earlier, which is connected in some way with Skr. prava (cf. Skr. parvedyus), iyījī, iyē, yesterday, to hīygo Skr. hīya (Mald. yē P., iyē Ch.); adā, to-day, = āja (Mald. ādu P.); heta, seja, tomorrow, which I would derive from a se answering to the Pali se, swė, the ṛā reminds one of the homologous dative ending; anikidd and assimilated anidd, day-after-tomorrow, from anika, the other, an extension of aiṇa, Skr. anita (cf. Skr. anitya). The foregoing comparison may give a fair idea as to how largely diffused is the Aryan element among the most essential words of the language. In the case of the pronouns, numerals, particles, and verbs Childers has pointed out a like preponderance of this element.32 In his full treatise on this subject the author of this sketch will compare the undoubtedly Aryan element of the entire ancient vocabulary as fully as possible, at the same time, however, seeking to approach closer to the subject of the non-Aryan remainder.

Notes by the Translator.

The above paper was read by Dr. Kuhn at the session of the Philos.-Philol. class of Munich on 5th July 1879. As far as I am aware he has not yet read or published the fuller essay to which this is only preliminary: the delay is fortunate, as Dr. Kuhn will thereby be enabled to make use of the valuable paper by Dr. Ed. Müller, entitled “Contributions to Sinhalese Grammar,” published by the Ceylon Government in 1880.34 I shall proceed to notice a few instances where Dr. Müller’s conclusions agree with Prof. Kuhn’s and vice versa. With regard to the colonization of Ceylon Dr. Müller accepts the Sinhalese traditions respecting Lāla, “not,” he says, “because I am of opinion that more faith ought to be placed in the legends of the Sinhalese than other Hindus, but because I see no reason whatever why they should choose a small and insignificant kingdom as the native country of their ancestors.” To this he appends the following note:—“Lassen (Ind. Alterth., vol. II, p. 105) identifies Lāla with Lātā (Greek Larike —Gujarāt). The whole context of the Māhātā however shows that this cannot be meant. King Niśaṇka Malla, a prince of the Kālinga, who has left many inscriptions in different parts of Ceylon, was born in a city called Sīnhabūra, which he maintains to be the same as Sīnhabūra where Wijaya was born. If so Lāla was part of the later kingdom Kālinga, a not unlikely place to suppose the Aryan conquerors of Ceylon to have started from. This seems also to be the opinion of Burnouf (Recherches sur la Géographie Ancienne de Ceylan, p. 61), as he identifies Lāla with Rā ḍ hā—la partie basse du Bengal actuel, Prékrit present chīḍhāti. It may here be incidentally mentioned that the root śā has produced another derivative as a verb substantive, namely tiṣṇavā, strictly passive of tabanāvā, “to put, to place,” which we have above (p. 606) derived from aṭapayati = Skr. sthipayati.

32 In certain particulars his first sketches can now be considerably amplified and corrected. His derivation of the pronoun mā this, from the stem mā is supported by the nom. mā of the inscriptions (e. g. E. Müller, Report on Inscriptions, år. 1876, p. 6). Api, we, and topi, you, are according to P. Goldschmidt (Report, år. 1876, p. 6) and E. Müller (Report, år. 1878, p. 6) to be traced to the Prékrit ṣambe and tumpa, Sīnhabūra, stand, be, must be derived not from Pali sāma but from the well-known

33 And since reprinted, with correction of misprints, år. in the Ind. Ant. July-August 1889.—D. F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>bakurō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>heaven</td>
<td>teriyangē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>earth</td>
<td>bintalavva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>llayata teriyangē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>moon</td>
<td>hāpateriyangē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>stars</td>
<td>hāpangaval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>light</td>
<td>gigiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>darkness</td>
<td>kaluvella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>duhūna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>nilatu (닐라)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>sea</td>
<td>terilatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>river</td>
<td>nilatava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>tank</td>
<td>nilatukatātina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>teriboraulavgē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>dumuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>field</td>
<td>paṅgurulla (ปาองรุ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>jungle</td>
<td>raluva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sand, dust, mud, stone</td>
<td>boraluva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>gavā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>woman</td>
<td>gavi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>bhandā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>girl</td>
<td>bhandī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>body</td>
<td>muruti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>keluvēli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>kherēliya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above terms are not to be found in Sinhalese literature for many centuries back. It is much to be regretted that the ill-health of this able scholar prevents his accomplishing the task which he had in view of a monograph on the Vēdādō and their language. As to the Rōdiyas, Alwis in the paper referred to in note 8 says that from amongst 128 words given by Casie Chitty he could only identify 6 Sinhalese words, but even of these six more than one of his identifications is erroneous. As Casie Chitty's list is not generally available to scholars, I give it here, in the hope that Dr. Kuhn and other orientalists may succeed in clearing up the mystery which enshrouds the origin of some of the words. I have in the third column given some suggestions as to the derivation of the words: these in many instances will no doubt be proved to be wrong. The Dravidian and Malayam words I owe to my brother, Mr. A. M. Ferguson, Jr., cf. batāra, used by all the Malayam dialects for "God," from avatāra.

S. bin = bhāmi; taldō = tala. (Identified by Alwis.)
S. āngā appears to be a general prefix, meaning "thing," = ānga?

S. nilatu, v. 104; āngā appears to be a general prefix, meaning "thing," = ānga?
S. nilatavva, v. 104, 18, 2.

Identified by Alwis as = S. kaluvara.
S. dala = dhātā.

S. pāγuwa, a division (from Tamil pāγu), = bhāga; rēlla, a fold, yard.

S. borālu, gravel. (Identified by Alwis.)

S. gōmi.

S. biliṇḍā. (Identified by Alwis.)

S. mārtīti.

S. kālu, black; vēli, cf. S. velā, creeper, vine, the hair of the head; cf. Bengī veluṭā, hair; cf. 8.

---

26 Since this was written a paper has been published in the Journal of the Ceylon Branch R. A. S., vol. VIII, part II, by Mr. De Zoysa, "On the Origin of the Vēdādō," which contains interesting specimen of their language. A notable feature is the retention of the palatal e which the Sinhalese has changed to s or h. The same issue of the C. B. R. A. S. Journal contains some valuable notes on the Maldive language, by Mr. H. C. P. Bell, whose report to the Ceylon Government, now passing through the press, will form a welcome addition to the meagre information existing concerning the inhabitants of the Maldives. Prof. Virchow has also recently published a most valuable essay on the Vēdādō (Berlin, 1881), dealing with their origin from an ethnological rather than a philological stand-point, his conclusion being that they are the aborigines of Ceylon and of non-Aryan race.—D. F.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Sinhalese</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>eye</td>
<td>දවතේ</td>
<td>v. 27, 2, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>face</td>
<td>විශ්වක</td>
<td>v. 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>ears</td>
<td>ප්‍රතිතත්වයන්</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>kata</em>; cf. Ruininga <em>gall</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>nose</td>
<td>විශ්වක</td>
<td>v. 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>tongue</td>
<td>කාලාවඹුරුම්</td>
<td>v. 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>කිහි කිහි</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>hīda</em>, heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td>පුරශය</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>pēkaniya</em>, navel; <em>rikta</em>, <em>ril</em>, vacuity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>belly</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 23. (Alwis identifies with S. <em>mulutan</em>, which he says means &quot;that which is cooked&quot;; this is clearly untenable.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>flesh</td>
<td>මරමුතම</td>
<td>v. 33, 2, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>blood</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>spittle</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>husband</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>wife</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>mother</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>grandfather</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>grandmother</td>
<td>පිටකිරුතා</td>
<td>v. 30, 37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>brother</td>
<td>க்குங்கு க்குங்கு</td>
<td>cf. Tamil <em>pāl</em>, tooth; <em>ānai</em>, elephant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>sister</td>
<td>க்குங்கு க்குங்கு</td>
<td>v. 17, 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>க்குங்கு க்குங்கு</td>
<td>v. 30, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>க்குங்கு க்குங்கு</td>
<td>v. 30, 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>priest</td>
<td>நவடா</td>
<td>v. 33, 18, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>elephant</td>
<td>பலநுவா</td>
<td>cf. Müller's derivation of S. <em>baḷdā</em> from Skr. <em>bādha</em> and affix <em>la</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>cheetah</td>
<td>ராலுவபுச்சா</td>
<td>v. 55.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>bear</td>
<td>மரந்திமகாநாகாயா</td>
<td>v. 33, 118, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>wild hog</td>
<td>மலுமாயா</td>
<td>v. 17, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>domestic pig</td>
<td>மகாநாயா</td>
<td>v. 16, 65.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>deer, elk</td>
<td>ராலுவல்த்தளா</td>
<td>v. 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>புஸ்தா</td>
<td>cf. Müller's derivation of S. <em>baḷdā</em> from Skr. <em>bādha</em> and affix <em>la</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>bitch</td>
<td>பிளஸ்டு</td>
<td>v. 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>cat</td>
<td>புப்பாகவணா</td>
<td>v. 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>jackal</td>
<td>பாங்குரலா புஸ்தா</td>
<td>v. 16, 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>vahindurā</td>
<td>வத்துவா</td>
<td>v. 16, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>ralava</td>
<td>நாதுவா</td>
<td>v. 16, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>bull</td>
<td>லுத்தா</td>
<td>v. 16, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>cow</td>
<td>லுட்டிட</td>
<td>v. 16, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>calf</td>
<td>லுத்திலைடுநா</td>
<td>v. 16, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>bull buffalo</td>
<td>பாங்குரலா லுத்திட</td>
<td>v. 16, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>cow buffalo</td>
<td>பாங்குரலா லுட்டிட</td>
<td>v. 16, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>iguana</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>S. <em>bin = bhāmi</em>; <em>pallō</em>, cf. S. <em>palli</em>, &quot;a small house lizard&quot; (Cl.) Tamil <em>piali</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>alligator</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>tortoise</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>lizard</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>snake</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>cock</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>hen</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>chicken</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>fish</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>tree</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>flower</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>fruit</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>v. 10, 104, 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>cocoanut</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>cf. Tamil <em>māṭṭu</em>, toddy, <em>māṭṭai</em>, huak; v. 78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>jak</td>
<td>பிளாள்</td>
<td>cf. Tamil <em>māṭṭu</em>, toddy, <em>māṭṭai</em>, huak; v. 78.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(81) plantain</td>
<td>pabburukan</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>pudlu</em>, plantain, <em>ruk</em>, a tree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(82) areka nut</td>
<td>pongulam</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>puvak</em> = <em>púga</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(83) betel</td>
<td>tebalā (? tobala)</td>
<td>cf. Pali <em>tamball</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(84) tobacco</td>
<td>rebut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(85) paddy</td>
<td>atumadu</td>
<td>*atu (?); madu, v. 86.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(86) rice</td>
<td>madu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(87) kurakkam</td>
<td>hinkuruma</td>
<td>S. <em>kha</em>, small, used as prefix to many names of plants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(88) straw</td>
<td>pangaran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(89) temple</td>
<td>bakuruangō</td>
<td>v. 1, 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90) house</td>
<td>dumuna</td>
<td>v. 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(91) door</td>
<td>matilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(92) cloth</td>
<td>potiya</td>
<td>cf. Tamil <em>poti</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93) mat</td>
<td>pitāvānna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(94) pot</td>
<td>vāmē</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(95) water pot</td>
<td>nilātu vāmē</td>
<td>v. 10, 94.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(96) rice pot</td>
<td>migiti vāmē</td>
<td>v. 118, 94.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(97) mortar and pestle</td>
<td>lakkana angavāl</td>
<td>v. 119, 2, 6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(98) knife</td>
<td>nāduva</td>
<td>v. 76, 37.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99) honey</td>
<td>uheela latu</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>gula</em>, jaggery; <em>sūkiri</em>, sweet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100) jaggery</td>
<td>gal miri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(101) salt</td>
<td>hurubu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(102) lime</td>
<td>aharu bulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(103) oil</td>
<td>maṭubu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(104) good</td>
<td>teri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(105) bad</td>
<td>hāpāyi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(106) no</td>
<td>navati</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>nata</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(107) to go, walk</td>
<td>dissevāvā</td>
<td>cf. Kian Dayak <em>tevah</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(108) to come</td>
<td>tevinavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(109) to sit</td>
<td>yāpinnavā</td>
<td>cf. Tamil <em>kāttīku</em>, to dance; <em>pasī</em>, to make.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(110) to sleep</td>
<td>lāvāntāvenavā</td>
<td>v. 16; cf. S. <em>navaṭanavā</em>, to cease, to stop, to hinder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(111) to dance</td>
<td>kuttandupanavā</td>
<td>cf. S. <em>kelum</em>, gladness. <em>Kelūni = Kāllīnu</em>, kelinavā, to sport; <em>gīla</em>, song, Gipsy <em>gilli</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112) to sing</td>
<td>kāllani igilenavā</td>
<td>v. 30:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(113) to laugh</td>
<td>galu pāhinavā</td>
<td>v. 27; 119.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(114) to weep</td>
<td>irvalu lukkanavā</td>
<td>Pali <em>pekkhāti</em>. (Alwis identifies with S. <em>penavād</em>, to appear.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(115) to see</td>
<td>pekanavā</td>
<td>cf. Malay <em>mākan</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(116) to open</td>
<td>hāpakaranavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(117) to cook</td>
<td>navatkaranavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(118) to eat</td>
<td>migannavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(119) to beat</td>
<td>lukkanavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(120) to kill</td>
<td>raṭukaranavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(121) to die</td>
<td>likkenavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(122) to bury</td>
<td>tāvanavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(123) to give</td>
<td>yappanavā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a letter to the *Indian Antiquary* (vol. I, p. 258), Dr. Hyde Clarke states that the Rodiya "belonged to the same general family as the Kajunah." He further says:—"There is little direct resemblance between the Kajunah and the Abkass, or between the Kajunah and the Rodiya, but the relationship of each is rather with the Abyssinian class." This Abyssinian class, he says, comprises the languages of the Agaws, Waags, Falashas (Black Jews), Fertites, Dizelas and Shankalis; and with these he connects, besides the Rodiya, the Abkass of Caucasia, and the Galela of the Eastern Archipelago, a Siberian class, and two American classes being also related. Dr. Clarke concludes his letter by saying:—"The group which I have named at present—the Siberio-Nubian—must have had possession of the whole of India before the Dravidians." Unfortunately, Dr. Hyde Clarke gives no proofs for his statements, and, as I have no vocabularies of the languages mentioned, I am unable to compare them with the Rodiya. The
Treasury of Languages (1873) pronounces Rodiya to be allied to Hindi, but this book, though it has the authority of some eminent names, is not altogether reliable, e.g., its statement that "Elu or high Sinhalese is Dravidian and closely resembles Tamil." With reference to note 4 I may mention that Dr. Müller (loc. cit.) gives a number of comparisons of Sinhalese words with the corresponding forms in the Asoka, Dramatic and Jaina Magadhi, the resemblances being sometimes very close. The word homada should have no asterisk: it is found in several inscriptions. With regard to the Sinhalese phonetic system, Dr. Müller states that the original Sinhalese alphabet had only the three short vowels a, i, u, besides e and o, the original quantity of which is still uncertain. The oldest Sinhalese also possessed the consonant c, of which Dr. Müller says: "c I have met with in inscriptions till the fourth century, afterwards it immigrated into s, and in the ninth century has quite disappeared." On the other hand, the original alphabet lacked the cerebral i and anusvara. With reference to the latter Dr. Müller says: "Although the anusvara does not appear in Sinhalese words up to the fourth century A.D., it is doubtful whether it was not pronounced; for we later find many words written with anusvarā or a nasal before a consonant which had the same in Skt. but not in ancient Sinhalese, while it would be difficult to consider them all as tattvas; for instance Skt. chandra, A.S. chada, modern Sinhalese handa, Maldivian ḫadu (khadu is a mistake), besides Skt. anga mod. Sin. anga, Skt. manḍala, M. S. manḍul, etc." He says further: "It is true the Sinhalese in ancient times wrote the anusvarā and nasal, before strong consonants in Pāli words, and besides without assuming the questionable words to be tattvas they might have been altered by the influence of the priesthood, the powerful instructors of the people. And on the other hand there are instances where the nasal has been lost forever. I therefore consider it best to assume that the Sinhalese had lost anusvarā and the nasal before other consonants." According to Dr. Müller, vowel lengthening is due to (1) contraction and (2) accent. As instances of the latter he mentions boḍī (ma) = bahū, anāvā 80, anāvā 90, and verbal forms like gāšana (from gāšana, gā) &c., as against older senim, sitim (10th century), and still older pāṭiṣatorikama for pratīṣṭhitākṛti-karma. Childers' theory to account for the terminal d of animate nouns is shown by Dr. Müller to be incorrect. He says: "The lengthening of the final vowel in animates as d in minād, I believe is due to a former termination in ak, affix ka, now used to indicate indefiniteness in inanimates. In modern Indian vernaculars, too, we find d as a masculine termination, comp. Beames vol. II, p. 160." He also says: "Originally every Sinhalese word terminated in a vowel between the 7th and 9th century the tendency of the language was so much changed that most nouns came to terminate in a consonant; later, a short a was appended to inanimates, animates males partly contracted the syll. ak to d (so at least I comprehend this process at present); and if they ended in a or i, this had been changed into wak and yak. W and y assimilated with the preceding consonants, and we thus find double consonants with d in the nominative singular (for instance kuraś, kurāvuk, kurādā)." On the subject of the vowel sound a (long ā) Dr. Müller says: "A further important addition to the vowel system was made by the two characters peculiar to Sinhalese a and its lengthening ā. They are not found yet in the 4th century but are firmly established in the 9th (about the interval I am unable to judge) yet, though not written they may have been pronounced long ago." He then quotes from Beames' Comp. Gram. vol. I, p. 141 ff., the following (as he justly terms it) "interesting note": "The Bengali language, as actually spoken by all classes, from the highest to the lowest, differs in many respects from the language as written in books. Especially is this noticeable in the treatment of the vowel d, which in colloquial usage is frequently, in fact almost universally, corrupted into e." But, curiously enough, the latter part of Mr. Beames' note, which is the most interesting with reference to the point under discussion, Dr. Müller omits, but, as his remarks refer to this very part, I think the omission must be due to the printer. Mr. Beames says: "This Bengali ē is pronounced more like the English a in hat, rat, etc., than like the full Italian ē in veno, agete, etc., and seems to be a linear descendant of the short ē of Prakrit.""Now," Dr. Müller says, "this is exactly the sound of the Sinhalese a, and as the Sinhalese probably came from a part of Bengal, they might have brought this sound with them. There is another reason to suppose that these sounds are older than the invention of characters proper to them. The Sinhalese vaddranaḥ is a corrupted tás from Pāli avaddhārati; the verbal noun at present is vaddrūma, older vajārūma. Now, in an inscription of the second or third century A. D. at Badagaṇiya we find vajeriya, 'he declares,' i.e., to express the sound ā which is a modification of d." I may just remark in passing that the representation of this sound by the Roman diphthong a may be considered very fairly satis-
factory, the a having the same sound in Anglo-Saxon, and the Sinhalese character itself being a modification of the symbol for a. Prof. Kuhn's remarks on the palatal sound seems some modification, owing to the fact which I have already mentioned of c being found in the oldest Sinhalese. With reference to the weak nasal sounds before the explosives y, d, and b, it is certainly curious that writers on the Sinhalese language have said so little on the subject. Even Childers has not, so far as I am aware, described the exact pronunciation of these sounds. In fact, Alwis, in the places referred to by Dr. Kuhn (SS. p. 116, and Descript. Cat. p. 236), is the only one who gives any sort of explanation of these nasals. He says they are "very soft," "very faint," and, "metrically, one syllable instant." But, according to him, this weak nasal is also found before j in Sinhalese. This I very much doubt: I believe the n has its full sound before j in Sinhalese as in Sanskrit or Pali. Childers' representation of this weak nasal sound by n before y, d, and b by b before b is very satisfactory. In Alwis' Descript. Cat. the combined nasal and explosives are represented by (n)g, (n)j, (n)z, (n)d, (n)b—a very awkward method certainly; and in the Rev. C. Alwis' Sinhalese Handbook they are printed n-g, n-d, n-d, n-b. In a review of this latter book in the Ceylon Observer of 14th July 1880 Dr. Müller made some remarks on the representation of these combinations which led me to think he had failed to notice this peculiarity of the Sinhalese language, but from a passage in his Contributions to Sinhalese Grammar I find I did him injustice. He there says:—"At present there is a difference in pronunciation between the real bindu and those weak nasals before other consonants. I doubt whether any two kinds of nasals existed in the twelfth century, for we find the bindu used with k and ligatures with all the other nasalized consonants." The real sound of such words as nūga, håda, håda, ånha, may be learnt by pronouncing them as nua, hada, hada, aba, but in each case interjecting a slight nasal before the explosive. I may mention that though in Ceylon manuscripts the compound characters which in the Sinhalese alphabet are used to represent the above sounds are made to represent the Pali ky, dz, and sz (szd is never so used), the best native scholars at present carefully distinguish them in writing, the letters being joined in Pali words but never combined. The anusvāra in the north Indian dialects is spoken with a strong nasal, whereas in Sinhalese it is very slightly nasal. When final or preceding a sibilant, the ṣ, as Childers has remarked, is pronounced like ng in German gang. (I would in passing raise a protest against the introduction by Rays Davids in his translation of the Jātaka of the unsightly symbol invented by Pitman for the ng sound. The ṣ and or ṣ has now obtained a recognised standing as the Roman equivalent of the anusvāra.*) Prof. Kuhn does not speak of the pronunciation given to ṣ in modern Sinhalese, but Dr. Müller says:—"The oldest form of this combination is ṣa in sasvetyupa (inscription at Kirinde) where the y is marked by a separate sign below the line. The group is still pronounced though not written in this way in Ceylon." Now this is certainly wrong: ṣa is always pronounced by the Sinhalese as ṣa, just as it is pronounced ṣy in Hindi, &c. The asterisk before kurulu should be omitted, the word being genuine. According to Müller yahala = uahala. The reason why val = vana was prefixed to asa = aghassa was, as Goldschmidt has pointed out, to distinguish it from as = asasa. The origin of rilasa is certainly obscure. Can it be a contraction from rali-muka, wrinkled-face? Cf. rali-muca with the same meaning as a name for the white-faced monkey (Clough). Müller explains monard as being for morana, i.e., mora+na, and this na he believes to be due (as well as the ṣa in u安全保障 = aṣa in yon = go) to a feminine in aṣ: the tiamer of the Maldives he thinks confirms this. Müller's derivation of oya from Skr. evatra, Pali caya, is I think the right one, and not oya. The word for hill is kanda, not ṣaṇḍa, and is, as Müller shows, from Skr. ṣāhanna: the older form is kanda. Sand is veṣi, not vula. The word for iron, yakaṣa, which Prof. Kuhn says is certainly non-Aryan, is as Aryan as it can be: it is a compound, (a)yakaṣa = ayakṣam; cf. in Clough yakula, yagula, yagadu, yadāma, yapata, yapalula, yabara, yavula, yahaduva, yakada, yakha, all compounds from ya = aya. Müller says that it is doubtful if orwasa is derived from udasa or direct from the Tamil. He derives ṣa, older ṣa, from sā, and explains the ṣ by the following transitions: sā, ṣa, ṣa, ṣa. The origin of orwasa is certainly puzzling: cf. Javanese ulu with the synonymous matika. Can it be that orwasa = matthaka with loss of initial? Perhaps the Maldivan bolle, ṣa, supports this. With the word for leg, kaka, cf. Malay taki and Tamil kāl. Colombo, Ceylon.

DONALD FERGUSON.
THE COLUMN INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI.

BY M. ÉMILE SENART.

Abstract.

Till the present we know of five columns or lādis inscribed with edicts of Piyadasi. The most important and oldest known is the Delhi column, commonly known as "the lād of Firuz Shah" (D), because it was that prince who caused it to be brought to Delhi from its original position. It is the one which embraces the most complete series. I think it most convenient for the present to arrange them in the way General Cunningham has done. This pillar, then, contains seven edicts, inscribed in four groups, one on each of its sides, and an eighth, below, occupies several lines round the shaft.

There is another pillar at Delhi which was also transported thither by Firuz (D'); this is the one that General Cunningham calls the pillar of Mirat from the name of its original position. It contains only a short fragment of the 1st edict, edicts II and III entire; edicts IV and V are only in part preserved, and edicts VI and VII are wanting on it.

The Allahabad column (A) contains edicts I to IV; the two first are alone intact; there remains only a line of the IIIrd; of the others longer or shorter portions. It is characterised by the presence of two additional fragments which we do not find elsewhere, and which are unfortunately spoilt. The one, already known from Prinsep, has been named by General Cunningham "the Queen's edict"; the other, which appeared for the first time in the Corpus, is addressed to the officers of Kausāmbi. They form a necessary addition in our revision of this class of edicts.

The two last columns have been found again in positions not far distant from one another; both contain the first six tablets. One is that of Radhiah (R), which General Cunningham prefers to call that of Lauria Araraj; the other, the column of Mathiah (M), which receives in the Corpus the name of Lauria Navandgarh. I need not enlarge on the description and history of these monuments; It will be sufficient to remind the reader that the different texts are, in all the parts in common, essentially identical. I therefore take for a basis, the longest version, the only complete one, that of the pillar of Firuz Shah. The text of it I transcribe and give in the notes all the different readings of the other versions, where they exist.

The orthographical or palaeographical peculiarities which this series presents are not such as to offer peculiar difficulties to the translation.

First Edict.


(*) Devāṇāmpiyi pīsādasi lājā¹ leva'ī ʻāhā⁴>[.] saḍvīsaṭi

(*) vassabhīṣitenā me* iyān dhamāmalipī likkhāpītā⁴[.]

(*) hiṣṭāpalatā dusasmatsipādyā⁴ aṁnata agāya¹ dhamākāmatāya⁴

(*) agāya parīkkhyā⁴ agāya²⁴ suṣāsāya⁴[.] aṃgānā⁴ bhāyenā

(*) aṃgān usāhenā[.] esa chu kho mama anusati-thi⁴

(*) dhamāṃpekkhā⁴ dhamākāmatā cha¹ suve⁴ suve vadhītā vadhīṣitā⁴ chevā[.]

(*) pulīsa pi cha me⁹ ukasā cha gevaya cha mañjuṁ cha anuvādhiṣitā

(*) saṃsātpiḍyaṇatī cha¹ alaṃ chapalai samadaṇapītave¹ hemeva²⁴ dīta

(*) mahāmati⁴ pi[.] esa hi²⁴ viḍhī yā iyān dhamāmena²⁴ pālanai²⁴ dhamāmena vidhāne²⁴

(*) dhamāmena sukiḥyānā⁴ dhamāmena gotiṭi"[.]

Translation.

"King Piyadasi, dear to the gods, says thus: In the twenty-seventh year of my anointing I caused this edict to be inscribed. Happiness in this world and in the next is difficult to procure, without (the part of my officers) extreme zeal for religion, rigorous supervision, extreme obedience, a very lively sense of respons-

2. A. "labha sa".
3. A. "yaddhata").
4. A. "na ma i".
5. R. "kita hi";
6. R. "dusasmatsipādyā";
7. M. "gāyaśa da";
8. R. "mattāya a";
9. M. gāyān pavikhyā; A. "pavikhyā a"; R. "pavikhyā a";
10. A. "agaya";
11. R. "śūṣṭaya";
12. A. "ṣa kho tāṁśi dha";
13. R. "ṣ̹a kho tāṁśi dha";
14. R. "pokha dha";
15. A. "kāmata cha su".
sibility, and extreme activity. But, thanks to my instructions, this care for religion, the zeal for religion grows and will grow (among them) from day to day. And my officers, superiors, subalterns and those of middle rank, conform to it and guide (the people) in the good way, the way so as to keep light spirits; the overseers of the frontier countries, the same. Because the rule is: government by religion, law by religion, progress by religion, security by religion.

Second Edict.

Prinsep, ut sup. p. 582 ff.; Burnouf, ut sup. p. 666 ff.

10) Devānāṃpiye piyadasā lāja 11) hevaṁ ahā[.] kāyaṁ cha[.] dharmasādhu[.] kāyaṁ cha[.] dharmes tī[.] apāsāya bahukyāne
12) dayā[.] dān[.] sache sochayē[.] cha khu[.] dāne pī me bahuvdihe dihimā[.] dupada
13) chatupadesā pakhi-vālīhaesa vividhe[.] me anugaha kaṭe āpāna
14) dākhiyā[.] ahā[.] pi cha me bahūni[.] haynāni kātha[.] stāye me
15) athāye[.] iyaṁ dāmāmalipī[.] likhāpitā[.] hevaṁ anupātapajānātu chilaṁ
16) thitikā[.] pa potī[.] ye cha hevaṁ saśītpajjasati[.] se[.] suka-stān kachhātā[.]

"King Piyadasi, dear to the gods, speaks thus: Religion is excellent. But, one will say, what is that religion? [It consists in committing] the least evil possible, [in doing] much good, [in practising] pity, charity, veracity and also purity of life. Therefore I have given alms of all kinds; to men and quadrupeds, birds and aquatic animals, I have distributed diverse favours, even to securing drinkable water for them; I have besides done good in other meritorious actions. It is for this that I have caused this edict to be inscribed,—in order that, conforming to it, they may walk in the same good way, and my word may endure. Whoever acts thus, he will do well.

Third Edict.

Prinsep, ut sup. p. 584 ; Burnouf, ut sup. p. 669 ff.

17) Devānāṃpiye piyadasā lāja hevaṁ ahā[.] kayanāmeva dekhā[.] iyaṁ me
18) kayāni kṣeteti nominate pāpaṁ[.] dekhā[.] iyaṁ me pāpaṁ[.] kṣeteti iyaṁ vā[.] āsāvane
19) nāmā[.] dupātivēke cha kuḥa eso hevaṁ[.] chū khou eso dekhīye imīni
20) āsāvāgāmīni[.] nāma[.] ātha chaṭḍīye ni-thūlīye[.] kolhe māne[.] isyā
21) kālalena va[.] haṅkaṁ mā palpibhasayissā[.] ca sa bāha[.] dekhīye iyaṁ me
22) hidatikāye iyaṁ ma name[.] pālatikāye[.] "King Piyadasi, dear to the gods, speaks thus: We see only our good actions; we say, I have done such a good action. In return we do not see the evil that we commit, we do not say, I have committed such a bad action, such an action is a sin. It is true that this examination is hard; nevertheless, it is necessary to watch ourselves, and to say: such and such actions constitute sins, as passion, cruelty, anger, pride. It is necessary to watch ourselves with care and say: I will not yield to envy and calumniate; that will be for my greater good here below; that will be for my greater good in the future."

Fourth Edict.


1) Devānāṃpiye piyadasā lāja hevaṁ ahā[.] saṃsvāsīvāsā
2) abhisitena me iyaṁ dāmāmalipī likhā- pitā[.] lajūkā me
3) bahūsa pānasatasahasesa janasi āyatā[.] tesaṁ ye abhibhāle[.] va
4) daṅde va atapatiye me kaṭe kiṁti lajūkā[.] asvatha abhīḥā[.]
chastisement against them, in order that these rájukas may with entire confidence and security attend to their duties, to establish and develop the welfare and usefulness of the population of my states. They will observe the progress or the sufferings, and together with the faithful they will exhort the (entire) population of my states, in view of assuring to them happiness here below and salvation in the future. The rájukas apply themselves to obey me; the purushas too will follow my wishes and orders, and they will spread the exhortations so that the rájukas may apply themselves to satisfying me. Just as after having confided your child to a skilful nurse you feel secure, saying to yourself: a skilful nurse cares well for my child, even so I have created rájukas for the good and utility of my subjects. That they may with confidence and security, free from pre-occupation, attend to their duties, I have reserved to myself personally all proceedings and chastisements against them. It is, in fact, desirable that there should obtain perfect equality in proceedings and penalties. Dating from this day (I introduce) the (following) rule: to the prisoners who have been judged and condemned to death, I grant a reprieve of three days (before execution). They will be warned that they have no longer or shorter to live. Thus warned of the term of their existence, they will give alms in view of the future life, or will practice fasting. I desire in fact that, even shut up in prison, they may make themselves sure of the other world. I desire the various practices of religion, the dominion over the senses, the distribution of alms, to spread more and more among the people.

Fifth Edict.

Prinsep, p. 590 ff. (cf. p. 965)

(1) Devānsāpya piyadasis lājā hevaṁ ahā [1] sadāsyātivaśa

2. E."heva", M."dapeva".
10. D.R."chahānti, M."chahānti me,"
11. D."sva sukhiyadahāntava, M."suvati ka,"
12. R.M."mama,"
13. R.M."jāka,"
16. D.R."abhiḥ,"
17. D.R.M."maas ka,"
18. D.R."kanna, A."nān a,"
34. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
40. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
41. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
42. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
43. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
44. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
45. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
46. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
47. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
49. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
52. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
57. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
60. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
63. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
64. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
68. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
70. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
71. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
73. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
74. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
75. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
76. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
77. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
78. D."jaya, M."jaya, M."jaya, 11. D.P.
ing I forbade the killing of animals belonging to the following species, namely: parrots, sārikas, aruñas, chakravākas, flamingos, nandimukhas, gairās, bats, water-ants (?) tortoises called dūḍi, the fishes named anasthikas, vairavayakas, the pumputkas of the Ganges, the fish called éśākṣa, tortoises and porcupines, parṇassasas, (?) simulas, (?) the bulls that wander at liberty, foxes, (?) turtle-doves, white pigeions, village pigeons and all quadrupeds which are not used or eaten; as for she-goats, sheep and swine, they are not to be killed whilst suckling, nor when with young, nor their young whilst under six months; capons must not be made, no creature must be burned alive, a wood must not be fired either for mischief or to kill the animals which dwell in it. Living creatures must not be made use of to feed living creatures. On the three full moons of the chāturmāsas, on the full moon which is in conjunction with the nakṣatra Tishya, on that which is in conjunction with the nakṣatra Puranavasā, the 14th, 15th and the day which follows the full moon, and, in general, each day of uposatha, fish must not be caught nor offered for sale. In these same days animals shut up in parks for game must not be destroyed, nor those in the reservoirs for fishing, nor any other class of living creatures. The 8th, 14th and 15th of each half-moon, and the day which follows the full moon of Tishya, of Puranavasā and of the three chāturmāsas, oxen, goats, rams or swine, must not be mutilated, nor any other animal that it is usual to mutilate. The day of the full moon of Tishya, of Puranavasā, and of the chāturmāsas, and the first day of the fortnight that follows a full moon of chāturmāsā, neither oxen nor horses must be marked. In the course of the twenty-six years since my anointing I have set at liberty twenty-six (condemned to death).—(To be continued.)

Translation.

King Piyadasi, dear to the gods, speaks thus:—In the twenty-seventh year of my anointing.
XIX.

Gmelin tells us that when at Udinskioostrog he sent for three Shamans. They were dressed differently to any Siberian Shamans he had hitherto seen. They wore a leathern dress strewn with iron trinkets, and with the claws of eagles and owls. These ornaments made the dress very heavy, and made a great noise when its wearer moved, "march to the distress of the evil spirits." The cap was pointed at the top like that of the old grenadiers, and was also covered with the claws of eagles and owls. The three Shamans went to visit our traveller at night, since they declared that they could not perform their sorceries in the daylight. They chose the open place where Gmelin was for their performance, and there made a fire. Our traveller wished them all to do their focus pocus together, but they said this could not be. One of them accordingly took his drum. The drumstick was made like a brush, a squirrel's skin being substituted for the bristles. The performance was the usual one. Gmelin tried to test them by asking if a man whom he knew at Moscow was still living. After making several contortions the Shaman replied that the devil could not travel as far as Moscow, an answer which again recalls some of those of the Western Mediums. The Shamans distorted their faces, writhed and threw about their bodies, screamed as if raving, and generally excited themselves until under the load of their heavy dress they perspired profusely. Their compatriots, says Gmelin, paid handsomely for their performances, but we had them gratis, and had the comedy repeated more than once. The one who had been consulted about the man at Moscow offered to inquire again, and after more contortions asked if the man in question had grey hair. Gmelin having replied in the affirmative the Shaman again beat his drum, and jumped about vigorously, and eventually replied that the man was dead. He had in fact been dead for 50 years, says Gmelin.1 On the Serednaia Bors, Gmelin met three Shamans and a Shamaness. The Shamans were apparently Tungusian, but the Shamaness claimed to be a Mongol. The former had on each shoulder two pointed iron horns. To their dress were hung two iron rings, one under the other, to each of which was fastened a leather strap, and to each of these a piece of thin iron eight inches long and one broad, having teeth like a saw on one side; at the end of the leather strap which reached to the bottom of the dress was a bell without a clapper. Here and there hung small iron rings, and below all two Chinese locks. The Shamaness had no horns on her shoulders. Her dress was hung with a number of discs which Gmelin says were like the so-called mirrors which are found in the graves; they had Chinese characters on one side. Behind her hung several long bands and a great rusty iron lock. She also had a Shaman's drum or tambourine, which the men had not. It was made as usual of leather or parchment stretched over a wooden frame. The drumstick was made of a crooked piece of wood, on one side of which was fastened a squirrel's skin. Instead of caps all four had a head ornament made of a number of bands fastened together crosswise, forming a kind of bridle. One of the Shamans, who was 70 years old, and who had practised his art for over 50 years, professed to be able to pass arrows through his body. A Saissan or prince urged Gmelin that he should see the Shamans perform. He, wishing to test them, persuaded one of his companions to feign that he was sometimes attacked with sudden faintness. The Shamans requested him to sit down with his friends, and then began their usual dancing and screaming, while the Shamans beat her tambourine. The performers pretended that a whole army of devils were among the strangers, and this byplay, it was said, was to see whose particular devils were the strongest. The lot fell upon the old Shaman already mentioned. He said that when he was in the bloom of his strength he controlled a body of 120 devils, but now that he had grown old he could no longer bear their caresses, and had lost his power accordingly. He was now asked to try and diagnose the disease of the man who was feigning illness, and after jumping and screaming for a while he

placed one of his hands above the other and pointed at him. He presently declared that the disease came from that locality, and said that it might be cured by the use of certain herbs. The Shamaness followed with her performances, and after similarly jumping and screaming for a while, she stretched her right hand towards the left of the patient and felt it above the place where the pulse is generally felt. She declared, however, she could see no disease. Another of the Shamans also felt him with both hands, after a similar performance "and smiled," says Gmelin, "as if he knew he was an impostor." He ended by giving a similar opinion to the Shamaness. Gmelin was asked to see the performance of the passage of the arrow, whereupon the old Shaman confessed before a number of Tunguses that he had in fact duped them, and had not passed it through his flesh but only through his robe, colouring it with blood he kept in a bladder, and that he could not have misled them if they had not been so credulous and stupid, and he repeated the performance before Gmelin himself. Similar performances were witnessed by our traveller, whose humour never deserts him, on the Unga river, where he met with a Shamaness who professed to thrust a knife into her flesh and to draw it out again, without leaving a wound, but she did her work so clumsily that the trick was patent enough save to the wondering Buriats. Here he was also introduced to a famous Shaman, who inter alia claimed to be able to move his body instantaneously to another place. This he did not see done, but he saw him walk about a fire on his bare feet which he explains by the fact that through their habitual dancing and going barefoot the Shamans' feet become very hard. He also saw him take up live coals and apparently wash himself with them, but he remarked the dexterity with which he surrounded the living coal with ashes as he did this.

When Gmelin visited the Buriats, near Udinsk, an old Shamaness, the grand-mother of one of their chiefs, had become paralysed, and could no longer perform her sorceries. This was deemed a great loss by them, as she used to discover thieves and to recover lost herds, and she not only claimed to have intercourse with the god of the nether regions, but also with the Infinite Being. On one occasion he informed her that he meant to descend to the earth on a certain mountain. She told her compatriots, and on the day appointed they assembled before day-break, and she marched at their head, addressing them in language likely to arouse their piety. When the first rays of the sun gilded the mountain top she said that the critical moment was at hand, that she felt a divine afflatus, and that those who wished to share her vision must keep close to her. The sun rose higher and higher, and presently some flashes of light came from the mountain top such as the Buriats had never before seen. They fell on the ground on their faces, and the old woman raised a cry of joy. She received a number of sables, pieces of cloth and silk, as presents, and she returned to her yurt amid the shouts and acclamations of the crowd. It was afterwards discovered that she had placed an image of polished metal on the mountain which had reflected the unusual light. This destroyed her credit with some, but not with the majority of her people. He describes the sacrifices made by the Shamans, much as Giorgi does, and tells us they offered such sacrifices to the god of the sky and to the devil. To the former in his honour: to the latter to appease his wrath. He says the Buriats were in great fear of their Shamans, and believed that they could, with the help of the devil, do them infinite harm, that when dead they returned to torment them in their sleep and threatened them with a violent death. When they had terrible dreams of this kind they repaired to the place where the Shaman had been buried with all his panoply, and tried to appease him by some sacrifice prescribed by a living Shaman. The sacrificed animal having been eaten, the skeleton was laid on the grave.

Pallas has described for us the traces of Shamanism that still remained among the Kalmucks when he wrote. He tells us their Shamans are despised and punished when discovered by the Lamas performing their hocus pocus. The male Shamans are called Ḳoḥ and the female Ḳudugun. When the Lamas failed to bring relief in trouble or danger, the common people still have recourse to them.

---

2 Gmelin, op. cit. vol. II, pp. 82-87.
3 Ibid. vol. III, pp. 70-73.
They belong for the most part to the poorest class of the community. They offer sacrifices (galtai khoo) according to the old practice, a custom which the Lamas, to conciliate the people, have adopted. This is a concession of principle, since the Buddhists object altogether to taking away life. The consecration of animals is also a custom which passed from the old Shamanism into the form of Lamism adopted by the Kalmuks.21 Pallas mentions the custom of consecrating a sheep which was part of the heritage from the Shamans as still prevailing when he wrote. He tells us that the rich Kalmuks were in the habit of choosing out a ram from their flock, which must be white with a yellow head. This was called Tengeri Tokkho, i. e. Heaven's or the Spirit's ram. It was not to be shorn or sold, but when it grew old, and it was thought proper to consecrate a fresh ram, then the old one was to be sacrificed. This was to be in autumn when the sheep were fat. The neighbours were summoned to such a sacrifice, which was accompanied by cries of the sorcerer directed towards the sunrise, and by the sprinkling of milk to feed the spirits of the air. It was carried out on a lucky day. The flesh was eaten, and the skeleton with a portion of the fat was burnt on a kind of altar raised on four posts, an ell and a half high, while the skin, the head and feet were hung up in the manner usual with the Burians.22 Marco Polo long ago referred to these sacrifices as prevailing among the Buddhists of Tangut, showing how early Northern Buddhism adopted the previous practices into its own. He tells us that such of the Tangutans as had children used to feed up a sheep in honour of their idol, which they sacrificed at the new year or on the idol's feast day, when they took the sheep and their children with great ceremony before the idol. Having killed and cooked the sheep and placed it before the idol while they said their prayers, they afterwards carried it home, called their relatives together, and ate it. The head, feet, entrails and skin, with some of the meat, were reserved for the priests. When the flesh had been eaten the bones were collected and stored carefully in a hutch.23

Pallas, in his travels had an opportunity of closely inspecting the performances of a female Shaman among the Burians. While at the Stenitza of Sharantziqoi one of these ladies, named Labantsiska, belonging to the Khorintai tribe, was introduced to him. She was accompanied by her husband and two other Burians. Each one had a magical drum. She told him the number of her companions was not complete. There ought to be nine drums in order that the ceremony should have its proper solemnity. She bore two sortis or batons which were covered like a horseman's sword sheath and ornamented at the top with a horse's head, a little bell and a number of small metal plates (kholbusa, a word meaning really a spoon). Her leather dress was also decorated with three pieces of metal. There hung down behind her from her shoulders, and reaching to the ground about 30 interlaced so called serpents (nuchal). They were made of pieces of black and white fur and of strips of the skins of the polecat and the red weasel. One of these serpents was split into three at its extremity. She called it mogol. Without this she declared that a Buriatian Shamaness's dress was incomplete. Her cap was covered with an iron helmet armed with three pointed horns resembling the horns of a roebuck.

She did not hesitate to go through her performance although it was broad daylight, and moved and jumped about in a violent way until she got excited, at the same time singing and reciting various curses and making noises, the drums accompanying her. These curses were repeated by the Burians who formed a circle round her. She resumed and completed her formula amidst convulsive transports and fainting and passing her hands over her face. After the first songs she began to run as if she wished to escape from the tent. Two Burians having planted themselves at the door to prevent her, she, among other conjurations, rushed with her head at the three Burians who played the drums, and who were seated on the left of the yurt, like a bull charging. She took her two batons in her hand, and jumped several times in the chimney or smoke-hole as if she wished to catch the spirits of the air and to bring them into the tent. She then adopted a cheerful manner, and requested that questions might be put to her. She replied while singing

---

22 Pallas, op. cit. vol. II, pp. 343-344.
and swaying to and fro. She asked Pallas for some alcohol, telling him he was a fortunate person, and that he would make some long journeys by sea. This concluded the spectacle. Pallas remarks upon the extraordinary generic resemblance pervading the Shamanism all over Siberia. The great annual religious feasts form a notable part of the Shaman polity. Marco Polo describes the new year's feast held by Kubilai in February. On this occasion the Khan and all his people were dressed in white, for they deemed that white clothing was lucky, a custom which, as Colonel Yule says, seems to be distinctly attributable to the Mongols with whom the first month of the year is still called Chaghan Sars or the white month. White was a sacred colour with the Mongols, while among the Chinese it was the colour of mourning. On the great feast day the Khan was presented with rich and costly gifts. The people also gave one another white things, and Polo declares that over 100,000 white horses, richly caparisoned, were presented to the Khan from various quarters on this occasion. White horses were deemed especially sacred, and Polo speaks thus of them: "Now these mares are passing across the country, and any one falls in with them, be he the greatest lord in the land, he must not presume to pass until the mares have gone by; he must either tarry where he is, or go a half-day's journey round if need be, so as not to come nigh them; for they are to be treated with the greatest respect. Well, when the lord sets out from the Park on the 28th of August, the milk of all those is taken and sprinkled on the ground. And this is done on the injunction of the idolaters and idol priests, who say that it is an excellent thing to sprinkle that milk on the ground every 28th of August, so that the earth and the air and the false gods shall have their share of it, and the spirits likewise that inhabit the air and the earth. And that those beings will protect and bless the Khan and his children and his wives and his folk, his gear and his cattle and his horses, his corn and all that is his. After this is done, the Emperor is off and away." The Buriats have, according to Giorgi, two great annual feasts. One in the autumn, when their new year commences. They called Sangha haras, or White Moon, and also Shoroi: Gudur. Giorgi describes at length one of these feasts, in which he took part. Such a feast, he says, was not necessarily held every year, and it was deemed enough in fact if it was held every second, third or fourth year. All the heads of families who attended either brought offerings with them or devoutly shared in eating those brought by others. The length of the feast depended on the number joining in it, etc. etc., sometimes one day, sometimes more. On the occasion referred to six sheep and one goat were offered, and it lasted two days. As a mountain was preferred for such feasts, accordingly in the one witnessed by Giorgi, the Saisan or prince with his family which lived in three yurts, repaired to a mountain whence there was a good view. The feast was meant to be confined to the God of Heaven, and to the sun, earth, mountains and rivers, but in the accompanying songs the whole of the Shaman gods were named.

Before the yurts towards the south a rope made of white hair from the mane of a consecrated horse (vide infra) was hung out from east to west, one end of it was fastened to a stake on which was a sacrificed animal, and the other to a birch tree. From the rope hung many rags of different colours, little banners and tufts of hawks' feathers, and a great number of objects used in tethering the foals in summer. On another small birch tree was a piece of wood like a rake with seven projecting teeth, and on each tooth a small three-pointed flag. These various rags and banners were supposed to assist by their waving the prayers of the assembly. The feathers were consecrated, so that they might afterwards be used to feather lucky arrows, and the pieces of wood so that they might be of greater benefit when used in the future. Further to the south there burnt a sacrificial fire (arshu). To the west of it stood a yurt built of rods covered with woollen or felted cloth and open to the fire. It was in the shape of a bowl. In it was placed a nography or god made of rags. It represented in silken stuff four outlines of naked men drawn in red chalk; all had leaded eyes, and on their heads were tufts of feathers. Near the rope was a shire (i.e., a small round spot), surrounded with a ring of dried dung.

---
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Here the refuse from the sacrificed animals was burnt. The Shaman, an intelligent man, was dressed in Chinese silver tissue and without the paraphernalia with which Shamans generally deck themselves. He wore a cap of sable fur. His assistant was dressed in the old-fashioned Buriat costume. On a coverlet made of vilok were placed four wooden bowls containing the milk of different kinds of domestic animals, and before the fire and on its north side was a stage four feet high standing on four posts with its boards covered with faggots. The people formed a ring enclosing the small yurt containing the god (Urutu), the fire and the stage. With his assistant the Shaman planted himself with the sheep to be sacrificed (oakhti) before the Urutu. He turned his face towards the south, while the sheep had its head turned towards the norgit or god, and the assistant held a bowl of sour milk. The Shaman began his prayer, and also to wave about the small prayer flag (godo). The people sometimes sang with him, and sometimes called out khasterish, i.e. "Have mercy." Meanwhile the assistant sprinkled the milk from the bowls in the air with a ladle, all except the last ladleful from each bowl, which was thrown into the fire by the Shaman. As soon as a bowl was empty, the assistant took up a little fat and put it, while murmuring a formula, between his girdle and his coat. One bowl was offered to the God of heaven and to the sun, the second to the earth, the third to the mountains, and the fourth to the rivers. The Shaman now took the sheep, and let its forehead touch the norgit. He then cut off a little wool from its back. Whenever in his song he mentioned the deity, he bowed and touched the ground with his hands, the bystanders also bowing. The sheep was then put to death by some of the common people. A slit was made in the breast, and the heart was pulled out until it lay on the breast, when the animal died. The Shaman now thrust the bits of wool he had cut off through the slit into the lungs of the sheep. This was supposed to protect all other sheep from the staggers and the dropsy, and to be otherwise beneficial. During the killing of the sheep the Shaman had nothing to do. Each one conversed as he pleased, and smoked tobacco. They now cut the flesh from the bones and boiled it. This was also done with the entrails, the refuse being thrown upon the shire. The boiled flesh was placed upon the platform or altar as an offering. As long as the Shaman's song, which was now renewed, continued, a boy held the boiled pluck of the sheep towards the south. The Shaman threw four bits of flesh and fat and as many pieces of the entrails into the fire. Prayers, bowings and waveings of prayer-banners were gone through as in the previous offering of milk. Four ladles full of broth from the meat were also thrown into the fire. The meat was now eaten without any ceremony. The skeleton was impaled upon a birch pole, and over it was stretched the skin of the sheep, the whole was then set up in a row with previous similar monuments, a row extending from east to west.

The people then re-formed the ring, into which the Shaman entered with his Shaman's staff (horba). He again struck up his song, but so wildly and with such shrieking and with so many frantic leaps, shiverings and roarings, that he might be well taken to be mad. He mentioned the Orkild and several evil spirits very often. The Buriats said that he was cursing them, and interdicting them from doing them or their flocks the smallest harm. Lastly, the shire was set on fire and burnt without any further ceremony. In such a sacrificial feast it was essential that the animal which was to be sacrificed was healthy. It did not matter what its breed, age, or colour were. The feast here described was the great autumn feast.

The other great feast, Saiya, was held in the spring, and was chiefly characterized by the offering of the first milk; several families joined together in making their offerings; after which the Shaman took the bowl and threw it towards the south. In throwing it, he made it turn like a wheel. If, when it reached the ground, it stood upright the gift was deemed to have been accepted; if, on the other hand, it fell over, the contrary, and a sheep or a foal had to be brought in its place. Giorgi tells us that when he was at Olkhan, the Shaman made three throws, all of which turned out with fresh authority as old practice enjoined by the Shamans.

It will be remembered that Chinghis Khan prescribed that all animals must be put to death in this way, a regulation in which he, no doubt, merely stamped
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is made, a piece of felt is spread out on the south on which are placed four bowls, one with milk, a second with airak, a third with cheese, while the fourth is empty. The coverlet with the offerings is called *turge*. Before the *turge* and also towards the south stands the horse with its head towards the south, held by two men. Before the horse there is planted a small birch tree with a small banner on it. The Shaman goes in his ordinary dress, carrying his prayer flags called *yodo*; these he puts in the fire, and lets the smoke from them rise into the horse's nostrils, while he murmurs a formula. He then cuts off some of the hairs from its forehead and its tail, and throws the bits towards the south, the bystanders meanwhile forming a ring and joining with him in a chant. While singing, he pours some of the milk, airak, and cheese successively towards the south. The portions of these still remaining in the three bowls he pours into the fourth and empty one, and taking a portion rubs the horse from its ears along the mane and down the back as far as the tail, murmuring softly all the while, then fastens a patch hardly a span in size in its mane. Lastly, he removes the bridle and places the bowl containing the remnants of the offering on the horse's crupper. When it falls off, if it falls behind it is deemed that the horse is acceptable to the gods. It is also important to note whether the bowl falls towards the East or South, when it is deemed more fortunate than if it fall towards the West or North. The herdsmen are accustomed also to erect on various hills an *obo*, which is a small empty hut, in which it is supposed the god who protects the cattle and cattle-breeding may shelter in the night or in bad weather.

Gmelin was also present at one of the Buriat New Year's feasts. The ceremony, he says, commenced at sunrise. Behind a row of birch trees about two fathoms long there were, a little to the left, two other trees of the same kind, and behind these were three Buriats, one of whom, a little in front of the others, was kneeling down. He held a branch of a birch tree horizontally, and pointing towards the rising sun spoke in a loud voice. Gmelin was told he was summoning the gods. The other two were standing, and each held a wooden cup filled with *kumis* and spirit distilled from it in equal parts.
They advanced for some distance, threw their cups in the air, and spoke certain words, while the one on his knees continued to pray. Having repeated the ceremony three times, they refilled their cups, and this time threw them in front of them. Gmelin was told that, having saluted the god three times, he had been pleased to accept their civility, and to show how pleased they were that he had designed to visit the Buriats they had thrown their cups towards him. Meanwhile a man on the left of the trees held a sheep which was to be sacrificed. In order to make it more acceptable some spirit and milk mixed together were poured over its head. Two men then threw it down, a third made an incision some fingers below its midriff through which he thrust his hand and broke the aorta, taking care none of the blood fell on the ground. When the animal was cold its intestines were taken out, its blood was carefully collected on a wooden plate, its skin was taken off and its left forefoot and right hind foot were broken at the joint and the two others were cut off. A small triangular piece of the sternum was detached with some of the flesh on it and covered with skin. The flesh was now all taken off, and put in a cauldron with the intestines, the latter having been first a little washed. The bones and blood were thrown into a pit, and the cauldron was put on the fire. The small piece of breast-bone was roasted on the ashes, and divided among those officiating at the sacrifice, and two other considerable people from the guests, and eaten. The meat and intestines when cooked were eaten with great speed, wood was put on the pit which was set fire to in order to burn the bones. The skin was suspended as a memorial of the sacrifice. Kumiz and spirit were freely drunk during the feast. Gmelin also describes the consecration of a horse which he witnessed. He says that he did not arrive until 5 o'clock in the afternoon, while the Buriats firmly believed that the consecration would not be effective if performed after midday, "but what will not faith do among simple souls," says our traveller. The Shaman declared it was not noon; they thereupon met solemnly, and no longer doubted the validity of the ceremony. The horse was a grey one. The Shaman pronounced some words over it, and then gave it a gentle stroke with his hand, and the man who held it made it run. Such a consecrated horse, he says, was never mounted nor employed in any kind of work. When its master died it was sacrificed, and it was then eaten by the Shamans and others. Pallas gives us an account of a sacrifice which he witnessed among the Derbets Kalmuks and which was made for the recovery of a sick woman and for the good fortune of her husband, the officiating person being a Shamaness (Udagun). A lucky day having been selected, a sheep was taken into the hut and was put to death in the prescribed fashion, the breast-bone was then taken out with the skin upon it, the blood and fat were collected together and the lower jaw with the tongue, wind-pipe, gullet, lungs and heart all in one piece, together with the liver, were then placed in a cauldron. The sheep was then cut across into halves, the fore-half was again split in two, the piece between the legs with the fat tail being detached as a tid-bit. The whole of the flesh was then removed from the bones, and was put into the cauldron and boiled, the right shoulder-blade with meat upon it being alone left uncooked. The breast-bone with the skin on it cut into strips was made into the shape of a triangle, and laid on the top of the other ingredients in the cauldron. Meanwhile night approached, which was the time specially chosen for their practices by the Shamans. An astragalus bone of a sheep (called shagui by the Kalmuks) was fastened to a red silk cord; one end of this was to be held by the host, while the other was thrown over the smoke-hole at the top of the yurt. The kettle was now removed from the fire, and standing opposite the door the Shamaness took a figure of Buddha which had been taken from a little box, made a lamp out of dough, and put it before the figure. The boiled flesh was now taken in a great bowl by two men, who first put it near the door, and then held it over the fire. The ears were detached from the head of the sheep and the hoofs from its feet. Then, with some of the skin and all the pluck they were put into a sack, in which and over the rest the heart was placed, and the whole was put down near the sorceress. At the same time some of the fat of the sacrificed animal, which was near the sick hostess, was put on the trivet or tripod over the fire. While the host
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distributed airak, the head and bones were stripped of the coarser flesh, and the brain was also taken out. The best part of the flesh, together with the tid-bit above mentioned, were now eaten by the sorceress, the host and the more distinguished people present. The rest was given to the ordinary Kalmuks, who were also allowed to drink of the broth mixed with blood from the great mug, partly with their hands, partly with bowls. Two of the relatives were allowed to take bones with flesh upon them. When the greater part was consumed and some more fat had been put on the fire, preparations were made for the burnt offering. The wood on the fire-place was ranged in the shape of a four-sided funeral pile. Three lamps made of dough were arranged round this in the form of a triangle. A loose cord was twisted out of fine wool from the sheep, this was wound about the boiled breast-bone. The fat about the kidneys which still remained over was put upon the fire, then the head, which had been well cleaned, then the lower jaw bones, then the breast-bone, then the still connected knuckle-bones of the legs, and lastly the ribs, upon which some flesh still remained, and upon the whole were strewn some portions of broken fat. The sick woman then poured some airak over the fire, then some milk, then some sugar and raisins, and lastly two large lumps of mingled butter and fat, while her husband covered the whole with a branch, and a piece of wood from the trunk of the tree called Arza by the Mongols. The sorceress now placed the host opposite the door, gave him a bowl with flesh and broth in his right hand, and in the left the above-mentioned shoulder-blade and one end of the cord which was hung across the smoke-hole of the yurt. Then taking up the sack with its contents as above described, she took it to each of the three lamps, and waved it over the fire, as if she meant thus to show it to the spirits of the air whom she summoned by repeatedly calling out Khunr Khunr! She then went up to the host laughing, and offered him the heart out of the bag, of which he bit off the point, and she also let his son and his sick wife taste. As she repeated the invocation a second and third time, the host again ate a portion of the heart until hardly any of it remained. The sorceress now put aside her sack and the host the shoulder-blade. The sick woman gave the sheep's caul, with a copper coin attached to it, to the assistant who put it on the fire. The Shamaness took a bell in her left hand and an arrow in her right one, and began to reel to and fro before the gods, to scream out invocations, to make gestures with her body, head and arms, so that her cap fell off. It was picked up by her assistant, who hardly refrained from laughing at this performance. She held it under her right arm, and marked it with a burning piece of the Arza wood. In the course of a quarter of an hour she had worked herself into a profuse perspiration, and felt herself sufficiently inspired to prophesy. She first announced to the host his future fortune. Thereupon several of the other Kalmuks asked her through her assistant to tell them of their affairs also, and they also screamed out to her their wants in person. She in turn replied. She continued to rave thus for an hour, when she laid aside the arrow, and continued her magical performance with two bells, and pretended to see two goddesses, one of whom she called Dai Khattun, the sea wife, and the other Okin Tenggeri (the young wife of the sky). She at length finished her performance. The flesh in the sack was now consumed in common, and about midnight the company separated. The sorceress retained as her reward two pieces of white cloth in each of which nine pieces of money were wrapped, nine having, as we have seen, been held a sacred number among the Mongols from an early period. The details here related, which seem so childish, are all doubtless of very ancient origin, and all have a symbolic meaning. Pallas adds that some of the Shamans were accustomed in their juggling to use a large kind of Jews' harp called Tümen khur.

On such occasions as the one above described the bones were to remain on the hearth until quite burnt. The flesh on the prepared shoulder-blade was to be consumed on the third day following. The pieces of copper money put in the fire were sought for the next morning by the invalid, and kept as sacred. Of the bones of the animal sacrificed the shoulder-blades were alone preserved, these being used in subsequent necromancy. Erdmann tells us that among the Buriats who are still Shamanists, the soothsayers or conjurers are called bugoi, or udagan, accord-
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ing as the sacred office is filled by men or women. The bugoi maintain that they know better than other people how to deal with certain mischievous spirits, named by them Ongotui, at the head of which is a spirit named Begdes, which dwells on the Mondorgon-ola, or the volcanic mountain near the Irkut. The promontory at the place where the Angara issues from Lake Baikal and the Island of Olkhon are also sacred places where sacrifices are made to conciliate these spirits, and as proof of their acceptance are carried off secretly by the bugoi. The Burjats have been accustomed, from the earliest times, to celebrate yearly festivals for the good spirits. Naked mountaintops are selected for that purpose, and the spots so chosen are marked by an obo, as it is called, or rude heap of stones. About midsummer, when the cattle of the steppe are in the best condition, offerings are brought to these altars, and the solemn rites are followed by wrestling matches and other popular amusements. The Buddhist Lamas, we are further told, have recognized and sanctioned all these ancient usages in order that the Burjats may regard the new religion only as an extension or completing of the old. They have declared the Begdes to be a true Burkhan, and in honour of him they allow their followers to celebrate a great popular festival every three years near the temple of the Kutukhta at Urga, on the mountain of Khan-ola.18

Pallas describes the oboes as erected both by the Mongols and Kalmucks, and as being, like many Lamaist ceremonies, relics of the old Shamanism. They are erected with considerable ceremony, are repaired to by people to say their prayers, and are also the rendezvous where the smallest feasts are held. They are generally erected in very fertile places and on mountains, and are made of sand, earth, stones or wood, raised into a mound, upon which are hung prayer-banners, prayer-wheels and ribbons, and, among the Mongols, shoulder-blades of sheep with Tibetan prayers upon them. They are generally consecrated to the protecting spirit of the earth. Each passer-by, who goes there to pray, leaves some offering in the shape of a piece of his clothing, some hair from his horse’s mane, &c. In addition to these oboes, the Siberian tribes, including the Mongols, erect heaps of stones on passes where a road goes, and each traveller takes a stone or piece of wood from the foot of the mountain and throws it on the heap, so that the mountain shall not be lessened in bulk by the wear and tear. The Lamas also hang their shoulder-blades of sheep with prayers upon them near mineral springs and baths, and they also hang rags, horse-hair or pieces of skin on bushes.19

Timofski tells us how near the river Iro, on the east of the road, there rises a perpendicular rock, forming the extremity of a chain of mountains that stretches along the right bank of the river. On the topof this mountain is an obo: the native raises such obos with solemn ceremonies, according to the directions of a Lama, before which he prostrates himself in devotion to the Almighty spirit. In time of war, he implores his succour to conquer his enemy, and to defend his country; when diseases afflict his family or his cattle, and under all his other misfortunes he begs mercy of the spirit of the mountains and the valleys. Every Mongol who rides past an obo alights from his horse, places himself to the south of the obo, with his face to the north, makes several prostrations, and lays something upon the altar. “I most frequently,” says our traveller, “observed on the obo’s tufts of horse-hair, which are pledges of the prayers of the Nomads for the preservation of their animals, their inseparable companions.” The obo serves also to point out the road, and to designate the frontiers.20

In regard to the practice of fastening rags, &c., to bushes and trees, which prevails so widely in Northern Asia, it is curious to turn to the history of the famous Ilkhan, of Persia, Ghazan, and to read how, in 1302, when at Bendlejin, he went to pay a visit to a tree under which he had sheltered when hard pressed by the rebel Nuruz. He now visited it with his amirs and wives, and like a good Musulman thanked heaven for his good fortune in a namaz of two rekats. After exhorting his followers, they were told, they proceeded to attach ribbons to the tree, around which the amirs danced. Pulad Ching-sang, the Mongol prince to whom Bashidu’d-din confesses his indebtedness for much information, then went on to relate a story how Chinghiz

Khàn's uncle Khubilai, whose bravery was so famous, when marching once against the Merkit alighted before a tree which was on his route, and having prayed there made a vow if he returned victorious to go and hang ribbons upon it. Having secured a victory he in fact returned and danced round the tree with his troops. Ghazan, we are told, was much pleased with this anecdote, and said if his ancestors had not been so pious, God would not have made them kings of the earth, and he proceeded to dance himself. 89

One of the oldest practices prevalent in the East, and which is closely bound up with Shamanism, is that of weather conjuring. Marco Polo says that during the three months of every year that the Khàn resided at Shangtu; if it happened to be bad weather there were certain crafty enchanters and astrologers in his train, who were such adepts in necromancy and the diabolic arts, that they were able to prevent any cloud or storm from passing over the spot on which the Emperor's palace stood. 91 This practice of weather-conjuring, Pallas says, is called Sadda Barina among the Kalmucks. The weather doctors not only profess to foretell the kind of weather which is impending, but also to control rain or clouds, fog or wind. They also profess to be able to counteract the effects of similar conjuring. The chief mode of weather-conjuring is by means of mystical formulae (tarni) which are to be addressed with a believing heart and deep devotion by the weather conjurer (sadvachi) to certain gods. To bring rain the formula must be addressed to the god Ochirbani. The following is the formula for this purpose:—

Um khun sungui nagarasa gangpak tsokka.

To cause clouds to rise the address must be to Mansushiri Burkhan with the formula:—

Um sarva sharma karem laalik tsokha.

To bring fog the following formula is addressed to the Burkhan Nagansana:—

Um sarwa ningwo rub rowok.

To create a cool breeze recourse is had to the Burkhan Radnasambova with the phrase:—

Um nga yoh yogi sokooha.

To drive away clouds recourse is had to the above-named gods and also to Khonjin bodissado, with the formula:—

Um yada nagara chikihil polpol tsokha.

Khonjin Bodissado is also appealed to to cause storm winds with the phrase:—

Um ghom ghom dam dam pat pat pungh pungh tsokha.

These appeals and formulæ are doubtless largely inspired by Lamaism. They are accompanied by ceremonies which are much more clearly Shamanistic. We are told the Tarnis or prayers are accompanied by the dipping of certain stones in water in a bowl, the water and the stones being thrown in the direction of the quarter of the sky whence the rain is to come. If a storm of wind is required then sand or dust is similarly thrown. 82 The stone used in weather-conjuring is jade, called yeda or jedo by the Kalmucks, and the weather-conjuring itself is called jedamishi, the Kalmucks call the conjurors jidajri.

Bergmann tells us they generally practise their art when it is clear that rain is coming. If they fail they declare that their efforts are counteracted by those of other magicians, or that the heat is too great for the rain to overcome it. 83 Pallas says they also make much of a stone sometimes found in the ground and at other times in animals. 85 This when put in the water causes it to bubble and boil, and being accompanied by certain tarni or formulæ cause rain to fall. 87 The chief method used in their ordinary prognostications by the Shamans is the famous one of prophesying from the marks upon the burnt shoulder-blades of sheep. The process was described long ago by Rubruquis, who tells us that when on one occasion he went to Mangu Khàn's palace he met coming away a servant (quidam famulus) bearing some shoulder-blades of sheep burnt as black as charcoal, and when he inquired what this meant he was told that Mangu never did anything without consulting such bones, nor did he even allow any

84 R. S. B. p. 310.
one to be admitted to his presence until he had thus decided whether it would be lucky to do so. This form of divination was thus carried out:—Three shoulder-blades having been procured, the Khán held them in his hand, and turned over in his mind whether some course was to be carried out or not. The servant then took the bones and burnt them in a hut close by, of which there were two close to the Khán's sleeping-quarters. When they were burnt black they were taken to him, and then carefully inspected. If the cracks caused by the fire occurred longitudinally, then it was deemed prudent to carry out whatever was proposed or intended; if on the other hand they occurred transversely, or if a bone broke into round pieces, then it was deemed inexpedient to carry out the plan.²² Pallas has given an account of this kind of divination as still practised among the Kalmuks. He tells us that among the various kinds of divination which have been apparently practised among the credulous Mongols, and which have widely prevailed in Asia wherever Shamanism has existed, perhaps the most famous is that of prophesying what will take place to-morrow or a few days hence, by an inspection of the fissures made in burnt shoulder-blades by the fire. These are interpreted according to certain systematic rules. This mode of prophesying is known to the Kalmuks as dalla tullike, and those who practise it are called Dallâji. These people are not Shamans but laymen, who have acquired by long practice great skill in the art. Among the Kalmuks there is a work entitled Dalla containing rules for the interpretation of the different cracks, transverse and straight, which occur in a burnt shoulder-blade, and the Lamaists employ a special prayer addressed to the god of medicine, O tâ-chi, while the bones are on the fire. The best bones for the purpose are those of sheep, of the larger antelope, of the roe and reindeer. A hare's shoulder-blade is only good for one day's prophecy, while that of the wild boar can only be used to foretell the issue of a boar hunt. The process of preparation is to take a shoulder-blade with its flesh upon it and to boil it. The flesh must then be removed with a knife and not with the teeth. When the bone is being burnt for some person not present, a piece of his clothing or of his goods must be present as an emblem (ghat) of himself. The bone must remain on the fire until the Dallâji deems there are a sufficient number of fissures, when he prophesies according to their situation, proportions and relation to one another, whether there will be ill-aventure or good, life or death, or whether some purpose will have a fortunate termination or no. Pallas says that it is strange how frequently these prophesies turn out right, thus increasing the reputation of this method of divining. Notwithstanding the variety there is in the disposal of the fissures according to the heat of the fire, the position of the bone, etc., there are certain principal lines which are tolerably constant, and to which the Kalmuks attach certain names and virtues. Pallas has given a detailed list of these which however require his plate to understand them.²³ In the earliest times of Chinese history we read of divination by means of the Tortoise (kuei). This was practised by burning certain herbs in the carapace of a tortoise until certain fissures appeared in it.²⁴ Pallas tells us that in the work Belgen Bichik, a special kind of divination is described, consisting in the selection of nine long threads or strings, to the end of one of which a bead is attached. These are held between the thumb and index finger of the left hand, and are plaited together with the fingers of the other hand during the reading of certain mystical formulae, the performer not looking at them. They are then wound once round the index finger, and one being taken at random is drawn out. The event is foretold according as the beaded thread comes out first, second, third, etc. etc.²⁵

²² Râbruquis, pp. 318-319.
fire with a knife, to take meat out of a cauldron with a knife or to trim a fire with an axe. It was deemed that by these acts the fire might be decapitated. Similarly it was forbidden to support oneself against the whip with which a horse was beaten (the Mongols, adds Carpini, used no spurs), also to touch arrows with a whip, to take or kill young birds, to hit a horse with its bridle, to strike a bone with another bone, to spill milk or other drink or food on the ground or to micturate in the house. Anyone committing such an offence wilfully was put to death, if involuntarily a large fine had to be paid, and the tent and its contents had to be carefully purified, before which nothing was to pass in or out of it. Again, if anyone took a bite of some food, and it choked him so that he spat it out again, a hole was dug under the tent, and he was dragged through it, and was put to death without mercy; and in the same way if any one stepped on the threshold of the house. Carpini remarks that the Mongols had many such customs, but to kill men, to invade the territory of others, to take the property of another, to fornicate, etc., etc., were not deemed sins among them. Gomboyef, in commenting on some of these prohibitions says they are for the most part still in force. It is still held to be a sin to take anything from a fire or a kettle with a sharp instrument, to cut anything near a fire, to strike a horse with a whip or a bridle, or to hit one bone with another, to spill milk on the ground, or to micturate in the yurt, or towards the sun or moon. It is no longer the custom, however, to put a choking person who spits out what he has in his mouth to death, but he is struck on the back with the fist, whence the proverb, Khakhkuan degere sidurakha, i.e. "To strike with the fist outside the choker." According to the Buriats this striking of the back is not meant to ease the person coughing, but to ward off ill-luck, and it is very probable, as Gomboyef says, that in old days it was only choking in the tent of the Khan that was deemed a mortal offence. Among the Mongols another method is now employed for warding off this ill-luck, namely, the ceremony called Dalalgha, which consists in the Shaman or the Lama, if he be present, taking a piece of the fat of the size of a fist from the tail of a sheep, putting it on the end of an arrow, waving it to and fro, and having invoked good luck, putting it at his request into the mouth of the master of the house, who must eat it without touching it with his hands.

Hyacinthe tells us that the Shamans are interred by other Shamans, who conjure the evil spirits not to disturb the soul of the deceased. The bodies of the Shamans are generally buried, according to a desire expressed before their decease, in elevated places, or in the cross ways, that they may be more easily able to do mischief to those who pass by. The Shamans sometimes predict, especially to those with whom they have not been on good terms, that their ghost will come and require of them sacrifices which it will be difficult to perform. The Mongols believe that the soul of the Shaman cannot go to God, but remains on earth in the form of an evil spirit, doing mischief to mankind; and the Shamans avail themselves of this belief to demand marks of respect and sacrifices. Therefore, if a person is attacked by some unknown disorder, the Mongols instantly run to the Shaman to consult him on the cause of the disease; the wizard never fails to attribute it to some evil spirit who demands a sacrifice; he conjures the malignant spirit to be appeased by an offering, and to leave the patient, and he receives some recompense for his trouble. These notices about Shamans might have been greatly extended if we had collected the materials available from among the Tunguses, Yakuts, etc., but we have deemed it better to limit our extracts to those relating to Shamanism as actually subsisting, until comparatively recently, among the Mongols. It has been long decaying among them, and Hyacinthe says that it received a great blow in 1819 and 1820 from an energetic and distinguished Lama who lived in the Kochun of Merghen-yang, who succeeded in expelling the Shamans from the country of the Khalkhas. This example was imitated by the Burists of Selenghinsk, and partly by those of Khoriin, and their utensils and apparel were burnt.

---


THE NOMENCLATURE OF TAWAF.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

SIR,—Would any of your readers kindly supply the information sought in the following queries:—

1. What are the names of the two Tawaf which the pilgrims perform at the mosque at 'Arafat, and at the mosque at Mina?

2. May the final Tawaf of Hajj and the first of 'Umra overlap one another (in other words, will one and the same Tawaf suffice when the performance of Al 'Umra immediately succeeds the performance of Al Hajj), or must the two Tawaf be performed in succession?

3. Bürkhardt speaks of pilgrims performing Al 'Umra immediately on returning from Mina, and without changing the Ihram. What is Tawaf called when so performed?

4. The Ihram being removed between the First Lapidation and the ceremony of Sacrificing, what are we to understand Bürkhardt to mean when he thus speaks of his having performed the ceremony of Al 'Umra without changing the Ihram of Al Hajj?

5. Is there a special name for Tawaf when it is performed after doffing the Ihram of Hajj and before donning it again for the ceremony of Al 'Umra?

6. Are the Tawaf before going out to 'Umra and the Tawaf after returning thence called by two separate names, or by the one name Tawaf-ul-'Umra?

7. Could any reader mention why the Mustajīd is an object of special veneration? The term Mustajīd, I may add, is the proper name of the long, narrow slit of red sandstone which is inserted perpendicularly in the wall of the Ka'bah, near the Tanami angle of the building, and is often mistakenly called Al-Rukm'1-Ya'arm.

Allahabad, Jan. 20, 1883.

J. D. Bate.

SAŅVAT AND MAURYA ERAS.

SIR,—May I be allowed to call attention to a passage in your invaluable periodical. There are many questions which have been settled already by Mr. Fleet's unwearied publications, and I am sure numerous uncertainties in Indian chronology will still be removed by that careful and accurate scholar. There is a passage in one of Mr. Fleet's articles in vol. VIII, p. 187, which will perhaps acquire great importance. We learn from it that in one of the three cases, where Vikrama VI speaks of having abolished the Śaka era, he men-

tions the names of Vi̊kramādītya and Nanda. It is true that the reading of this passage is not yet quite settled. Mr. Fleet translates: "The son of this Āha-vamallādevā was king Śaṣmāvara, whose younger brother was the emperor Vi̊kramā, possessed of the beauty of Chakradhara (Vishnu)," having said, "Why should the glory of the kings Vi̊kramādītya and Nanda be a hindrance any longer? he, with a loudly uttered command, abolished that (era) which has the name of Śaka, and made that (era) which has the Chalukya figures?" There is one word in the text for which Mr. Fleet is obliged to make a conjecture, that however does not touch the two names of Vi̊kramādītya and Nanda, nor the fact that they were presumed to have established eras of their own like Vikrama VI.

As to Vi̊kramādītya there is no doubt about his era, though the first indisputable date is only known from Vikrama Sanvat 1043 in one of Dr. Bührer's Chalukya grants (vol. VI, p. 180 seqq.); for as regards the earlier dates that of Sanvat 486 is not clearly marked on the plate, as I learn from a letter of Dr. Bührer's, kindly communicated to me by Professor Max Müller; the other date of Sanvat 802 is regarded as doubtful by the Editor of this Journal in a footnote to vol. V, p. 112.

As to Nanda—this is the part of the passage to which I intend to call special attention. It has not yet been noticed by any scholar so far as I know, that there ever was a Nanda era. But we find in a Kaligra inscription of Aīra Meghāvahana (see General Cunningham's Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, pl. XVII.) line 6, the very remarkable passage: Nanda-rāsa iti-vase-sata-oghdástian. —When king Nanda [or the Nanda kings] had been destroyed three "hundred years before." Unfortunately this inscription is not yet published in a satisfactory manner, though General Cunningham's copy has corrected many passages left doubtful by the previous copyists, we shall not be able to make full use of this, the oldest dated inscription, until we have a photolithographic copy in the same way as the Editor prepared those of the Aśoka inscriptions in his Archaeological Report, vol. II, so we cannot yet finally conclude from that passage that the Nanda era was in fact a Maurya era, because it dated from the extirpation of the Nandas. On the other hand, I have great doubts myself as to the supposition that in the time of Vikrama VI, there was anything known about a

1 This is a misnomer; the inscription is of Rāja Kharavela.—Ed. I. A.

2 Major Kittredge and General Cunningham transcribe tāgh instead of ṭogh.
Nanda era. But since the passage quoted above from Mr. Fleet's inscription is beyond suspicion, I must venture to maintain my belief, until further inquiries confirm this view which is forced upon me, or refute it.

Dr. E. Leumann.

AN ADEN EPITAPH.

An epitaph has been discovered in a mosque at Aden, dated A.H. 563 (A.D. 1168). It is supposed to have been brought from one of the disposal of burial-grounds of Aden, and commemorates "a virtuous free woman the mother of Abdallah, the emancipated slave of the glorious Sultan Yehia bin Abi-s-sadad al Muwaffak al Taqari al Islami. Died at Awân on the last day of Ramadhan in the year 563." It is "inscribed by Muhammad bin Barakat bin Ali Harami."

Awân is perhaps the old name of Aden itself; at any rate it was almost certainly in the immediate vicinity. The Harami tribe still exists in Hadhramaut.

ASIATIC SOCIETIES.

The Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal is rather falling into arrears, No. 2 of the volume for 1882 having only been published in September last. It is mostly occupied with a continuation of Babu Sarat Chandra das's contributions on the Religion, History, &c. of Tibet. These papers are interesting, and it is only to be regretted that the author does not prepare his work with more attention to details of uniformity of spelling, clearness of statement, &c., or that the papers are not more carefully edited. The contributions here presented contain: (1) The rise and progress of Jîn or Buddhism in China, translated from the Dab-tha 'kalj vi Mâloö, prefaced by short accounts of the Mâ-tse, Li-ya-tse, Chwân-tse sects, and that of Yusu, which preceded Buddhism in China and somewhat resembled it; then comes the usual account of the introduction of Buddhism from India; the contributions to its literature, &c. which it received from Tibet; the five Buddhist schools in China, viz. —1. The Vinaya or Mahâyâna; 2. The Mantra or Tantrika; 3. The Vaipulya-Darsana or Mahâyâna; 4. The Gâbhâra-Darsana or Sûnyatâ; and, 5. The Sârârtha-Darsana schools. (2) The sacred literature and philosophy of ancient China, translated from the same source; the Bon (Pon) religion in China; and the Ho-u-se or Hoi-hoi, apparently a Muhammadan sect, of which the Tibetan author seems to have had but a low opinion:— he says, "they send the spirits of all animals killed by them to the Pan, who takes charge of them. The spirits of those that are killed by others, who are not Hoi-hoi, are damned. A Hoi-hoi will not eat the flesh of an animal that has been slain by outsiders!" and, he adds, "these wicked people certainly turn into pigs after their death, for which reason they do not touch pork, the touch of which brings defilement, and the eating of which destroys their intellect and understanding." (3) The life and legend of Nagârjuna, the founder of the Madhyamika school. According to this account he was the only son of a Brahman of Vidarbha, whose death the astrologers predicted in a week unless a hundred Bhikshus were fed and religious ceremonies gone through, and even then he would die in his seventh year. Avalokitêśvara-Khaśarpâna, however, appeared to him and advised him to go to Nâlendara, where he would escape death. There he was ordained a Bhikshu by the high priest Sârâhâ-Bhadra, whom he afterwards succeeded. Vajrâsana or Buddha-Gayâ was then the headquarters of the Sârâvakas—as the decaying Hinayâna sect was then called, and Nâlendara of the Mahâyâna school. He surrounded the great temple of Mahâgandhêla or 'the mansion of fragrance,' with a stone railing, which he furnished with Vajragavaksha or 'precious riches,' and outside of which he erected 108 smaller chapels. He also surrounded the great shrine of Śrî-Dhâňya-kaṭaka with railings. At this period, "Mañjâ, king of Otüsha (Orissa), with a thousand of his subjects embraced Buddhism." In Mârâ, "in the city of Dharâ, king Bhojâdeva with many hundreds of his subjects embraced Buddhism." He erected "many vihâras in Pratâpâsela, Oœiša, Bangala, and the country of Iêshâvârdhâna. In the latter part of his life Nagârjuna visited Dakshina, where he did many things for the preservation of the Southern congregation." In Drâvidâ he overcame in a disputation two famous Brahmanas—Madhu and Supramadhu—who became converts. He is said to have been a great friend of king De-chye (Śûnkara), of Southern India, with whom he entered into a compact to live and die. The king's life was thus secured by the saint's; but in this king's old age the mother of the heir-apparent advised her son to ask Nagârjuna for his head. This he did, and the saint showed him he could only be killed with a blade of Kusa grass. This is followed by (4) detached notices of different Buddhist schools in Tibet. The other paper is the first part of one by Mr. Grierson on Manbodh's Haribana, containing the text of a Maitâli poem, by a poet named Manbodh or Bholan Jhâ, who died about A.D. 1738. The interest of this is purely philological.

The Proceedings of the same Society also is in
arrears, the number for July and August appearing only in December. The most important notices in it are:—Lieut.-Col. G. E. Fryer's argument for the date of the Pāli grammarian, Kaśchāhāyana, being about the 12th century A.D., and Dr. Hoernle's contention that it is really much earlier; and an account of a very ancient fragment of a MS. on Arithmetic found at Bakhshāli in the Yūsufinai district, written in Sāradā characters and in the Gāthā dialect, by Dr. Hoernle, which we extract:

Dr. Hoernle exhibited at the meeting of the Society on 2nd August last a remarkable birch-bark Manuscript, found at Bakhshāli, in the Yūsufzinai District, in the Panjāb.

The MS., he said, was found in a ruined enclosure, near Bakhshāli, a village of the Yūsufzinai District, in the Panjāb, by a man who was digging for stones. It is written on leaves of birch-bark, which have become so dry by age as to be like timber, and, unless very carefully handled, they crumble into pieces. Hence, unfortunately, by far the largest portion of the MS. was destroyed when the finder took it up; and even the small portion that now remains is in a very mutilated state.

With much care and trouble I have succeeded in separating all the leaves, and have found that 66 of them still remain, of none of which, however, much more than one-half is preserved. For permanent preservation, I mounted each leaf separately between two pieces of 'talc.'

The MS. is written in the so-called Sāradā characters, which are still used in Kashmir, and which, as they occur on the coins of the Māhārājas of Kashmir, are of a not inconsiderable age. Some of the forms, which very frequently occur in the MS., especially of vowels, very closely resemble the forms used in the Aśoka and early Gupta inscriptions. I have not observed these particular ancient forms in other MSS. written in the Sāradā characters, e.g., in the Mahārāja MSS. published in the Cambridge Palaeographic Series. Hence I am inclined to look on them as an evidence of great age in the Bakhshāli MS.; and as the West Indian Districts were early lost to Hindī civilization through the Muhāammadan conquests, during which it was a common practice to bury MSS. to save them from destruction, the Bakhshāli MS. may be referred to the 8th or 9th century A.D.

I have looked over all the leaves of the MS. that remain, and have carefully read and transcribed about one-third. I have thus seen enough of the fragment to make sure that the whole of it treats of Arithmetic (including apparently Mensuration), though incidentally a few rules of Algebra are noticed. The latter refer to the solution of indeterminate problems (kuṭṭaka). The arithmetical problems are of various sorts; e.g., on velocity, alligation, profit and loss, etc. I may give one or two examples: thus “A and B run 5 and 9 yojanas a day respectively, and A is allowed a start of 7 days or 35 yojanas; when will A and B meet?” Or, “A and B earn 24 and 11 dināras a day respectively; A makes a present of 10 dināras to B; how soon will their possessions be equal?”

An example of an algebraical problem is: “A certain quantity, whether 5 be added to it or 7 be subtracted from it, is a square; what is that quantity?” The solution, given in this case, is 11; for $11 \times 5 = 16$ or $4^2$, and $11 - 7 = 4$ or $2^2$.

The fragment, however, evidently does not contain the whole of the treatise on Arithmetic; for many subjects, commonly treated in Hindī arithmetical works, do not appear to occur in it; and this is confirmed by the numbers of the rules (or sutras, as they are called). The earliest numbered sutra that I have noticed is the 9th, and from internal evidence I conclude,—though the numbers are lost,—that the 7th and 8th rules are also preserved. The latest number I have met is the 57th.

The method observed in the treatment of the problems is as follows: first a rule is given, introduced by the word sutra; next follow one or more examples, introduced by tād, and stated both in words and in arithmetical notation; the latter is sometimes indicated by the term sthāpanā; next follows a solution in words, which is always called karaṇa “operation”; and lastly comes the proof, generally expressed in notation, and called pratyāyana or pratyaṇya. This method differs considerably from that used in other Hindī arithmetical treatises, e.g., in those of Bhāskara and Brahmagupta. The latter also use different terms; instead of tād, examples are called by them uddēśa or udāharaṇa; instead of sthāpanā they have nyaya; karaṇa and pratyāyana or pratyaṇya are not used at all. The term sutra they employ occasionally, but in most cases they say karaṇa sutra, which latter term may contain a reference to a karaṇa-work such as that in the Bakhshāli MS. There are, also, some differences in the method of notation as used in this MS. and as commonly established. Division is indicated by placing one quantity under another without a line between them; e.g., $\frac{5}{8}$ ($= \frac{1}{4}$): multiplication, by placing one quantity beside the other; e.g., $\frac{5}{8}$ $32$ ($= \frac{1}{8} \times 32 = 20$); addition, by writing yu (abbreviated for yuṣa “added”) before or after the additive quantity and placing the latter either by the side of, or below, the other quantity; e.g., 11 yu or 11 yu $5$ ($= 11 + 5 = 16$): subtraction, by writing the negative sign + after the subtractive quantity.
and placing the latter besides or below the other quantity; e.g., \(1 \frac{1}{3} \) \(= 1 - \frac{1}{3} = \frac{2}{3}\), or \(11.7+4\) \(= 11 - 7 = 4\). This negative sign is the most remarkable difference between the Bakhshali MS. and the works of Bhāskara and others. The MS. uses a cross \(\times\) (exactly resembling our modern plus sign), while the sign which is commonly used is a dot, placed above the quantity; e.g., \(11 \times 7\) \(= 11 - 7 = 4\). I may add that the cipher is used (as in the Lilāvatī) to indicate an unknown quantity, the value of which is sought; e.g.,

\[
0 \quad 5 \\
1 \quad 1 \\
+ \quad mā \\
0 \quad 7 \\
1 \quad 1 \\
\mid \text{for } x \quad \frac{1}{1} + \frac{5}{1} =
\]

\[
y^2 \\
1 \\
\quad 1 \\
\quad 1 \\
\quad 1 \\
\mid \text{and } x = \frac{7}{1} \\
\quad 1 \\
\quad 1 \\
\quad 1 \\
\mid \text{here } x = 11, y = 4, z = 2; \\
\mid \text{mā abbreviated for mūdā “square”}. \\
\]

It is, however, also employed in the usual way as the tenth figure of the decimal notation. A proportion is expressed thus: \(\frac{1}{6} \quad 13 \quad 30 \quad 1 \mid \text{pha 65}\)

(for \(1: 13 \frac{30}{6} = 30: 65\); \text{pha abbreviated for phalana}.)

All these peculiarities of method, terminology and notation, differing as they do from those in common use since the time of Brahmagupta (about 628 A.D.) and Āryabhaṭa (about 500 B.C.), whose mathematical treatises are the earliest known, tend to show that the work contained in the Bakhshali MS. is more ancient than any of those I have just mentioned.

There is another remarkable feature in the MS., which points in the same direction, namely, the language in which it is written. This is what is now commonly called the Gāthā dialect, because it was first noticed in ancient Buddhist works (such as the Lalita Vistara) written in verses or gāthas. The term Gāthā dialect, however, is no more appropriate now, because that dialect is now known to be also used in ancient Buddhist works, which are partly written in prose, such as the Mahāvastu, of which M. Senart has just published an excellent edition. However that may be, it is generally admitted that this species of language is a very ancient one. It is a kind of ungrammatical Sanskrit (judged, that is, by the standard of what is commonly called Sanskrit), interspersed to a large extent with ancient Pāli or Pāli forms. There is some dispute as to the exact origin, time and locality of this species of ancient irregular Sanskrit. But in all probability it was current in the early centuries just before and after the commencement of the Christian era, as a literary or cultivated form of the ancient Vṛndacūr Pārśkṛt of North-Western India, in the countries to the east and west of the Indus, till it came to be superseded by the classical Paninian

Sanskrit. It is this language which is employed in the Bakhshali MS. It would be out of place here to enter into philological details; but I may mention that the language of the MS. is marked by all the peculiarities in orthography, etymology, syntax, etc., of the so-called Gāthā dialect. The evidence of the language, then, would tend to show that the work contained in the Bakhshali MS. must be ascribed, in all probability, to the earliest centuries of the Christian era, and further—since the Gāthā dialect has hitherto only been met with in Buddhist literature,—to a member of the Buddhist community. If the latter supposition be correct, we should have in this MS. the first Buddhist Arithmetical work which, so far as I am aware, has hitherto become known.

There are, further, some specific points in the work contained in the Bakhshali MS. which tend to point to a peculiar connection between it and the mathematical portion of the Brahma Sphuṭa Siddhāntā, the famous astronomical work of Brahmagupta, which was compiled in 628 A.D. Thus an algebraical rule in the MS. occurs in strikingly similar language in Brahma Sphuṭa’s algebra; again the foreign terms dīndra (Latin denarius) and dramma (Greek drachme) occur in both, etc. The mathematical treatise in the Bakhshali MS. is undoubtedly older than that of Brahmagupta; but what the exact connection between the two works may be, I am not as yet in a position to say. These are points which require further investigation, in which I am still engaged, and the results of which I hope to have a future opportunity of communicating to the Society. My present remarks are not intended to be more than a preliminary notice of the MS. In conclusion I will only repeat that the questions of the age of the MS. and of the work contained in it are entirely distinct; and that the date of the work is certainly very much earlier than the MS. copy of which this fragment has been found.

No. 3 for 1882 has been published since, and is occupied by a collection of 64 Hindū Folk-songs from the Panjāb, with translations and notes by our able correspondent, Lieut. R. C. Temple. The only other paper is a Note by P. N. Bose, B.Cs., on some earthen pots found in the alluvium at Mahāvāra in Nimār. These vessels had been already noticed by Capt. Dangerfield (Malcolm’s Central India, vol. II, p. 325). The author would identify Mahāvāra and the neighbouring Mandālavāra as the Mahāsāṃjñājī to which Asōka sent the Thero Mahādōva as a Buddhist missionary; but the other missionaries were all sent to countries, not towns or small districts, and it seems much more probable that Mahārāj is meant by Mahāsāṃjñājī.

\[1 \text{ Proc. As. Soc. Beng. Aug. 1882.}\]
No. CXXVI.

THIS inscription is edited from the original plates, which belong to 'Mallampati Mangaya' of 'Yelivarru', in the 'Repalli' Talukā of the Guytār District, and were obtained for my inspection by Dr. Burgess. The owner of the plates states that in 1894 he was building a new house, and, as he was bringing earth, the bullock put its foot into a hole in the path. On digging, he found a large jar, with a rusty iron covering. Across the jar was an iron bar, from which hung the copper-plates. 'Yelivarru', the Elavarrā of the grant, is a small village between 'Intura' and 'Amarta-lura',—the Ithūrī and Ammunūrī of the grant. It is thus not far from 'Tsandavole', where, a few years ago, a quantity of gold, melted into a mass and in coins, was found.

The plates are five in number, each about 7¾ long by 3¾ broad. The edges of them were raised into rims to protect the writing; and the whole of the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation. The ring is about 4¾ thick and 3½ in diameter; it had not been cut when the grant came into my hands. The seal on the ring is circular, about 2½ in diameter; it has, in relief, on a countersunk surface,—across the middle, the motto Śrī-Tribhuvanādikāsiva; in the upper part,—in the centre, a standing boar facing to the proper left, with the sun directly above it, the moon on the proper right, and an elephant-god on the proper left; and in the lower part, a floral device, an eight-leaved water-lily. The five plates weigh 67½ tolas, and the ring and seal 54½ tolas; total, 121½ tolas. The language is Sanskrit throughout.

This grant is partly a palimpsest. Plates i, ii, iii, and iiii, are engraved over a cancelled grant, beaten in so carefully that the letters of it are now mere scratches of no depth and breadth at all, too faint altogether to appear in the lithograph. The characters are of an older type, more like those of the grant of Prithivimūla, son of Prabhākara. Of the original inscription there are five lines on each side, running the same way as the lines of the present inscription. Below jō to || of line 23 of the present grant there can be read tīhām-puraśānu nipunā; above lāh to va of l. 27 there can be read yē Tuṇavāṣa-dāna-grāmā; above kyā to bhā of l. 6 there can be read alaṃāryati śeṣeṣhān grāmāṇāra mādhya; and above vi to shtā of l. 7 there can be read parihārā (ṛ) kṛṣṭya. These are the only consecutive passages of the older inscription that can be made out. Plates iia and iiii, again, are engraved over another grant, beaten in so that no traces of it appear in the lithograph. The characters are of about the period of those of the present grant, but not so well formed. Of the original inscription there are nine lines on each side, running at right angles to the lines of the present grant, so that only about seven letters of each line remain, the rest having been cut away in re-fashioning the plates for the present grant. A letter or two can be read here and there; but no consecutive word, worth noting, can be made out. Plates i, i, iv, va, and vb, are not palimpsests.

The present grant is one of the Eastern Chalukya king Amma II, also called Vijayāditya; it is therefore subsequent in date to Śaka 867 (A. D. 945-6), which is given in No. XXXIV. (vol. VII. p. 13) as the year in which he succeeded to the throne. It records the grant of the village of Elavarru, in the Velanāṇu viṣaya or district, to a Brāhmaṇ named Kūramīya, of the Kāyapa gōtra, who was the head of the trikarama or writing-department of the svuṭbhānādyāra or treasurer of gold.

Transcription.
First plate.

[1] Svasti Śrī'matām sakala-bhuvana-sa[nyāsī]śtūyamāna-Mānāvyā (vyā-sagōtrānām) Ḥā-

* Vol. X. p. 244, No. 9.
* In l. 5 the dynastic name is written 'Chalukya.' The same form occurs in l. 16. But in l. 39 we have the older and more correct form 'Chalukya.'

* The lithograph is imperfect in respect of the t here; the sn of saptā, l. 11: the s of Gopālbhāka, l. 15; the first s of trikārama, l. 16; the s of deśa, l. 20; the bhā of bhāva, l. 42; the pha of mukhākṣa, l. 50; the qa of part, l. 51; and the pha of phaśa, l. 58.
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[†] tānaṇī Śrū[mi*]-Mahāsēna-pāḍ-anudhyātānāṁ bhagavan-Nārāyaṇa-prasa(s)ā)da-

[†] samāśādita-vara-varākṣalāḥ[ṭuṭh*]n-ekhaṇa-khaṇa-vaśikrit-ārāti-mā-

[†] udālānāṁm=sāvamādāvabhita[th]aṁśaṁ-paviṭikrita-vapulaṁ Chā-

[†] lukuṇāṁ kula=alamkārāṇiḥyōbh Satyāśraya-Vallabheṇḍrasya bhrātā Ku-

[†] bja-Viṣṇuvarḍhanō=sā́dāsya varṣhāpi Veṣṇu-dēśam=apālayat || Tad-ātma-

Second plate; first side.

[†] jō Jayasiṇhās-trayas-triṇāstaṁ || Tad-anu̇-Endraruṇa-mandaṇo Viṣṇuva-

[†] ṭṛddhāno nava || Tat-sūṇa=Maṁgī-yaṣvarāḥ paṇcīca-viślātiṁ || Tat-potro-

[†] Jayasiṇhās-trayōdāsā || Tad-aṇvārañāḥ Kokkūḥ shaw=ma-

[†] sān || Tasya jyēṣṭhō bhrātā Viṣṇuvarḍhamanā=tam-uccēṣṭāya sapat-

[†] triṇāstam || Tat-potro Viṣṇyāditya-bhṛtāракō=sā́dāsya || Tad-anu-

[‡] ṭo Viṣṇuvarḍhā(ṛddha)naḥ sāṭ-triṇāstam || Tat-sūṇa Viṣṇyāditya-Nārāyāṇamṛg-

[‡] rāja=ch=āśṭa-chatvārinīṣṭam || Tat-sūṇa Kaḷi-[Viṣṇu*]varḍhamanō=ddhyo(ḥy)-

aruddha-varṣhā(ṛsha)j

Second plate; second side.

[‡] Tat-sūṇa Guṇagāṅka-Viṣṇyādityas-chataḥ-chatvārinīṣṭam || Tad-anu-

[‡] ja-Vikramāditya-bhūpā(ḥa)teḥ sūnus=Chāḷukya-Bhima-bhūpālas-tri-

māṇaḥ || Tat-potro Kollabhiṇḍa=Viṣṇyādityaṇa sa-

[‡] =māṇān [ | *] Tat-sūṇa=Amma-rājō saṅkac varṣha(ṛsha)ni || Tad-saṁ-

[‡] Viṣṇyādityanām ba(ḥa)laṁ=uccēṣṭāya Talaṇā. mās(a)ṁ=sākaṁ [ | *]

[‡] Taṁ jītvā Śeṣ(a)ḥa lukuṇy-Śhī(ḥh)ma=taṇayō Vikramāditya ekālaṇa mā-

[‡] sān || Tatas=Talaṇa-rājaṁya suto Yuddhāmalaḥ saṅkac varṣha(ṛsha)-

Third plate; first side.

[‡] ni || Tat-potro Kollabhiṇḍa=Viṣṇyāditya=sūto Bhima-ṛa-

[‡] jō dvādaṁ varṣhāṇi || Tasya Mahēṣvara-mūrtīṛ=Umā-samā-

[‡] =n-ākṣiṇē Kūmār-ābhāḥ Lōkamahādēvyā[ḥ*] khali yu-

[‡] =s=saṁmahāvad=Amma=ṛaṭhyāḥ || Jalajāpatra-cā-

[‡] mara-kalas-āṁkuśa-lakṣhaṇ-āṁku-kara-charaṇa-ta-

[‡] laḥ lasad-aṁnuvavāla[ṁ*]bita-bhunayugaparīgho girī-

[‡] ndra-sāṁ-ūrṇakaḥ || Yō rūpēṇa Manōjāṁ vibhāvēna Ma-

Third plate; second side.

[‡] hēndram=aṁmakaram=aṁru-mahāsā Haraṁ=ari-purna-dahanēṇa nyak-kurvvan=ḥa-

[‡] ti vidita-dig-avani-kt[ṛ*]tiḥ || Sā sakala-ṛipuṇirpati-muka=taśa-gathita-manī-

[‡] gana-madhukam-nikam-paricchumita-charapasarasiruṇyagala=

[‡] Yngalēchana-padakamalā-vilasadvīrēpā(phā)jamāno māṇo=nā-

[‡] =t-ā(ḥ)na=ṇāḍhata-samasta-lōkāḥ samastabhuvaṇaśraya-Sṛ-Śri-viṣṇy-

[‡] dītya-mahārājāhdiha(rājḥ) paramēsvaraḥ paramabhaṭṭāraḥ paramabrahmapaṇaḥ Ve-

[‡] nāṇḍu-viṣhaya-nivāsinō rāṣṭrak(va)ta-pranukhāṇ-kutumbina|h*] samāḥ=etṭham-ā-

kīpayaṁ.

Fourth plate; first side.

[‡] ti || Vidvat-kavindra-prabhavaṁ prasiddhaṁ pūjya-ādayaṁ bhūri-guṇ-adhīvaṁ dhammasīkaṭha-bhūmi-

[‡] [ṛ*]=niṇṇiyama-svadhaṁ paṁptaṁ, paraṁ Kāḷyapaga-gōtraṁ-asit || Tatra bhūsuma-yāsthēh-

[‡] ta-viṣyākarma-shākka-viṣyā-vīrmmāla-ādaṁh vēdā-viṣyā-sāstra-sammu(mū)-

[‡] hō Viḍdamayya iti viṣya-kṛitiḥ || Bhūdēva-varṣa-a[ṁ*] luvi(ḥh)śītarēmē-

[‡] [ṛ*]=viṇṇa-vetvar-ṣaṁjna(ja)karī-bhām-bhēmāḥ tat-sūṇa=Amābhojāṁh-ōpāmāṅo

[‡] viṇṇa-vetvar Viṣṇa-dahtraiṣudha || Arunadhāya viṣṭaḥṣaṇa Vaṁsāvahyas-ōpamāṅ-

[‡] yāt pativrat-āṭmayā dhammaṣṭapatiya yā-s-c=Anamavaya || () Kula-kram-

āyātam=udāra-bhū-
YELAVAṉRU EASTERN CHALUKYA GRANT OF AMMA II.

[Image of two rectangular plates with inscriptions in a script]
YELAVARRU GRANT OF AMMA II.
Fourth plate; second side.


[44] bhidhānah || Śrī-Lokamahādevyā samavardhīyata yō=smad-āmahayā prītyā chāturyya-nāgara-

[48] kayō=āvāsā-sthānam-iti manāharayōḥ || Apahasati vagmitā Vāg-vanītām yatra-sthi-

[49] tā mahā-chaturē asūjaya-va(dha)rā nāgaraka-Jalajabhava-Bahuṃkha-priyām

[51] satataṁ || Upadayaṭe prasāngat-sujanatayā ch-ātma-sahajayā yasya |

[52] vibhavaḥ pati-prasā(sā)um[syā]* śe-chitram-īdāṃ sādhvā vāda iti || (||) Rasiṅkām=

[54] ātirasikā=chaturājām=adhikr- |

[56] chaturā ev=āyaṁ Köramiya-nāmadheyōḥ' vidushāḥ-satyantya-vijja(jā)ni || (||) Sēvita-samasta-bhū-

[58] pati-hridaya-sthitī-bhāg=guṇ-ōpānamūlāya(līya)ḥ muktāphala-sachcharitaḥ Körami-

yāḥ(yō) vastu-pu-

Fifth plate; first side.

[61] rusha ity=upapannāḥ || (||) Anāgata-jīśa(jā)na-vivekīni ḍha=snindya-chāritra-paraḥ hi

[64] chēṣṭā aēśha-bhō-

[66] g-ōpanatam=manācha ahō mahāt=Kōramiyaśa puṣṭaṁ || Tasmai Köramiya-nāmā

[69] suvārṇa-

[71] bhāṇḍāgara-śrīkaraṇa-mukhyāya Elavarru-nāma-grāmasarvāvā-kara-parāhāṛēn-śāgrahāṛ-

[74] krītyo=ōdaka-pūrṇa(vṛvma)m=uttarāyaṇa-nimittē-smābhir=ddatta iti viditam=astu vaḥ |

[77] Asya=āvādhayaḥ

[79] pūrvā(vṛvma)taḥ Gomācchuva simā || āgniṣṭataḥ Daṅguṁharta simā || daksiṇāṭaḥ

[81] Iṣṭūrī simā || nairī-

[84] ti-pāschimāḥbhujam Premparti simā || vāyavyataḥ Turinīḍi simā || uttar-

[88] ēsānāḥbhujam Āmunaṇi simā ||[8]*

[90] [*] Asya=ōparī na kēnacchāi=bādēihat karattvaḥ yaḥ karotī sa paṃchamahāpātakō bhavati |

[93] tath=ōktāṁ Vyaścena || Bahu-

[96] bhīr=vvvasudhā dattā bahubhūsi=chānumālītī yasya yasya yadā bhūmis=taṣyā tasya tadā

[98] phalaṁ || (||) Sva-da-

Fifth plate; second side.

[100] dattāṁ para-dattāṁ va yō harēta vasaṅdhāraṁ vasha-sahasraṇi vishtāya[ṃ]* jā(jī)yaṭe kṛmaṁ ||

[103] [*] Ājñaptīh Kataca-rājā [ | *] Potanabhāṭṭa-kāvyam [ | *] Jontachārya-likhitaṁ ||

Translation.

Hail! Kūṭa-Vishṇu-vardhana,—the brother of Satyaśraya-Vallabhendra, who adorned the family of the Chālukyaś, who are glorious; who are of the Mānaya gōtra which is praised over the whole earth; who are the descendents of Haṛiti; who have acquired sovereignty through the excellent favour of Kauśiki; who have been cherished by the assemblage of (divine) mothers; who meditate on the feet of Śvāmi-Mahāśeṇa; who have the territories of their enemies made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the excellent sign of the Boar, which they acquire through the favour of the holy Nārāyaṇa; (and) whose bodies are purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—ruled over the country of Venaṅgi for eighteen years.

(L. 7.)—His son, Jayaśiśuḥ, (ruled) for thirty-three* (years).

(L. 8.)—Vishṇu-vardhana,—the son of his younger brother, Indra,—(ruled) for nine (years).

(L. 9.)—His son, the Yuvarāja Maṅgi, (ruled) for twenty-five (years).

(L. 9.)—His son, Jayaśiśuḥ, (ruled) for thirteen (years).

* This Viscarṣa is superfluous.

See note 2 above.

* The more correct reading, 1.1.2, would be Haṛiti-purāṇī or Haṛiti-purāṇados, who are Haṛiti-purāṇa, or Haṛiti-purupāṇas. The present reading refers to the

legend adopted by the Western Chālukya; see Dynasties of the Kanara Districts, p. 5, note 2, and p. 17, note 2.

No. XXXIV. 1. 7, says 'thirty' years.

11 In id. l. 8, the name is written 'Maṅgi.'
(L. 10.)—His younger brother, Kōkki, (ruled) for six months.

(L. 11.)—His elder brother, Vīśṇuvar dhana, having expelled him, (ruled) for thirty-seven (years).

(L. 12.)—His son, Vījayaḍītya-Bhāt īraka, (ruled) for eighteen (years).

(L. 13.)—His son, Vīśṇuvar dhana, (ruled) for thirty-six (years).

(L. 14.)—And his son, Vījayaḍītya-Narēndrām āgarāja, (ruled) for forty-eight (years).

(L. 15.)—His son, Kali-Vīśṇuvar dhana, (ruled) for one and a half years.

(L. 16.)—His son, Guṇagūka-Vījayaḍītya, (ruled) for forty-four (years).

(L. 17.)—The king, Cālukya-Bhimā, the son of his younger brother, king Vikramādītya, (ruled) for thirty (years).

(L. 18.)—His son, Khollabhikhāṇḍa-Vījayaḍītya, (ruled) for six months.

(L. 19.)—His son, Amma, (ruled) for seven years.

(L. 20.)—Having expelled his son, the child Vījayaḍītya, Tālapa (ruled) for one month.

(L. 21.)—Then Yuddhamalla, the son of king Tālapa, (ruled) for eleven months.

(L. 22.)—His son, king Bhimā, the son of Kollabhikhāṇḍa-Vījayaḍītya, (ruled) for twelve years.

(L. 23.)—The son, who was like Kumār, that was born to him who was like Mahēśvara, from Lōkamahādevī, who was like Umā, was named king Amma. The palms of his hands and the soles of his feet were marked with the leaves of water-lilies and with chauris and with water-jars and with elephant-goads; he had two arms, as strong and massive as iron doorbars, which were charming, and which hung down as far as his knees; and he had a chest which was as broad as a table-land of the king of mountains. Putting Maṇāja to shame with his beauty, and Mahēndra with his power, the sun with his great splendour,

(and) Hara with the destruction of the cities of his foes,—he is resplendent, having his fame acquainted with the (distant) regions and the (whole) earth.

(L. 30.)—He, the asylum of the universe, Śrī-Vījayaḍītya, the supreme king of great kings, the supreme lord, the most worshipful one, the devout worshipper of Brahmā,—whose feet, which are like water-lilies, are kissed by the bees which are the jewels set in the diadems of all the hostile kings; who behaves like a beautiful bee at the feet of Ayunā-lōdana; (and) who is made very proud by having all proud people bowing down before him,—having called together the kuṭumbā, headed by the rāṣṭrakūṭas, who inhabit the district of Vēlanāṅga, thus issues his commands:

(L. 36.) “There was the Kāśyapa gōtra,—the source of wise men and excellent poets; famous; the origin of persons worthy to be worshipped; the dwelling-place of many virtuous qualities; the place of very pious people; the abode of religious observances; the most worthy object of all. In it (there was born) he whose fame was celebrated under the name of Viddamayya,—whose body was (made) pure by means of the learning and the six kinds of rites and the observances that are proper for Brahmans; who was acquainted with the Vēdas; (and) who knew the (whole) body of the iāstras. His son was the learned (and) famous Viddamaya, like to Ambhāvabhava,—who was the moon of the ocean of the race of Brahmans; (and) who was a ray of the sun to the (white) water-lilies which were learned men: and by means of his devoted lawful wife Anamavā, he became like Vaśishtha who was possessed of (his wife) Arundhati. Their son (was) he who was named Kōramiya, resembling the earth (in steadfastness),—who bore a form, not behold in any other and never heard of before, which came to him by inheritance, (and) which was of a noble nature, (and) which supported the world. Through affection he was nourished by our mother, Śrī-Lōkamahādevī, as being the dwelling-place of the ever charming (qualities of) cleverness and politeness. The

Districts, p. 45, note I.

Śiva, as Trinētra.

Brahmā, as born in the water-lily.

Or Anamavā.
AN OLD-CANARESE INSCRIPTION AT TORAGAL.

BY K. R. PÁTHAK, B.A., BELGAUM.

Toragal is a small native state, subject to Kolhapur, and is situated on the confines of the Dhărâvâ District. In a matha at that place, called the Gachchina-Hirematha, there is a stone-tablet, leaning against a wall, on the left hand, as one enters the monastery. It bears an inscription recording a grant of land to the god Suggalësva by Suggalëdevä, with the permission of her husband, the Mahâ-mandalësva Barma, in the Śaka year 1110 for 1109 (A.D. 1187-88) the Pâvânya sâvat-sara. It is in the Old-Canarese language and characters. The writing covers a space of 2’ 8½” high by 2’ 6½” breadth.

I propose to discuss here the meaning of the expression paścëmahâ-sâbda, which occurs in line 2 of this inscription. In the first volume of this journal, p. 81, Mr. S. P. Paśjit disputed the meaning that naturally suggested itself to the native mind. And, Mr. Paśjit being an eminent native scholar, his remarks led Sir Walter Elliot (vol. V, p. 251) to look for an explanation of this Sanskrit phrase in Firistabha, whose opportunities of making philological researches could hardly have been very ample. Nor is it quite clear that Firistabha had any idea of the Hindu paścëmaḥ-sâbda in his mind, when he penned the passage quoted by Sir Walter Elliot. As to the passage from Chand’s Prithiraj Râasu relied upon by him, it will suffice to mention that two such eminent scholars as Mr. Beames and Mr. Growse differ widely in the interpretation of it. I admit, however, that the real meaning, about which no Paśjit would hesitate, was given by Mr. Growse and supported by a quotation from Tulsi Dâsa. It is however true that Tulsi Dâsa does not use the full expression paścëmaḥ-sâbda; and that he is a comparatively modern poet. I will now quote a passage from a Jain author, who

**Note:**

16 Brahmi, as born in the water-lily.

17 Perhaps Vashnu, as Sahastrana.
lived in times when the expression *pañcamaḥāśabda* was still in use in a living language. Rēvākōṭyāchārya thus describes a royal procession:


"While the dancing girls of the harem, rising behind, came waving chaṇīra on both sides; while white umbrellas, the pālikētana-banner, and the banners bearing the figures of a moon, a sun, a lion, a tiger, an alligator and a fish, and other signs of royalty, were flowing before; while the five great musical instruments and the auspicious drums were being sounded; and while the heralds, bards, and beggars, and poor and helpless people, were being presented with gifts to their satisfaction,—Vidvuchchōra proceeded to the chaityālaya adorned with a thousand summits, alighted from the state elephant, went thrice round the *basadi*, bowed to the god, ...... and spoke thus."

It is plain from this passage that the term *pañcamaḥāśabda* could never mean "the playing of a royal band five times a day." The five great musical instruments, spoken of by the Jaina chronicler, are thus enumerated by a Lingāyat writer,—śringa, tammata, sākṣha, bherī, and jayaghaṇṭā; in the Vīvēkachintāmaṇi.

**Transcription.**

1 Namas=ṭūṅga-śīrās-chnihi-chaṇḍra-chnama-chaṇravī trailōkya-nagar-āraṁbha-mūla-staṁbhāya śaṅbhavī ||

2 Svasti Saṁadhigata-pañcamaḥāśabda-mahāmaṁḍalēsvaram bhujabalavira-Nigalākṣaka- ||

3 mall Gagukārav-achāryyaṁ nuṇīd-ānte-gaṇḍa gaṇḍa-mārttaṁ jaga-dorgva-gaṇḍa ārimad-Ā. ||

4 havamalla-Bhūteyadēvama parākramav=ems=emdaηe || Muntrie Paṁchalaṁ besai piṁ-.

5 tire Nūṁmaţi-Tailan-ānte sāmaṁta-kadaṁbakaṁ tolage Paṁchalananaṁ peṇad-ikki koṁda śuruṇaṁ tanag-āge ||

6 Chakri kuṛde tāktidan-Āhavamalla-nāma-vikrāṁtade maṁḍalēśa-padamāṁ negaḻ = Āhavamalla-Bhūtigām || Īnut ||

7 pēsar-vvett=Āhavamalla-Bhūteyadēvaniṁ tat-priya-tanuṁ Āvaramalla-bhūpaniṁ tat- tane(na)yaṁ Chaṭṭamaṁhiḍājaniṁ ta- ||

8 t-tanubhaṁvāna Āvaramallaniṁ tad-apatiyaṁ Kaliyanga-Yudhishṭhiranā Chaṭṭarasanāṁ jan(i)n-naṁdaṁ maṁḍalēśa-mukha-darpasa- ||

9 śan=Ārāsāv-āri-Madana-Mahēsvaramun=emha birudegaṁ-anm navarttham-āge negaḻda maṁḍalēśa-varamvān Bhrūrā- ||

10 san-ātana parākṛta(kra)mav=ems=emdaηe || Kēḷvana kiviyaṁ guṇṭaman-āly-inegam beṭṭit-enisu yottajī-vaṅrumīd=ā- ||

11 t-vare lakkvīyoj=datuṁ=vveḷ-inegam nagalav-ikkidām Bhrūta-ṇri(p)iya || S(ā)raḥbhi- taramgam=avardis-ambarav=un(y)nata-Mēru- ||

12 bhūdharaṁ guru-kuchav=abuja-shaṁdāvaṁ anurāgamān-ārjīṣuv=ānamāṁ lasat-paranichayaṁ vibhōsa(sa)yam=en-mal-pa- ||

13 nirājīpa naṁdaṇ-Āṭivisstāṇeṇaṁ=ānte viśva-dharaṇaḥ-avathu sō(ā)bhīsugmaṁ niraṁ- tavaṁ || Āṁt=ā p(pr)iṭhi=vṛti-madhyaḥda- ||

14 Mēru-parvaṭatada dakhšīṅa-dīgas-bāṅgada Bharata-kasṭhadṛdoṁ || Āṁt=ōlvan=ānte dhātri-kāṁteya kuṭalav-emippa

1 From Mr. Fleet's ink-impression; revised by Mr. Fleet.

2 This ānanda is superfluous.
[14] Kuṭṭala-vāṃśu-āṭānāṭa Kuṭṭala-bhūbha-spūntikāda-ānīta karaṁ sogayisikkā Toragale-

dēśaṁ || Allī || Nereda kau(kav)āyanūru

[14] baggisuva kōgite tāī-te-vaḷḷī suttalaṁ toru ājūrtta māmara-nikāyaṁ-agguvīna

carpnu-doṁṭhavā-āniṁ.

[17] =arikēya chārū-rāmādansan-vāḷava rājīse sō(śō)hē-vētta-ā Toragale Bhūtanaṭha-

vibhuvīrī bāḷaṁ-i.

[18] rppa Malaprāhāriyivā || Ānīt-ā ājūrman-ālīva Bhūtayadevānā priya-tanūjaṁ Barmma-

bhūpalaṁ parakrā-

[19] mav-eṁt-eṁdāda-ā Ṭaṁṭaṅsituttar=irpp=sari-nīr(nī)āḷaṁra hiṁḍa nij-āśī-daṁīgāḍīṁ

kaṁṛyā-bārodol-sulśi pāṇiyā-

[20] bārada nīran-dūḍī niṅkka(kam)āṅtakaṅvā-āge maṭaṇaṁ sale Daṁḍina-Gōva-

enbudaṁ bāṭarer bāllaṁaṁ negeda bālla-

[21] hārō=kali Barmma-bhūpalaṁ || Ari-bhūpalaṅkar=ōdī-dī allī diṭaṁī puṁ=ṇy-āīgū-

āṅkī-saṁhāravaṁ caṁd-e.

[22] ñēyallī vaṁcī-vaṁcaraṁ kaya-āṅtōj-āṅtulī allī nirvēra-vīrasu ṣuchi āṇī Śūdrakānol-ā-

Gāṅgēyavanol-Ka-

[23] rāṇaol=sari-saṁ Daṁḍina-Gōva-Barmma-mahiṇpaṁ viśvāmbarā-bhāgadol-ā || Ānīt-ēseva

parakrāmaṁ be-

[24] rasu chakravartigala hēlikeyīṁ muṅguḍāyādiṁ rākku-diśvārakakāṁ ṃaṇḍu

hēla kaḷeśvāmāṁ sāḍēyān-mā-

[25] di ḍaṭedā Lōkāpura-haṁneraḥ Ḍoḷoḷugāḍaṁ mōvattā Ḍoḷoḷugāḍa Navilugugā-

nāluttu Ko-

[26] ūṇurū-mōvattu yint-ū diśāṅgulam-āḷuttaṁ Barmma-bhūpalaṁ Toragalelam sukaṁ-

saṁkathā-vinōṅaṁī rāi-

[27] jyaṁ-geyyuv(γyyu)tt-īre || Ā Barmma-bhūpalaṁ saṁravāṅga-Lakṣhmiyīn appa Sugga-

ladēviyāra gun-āṭiṣayaṁ=eṁt=eṁ-

[28] ddāde || Satāta madīya deyyav-Āmri(mṛ)i tēśvaran-ū Nīgalaṅka-Barmma-bhūpate

pativ-ān=ṇyathāpī

[29] sa(sa)raṇ=rīl=eṇaṅg=ēṇḍu trīṅguṛ-yukta-śuddhāḥddhā(āddhā) tēyin-udagru-puṁ=ṛya-ṛidhi Sugga-

ladēvī laścī-charitra-bhū-

[30] ši(shi)te ghaṭa-sarpapavaṁ hiḍūḍu geludā-śiṭāṭalav-eyde baṁ=ṇiṣaṁsul || Hariyu Siri

Harana

[31] Pārvvati Sarasījasuṁbhavaṁ Vāṇīya=eṇḍ-ātumaduddiṁ dhare pogaḷe negalda pēp-em

parama-patiṁbra(ṟωra) tēye nine

[32] Suggaladēvi || Ānīt-anēka-grupagāl(n)ā-laṅkākrī(ṛjīte sa(sa)tapata-nētre dāna-virājite

gōtra-pavīte paramamāḥēva-ti-

[33] yum=enīsi negalda Śṛī-Suggaladēviyārumu tāva mādīsaṁ Śṛī-Suggalēsvaramādevargge ||

Sa(sa)ka-varsham 1110one-

[34] ya Plavanga-saṁvatsaraṁ Puṣyā(shy) bahuḷa 10 Vaḍḍavārav-utterāyaṇa-saṅkra-

maṇ-vaṁ-

[35] tiptiḍaḷu Baṁ=nuṁidēvarasurā kavyalaya Suggalēviyār-i-sa-kōṇu Hālaholēya

[36] holad-olage dēva-dēvasa(sa)n appa Śṛī-Suggalēsvaramādeva dhūpa-dīpa-nāvēvdā-

tambho(bhū)lakkā-saṇḍrā-ā.

[37] [r*]kkā-ṭānāna bāṁadu naṇav-āṅtu koṭṭa mattar-egraṇu kāṃbaṁ nānūḍa yaṭiṭvēn

[38] addakke sīme tēnkalu Kumbārargeryiṁ muḍalu Suruganahāḷiṁgē hōda batte pāṣchīma-

[39] daḷu Kumbārargeryiṁ Baṁmivērūṅge ḍalāvaṁ dāṇī hōda batte baṭṭaḷa Baṁkheppu

[40] muḍalu herggaḍ-Chauv[ṁ*]damaya-nāyakara mega herggaḍ-Mallayana keyi || Ā

[41] dēvaṁ muṇḍaṇa kalla-gāṇḍapada mān=ṇiṣeṇyaṁ dēvaṁ naṁdā-dīvīge[ge*] koṭṭa-

[42] ru ||

* These two letters, ṭbhd, were omitted at first, and

were then inserted, in small and rather faint characters,  ||

* These Anuṣṭraus are superfluous.
Salutation to Śambhu, who is adorned with the moon resembling a chauri resting on his lofty forehead, and who is the foundation-pillar for the erection of the city of the three worlds!

(L. 2.)—Hail! To describe the prowess of the glorious Āhavamalla-Bhūteyadēva, who had acquired the five great sounds, who was a Mahāmandalēvara, the heroic Nighātakamalla possessed of power in his arms, the spiritual head of the Genukāras, a hero in the right sense of the word, a very sun of a warrior, the sole master of the world. The distinguished Āhavamalla-Bhūtiga received, at the hands of the emperor, the name Āhavamalla and the distinction of a Mandalēvara, by reason of the heroism he displayed in killing Paṇchala, when the latter encountered him; while the confederacy of petty kings headed by NārmaḍiTāila, who were in the rear, took to flight.

(L. 6.)—From Āhavamalla-Bhūteyadēva who had won so much renown, sprang his beloved son, Dāvaramalla. To him was born king Chāṭṭa; from whom sprang Dāvaramalla. His son was king Chāṭṭa, who was looked upon as the Yuddhakshira of the Kali age. His son was the distinguished Mahāmandalēvara king Bhūta, who was a mirror to the faces of petty kings and a very Śiva to the hostile Arasāsavas, these titles being realised in him. To describe his prowess; king Bhūta put shackles on the feet of his enemies……

(L. 11.)—Decorated with numerous smiling gardens, the whole earth shines for ever, like a lady, having for her garments the waves of the ocean, the lofty mountain Mēru for her large breasts, clusters of lotuses for a face winning affection, and shining groups of towns for her ornaments. In the centre of such a world, and to the south of the mountain Mēru, is situated Bharatakshētra, which contains the country of Kuntala, resembling the ringlets of the lady earth so full of charms. And the district of Toragale appears exceedingly beautiful, like shining pearls in those ringlets. There this Toragale is adorned with cuckoos bending down areca-nut-trees, betel-creepers in leaf, groves of mango-trees found on all sides, dark plantations of agura-trees, and rows of smiling gardens of arīke, with the lord Bhūtānatha and the (river) Malapraḥārī, which flows hard by.

(L. 13.)—To describe the prowess of king Barma, the beloved son of Bhūteyadēva, who ruled over such a country. The valiant king Barma, the most distinguished of heroes, dispersed…… with his own sword, the herd of hostile kings who appeared against him,…… made the earth free from enemies, and thus achieved the warrior’s distinction called Daṇḍina-Gōva. In this part of the earth, king Barma, who had the title of Daṇḍina-Gōva, was the equal of Śukrakā in invincible bravery, when hostile kings opposed him,—of the renowned Bimala in purity, when he saw the charms of numerous virtuous women,—and of Karṇa in liberality, when a crowd of bards opened their hands.

(L. 23.)—Adorned with such brilliant prowess, king Barma, having received instructions beforehand from the emperor, proceeded in the four directions, accomplished his mission, and obtained, as a reward, the Lēkāpura Twelve, the Hoḷalugunda Thirty, Dōḍḍavāḍa, the Nāvilugunda Forty, and the Koḷenuru Thirty.

(L. 26.)—While king Barma was ruling over these districts, with the delight of pleasing conversation, at Toragale; to describe the
excellent qualities of Suggaladévi, who embodied the whole prosperity of the person of the celebrated king Barma, saying, "Amriteshvara is ever my (favourite) god; and this king Nigalašika-Barma is my lord; to none else can I look up for protection," Suggaladévi, — a depository of pre-eminent merit by reason of her purity in respect of body, mind and speech; and embellished with spotless character; — succeeded in catching a large snake, 18 to the admiration of the whole world. She is exulted with great delight by the world, saying, "Suggaladévi; you are distinguished as the chastest woman, like Lakshmi, wife of Vishnu, Parvati, wife of Siva, and Sarasvati, wife of Brahmađéva."

(L. 39.) Thus adorned with many virtues, illustrious for liberality, and whose family was pure, the most venerable lady, the lotus-eyed Suggaladévi, with the permission of king Barma, granted, to continue as long as the sun, the moon, and the stars might last, 2 mattars and 450 kambas, in the field of Hljåbolie, to the god Sīri-Suggalévara established by herself, to meet the expenses of incense, light, oblation and tāmbūla, for the god of gods Sīri-Suggalévara, in Saka 1110, being the Plavanga saññatsa, 19 on Vaññavara, the tenth day of the dark half of Pushya, being vyatipata, on the occasion of the sun's commencing his progress to the north.

(L. 38.) — The boundaries of the land are: to the south, the path leading to Suruganahàlu, in the east of Kumbāraga; to the west, the path leading from Kumbāraga to Bannivuru across the rivulet; to the north, Belakuppe; to the east, the land of the Herryade Mallaya, the son of the Herryade Chavundamayyanàya.ka.

(L. 40.) — A manul of oil from the stone-mill in front of the god, was given for the perpetual light of the god.

(L. 43.) — He who preserves well these things granted in this way, shall obtain the fulfilment of his desires! He who destroys them, shall incur the guilt of having killed Brahmans, Goravas, a herd of cows, or wives, without feeling disgust, on the Ganges, or at Gayà, Kâdara, or Kurukshetra; he shall fall into hell.

NIŚĪDHĪ AND GUDDA.

BY J. F. FLEET.

In Vol. VIII, pp. 245-6, I published a short inscription of the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D. (Pâli, Sanskrit, and Old-Canaarese Inscriptions, No. 74) from a monumental stone standing in the courtyard of the Mêgôci temple at Aihole in the Káladgi District. From the want of other inscriptions to compare it with, my version of it, as given there, had several errors in it. The correct version is as follows:

Transliteration. 1


Translation.

"The niśīdhi of (the merchant) Râmiśetti, a Setàgutta of the Erambarga 2 district, — the guḍḍa of Kumudandu of the Balôtkâragaṇa (sect) of the Śrî-Mûlasaṁgha; and the son of (the merchant) Aichisetti."

18 The fact that the snake did not bite her, was considered the highest proof of her chastity.

19 By the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronicle, Saka 1110 was the Khôka saññatsa, and the Plavanga saññatsa was Saka 1109.

1 From the original stone; not from the photograph.

As regards the word niśīdhi,—which occurs also as niśīdhī, niśīdhīti, and niśīdhīkhe. — Mr. K. B. Pâthik tells me that it is still used by the older members of the Jain community, and that it means 'a tomb erected over the remains of a Jain ascetic.' And he has given me the following passage from the Upasargabhāṣya Kathe in which it occurs:

Rishi-samuddaṁevalaṁ dakshinopadâśin bauḍu bhaṭṭarâsa niśīdhīkhe-yogīd-ayâl &c.; — "The whole assemblage of the saints having come by the region of the south, and having arrived at the niśīdhī of the venerable one, &c."

And as regards the word guḍḍa,—in Vol. X., p. 159, note 16, I have given another short inscription in which it occurs, and have pointed out that in such passages it seems to have the meaning of 'disciple, follower, or adherent.'

The following six short inscriptions will be published.

2 The capital of the Sindha Mahâmanḍâlîcârara. The name is also written Erambirage. It is probably, as Sir Walter Elliot has suggested (Madras Jour. of Lit. and Science, Vol. VII., p. 207), the modern 'Telburga' or 'Telboorga' of the maps, in the Nâskâ's Dominions. — Lat. 19° 37' N., Long. 79° 35' E.
serve to further illustrate the use of nākdhik and gudda in the meanings given above.

No. 1.

An Old-Canarese inscription on a monumental stone in Survey No. 11 at Kadam, seven miles north of the Tālukā Station of Kanjiki in the Dharwād District. Towards the top of the stone, there is a compartment containing—in the centre, a seated figure, under a canopy or shrine, facing full-front, cross-legged, and with the hands resting in each other in the lap; and at each side, a standing figure holding a chaury away from the seated figure. Then come the first two lines of the inscription. Then comes a compartment containing—in the centre, a thavakolō, or Jain reading-stand, without hanging tassels, but with a book or manuscript placed on it; on the proper right, a seated figure, holding in the left hand a pīkā or peacock’s-feather fan or brush towards the fławaklō; on the extreme proper right, a kamaṇḍalu or water-vessel used by ascetics; and on the proper left, a seated figure facing full front, cross-legged, and with the hands resting in each other in the lap. Then follow the remaining five lines of the inscription. The whole inscription, if pieced together, covers a space of 0' 7" high by 1' 4½" broad. The inscription is of the time of the Dēvagiri-Yādava king Śīnghañwa, and is dated in the Parābhava saṅvatāra, Śaka 1163 (A.D. 1246-7).

Transcription.*

[1] Svasti Śīnṣatva-Yādava-Riyavanarāyaṇa ba-(bha)jabala-pra-
[2] tāpa-chakravartti Śīnṣhaṇāvah [ra*] varaha 37 Parā-
[3] bhava-saṅvatāsara Mārgasāira su-su-
  - dha(ddha) paṁ-hami Br[iv]ja-
[4] [spati]vāradalu Sūrasthagaṇa Mūla-
  - saṅghada Śīr-Naṇdi-
[5] bhāṭṭārikādēva guṇa Kaḍakula-
  - Sāvāha-Bo-

[*] ppaganḍana heggaṇe Sōmayanan samā-
  - di(dhi)(yi)m
[*] maṇḍipī svargga-prāptan-adā[na*] [[*] Maṇgga-mahā-śrīl

Translation.

“Hail! On Thursday, the fifth day of the bright fortnight of the month Mārgasira of the Parābhava saṅvatāra, which was the thirty-seventh year of the glorious Rāyanārāyaṇa of the Yādava, the puissant and valorous universal emperor Śīnhaṇḍava. Sōmaya-

*[[*]]

yan,—the guḍa of Śrī-Nandibhātākādeva of the Mūlasaṅgha of the Sūrasthagaṇa (sect) ; (and) the Heggade of Sāvanta-Boppaganḍa of Kaḍakul,—having died in a state of complete abstraction of the senses, attained heaven. May there be auspicious and great good fortune!”

No. 2.

An Old-Canarese inscription on a monumental stone near the temple of Haṣamanta or Haṇumān inside the village of Kadam. At the top of the stone there is the sun on the proper right, and the moon on the proper left. Then comes a compartment containing—in the centre, a seated figure, under a canopy, facing full-front, cross-legged, and with the palms of the hands resting in each other in the lap; and at each side, a standing figure waving a chaury towards the seated figure. Then come the first two lines of the inscription. Then comes a compartment containing—about the centre, a thavakolō, with hanging tassels and with a book or manuscript placed on it; on the proper right, a figure, sitting to the thavakolō, of a saint reading the book; on the proper left, a seated figure, apparently of a woman and therefore of the Claṇḍigaudī of the inscription, holding, in the right hand, a pīkā over the thavakolō; and on the extreme proper left, a kamaṇḍalu. Then follow the remaining eleven lines of the inscription. The whole inscription, if pieced together covers

boards, and shaped so as to hold the book on a slant. He takes the word as an Arānā, thavana being the Prakrit form, of frequent occurrence in Jain literature, of the Sanskrit śāaphana, and kāla being a Canarese word meaning ‘staff, stick, rod, stem.’ And he has met with two representations of a thavakolō, resembling that of the present stone, at p. 532 of a MS. of a Jain work on Māhāvīravātisāra attributed to Maṇḍāraka-Pharma-

[1] From an ink-impression.
[3] * In the other inscriptions the name is written Kajakā, a.
NIŚIDHI AND GUDDA

April, 1883.

A space of 0' 11" high by 1' 4½" broad. The inscription is dated in Śaka 1201 (A.D. 1279-80), the Pramāthī saṁvatsara.

**Transcription.**

1. Svasti Śrīmatu-Sā(śa)kavarsa(śa) 1201
2. Pramāthī-saṁvatsara
3. rada Bhāḍrapada su(śa)ddyha chhat[t*]i
4. Sōmavārī-adīnu śrīma-
5. nu-Mālaśaṅghada Paḍumasi[śo]n-
6. bhāt.[t*]ārakādēvānī gu-
7. [d[†]i] Kāḍakoḷada Śāvaṁta-Siriyama-
8. gaṇa sa-
9. māḍhdaḥ(dhi)yīṁ madhrop saṛvga-
10. prāptey=ida niśidhā(dhi).
11. [ya stambham [†*]a Maṁgaḷa-mahā-ārī-
12. śrī-śrī [†*]
13. [Hirya-Boppagauḍa Chik[k*]a-Boppa-
14. gaṇḍa Chikka-gauḍa
15. Ka(?))idāva Ruvā(?))da(?))virdēva
16. mukhya haṁneradu-hi-
17. [†*] samasta-praje basadige koṭṭha yere
18. mattaru 1 [†*] Śrī-
19. vāṁya maṁgaḷa-mahā-ārī-śrī-śrī [†*]

**Translation.**

"Hail! The pillar of the niśidhi (in commemoration) of Chaṇḍigauḍa,—the guḍḍa of (†*) Paḍumasi[mabhaṭṭ]a[rakadēva] of the holy Mālaśaṅgha; (and) the wife of Śāvaṁta-Siriyama-
20. gauḍa of Kāḍakoḷa,—having obtained complete cessation from worldly acts, and having died in
21. a state of complete abasement of the senses, and having attained heaven, on Monday, the
22. sixth day of the bright fortnight of (the month)
23. Bhāḍrapada of the Pramāthī saṁvatsara, which
24. was the Śaka year 1201. May there be auspicious and great good fortune! The twelve Hīta,
25. (and) all the people, headed by Hirya-Boppa-
26. gaṇḍa, Chikka Boppagaṇḍa, Chikka-gauḍa,
27. (?)) Kalidēva, (and) (?)) Ruvāvirdēva, gave
28. one mattar of black-soil land to the basadi
29. May there be auspicious and
great good fortune!"

No. 3.

An Old-Canarese inscription on another monumental stone in Survey No. 11 at Kāḍakoḷa.

Towards the top of the stone there is a row of three seated figures, facing full-front, cross-legged, and with the palms of the hands resting in each other in the lap. Immediately below them are two similar figures, one at each side of the stone, with a compartment between them in which there was perhaps a third similar figure, or some other sculpture, now effaced. Then follows the inscription, which covers a space of 0' 7½" high by 1' 5½" broad. The characters are of the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D.

**Transcription.**

1. Śrīmatu-Khara-saṁvatsara-adīnu
2. Kattaya-Aičhi-seṭ[t*]iya ma-
3. ga Chāṇḍayana nishidhīgaya ka-
4. [†*] l[†*]a

**Translation.**

"In the glorious Khara saṁvatsara,—the stone of the nishidhīgī of Chandaya, the son of (the merchant) Kattaya-Aichiseṭti."

No. 4.

An Old-Canarese inscription on another monumental stone in Survey No. 11 at Kāḍakoḷa.

At the top of the stone there is the sun on the proper right, and the moon on the proper left. Then comes a compartment containing—in the centre, a seated figure under a canopy, facing full-front, cross-legged, and with the palms of the hands resting in each other in the lap,—and at each side, a chaṇḍi and a small floral device. Then comes a compartment containing—in the centre a thāvaṇabolu, with hanging tassels and with a book placed on it; on the proper right, a seated figure, of the usual description as above, facing full-front; on the proper left, a seated figure holding, in the right hand, a piṇchha towards the thāvaṇabolu; and on the extreme proper left, a kamaṇḍalu. Then follows the inscription, which covers a space of 0' 9½" high by 1' 0" broad. The inscription is dated in Śaka 1189 (A.D. 1267-8), the Prabhava saṁvatsara.

**Transcription.**

1. Svasti Śrī-Sā(śa)kavarsa(śa) 1189
2. Prabhava-
3. va-saṁvatsara Māgha su(śa)dha(ddha)
4. 5 Su(śa).
5. [†*] kravāradalu Mālaśaṅghada Śūra-
6. [†*] sthagaṇḍa Śrī-Nāṁdibhaṭṭaṛakadēvān-
7. gu-

8. [d[†]a] Kāḍakoḷada Śāvaṁta-Dēvagā-
9. vūṁḍa-

* From an ink-impression.
† From an ink-impression.
["*"] na maga Mārāgāvūṇḍa sarvya-nirvi(r̥)-[tti*]yaṁ kai-
["*"] yi-komud humādiyin muddhipa svā-
["*"] [t̥]*jṛ-ga-prāptan-āda niśādiya stam-
bha ["*"] Main-
["*"] gāla-mahā-sīrī-sīrī ["*"]

Translation.

"Hail! The pillar of the niśādi (in com-
memoration) of Mārāgāvūṇḍa,—the gudḍa
of Śrī-Nandibhāttrakadēva of the Sūrasthagaṇa
(sect) of the Mūlasaṅgha; (and) the son of
Śāvanta-Dēvagāvūṇḍa of Kāḍakoloa,—having
obtained complete cessation from worldly acts,
and having died in a state of complete abstrac-
tion of the senses, and having attained heaven,
on Friday, the fifth day of the bright fort-
night of (the month) Māgha of the Prabhava
saiṅvatara, which was the Śaka year 1189. May
there be auspicious and great good fortune!"

No. 5.

An Old-Canarese inscription on a mono-
mental stone in front of the temple of Kalamē-
vāra at Siggaṅha, the Tāḷukā station of the
Bākāpur Tāḷukā in the Dharwād District.
The sculptūres on the stone are,—in the centre,
a seated figure of the usual description, facing
full-front, with a chaṇḍāri on each side, all in a
shrine; on the proper left, another similar
seated figure facing full-front; and on the
proper left, another seated figure, facing full-
front, with the left hand in the lap, but with
the right hand, holding a pūṃchha, lifted and
stretched out over a small thavāṅkūḷu which
is without tassels but has a book placed on it.
The inscription covers a space of 0' 4½" high
by 1' 1½" broad. The characters are of the
sixth or thirteenth century A.D.

Transcription.11

[¹] Svasti Śrīmata-Byu(vya)yaya-saiṅvatara-
rada Mārgga-
[¹] ni(ṣi)ya ra la 11 Su(ṣu) | Dās(ṣi)ya-gaṇa-
[da*] Bāḷachāni-

11 From an ink-impression.

The word is in the singular, though the substantive
is in the plural.

The second of the two uniform lines on the front
of the stand ends here. My man was not allowed to
enter the temple, and had to get the impression made
by an Upādhyāya of the village; hence the omission of
the concluding words, which must be somewhere round
the corner so as not to be visible from the door. Seeing
that the impression was incomplete, I wrote to have a
search made for the rest of the inscription. I have
thus obtained the commencement of line 3, but have not
been told whereabouts on the stand it is. After the

[¹] dratraividyādeva guḍ[ṛ̥]a Saba(?)-
rasiṅi-set[ṛ̥]i-
[¹] yarv svargga-prāptan-ādana[¹] ||

Translation.

"Hail! (The merchant) (?) Sabaraśingisṭṭi,
the guḍḍa of Bāḷachandrastraividyādeva of the
Dēviyagāṇa (sect), attained heaven on Friday,
the eleventh day of the dark fortnight of (the
month) Mārgaśira of the glorious Vyaṇa
saiṅvatara."

No. 6.

An Old-Canarese inscription on the front
of the abhpakṣa-stand of an image inside a
Jain temple at Homnur, two miles to the south-
west from Kāgal near Kōllāpur. The image is
that of a standing Jīnēndra, with a serpent coil-
ing up behind it and displaying seven hoods over
its head, and with a small kneeling or sitting
figure in each lower corner. The inscription
covers a space of 0' 1½" high by 2' 7½" broad.
It is of the time of Ballāḷaṇa and Gāṇ-
ḍārāditya of the Śilāhāras of Kōllāpur,
whereabouts about Šaka 1030 (A.D. 1108-9).

Transcription.12

[¹] Svasti Śrī-Mūlasaṅgha Po(pu)nag-
āvṛkṣamalāgana Rātrimati-Kanitatya
guḍḍaśi Bāmmagāḍaṇīm bà-
[¹] ḍīsīda bāsādi śrīmaṇ-bhāmaṇḍaḷāvramaṇ-
Ballāḷadevanā Gaṇḍārāditīyādeva-
(nam)-āhārā-dānsakke bitta kammava-
[¹] nūṛaṅkāṃ aru-gayi mane . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Translation.

"Hail! The glorious Mahāmāṇḍāṭīvāras
Ballāḷaṇa and Gāṇḍārāditīyādeva
allotted two hundred kammas and a house
(measuring) six cubits, . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
for the purpose of providing food (for those
performing penance), to the bāsādi which Bām-
magāṇḍaṇa, the guḍḍa of Rātrimati-Kanti
of the Punnāgavṛkṣamalāgana (sect) of the Śrī-
Mūlasaṅgha, had caused to be built."13

word mane, there appear to be some further letters, now
illegible.

12 Graham's translation of this inscription (Kōlkapoor,
p. 466) is: "Be it prosperous! Obedience to the rea-
soning of Gōrōo Moolūgan, the professor of Pooṇa-
vakasa (doctrine of a certain religious sect among the
Jains). It is the light of wisdom and knowledge to the
darkness of ignorance and superstition. The chief of
extensive dominions, Ballāḷ Deo and Gundaṇḍītya,
granted in charity a field in the village of Veenoor (thís
present honor) to the Būṣīe built by Bumgowood."
This is a fair sample of the value of the translations
supplied to and published by him, and of the way in
which inscriptions are dealt with by the ordinary
Pāṇḍit.
NO. 18.—LITTLE ANKLE BONE.¹

Once upon a time there was a little boy who went to live with his aunt, and she set him to tend sheep. So all day long he tended sheep in the wilds and blew on his little shepherd's pipe from morn till eve. Now one day a great big wolf appeared and looked hungrily at the little boy, and then at his fat sheep, and said:

"Little boy, shall I eat you or your sheep?"

Then the little boy answered, "I don't know, Mr. Wolf; I must ask my aunt."

So all day long he played on the pipe, and in the evening when he brought the flock home he asked his aunt, saying:

"Auntie, dear, a great big wolf asked me to-day if he should eat me or my sheep. Which shall it be?"

Then his aunt looked at him and then at the fat sheep, and answered sharply, "Why, you, of course!"

So the little shepherd went off with his flock next morning and blew away contentedly on his pipe till the wolf came, and then he said:

"If you please, Mr. Wolf, auntie says you are to eat me."

Now the wolf, savage as he was, could not help having just a little pity for the tiny shepherd with his tiny pipe, and said kindly, "Could I do anything for you after I have eaten you?"

"Thank you," replied the little shepherd.

"If you would be so kind after you have picked my bones to thread my ankle bone on a string and hang it on the wild oak that weeps over the pond yonder, I shall be much obliged."

So the wolf when he had eaten the little boy and picked the bones did as he had promised, and hung the ankle bone by a string to the branches of the oak, where it danced and swung in the sunlight, and the winds whistled softly through it.

Now one day three robbers who had just robbed a palace came by, and seating themselves under the oak began to divide the spoil. Just as they were beginning to divide the golden pans and the silk apparel and the silver vessels into three heaps a jackal howled, and at the same instant as luck would have it the Little Ankle Bone's thread snapped and down it fell on the head of one of the thieves like a stone. This the thieves considered to be a warning,¹ and whispering to each other that they were discovered they fled, leaving the treasure behind them.

"Now," said Little Ankle Bone to himself, "I shall lead a fine life." So he went into the town and bought a new shepherd's pipe, and played so sweetly on it that all the beasts of the field and forest and all the birds of the air and the very fishes in the pond flocked to hear him. Then Little Ankle Bone built marble basins around the pond for the animals to drink out of, and sat all day under the oak and played to them, and in the evening the doves and the tigresses and the she-wolves all came to him to be milked. Some of the milk he drank and the rest flowed into the pond until at last it became a pond of milk which grew bigger and bigger day by day.

At last an old woman passing by heard the shepherd's pipe and following the sound came to the pond of milk. She was wonder-struck, especially when Little Ankle Bone called out:

"Fill your pitcher, mother, fill your pitcher. All may drink who come hither."

So she filled her pitcher with milk and went her way. And as she journeyed she fell in with the king of the country, who, while hunting in the forest, had lost his way. Seeing the old woman's pitcher he called out:—"Give me

¹ The word used was girf, which appears to be local, and to be arrived at thus girī, dim. from girī = girī, Panj.-Hind., an ankle bone. In the verse at the end of the tale 'Little Ankle Bone' calls himself Gotēla Ema a very interesting instance of the manner in which modern Panjāb proper names are formed.—B.C.T.

² Māi = maternal aunt.—B. C. T.

³ bāhār, basa, orsarī; a flute, reed, pipe; made famous to all time by the legend of Krishna.—B. C. T.

⁴ bos-plu-queerus arca, the wild oak of India. Its branches grow very low, frequently touching the ground.—B. C. T.

⁵ Dauriā; dawrī, Panj.-Hind., a wide-mouthed earthen vessel, a marble drinking place for animals, a marble trough.—B. C. T.
a drink of water, good mother, for I am half dead of thirst."

"It is not water, but milk, my son," replied the old woman, "which I got from the Milky Pond yonder."

"The Milky Pond," cried the king, and began enquiring. After a while he determined to go and see it for himself. When he reached it and saw all the animals drinking out of the marble basins and heard Little Ankle Bone playing ever so sweetly under the oak tree, he said aloud:—"I'll have the little piper if I die for it."

No sooner did Little Ankle Bone hear this than he set off at a run with the king after him. Never was there such a chase, for Little Ankle Bone hid himself in the thickest briers and thorns, and the king was determined to have the little piper.

At last the king caught him and instantly it began to thunder and lighten terribly. Whereupon Little Ankle Bone cried out:—

Kyā guṇḍe, badalā garkande?
Gaj karaḥ sarē des;
Ohnā hirānā de than pasmās:
Gītād Rām ēd pārde.¹

Oh why do you thunder and lighten, dark heavens?

Your noise is as nothing to what will arise,

When the does that are waiting in vain for the milking,

Find poor Little Ankle Bone rest from their eyes.

He wept and wailed so that the king, seeing he had but an ankle bone in his hand let the little creature go back to the pond. And there Little Ankle Bone still sits under the oak-tree playing on his shepherd's pipe, while all the animals of the forest come to listen and drink out of the marble basins.²

---

EARNESTNESS IN CHINESE BUDDHISM.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH EDKINS, D.D., PEKIN.

(Extracted from "the Catholic Presbyterian," August 1882).

Buddhism in China has passed through many phases, and at different periods has shown great skill in fashioning its doctrines to the varying hour. By transcendental philosophy it has won the learned, and by the metempsychosis the people. By a lofty ascetic morality it has attracted those whose hearts are made warm by representations of the beauty of self-denial and contempt for worldly distinctions, while by an ingenious logic it has fascinated the intellect of many a youthful reader, whose successive objections to its doctrines have been met and overcome by the persevering use of pictorial metaphor.

The majority of the monks are indolent and without religious aspirations. They live in free quarters with hardly anything to do, encouraged in idleness by the monastic system which takes them away from the pursuits of industry to pass a life of quiet meditation in the company of others like-minded with themselves. Their new home may be in the city, the mountain, or the village, or beside a highway or a river. But in almost all cases their duties are light. In large monasteries they are under rule. In the small monasteries each does as he pleases, and in most cases does very little. They have charge of the temporalities of the monastery and of funeral services in families. In some cases they conduct daily service in the monasteries. In other cases they go out on begging expeditions among the rich of adjoining cities, proceeding in companies, and chanting prayers on the way. The priest in charge of a monastery with its lands, holds a deed. In many instances he can part with this for money to another priest, at his discretion. In most cases, however, he is simply placed over the property by the chief residents of the neighbourhood. In no case can he properly or honestly sell the property. He should, indeed, have no property at all, and of this his shaven head is evidence. With the shorn locks goes the worldly gear of the neophyte. The vow of celibacy is accompanied by a vow of total abstinence from wine and flesh of every kind. But these rules do

¹ Lit., why echo, O thundering clouds? Roar and thunder through all the land; the heads of the does yonder are full of milk; Gītād Rām (Mr. Ankle Bone) has gone away.—R. C. T.
² This story, told by a small boy in the Bār (forest; thickly-wooded jungle) of the Gujrānwālā District, is common amongst all the wandering cattle-drovers' children. In the Bār, wolves are very common, and the story seems to point to a belief in some invisible shepherd, a sort of Spirit of the Bār, whose pipe may be heard. Cf. Grimm's "Singing Bone."—E. A. S.
not make the Chinese Buddhists a devout class. The nation is not devout as a nation, and even the devout individual is rarely met with. The idea of special sacredness does not easily attach itself to temples, nor do the monks show any special reverence in the presence of the images, while the number and coarseness of the images tend to detract from their effect. Solitude is not the feeling which is most naturally awakened in the visitor's mind when he sees them. The people of the neighbourhood neither show it nor expect it in others.

Yet there have been not a few devout Buddhists, as may be clearly inferred from their biographies and from the books they have left behind. The peculiar doctrines of their religion, when thoroughly accepted, would induce seriousness of deportment and an earnest life. For instance, the contempt shown by this religion for the world and for wealth and honour would induce many persons out of the hundreds of millions who have at various times become monks, to take the vows with very serious intentions. Among the laity also, the reading of Buddhist literature has had a marked influence on some. The heroes, lay and clerical, among the Buddhists, who have achieved wide fame for themselves in this way are not a few, and this is true also of heroines.

In spite of the fact that the national temperament is not inclined to spiritual devoutness, but rather to secularity; that the Confucianists have always looked coldly on this foreign religion, scorning it publicly, and despising it in their hearts; and that emperors have by repeated edicts held up the Buddhists to popular condemnation, still devout men and women have been found among them.

These are but a very small percentage of the whole number of monks. The chief reason of their being few is found in the nature of Buddhism, as a religion without God. That belief in God which gives vigour to a religion is absent from Buddhism, except in so far as Buddha, in this system of belief, takes the place of God in the devotee's consciousness. This, however, is only a limited conception.

As a man, Buddha is long since dead. As God, Buddha is lost in pantheistic indefiniteness of idea. Both the metaphysical dogmas and the understood sense of the Nirvana surround the idea of God with a thick haze.

For the soul feeling after God, in the region of Buddhist thought there is no personal reality to be grasped. The divine and almighty Being becomes an image like that in Virgil of the deceased wife of Æneas, which he three times tried to seize and to embrace—

"Ter conatus ibi collo dare brachia circum,
Ter frustra comprensas manus effugit imago."

Thrice round her neck he tried his arms to clasp, Thrice clasped in vain, the shadow fled his grasp.

Buddhism is a very disappointing religion to those who sigh for certitude and reality. It serves for those who are content with dreams. It supplies them with fancy sketches of the future, but fails to endow those visions with permanence, so that the hungry soul finds nothing to feed on in this religion but philosophic dogma and unreal imaginations. Yet, that there have been devout men who, under Buddhist training, have shown great earnestness, will now be proved by examples.

The devotion of the Chinese Buddhists to their religion may be illustrated from their old biographies in great abundance. When these narratives were penned, there was great vigour in the propagation of Buddhism. The Chinese neophytes of the first centuries had among them many more noted names than is true of the modern Buddhists.

The biographical records of those earlier times contain many hundred separate personal narratives of men thought worthy of a place in those compilations which form a sort of "Lives of the Saints."

The authors of the various Buddhist "Lives of the Saints" have before them an ideal of perfection very different from that of the Christian. The qualities which they regard as making up the sum of goodness are such as these: the despising of the world, submission to the rule enjoining vegetarian diet, and other ascetic rules of Buddhism, devoted study of the Buddhist books, diligence and aptness in converting those who are still in the world to the monastic life. To these may be added a deep perception of the truth of Buddhist dogmas, success in defending those dogmas, and some conspicuous instances of self-denial.

In these lives some men are represented as fearing to pollute the pure rules of the monastery, and therefore for a time returning to the world. Later they take the vows, being con-
vinced that the Buddhist doctrine transcends any other.

The favourite books read at that time, that is, in the fifth and sixth centuries, were the Heaven-ching, the Nie-pu-ning (Nirvāṇa Sūtra), the Wei-wo-ning (Vimalakīrti Sūtra), the Lotus, the Four Divisions, the Po-jo-ning (Prajñā Sūtra), and the Discourse on the Earth (Dasaabhāmi Sūtra).

A devoted student would read 4000 or 5000 characters a-day, and, if he had a good memory, would recollect all he had read. Some are described as reading Buddhist books when from five to six years old, and at nine years, by studying the Nirvāṇa discourses, to have perceived that the world deserves contempt.

One devotee is represented as finding in the Nirvāṇa a cure for sickness and cold, so that a single grain of rice with vegetables, and one garment with straw in addition, would satisfy him; for while his body grew weak, his mental animation would be more and more perfect.

These saints, when young, are described as distinguished by modesty and decorum. One of them, who became a monk in A.D. 470, in the time of the Emperor Ming-ti, of the Sang dynasty, at sixteen years of age was remarkable for his attention to the instructions of his teachers. If they were very sick, he would not eat for several days. He constantly waited on them all this time. So long as they did not take food, he would not. When they ate or drank, he would do so too. When they were quite recovered, he would again take his former amount of nourishment. Thus his ascetic virtue became strong and clear. At the same time he grew in knowledge, and was in fact more profoundly wise than the barbarians,—the author meaning by this phrase probably the Hindu Buddhist saints, and those of Kabul and Turkistan. The princes of that time appointed conferences, at which select priests were appointed to discourse. In these conferences, when the lot fell on our hero, sitting on the last seat, he distinguished himself above all that came before him.

According to the same narratives, the middle life of distinguished monks in the monasteries was marked by careful reading of the Sūtras of Buddha. Much of their fame for devotion consists in this, but retribution came with sure footsteps to substantiate their claim to be admired.

The same priest who was so sympathetic and respectful to his teachers, when twenty-nine years old, met with a female fortuneteller, who could foretell the future exactly as it subsequently occurred in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, and in fact, so it was said, in the hundredth case too. She said to him, "Teacher of the law! you are learned and wise, and your fame reaches all over the world. But unhappily you will only live to thirty-one." Hearing this, he ceased his public teaching, and applied himself to self-improvement and reflection, making a vow not to go out of the door of the monastery. He then searched the Sūtras, and meeting with the Vajra Prajñā, or Diamond Sūtra, he took it reverentially to his room to read. When the end of the year came, he bathed himself with perfumed water, made the room perfectly clean, and chanted this book, intending thus to meet his approaching death. But on a sudden he heard a voice in the air, saying to him, "Good and brave man, last year thy life was fixed by retributary fate to end at thirty-one. But now, through reading the Prajñā, you have by the strength of that book acquired a lifetime twice as long!" Our hero after this went in search of the fortuneteller, who exclaimed on seeing him, "Why! what is the reason that you are still living? Formerly I saw distinctly that you would lead a short life, now I see that I was wrong. Sham! Your fate I see plainly cannot be foretold." Our hero asked, "How long shall I live now?" She replied, "I see by the structure of the bones of your face and head that you will live to be more than sixty." To this he answered, "I should not have called fifty a short life, but now I am to live longer than that." He then told all that had occurred to the fortune-teller; and it need not be added, that she received with great delight this confirmation of her prophetic power. After this he lived to the time foretold by the wise woman. In consequence, all over the region known then as Kiang-tso, and now called Kiang-nan and Kiang-sa, the practice of chanting the Diamond Sūtra grew fashionable; and many other proofs of wonderful efficacy following on reading this book were spread abroad. The popularity of certain treatises among the Chinese Buddhists is based on their fame for magical efficacy, which they have accidentally
acquired through incidents in the lives of saints. It will occur to every one who is acquainted with China, that this is also true of certain temples in every part of the country. They become famous through their connection with some noted priest, to whom remarkable things have happened.

Later in life the same monk became very conspicuous; and it was such men as he that lent strength to Buddhism in the period of advancing prosperity which had then arrived. The State began to favour, this religion, and encourage its institutions. Chi-t'sa-n'g was among the representative men of the time when Buddhism rose, as nearly as it ever did, to the point of becoming the State religion of China and yet failed to reach that point. It is important to know what sort of a man he was. He was firm, without being violent. He did not become worldly in tastes when enjoying imperial favour, but continued the quiet occupations of the monkish cell, reading the metaphysical books which his religion holds sacred, and explaining them to his monkish audiences. In his hand Buddhism did not bend to State power, nor did he and those like him succeed in attracting the State so far towards their views as to cause the abandonment of the old State ceremonies. They only persuaded the Emperor Liang-wu-tito forbid the use of animal sacrifices in the worship of heaven and earth, and that of the spirits of grain and land, and the Emperor Wei-hien-wen-ti, A.D. 470, to do the same thing in North China. Confucianism received a brief check: China wondered when the former of these two emperors went to a monastery and became a monk, and felt relieved when he returned to his throne. He loved Buddhism, but Confucianism was too strong for him. Matters soon resumed their old footing.

Liang-wu-ti was the Constantine of Buddhism in China; but he did not accomplish as much for Buddhism as Constantine did for Christianity. Buddhism endured much suffering after his reign, and Confucianism still maintained its superiority in regard to civil rights and authority. Buddhism flourished greatly during the forty-eight years of the reign of Liang-wu-ti. That emperor wished to assume the control of the monks, on the ground that the government of the higher priests did not follow them beyond the gates of the temples where each presided. Acts of excess abounded without check. The priests who held office should, in regulating the observance of the religious rules, be under the emperor, who should regulate all. A document was sent for the signatures of those who approved. It was brought to Chi-t'sa-n'g, who drew his pen across it as a sign of disapproval, on the ground that a layman, not understanding the depths of the Buddhist doctrine, which is as a great sea, cannot administer the government of the Buddhist community. The emperor read this remark, and paid no attention. The resistance of the monk was of no avail. The edict was promulgated. The emperor called an assembly of the priests. Chi-t'sa-n'g came in late. The emperor said that he intended to make a change in the mode of procedure in cases of delinquency. Monks were not sufficiently trained. Those in authority among them, through ignorance of the laws, punished culprits too severely. He would himself, in leisure hours, act as Buddhist magistrate, dressed as a white-robed monk, and would establish regulations in accordance with law. This was the duty properly of abbots and other chief monks, but Buddha himself had expressly entrusted kings with this power. In conversation with various priests, he had found on various occasions that they coincided with him in opinion. He added that he would like to know the opinion of the monkish teacher of the law whom he saw present. The monk was in favour of allowing things to remain as they were. To this the emperor consented, but he was very much displeased. It became necessary for the chief persons of the monkish fraternity to intercede for Chi-t'sa-n'g, and this they did with some effect.

When he was asked, "Why were you not afraid to excite the emperor's anger?" he said: "I am old, and whatever the emperor may command, I have not long to live. As to death, I do not regret that my end must come; therefore I am tranquil." He continued to discourse on the Diamond Sūtra and the Prajñā, and died A.D. 519.

As an early example of the devotion of the Buddhists, we may give the cutting on stone, near Pekin, of the Buddhist sacred books, at the hill called Siau-si-t'ien, the Lesser Western
heaven." On this hill, facing the east, are eight caves, in which the stone tablets containing the Buddhist books are piled up. The place is within a short and pleasant walk from the rich and ancient monastery known as Si-yu-si. The way lies along the bank of a broad mountain stream, where you may sit on some large stone and pore upon the brook that bubbles by, close by the monastery. A strong stone bridge leads to a farm where the people are busy harvesting. The road lies beyond this farm through a cypress wood of considerable size, or along the edge of it, as the pedestrian may feel inclined. He passes beyond the wood through fields which gradually rise till they are lost in the lower slopes of a hill, where the caves of the tablets are found. Ascending this hill, the traveller passes several caves closed up by strong stone gates, made of upright stone bars, so as to form a double row of gratings, one above the other. Through the gate he sees tablets of stone piled irregularly. Still rising, he arrives at the entrance of an open cave. Round its four sides are placed, in the wall, limestone tablets. Each of them has 988 characters clearly cut. There are in this cave, in all 150 tablets, and, therefore, there are 148,200 characters in all. The tablets are arranged in two or three tiers, according to the size and shape of the cave. Four octagon pagodas support the roof, and more than 1000 images of Buddha are placed in small niches, in sixteen rows, upon the surface of these pagodas, and these rows reach from floor to ceiling. There was no one on the hill when I was there with our party, but a tradesman from the city of Pau-ting-fu, who earns his livelihood by taking rubbings from tablets. A request to him to take copies of two inscriptions which gave the history of these caves, brought in the evening the requisite information regarding this remarkable work of ancient Buddhist zeal. In the year 1026, in the time of the Liu dynasty, a governor of Cho-chen, the city to which this mountain and the monastery Si-yu-si belong, sent messengers to search the mountain. The caves were carefully examined, and the priests of the monastery questioned, but they knew nothing definite. The caves were opened, and a register made of the tablets, which were found to contain the Ching-fa-men-ching, the Nie-pa'n-ching (Niradana Sutra), the Hwa-yen-ching (Avadhanaka Sutra), and the Po-jo-ching (Prajna Sutra)—in all, 1860 tablets. From dates and names found here and there it appeared that about A.D. 629, in the Sui dynasty, the priest Tsing-wan-Tsing originated the undertaking. His object was, by engraving the Buddhist sacred books on stone, to preserve them from possible destruction. He boiled at this work till his death in the year A.D. 639. A second monk continued this task of carving tablets with the words of Buddha. After his death another successor was found to carry on the work. So the thing went forward for five generations. During all this time, extending probably much longer than a century, these five priests in succession continued their work of engraving on stone the sacred books of their religion. Seven widemouthed wells, hollowed in the rock near the doors of the seven caves, seem to tell of long labour, of thirst, of cool draughts of water from the rock during hot summer days, of the constant need of water by the graver for his tools, of months and years spent on the mountain, working steadily with chisel and hammer, simply on account of admiration for Buddha and his doctrines, mixed with a belief in the great merit to be acquired by this long and wearisome task. Then after perhaps 130 or 150 years the work ceased. The spirit of devotion slumbered and the cutting of the tablets closed till the eleventh century. There was an interval of 250 years before the cutting was again begun.

In the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, as is well known, there was much faith amongst the Chinese Buddhists. In the fourth century, Fa-hian went to India, and returned after fifteen years. His object was a religious one. His narrative is pervaded by a spirit of deep faith in his religion. It was Buddha's life and teaching that stirred in him the desire to travel to India, that he might visit his birthplace, the scenes of his preaching, and the spot where he died.

Then comes the name of Hsien-Tsang, who left China on his way to India, A.D. 629, while these tablets were being cut, and returned after seventeen years. With him our stone carver may be compared. They were contemporary. The one desired to add to the Buddhist books, the other to preserve them from all danger of destruction. But the same sort
of religious zeal animated them, and it was the spirit of the time in which they lived, and of which they were the most eminent examples. China has held one in memory, and almost forgotten the other. The one was recognised by the court and the nation as a hero, the other toiled on the mountain at a long distance from the capital, which was then in northwestern China, at the south end of Shan-si.

In the Liao dynasty, the work of this forgotten priest came to light, and great admiration was excited. In 1038, it was resolved to complete the unfinished undertaking with public funds. New tablets were cut to the number of 360, and in A.D. 1058 an inscription was set up to commemorate their completion, giving these details.

To give a more definite idea of the work done, it may be mentioned that the cave we saw contained 150 tablets, which were large enough to admit of the New Testament being twice written upon them, in characters of the same size and in the book-language version. But there are in all 2730 tablets enclosed in the seven caves. Of these, 2130 were cut by the five priests working alone in succession for more than a century without public money, and the work they completed would be equivalent to about thirty-two New Testaments.

The characters are clear and well cut, and look like those of the Syrian inscription, which indeed was a contemporary work.

The work proceeded for thirty years, when public money was used. The number of tablets increased by six hundred, and a close was put to the undertaking when the four principal divisions of the sacred books were finished in 1011 chapters. These constitute about a sixth part of the entire Buddhist collection, as it was settled in the reign of the Emperor Yung-cheng, in the eighteenth century. Of course, many books are included in this recent collection which do not profess to consist of the true words of Buddha, but avowedly came from the hand of various authors.

The favourite books of the northern Buddhists are those of the Mahayana or Great Development. It was for these that H i w e n-T s a n g had an attachment, and a larger supply of these he brought to China from India. It is these that are engraved on the tablets, and that here continued to be favourites with the Buddhists of China.

I now proceed to give an instance of a highly educated layman, in the twelfth century, becoming a believer in the Buddhist doctrines, and zealously engaging in their propagation, though not a monk. This was W a n g-j h i e u, author of the work called Tsing-tu-wen (Sukhāvatīvyuha).

He was himself a doctor of literature, and could therefore address the cultured class on behalf of Buddhism in a way they could appreciate. He says, when exhorting young students, that the success of some very young scholars at the examinations, and the failure of others who had studied hard for many years, is a manifest result of virtuous and vicious conduct in a former life, according to the doctrine of metempsychosis. To old scholars he says, "The past is to you merely a fleeting dream. The days succeed each other quickly. Who can help growing old? Surely you should earnestly give attention to this doctrine. Whether a man be old or young; if he reform others, and cause them again to produce a reformation in friends and neighbours, he will have greater happiness in this life, and after his death he will be born in a much better condition."

He exhorts those who chant Buddhist prayers in the following terms:—"To chant prayers and make vows of abstinence is truly a good thing. You will obtain a reward of great happiness in the coming life. But this reward is limited. You will be still involved in the ever-circling wheel of life and death. If you further seek to be born in 'the peaceful land,' you will escape from the wheel of life and death. Although the attainment of your own reformation is a merit, yet it is a small merit: to exhort others is certainly a greater merit. Your merit will be still greater if you persuade other men to become, in their turn, exhorters, and teach them also to chant and make vows of abstinence as you have done. In this way you will be much more honoured in the present life, and enjoy endless happiness in the next."

He exhorts monks in another way: "You have done some virtuous things, but you are still passing round in the wheel of life. When the reward of your few virtuous acts is complete, you will fall again into misery. You had better prepare for the peaceful land, become extricated from the wheel of life, and see A m i tā b h a B u d d h a. Then you will for ever cease to be
a monk. Whenever any one gives you a piece of money, or a meal, you should tell him of the peaceful land. This you should do from gratitude. Even if he does not believe, you should still tell him of it. His ear will become accustomed to it, and then at last he will believe. Then assuredly his advantage will be great.”

In exhorting silk-worm cultivators, he says, “Silk-worms produce silk, which makes clothing for men. This is the way of the world, but it is the cause of a great destruction of life. There are those who support themselves by the favourable judgment of Ma-ming p’u-sa (Aśvaghōṣha). But an examination of the Śūtras shows that he never said what is attributed to him. It is only said that Buddha instructed his disciples not to wear silk clothing or leather shoes, because they cannot be made without killing animals. Since the care of silkworms is one of the regular occupations of life, those who are engaged in it ought to be ashamed, and constantly feel sorry for what they do. Reciting the name of Amitābha Buddha, they should give utterance to a great wish, to the effect that after seeing Buddha, and obtaining enlightenment, they desired to undertake the salvation of all the insect lives they had destroyed while engaged in the care of silk-worms. If they constantly repeat Buddha’s name, and heartily feel this desire, they will be born in the world of perfect joy; and should they be successful in reforming others, who in their turn will be exhorters to reformation, their happiness will be great in this life and the next.”

Filial piety being the most prominent of the Chinese virtues, the author urges on sons to exhort their parents to seek birth in the peaceful land. By doing this they will not only be filial to them for one life, but be the means of conferring on them the greatest possible longevity and unmeasured happiness during immense periods of time, numerous as the sands of the Ganges. This is filial piety, he says, of the truest and greatest sort.

In the same way, pithy exhortations from the Buddhist standpoint of the metempsychosis, with the addition of the western heaven, are addressed to medical men, to the rich, to women, to concubines, to the covetous, to those who love their families, to farmers, etc.

This author composed his book about the period when printing became common. Since that time it has been repeatedly republished and continued to be popular. By these examples, taken from Buddhist history in the sixth, seventh, and twelfth centuries, it may be plainly seen that there has been much of a certain religious earnestness among the followers of this faith, and that their zeal has displayed itself in various ways. We find here firm resistance to State encroachment in taking on itself ecclesiastical authority. We see also the patience of a quiet zeal continuing for many tens of years the engraving of Buddhist books on stone as a work of religious faith. Then we have a most zealous exhorter appealing earnestly to his countrymen of every class to adopt the Buddhist morality and life for the hope of heaven, and from a conviction that this world is vanity, that Buddha is wise, and that all he taught is true.

**MISCELLANEA.**

**NELEVĪDO.**

The following are some of the passages in which this word occurs:—

No. L. (vol. VIII. p. 20), and the Kembhāri inscription of Saka 975 (id. p. 105); Kalyāṇadā naṇekūṭjinaṭa.

Pāli, Sanskrit, and Old-Canaarese Inscriptions, No. 163, ii. 11-2, and No. 164, l. 14-5 (vol. IX. p. 50); Ṛgavrīya naṇekūṭjinaṭa.

No. XVII. l. 11 (vol. X. p. 127); Bandhāpurana naṇekūṭjinaṭa.

No. CXVII. l. 31 (vol. X. p. 252, and Errata); Śrītūṣadāri-Pāṇṭhāpurana naṇekūṭjinaṭa.

And the Siddāpur inscription of Śaka 1080 l. 19 (vol. XI. p. 273); Saṃpādāya naṇekūṭjinaṭa.

In the latter passage, Mr. K. B. Pāṭhak translates “in the vicinity of Saṃpādāya.” But nele-vīḍa certainly has a far more specific meaning than ‘vicinity.’ It is compounded of nele, ‘place, abode, residence; one’s own house; fixed,’ and ādu, to which Sanderson gives the meaning of ‘a temporary residence, a halting-place.’ And though Sanderson does not give the word nelevīḍa itself, yet he gives a somewhat similar word, nele-adu, in the sense of ‘a place of abode, a fixed residence.’

As I pointed out in vol. VIII. p. 105, it is
difficult to translate the word, because it is not quite certain whether it is equivalent to rājadhāni, 'capital,' or to vijaya-skandhāda, 'victorious camp.' Now the Old-Canarese inscriptions of the Śilāhāras of Kōlpī pur use the same word in referring to their capital,—Vaiśākapada neelavādī. But a Sanskrit inscription of one of them, dated Śaka 1073 for 1072, the Preamble saṅkrama, contains (I.11-2) the passage Śrīmad-Vaiśyāditya-vaiśākapada Vaiśākapada-thiraśībhiru subhasakathā-viśānāma vijaya-rājaṃ hūrvaṇa; which gives us the Sanskrit thiraśībhiru as the correlative of the Canarese neelavādī.

In the Sanskrit, as in the Canarese term, we have still an apparent contradiction; since the first member of the compound, thira, means 'firm, fixed, permanent, enduring,' while the second member, sībiru or sīvira, means, according to Prot. Monier Williams, 'a camp; a royal camp, royal residence; an intrenchment for the protection of an army,' and therefore conveys the idea of a temporary abode. But both the words appear to occur only in connection with the names of large cities which were permanent capitals. And in one instance we find the word rājadhāni, which could hardly be applied to a temporary residence or halting-place, coupled with neelavādī. It would seem, therefore, that neelavādī has the meaning of a 'permanent capital,' rather than of a temporary victorious camp.'

J. F. Fleet.

Belgaum, 9th February 1883.

THE GAṅGAS.
(From Mr. Fleet's Dynasties of the Canarese District).

The Gaṅgas are mentioned in connection with Pulikēśi II, who succeeded to the throne in Śaka 532 (A.D. 610-11) and continued to reign up to at least Śaka 556. Previous to that they had been conquered by Mṛgēśa, of the Kadamba dynasty of Pulikēśa.1 Seven Gaṅga copper-plate grants have been published by Mr. Rice,2 and one by myself,3 and three stone-tablet inscriptions by Mr. Kittel;4 and such information concerning this dynasty as is derivable from them and from an old Tamil chronicle called the Koṅgudāndarajakāl has been already compiled and published by Mr. Rice,5 and the result is a tolerably lengthy account and list of kings, such as it is. There was undoubtedly an early and important dynasty of Gaṅga kings; for, in addition to the present inscription, it is mentioned, as has been indicated, also in one of the Kadamba grants of Mṛgēśa-varmā. But, while of necessity I admit this much, I cannot go further than this; and especially I cannot say with Mr. Rice that 'the true history of this important line of kings may be said to have been entirely brought to light and authenticated by the inscriptions' mentioned above. If these inscriptions could be accepted as genuine, they would certainly establish Mr. Rice's point. But,—whereas the grant published by myself, belonging to the third generation inclusive of the founder of the dynasty, purports to be dated in Śaka 169 (A.D. 247-8), and therefore to be the oldest known record of the kind, of fixed date; in Western India,—there are incontrovertible grounds for stamping this grant at once as spurious. For, not only do the characters in which it is engraved show most conclusively that it is a forgery of not earlier than the end of the ninth century A.D., but also the date established by it cannot possibly be made to fit in with the dates established by the other grants for subsequent generations of the same dynasty.6 And further still, this grant of Śaka 169, and the Merkara grant of the year 388, and the Nāgamaṅgala grant of Śaka 698, were all engraved, on their own showing, by one and the same man, Viśvakarmānākhyārya. The other grants may all be criticised in the same way, palaeographically, and on other grounds. But we have also extraneous corroborative evidence of the most important kind. These grants all agree in respect of the first three generations of the dynasty,—viz. Koṅganavarmā (or Mādhava I), the founder of the dynasty; Mādhava II, the son and successor of Koṅganavarmā; and Harivarmā, the son and successor of Mādhava II,—and the grant published by myself gives Śaka 169 as the date of Harivarmā. Now, amongst the numerous stone-tablets extant at Lakshmēswar within the limits of the Dharwād District, there is one of the Gaṅga dynasty7 which gives exactly the same account of these three generations,—adding also Mādhava I, as the proper name of Koṅganavarmā, the latter being really only a family-title,—and records a grant by Māruśaṅka, the younger brother of Harivarmā, in Śaka 890 (A.D. 985-9). If the Lakshmēswar inscription were a forgery, the forgers of it would certainly have given it a much earlier date than Śaka 890, and would probably have

1 Ind. Ant. vol. VI, p. 25.
3 Id. vol. VIII, p. 212.
4 Id. vol. VI, p. 89.
5 Mysore Inscriptions, pp. xi, &c.
6 The Merkara plates purport to record a grant in the year 388, which can be only Śaka 388, by the great-grandson of the Harivarmā of the grant of Śaka 169. And the Nāgamaṅgala plates purport to record a grant in Śaka 698 by the eleventh or twelfth in succession to Harivarmā.
7 Ind. Ant. vol VII, p. 101; also see p. 112.
endeavoured to imitate the more ancient characters, instead of engraving it in genuine characters of the tenth century A.D. Taking all things into consideration,—the palaeographical and other objections to, and the internal inconsistencies in, the copper-plate grants; the existence of this stone-tablet at Lakshmeshwar; and, Mārasimha having also had the title of Satyavākya, the probability that Mr. Kittel’s Kīngkṣ̩aṃaṭṭi stone-tablet inscription of Satyavākya-Kongupavaranā, dated Śaka 900 (A.D. 978-9), is another inscription of Mārasimha,—there can be no doubt whatever that the dates of the copper-plate grants are spurious, and that the date of the Lakshmeshwar stone-tablet inscription is the true one for the third generation from the founder of the dynasty. And, finally, if any further argument is required, there is one more point which is of the most conclusive kind. In his paper on the Kaṭlab grant of Govinda III., at page 11 above, Mr. Rice draws attention to the fact, which I had overlooked, that the Markara plates mention a king named Aklavāra, undoubtedly a Rāṣṭraṅga, as Mr. Rice urges,—the inscription, in fact, purported to be made by a minister of this Aklavāra with the sanction of the Gaṅga king. As will be seen further on, the tradition of the Aklavāra of the eleventh century A.D. mentions a Rāṣṭraṅga king named Kṛṣṇa, whose son Indra was conquered by the Early Chalukya king Jayasimha I., about the beginning of the fifth century A.D. And confirmatory evidence,—at any rate of the existence of an early king named Kṛṣṇa, who would be slightly anterior in date to Jayasimha I., and who very possibly did belong to the Rāṣṭraṅga dynasty,—is afforded by some silver coins, found at Dēvalānā in the Nasik District, which have the name of Kṛṣṇa on them, and which, on palaeographical grounds, are to be referred, as was done by Dr. Bhāu Dāji, to the end of the fourth century A.D. The date of Jayasimha I. was, as has been said, about the commencement of the fifth century A.D.; and accordingly General Cunningham has referred these coins specifically to the king Kṛṣṇa, said to belong to the Rāṣṭraṅga dynasty, whose son was vanquished by Jayasimha I. Now, Kṛṣṇa II. of the Rāṣṭraṅga dynasty, for whom we have the dates of Śaka 797 (A.D. 885-6) and 833 (A.D. 911-12), and also Kṛṣṇa IV., of the same dynasty, for whom we have the dates of Śaka 867 (A.D. 945-6) and 878 (A.D. 956-7), both had the title of Aklavāra. And Mr. Rice,—starting with the suggestion that

---

* Id. vol. VI, p. 102. * See Id. vol. VII, p. 103. + Mr. Rice considers that he was the oldest minister of Aklavāra. I should prefer the equally justifiable hypothesis that he had been the minister of Aklavāra, and that, either on the death of that king he voluntarily

the fact, that nearly all the Gōvindas, and only the Gōvindas, among the Rāṣṭraṅga had the title of Prabhāṭavarsha, leads to the inference that the relations between the peculiar titles and certain names of the kings of that line were constant,—proceeds to point out that, on this analogy, Aklavāra would indicate a king Kṛṣṇa, and finally intimates that the Aklavāra of the Markara grant is to be identified with the king Kṛṣṇa whose son was conquered by Jayasimha I. This identification, if it could be accepted, would of course be a strong argument in favour of the genuine antiquity of the Markara plates. The full facts, however, really tend very emphatically in quite the opposite direction. Even if any such constant relation between the names and titles of the Rāṣṭraṅga kings, as Mr. Rice has suggested, could be established, it would still be unsafe to be positive in allotting the title of Aklavāra to this early king Kṛṣṇa, about whom we as yet know so little. But no such constant relation can be established. To take first the case of the Gōvindas, relied upon as the basis of his argument by Mr. Rice,—the inscriptions have given no secondary titles of Gōvinda I., and have given only that of Vallabha II. for Gōvinda II.; and, though Gōvinda III. and Gōvinda IV. certainly both had the title of Prabhāṭavarsha,—the former of them having also three other hereditary titles,—yet Gōvinda V. had not that title, but was called Suvarnavarsha II. and Vallabhārāṇeṃa II. Again, Suvarnavarsha I. was the title of Karka or Kakka II.; while Karka or Kakka III. had not that title, but had the titles of Amogha-varsha III. and Vallabhārāṇeṃa III. And finally,—to come to the Kṛṣṇas,—Kṛṣṇa I. had the title of Aklavāra I., but also that of Vallabha I.; Kṛṣṇa II. had the title of Aklavāra II.; the inscriptions mention no other names of Kṛṣṇa III.; and, though Kṛṣṇa IV. again had the title of Aklavāra III., yet he had also that of Niru-pama II., which had belonged in the first instance to Dūruva. These facts are quite enough to show that there was no constant relation between the names and the titles of Rāṣṭraṅga kings. And, turning to another dynasty, that of the Western Chalukyas, there, also, we find that there was anything but a constant relation between the names of the kings and their titles—the title of Āhamalāla belonged to Taila II., and Sēmēśvara I.; the title of Trībhuvanamallā belonged to Viṃkamādiyā V. and Viṃkamādiyā VI., but also to Sēmēśvara IV.; and the title of Tailākṣantiyamalla

or compulsorily left the Rāṣṭraṅga and took service under the other dynasty, or, on the subversion of the power of the Rāṣṭraṅga by the Western Chalukyas, part of their dominions, of which this minister was still in charge, fell into the possession of the Gaṅgas.
belonged to Sūmēśvara I, Jayasimha IV, and Tails III. This part of the argument, therefore, falls entirely to the ground. And—since the alphabet of the Merkara plates is, in spite of certain attempts to reproduce the more ancient forms, certainly not earlier than the end of the ninth century A.D.; and since, other circumstances also fitting in, we have an Akālavāraśa of the Rāštrakūṭa dynasty whose reign lay about the middle of the tenth century A.D. and whose dominions extended at any rate to the confines of Muisur,—the obvious and the only tenable identi-

fication is that the Akālavāraśa of the Merkara plates is, not the early king Krishṇa of the end of the fourth century A.D., but this same Akālavāraśa II., or Krishṇa IV., of Śāka 867 (A.D. 945-6) and 878 (A.D. 956-7). This disposes finally of the pretensions to antiquity of the Merkara plates. It follows, therefore, that Mr. Rice's Ganga kings are not the ones with whom the Kadambas and Pulikēśa II. came in contact; and we have still to discover who the latter were, and to ascertain the authentic early history of the Ganga dynasty.

The Journal Asiatique, VIIIème série, tome XX, No. 2 (for Aout-Sept. 1882) contains the continuation of M. Senart's study on the pillar inscriptions of Piyadasī, an abstract of which will be given at a later page. This is followed by two papers on Sanskrit Inscriptions from Camboja: the first a general report by M. Berthelot of the collection made by Capt. Aymeron at Phnom Penh and other places in Central Camboja,1 which has been entrusted to him and MM. Barth and Senart to translate; the second paper, by M. Barth, contains a specimen of these inscriptions edited and translated with the author's well-known scholarship and judgment. The inscription is No. 8 of the collection, and is from Ang Chhamnik in the Koh district, in the province of Ba Phnom, on the left bank of the Mêkong, in the south of Camboja. The characters are those of the most ancient inscriptions on stone in the Dekhan. They essentially agree with those of the first Chalukyas from the sixth to the eighth century, which are engraved on the walls of the temples at Bāsami, Ahbole, and Paṭṭaṇakal. The only differences any way noteworthy are that the tail of the t to the left is more marked, the a less forked at the base, the r does not pass below the line, and the k in most cases preserves a more square form without prolongation below, and with two symmetrical curves of the cross line. They approach in general, more than to any others, the style of the inscription of Mangalisa at Bāsami (578 A.D. Ind. Ant., vol. III, p. 305); and those of Vikramādiya II, at Paṭṭaṇakal (middle of the eighth century; Ind. Ant., vol. X, p. 164), but for beauty of type, simplicity, and perfect elegance of proportion, this inscription is not only superior to these last, but in general to all epigraphs of any extent of the same family as yet published. The work of the lapicide is careful in every respect, and the orthography consequently cor-

rect. The language is exceptionally accurate. It relates the erection of a linga and the endowment of a shrine sacred to Śiva-Vijayēśvara, and gives the following list of kings:

1. Rudravarman.
2. Bhavavarman.
3. Mahēndravarman.
4. Iśānavarman I.
5. Jayavarman I.; in the year 539.

The year is indicated by devadēśhastelanañayute. The era is not given but from the style it may be supposed to be the Śaka, thus corresponding to A.D. 607.

Another inscription from Han Khiec, not quite complete, contains the praises of Bhavavarman of the preceding and of his son and successor, and is probably the oldest of the series.

The inscription of Baksey Chang Krang gives us the names of three vassal kings of Śambhupura—

Pushkarāksha.
Rājēndravarman.
Mahipatavarman.

This last becomes suzerain under the name of Jayavarman, and makes his capital on Mount Mahēndra. It also gives the suzerain kings of Vyādhapura as follows:

1. Narēndravarman.
2. Rājapativarman.
4. Jayavarman II. (Mahipativarman).
5. Jayavarman III.
6. Rudravarman II.
7. Prthivivarman.
8. Indravarman.

There may be a century between Jayavarman I. and Jayavarman II, who were of the same dynasty; and Indravarman had ascended the throne in 799,

1 See Cochinchine française, excursions et reconnais-
sances (Saigon) fasc. viii.; Recherches et mélanges sur les Chams et les Khmers.
and Yasóvarman succeeded in 811. From the inscriptions of Baksey Chang Krung and Prasat Pra Dak the list is continued thus:—
10. Harshavarman I.
11. Isánavarman, was ruling in 832.
12. Jayavarman IV.
13. Harshavarman II.
14. Rājendravarman, ascended the throne in 866.

From other inscriptions the further succession appears to have been probably thus:
17. Súryavarman, 932 (perhaps the founder of Angkor Vát) to 988 or later.
18. Udayadityavarman.

These are the mere chronological results, from which other and more important ones are to be derived; among these they help us to assign the date of the great temples at Angkor to about A.D. 825; for the inscription of Prasat Bat Chum at Angkor-Thom attributes to Rājendravarman—towards the middle of the tenth century A.D.—the embellishment of a city called Yasódharapuri which is probably Angkor-Thom itself; and generally all the inscriptions furnish us with the latest date at least to which we can ascribe the buildings on which they are, and thus help us to important data in the history of art in Cambodia.

"India," says M. Bergaigne, "is always India, beyond the Ganges, as on this side. Its history, or at least that which we are able to learn, is really its religious history. But the religious history of India is an important part of the religious history of humanity." They also throw important light on the early colonization of the Hindus.

These are all religious inscriptions, mostly Śaiva; but there is a long Buddhist one of Jayavarman V.

The remainder of the part is occupied by a fresh translation of the non-Semitic inscription of Hammurabi by M. Ar. Amiaud; a Notice of the Sect of the Yezidis by M. N. Sionafi, consisting of cosmogonic traditions, traditions of their origin, and on their Emit; a letter from M. Hulvy on the identification of the town of Albaía in Arabia with Nescus or Nesca of classical authors; and Book Notices of C. de Harlez's Manuel du Pèlerin des Lieux de la Perse, and Jerad Boy's État militaire Ottoman.

BOOK NOTICES.


This pamphlet of 56 pages issued in November last, and forming a paper in the last issue of the Bombay Branch Asiatic Society's Journal gives an account of the relics found in a stūpa at Supärā, excavated by Mr. J. M. Campbell and the author last April, and of some fragments of the VIIIth edict of Asoka, and some small inscriptions and carvings on the Padana hill in Salsette. The paper is a very full one, as indeed the importance of the find at Supärā deserved it should be, and besides the notes signed by Mr. Campbell, his hand may be traced throughout in the references to European authors; it has finally, however, been but indifferently edited.

The paper opens with an enumeration of all the references to Supärā the author has been able to find in either Oriental or Western literature, though he seems to have missed many of those cited by the Editor of this Journal in August last, (vol. XI, pp. 236-) and by Dr. Klatt (p. 293) and, cautiously enough, he entirely passes over the identification of the place mentioned in these early references. Lassen had fixed upon Surat, and his authority was accepted until given in this Journal (vol. I, p. 321), about fourteen years ago, when the identification first really directed attention to Supärā.

The discovery of a block of basalt bearing a small fragment of the VIIIth edict of Asoka, consisting of about eight letters in each of six lines, supplies the author with a text on which he hangs a comparison of the other five versions, and gives a new translation of this edict, which we could have wished for the sake of clearness that this had been given in better English,—it runs thus:—

"For long, kings have started on pleasure tours where were (which consisted of) the chase and other such amusements. For this reason a religious tour was started by the ten-years-installed Piyalasi, dear to the gods, who had reached true knowledge. In which (tour) this happens: Visiting and making gifts to Brāhmaṇas and to Buddhist monks, visiting old men, making gifts of gold, looking after the land and the people, giving instruction in religion, and making enquiries as to (the state of) religion. By such means this

8 See Kern in Revue de l'Histoire des Religions.
1 The Pandit has introduced the use of in the transliteration of Sanskrit words for the palatal sibilant . Now as Grimm, Whitney, the Dutch Orientalists, and others, use this sign for the lingual , as being analogous to the use of , &c., for the other linguistics, this use of for the palatal "is against every analogy, and altogether to be condemned." (Whitney, Ind. Ant. vol. XI, p. 296).
(religious tour) becomes a source of great delight in other parts (of the dominions) of king Piyadasi, dear to the gods."

On a hillock called Vakālā, near Supārā, five names were found on four blocks of stone, three of them feminine,—on which majority of 3 to 2 the Pañjīt lays great stress—and his imagination converts them into records of gifts to the vakula stūpa,—if they are not monumental and marking "empty memorial tombs."

The find of objects in the Supārā stūpa, consisted of a circular stone casket two feet in diameter and 17½ inches high, formed of two equal parts, enclosing a copper casket, inside which were four smaller caskets—one within the other,—of silver, stone, crystal and gold—the latter about 1½ inch diameter, weighing 153 grains, and containing some tiny fragments of earthenware, which the Pañjīt believes to be fragments of Gautama Buddha’s begging dish. Round the copper casket were eight seated Baudhāya images of which drawings are given—the correctness of which is only approximate. Between the caskets were a large number of gold flowers, a small image of Buddha (weighing 14 grains), 13 stones,—beryls, crystals, glass beads, &c. and a silver coin of Yajñā Sātakarā, on which he reads the rather indistinct legends—on the obverse—

Siriyāṇadakaniśa raśi Gotamiputera.

‘Of the illustrious Yajñā Sātakarā, the king Gotamiputra’

and on the reverse—

Chaturapanasa Gotamiputukumāra Yaṇṇaśaka-

kani.

‘Yajñā Sātakarā, son of Gotami, prince of Chaturapana.’

The author in his remarks assumes that since Pulumāyi and Chāṣṭhāna are very probably the same as the Sirī Polemaica and Tastanes of Ptolemy, therefore they were contemporaries. This is very bad logic; Ptolemy’s notes on the two geographical positions contain no verbs, and might refer to two notable kingly hundreds of years apart, and he might also with equal propriety have enters Taxila as ‘the capital of Poros.’ That these two kings were contemporary, has, however, been proved on other and satisfactory data. He places Yajñāśrīl as the second successor of Pulumāyi, with Chaturapana, the father of the latter between,—forgetting altogether to assign a place to Māṇjūśrīputra.

The eight images he identifies with Śākyamuni, Kaśyapa, Kanaka, Kuṇakuchchhandha, Sikhi, Vi- 

It is to be regretted that the ‘section’ of the stūpa given on plate III, is so very inaccurate and misleading; and the dimensions of 67 feet in diameter given at one place, and 398 feet circumference at another, do not tally. It is almost impossible now to determine the diameter, but it was probably very close upon 70 feet, paśyā and Mātrēya. Groups of 8 or 9 figures are so frequent in Baudhāya mythology that, but for the tree cognizances over seven of these, we might regard them as the representatives of any of the groups so frequent in China, Tibet and Japan. The symbols over the first seven, however, if not decisive, are strongly corroborative of the Pañjīt’s identification. But it is to be remembered, that, like the Hindu guardians of the eight points, the Buddhists have also a similar series, in which Akṣobhya is placed on the east, Siddhābhūta on the south-east, &c., and, as here, Śākyamuni on the north-east. The eighth figure, which the author identifies with Mātrēya, however, is seated not as a Buddha but a Bōdhisattva, with his feet in the lañāla madrā, holding a branch with flowers on it in his left hand, and quite as much resembles Avalokiteśvara or Māṇjuśrī as it does Mātrēya: may it not very probably be meant for Pūrṇamadhyāriṇi Bodhisattva of Supārā, who is to reappear as Dharmaprabhu Buda? and may not the fragments be of Pūrṇa’s bowl? The Pañjīt, however, states confidently that “the meaning of the circle of Buddhais that Mātrēya, the Coming Buddha, has come, has entered the relic mound, and asks from Gautama his begging bowl in token that Gautama admits his claim to be Buddha. The other Buddhais are present, because it is the belief that Gautama’s bowl had been passed from one Buddha to another as a symbol of the office of Buddha.”

This is so fanciful and assumes so much that we cannot accept it. Besides, had any fragments of Buddha’s Bhikshupātra been known to exist so late as the date of the Supārā stūpa, and been deposited there, we should surely have found some reference to the fact in Baudhāya literature, which tells us so much about the bowl.

The style of this Mātrēya’s ornaments too, he thinks, belongs to the 7th or 8th century, and therefore the tope must have been opened then, “when new images and probably new copper and silver caskets were put in.” This is a mere theory without satisfactory evidence.

The last few pages are devoted to an exhaustive account of the symbols and short inscriptions cut on the face of the rock at Padana hill in Salsatte island, some of them mere names, the longest being the Baudhāya formula,—Ye hetu dharmā, &c. The pamphlet is of great interest, and though scholars will differ from the theories propounded in it, all will willingly acknowledge the value of the discoveries.

or 220 feet in circumference. It is hardly necessary to point out that the brick and earth dome may have been stilled, but could not have been of the form proposed by the Pañjīt. The plinth too, was probably less than 18 feet broad. Plate IV is also misleading.—J.B.

We owe the Oriental Translation Fund Committee and Dr. Sachau a debt of gratitude for rendering this most interesting work on Oriental Chronology accessible to the English reader. It is well known that Albīrūnī is one of the most comprehensive on the subject, whether by an Oriental or Occidental author, and its general accuracy is no less marked a feature. The translator has done his work well, and with the most marked ability, as is evidenced by the notes he has appended to it.

The practical utility of the work lies in its usefulness for transforming dates in the ancient calendars of which the author treats into Julian dates. In order to do this successfully it is necessary to know the epochal day of each era, the months and the number of days they contain, and in the case of intercalated years, the year in which the intercalation occurs.

A few notes made in the course of perusal of the work, rather than a review, may afford some idea of the character of its contents.

Albīrūnī nowhere connects the Christian Era with the Epochs to which he refers, but it is agreed on all hands that the Era of Nabonassar began on Wednesday, 26th February, 747 B.C.

With this and the Table of intervals on page 133, it is easy to find the dates, according to Albīrūnī, at which the different eras commenced, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Dīlūvi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17th Feb. 3102 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nabonassar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th Feb. 747 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Philippī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th Nov. 324 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Alexandri</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Oct. 312 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Augusti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29th Aug. 25 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Antonini</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29th Aug. 137 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Diocletianī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Jan. 290 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Fugta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th July 622 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Yazdazirdi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th June 632 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era Mu'tasidī</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th June 895 A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The months belonging to each calendar are found at p. 82. In those systems, such as the Arabic Nabonassari, where vague years are used, it is only necessary to know where the five intercalary days fall; as all the years resemble each other, having each 365 days. In the calendars where the years are Greek or Syrian, two methods of finding the intercalary year are given, the one on p. 136 &c., the other on p. 175 &c., and the same may be found in each case from the

---

1 Ideler says Friday (see p. 405). This Era is the same as the Kaliyag which began at midnight 17-19 Febr. 3102 B.C. The lunar Ahargana is counted from Thursday, the Solar from Friday.

2 Ideler gives Thursday (see p. 406).

3 This Era is usually given as beginning on Friday 29th Augt 284 A.D., and this the dates on p. 108 agree. Ideler makes the Epochal day Wednesday, (p. 109).

4 Ideler gives Thursday.

5 From p. 37 we find that the Era of Almu'tasid was

---

...
first. For the Era Antonini the first rule would give the fourth, the second rule would give the second, and the formula for the Signum the first current year. We find no statement in Albiruni which would enable one to decide which was correct. The signum for the Era Mu’tadidi should most probably be \( x + \frac{2}{4} + \frac{4}{4} \), not \( x + \frac{2}{4} + \frac{4}{4} \).

The rules for finding the Signum Muharrami (pp. 176-184) are unnecessarily elaborate. The following rule will be found to give correct results:

"Divide the current Hijira year by 210, and call the remainder \( R \); multiply \( R \) by 131, to the product add 63, and divide the sum by 30. The quotient, rejecting the sevens in it, will be the Signum. Or \( \text{Signum} = \frac{4R + 11R + 63}{30} \) (rejecting sevens)."

The construction of the Table on p. 179 is not apparent. The editor states that the Signa Ramadhan, and not the Signa Muharrami, is indicated by the Table. But it fails in many instances to give correct results, thus: Year 8—Signum Muharrami = 2 and the S. Ramadhan = 2 + 5 = 7, and not 6 as given in the Table.

If, however, we add 55 to the year, or subtract 155 from it, and enter the Table with the number now found, we shall find the correct Signum Muharrami; thus: A. H. 1 + 55 = 56, which gives VI; so—A. H. 158—155 = 33, which gives IV; and A. H. 100 + 55 = 155, which gives IV.

At p. 138 it is stated that the 1st of Töt of the Æra Dilaevi always coincides with the 15th of Bahman-Mah in the non-intercalated Æra YazaHRaizidi. This is a mistake.

The interval between the two Æras is 1303598 days (p. 133) = 3735 years, 323 days.

Hence, (366—323 = ) 43 days will have elapsed by the 1st Töt of the following year, or 1st Töt coincides with 13th Ardifahist-Mah.

The statement in the following paragraph that the 1st Töt of the Æra Nabonassari coincides with the 1st of Daf-Mah in the Æra YazaHRaizidi is quite correct, for the interval (p. 133) is 593425 days or 1379 years, 90 days, and it will be (366—90 = ) 276 days before 1st Töt is reached, and this brings us to 1st Daf-Mah.

Albiruni’s account of the Jewish system is most interesting and satisfactory. It should be observed that in marking the week-day, Albiruni gives the elapsed, not the current day. With him 5d. 14th means that point of time when, from sunset of Saturday five days have passed, and 14 hours more, or in other words 8. A. M. on Friday. Some prefer the perhaps less accurate but more convenient form, 6 days 14 hours, as giving the day of the week ‘Friday.’

In the same way it should also be noticed that while by the common method the Æra Adami commences on Monday, 7th Oct. 3761 B.C., or (2) 347999d. 5h. 11m. 20s.

Albiruni uniformly makes the commencement one year later .................(4) 354 8 48 40 i. e., Friday, 26th Sept.

3760 B. C.; ............... (3) 348352 14 0 0 so that any given year of the Æra Adami is by Albiruni’s method one less than by the common method. As, however, a corresponding change is made in the intercalated years, this leads to no practical inconvenience.

At p. 65 he gives a circle illustrating the three methods by which Jews in different places arranged the intercalary year in their very intricate system.

The outer circle here (not given by Albiruni) shows the intercalation by the common system; the second the intercalation when Albiruni’s system is followed: the third when the era began a year later still; and the fourth, or innermost circle, when the cycle was counted from Æra Alex. 12. e.g. (See note at p. 390.)

A.D. 1 = Æ. Adami 3762 by the common method.

= " 3761 by Albiruni.

= " 3760 by others.

= Æ. Alex. 313.

Dividing the first three, and the last less 12 (313—12) by 19, we have as remainders, 0 or 19, 18, 17, 16, and so on. Examining the circles it will be found that by all the methods the given year was reckoned embolismic. Albiruni states that the second and third of these cycles were followed by the Jews of Syria, but that the latter mode of arrangement was most extensively diffused among the Jews, and that they preferred it to others, because they attributed its invention to the Babylonians.
There is not only agreement as to intercalations, but between Albiruni and the mode at present in use there is the same agreement as to the length of a cycle and of the different kinds of years. One hour contains 1680 Halakim, and—

| Cycle of 235 lunations. | (2) 6938d. 16h. 33m. 3s | = (2) 6938d. 16h. 35'5 H. |

Ordinary year of 12 " = (4) 354 8 68 40

Embolismic " 13 " = (5) 383 21 92 43.5
= (5) 383 21 589

By the method at present in use among the Jews, when the Mōled falls on Sunday, Wednesday, or Friday, the new year begins on the following day; when in a year immediately following an embolismic year the Mōled falls on Monday, as late as 15h 32m 45s (15h 58' H.) the new year must be postponed to Tuesday; and when in an ordinary year the Mōled falls on Tuesday as late as 9h 11m 28s (9h 20'44s.) it is postponed to Thursday. On p. 152 the character of a year beginning on Thursday is given as "Intermediate," it should be "Imperfect;" for on the same page it is stated that in Leap year when New Year's Day is a Thursday it cannot be Intermediate.

On p. 151, 6h 20'8 H. must be a misprint for 6h 40'8 H., but with these two exceptions, as will be seen by a careful examination of pp. 150, 151, 152, there is the most perfect agreement of present practice with Albiruni's statements. We have oftener than once seen it asserted that the modern Jewish method was not more ancient than the 15th century of our Æra, but the work of Albiruni, dating as it does from (cir.) A.D. 1000, proves that the Jewish Chronological system of that period was identically the same as that now in use.6

The period at which the beginning of the Jewish year returns to the same date is correctly given (p. 154) as 30,288 cycles.

At the foot of the page (154) the Editor says: "Here follow the three tables, which I have united into one,"—but the Table is nowhere given, though referred to in the Annotations, p. 409.

Dr. Schramm is quite correct in his computation, (p. 409) taking the Epoch of the Æra Adami as 7th October 3761 B.C., but Albiruni, as we have seen, makes the Epoch a year later, and it is the beginning of year 4754 in his system that is required. By the common tables this is found to be Saturday, September 8th, 994 A.D. at 14h 53m 56s, or 14h 97' H. The Jews reckoned 3448 years between the Æra Adami (Alb.) and the Æra Alexandri, and deducting this and other 12 years, from 4754 we have 1394, which divided successively by 532 and 19 gives 2 great cycles, 12 small cycles, and a remainder of 2 years. Then by tables pp. 145-147, we have—

Basis 2d 11h 86m.
2 G. C. 3 14 929
12 S. C. 4 6 600
2 yrs. 3 6 385

= 6d 14h 97' H.

This corresponds with the time found by using the common tables—for by Albiruni's method the number 6 indicates that Friday has passed, and that the required time is Saturday 14h 97' H. Thus; 1st Tisri, A. Adami (Alb.) 4754 = 8 Itul. Alex. 1305 = Saturday, 8 September A.D. 994.

See also Assaying Circle (p. 142) where for the 2nd year we have Itul 8 C.

The Basis is omitted in the Table. The intercalation of the Table for single years (p. 143) agrees with the innermost circle (p. 65 also given above), and the basis is the Mōled of the 12th year of the Æra Alexandri. The Editor's explanation on p. 409 is erroneous, as is also the Mōled for Alex. 12 given at p. 407. For—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Æra Adami (Alb.)</th>
<th>1 5d 14h 0H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Gt. Cycles ...</td>
<td>3192 3 20 909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Small, ...</td>
<td>290 2 15 770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yr. ...</td>
<td>1 4 8 576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mōled for .......... 3490 is 2 11 86

The perfect agreement of the different methods of finding the mōled for any year may be seen by taking an example. The amount to be added for each of the earlier years of the Cycle is as follows:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common.</th>
<th>1. (4) 354d. 8h. 87'8 H.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. (1) 708 17 672 H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. (0) 1092 15 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. (4) 1446 23 1057 H. &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albiruni.</td>
<td>1. (4) 354d. 8h. 87' H. e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. (3) 738 6 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. (0) 1092 15 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. (4) 1446 23 1057 H. &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æ. Alex. 12.</td>
<td>1. (5) 383d. 21h. 58'9 H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. (3) 738 6 385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. (0) 1092 15 181 H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. (6) 1476 12 770 &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead of the Tabula Legum (pp. 161, 162) we may use the following:—To the current year of the Æ. Adami add 40. Divide the sum by 350, and call the remainder x. Then Yōbōl = (x/350) r, and Shābōl = (x/7) r.

The Table of Tekfāth (p. 169) is of simple construction, and may, at one period, have been of use in determining the time of the Vernal Equinox.

---

* The fact that the system was linked on to the Æra Alexandri in the way we have indicated may have given occasion to the statement that the Jews employed the Era of the Seleucids till the 15th century.
NOTHING has hitherto been written about a hitherto unknown Yādava dynasty, whose dominions at one time extended over the present Nāsika zila. I know of only two inscriptions of this dynasty, one of them a copper-plate and the other a stone inscription, the two together forming the basis of this paper.

The copper-plate was bought by the late Dr. Bhānu Dāji from a husbandman of Bassein, and lay in the possession of the trustees of his brother, the late Dr. Narāyana Dāji, from whom it was obtained by the Hon’ble J. Gibbs, C.S.I., and handed over to me by Dr. Burgess. It consists of three plates each 11½ inches long and 7½ broad, which are held together by a ring at the top. The ring has a Gāruḍa sitting with folded palms, and on either side of him are two conch shells, emblematic of Viṣṇu. The writing on the plates runs across and, as is usually the case, both sides of the middle and only the inner sides of the first and third plates have been engraved. The number of lines in the first plate is 24, in the second on either side 23, and on the third 21. All the three plates are well preserved, and do not appear to have suffered from the effects of time. The writing is in Devānāgari, much resembling that used in Śilāḥra inscriptions. The letters न, र and श are a little different from modern Nāgari, and, as in old manuscripts, the मात्र stroke is placed before the letter over which it is meant to stand. The language is a very incorrect Sāṃskṛta; the first ten slokas are in a variety of metres, and the rest in prose. As the poet does not appear to have been a scholar, there is no lack of grammatical inaccuracies, which often make it very difficult to understand the precise meaning of the text. Add to this that the engraver appears to have made numerous mistakes in his work, due, I think, to his ignorance of the letters. It often occurs that not knowing a particular letter, he has cut it in a fashion quite his own.

Transcription.

Plate I.

[1] १ स्वस्ति जयेन्द्रभद्राये। चैतापेयं संस्कृति भागवत्मयाध्यायेनचाच्याचारः। 2 परमतपसा
[3] १ योगितम वायुवताय। अभियायं भवति नित्याधारामपि प्रायोगिः। 3 देवं संयं यद्युतितेऽपि। संक्षरः
[5] १ सं 'करोपु्य ॥ १। आदिः स्वायत्। ६ दुःधाराऽनुरुक्तिः श्रीविजयस्य। 4 सहिता गाणो निरजनशस्वे खरे
[7] १ तनुदार्शिवलीसनाताः। संख्यामेव रिपुप्रतिपादितिरस्तरः। 5 संख्यामेव द्रुम वं च हरो दोभास्तिविषये।
[9] १ संहारं संधयोगम्। येनकारां पुरे व जेदुपुपे श्रीनिदिनेष्वरे तुपुः कुलदीपको गुणनिवः।
[11] १ 'श्रीम्यायियस्यपत्रस्य। 2। आदिः सन्तोषं दग्धवालस्य। 11 'श्रीमणुवहितस्य। 3 'श्रीरामस्यनन्दनवरं
[13] १ वधिन्विविखितः। 12 'आवविषयं कबूतरं भूमिलहरेः। 13 'श्रीविजयस्य नृपस्य तस्मात्सरस्य। 14 'भितः
[15] १ शर्मवायविवेकसुधिगुणस्य। 16 'राष्ट्रसुधारं। 17। या जातायवालनानांस्य। 18 'यद्यपायारिता।

1 The श of अं-पद्यम looks like द owing to a mistake of the engraver's. 2 Read चैतापेयकेष यो तो. 3 The यो of भागवत्मयाध्यायेनचाच्याचारः looks like शिर्ष: a mistake of the engraver. 4 Read पायकेष यो तो. 5 Read शिर्ष: शिर्स्य. 6 There is a break here in the metre. Sandhi rules would have excluded, but in either case the metre breaks. 7 Read संयतस्य. 8 Read शिर्स्य. 9 There is a break here in the metre: नृप: gaining the best among men would be a good reading to preserve the metre. 10 There are two letters wanting after शिर्स्य: to complete the metre. 11 ी भुजावायविवेकसुधिगुणस्य. 12 In the original जाती looks like जाती: perhaps by a mistake of the engraver, of ज for ज, the two letters being much alike. 13 For जाताय जाताय ी. 14 Read भूमिलहरे. 15 तस्मात्सरस्य may be also read सरस्यवरं or सरस्यवरं. 16 The श of ीबूतर 'कबूतरं looks like रकः, but this makes no sense, while the similarity between श and रकः accounts for the mistake of the engraver. 17 Read सुधारं. 18 The metre breaks in this pada; perhaps श्रीरामस्यनन्दनवरं would be better. 19 As it stands शाल्ल शाल्ल makes no sense; perhaps शाल्ल means, the letters न and र being similar in form. 20 The metre breaks again in this pada; द ought to be long but would make no sense.
Plate II, first side.

[...]

Plate II, second side.

[...]
Plate III.

[43] भागवतमानित: विश्वायविनते । तस्मातसीरीवर्गापि भूमिदानन प्राप्तेचुल। राजाधिपतंगीयारं ।
[44] सवै भूमी प्रस्तुते । तस्मात भूमिप्रस्तुतनन परीत संवेदद: । देवसातनी हर्तीह नर ।
[45] नरकरिभागु(ज) वहसानी वृषे मृत्युसत्यते नरकेको ते । सदासं परदाता वा ये हरेत वापुरात ।
[46] हद्य बस्तिसाता के निमा जानीवे कम' । बाणीप्रति श्रवणिको रत्न: र धार्मिक ।
[47] वोटियोरिविनु भूमिहरू न हुया: भूमिय यु (प्रतिविद्युत: यस्त भूमि प्रयत्त्वचत् ।
[48] इवेव पुष्करायादी नयिन्य संगमानिनी । चन्द्राकेदा र धारणीयमसातपन ।
[49] ताराका आवलोकाय प्रभुराजयाम प्रच्छाव । वेशं संधयों यस्याके देवायकामाण: । वेशं वनी ।
[50] च दानस्य एवं वास्तन्त्र स्वाता: । हर्षा देवस्य यो भूमि भ्राणसुपरीयात । 
[51] सदासं पर: ।
[52] दाता या स प्रत्य नरकेके नर: । सर्वो भूमि प्रस्तुतिरुच्छेदन न संस्कृतः ।
[53] नरणसं हस्ताक्षराणि कालाकालय । गद्यसंस्कृतिको वामाय प्रतिविद्युत: । गद्य: प्राप्त: तक्षेण: 
[54] समासं वा पलसाश्रयाय प्रतिविद्युत प्रक्षेपाय चित्तित । संभुवन: लेकायनायेकन ।
[55] घटितं । संभुवन: ।

Translation.

Oṃ! Hail, Victory and Prosperity! May that venerable happiness-conferring god who creates the lord of the three worlds, who is possessed of the lustre of magnanimity, who is worthy of being adored in their minds by contemplating sages of great austerities, and who generally does not appear even to the gods: (may he) confer prosperity on the Lord of Yadupati.

There was, in the beginning, a famous king (named) Dṛḍhāprāharā, like the illustrious Vishāv, (who was) the crown of his race and came from the town of Dvārakāti, (who was) powerful in breaking the heads of the foot-soldiers and the elephants of his enemies and who made famous on the earth Chandraśīryapura previously existing.

To him was born the illustrious king Saṇchandra, best among men, who always obtained a good name in (his) country and among (his) infancy, by whom was founded the town of Saṇyapura in the good Sindinera.

After him came his son Dvādiyappa, the lamp of his family and depository of good qualities. After him came the illustrious Great Bhilla, a veritable moon on the earth. After him came king Śrīrāja an ornament on the earth. Before him was the illustrious king Vaddiga, a Harion earth; and therefore but सुरिपृया has been added here without reference to metre. 39 Read सप्पायी. 40 Read प्रतिविद्युत: should be प्रतिविद्युत: otherwise the metre breaks. 40 The word श्राव seems to have been dropped after मारण। 41 For राजपुत read राजारु। 42 For बी read ना। 43 For मंदे read मंगले।
he was exactly like the illustrious good Bhillama in his actions.

(5). Whose wife was the daughter of king Janja, Lasthivavva by name, possessed of the (three) good qualities of virtue, liberality and hospitality, who was of the Rástrakúta race, as being adopted (by them) at the time of the rule of the young prince (during his minority), and who therefore by reason of bearing the burden of the kingdoms, with its seven agna, was an object of reverence to three kingdoms.

(6). (Whose) principal queen was always the beautiful Sritivalladaví, adorning her family by her majesty, virtuous, produced from the mine Gogiraj of the Cháluksya dynasty and a head of feudatory chiefs, who was really the jewel of a woman produced by the creator for the head of feudatory chiefs.

(7). The embracer of whose body was the illustrious king Téuaka, (and) from him was produced king (dharadhara) Bhillama, with the title of manadalika, the clever Yádava adorning by the lustre of the glory of his race the three worlds and worshipping the feet of the destroyer of evil-doers (Vishnu) on the surface of the earth.

By whom, a Ráma in the battle-field, who made a great mark was Áhavamalla, an Indra on the earth, killed by the blow of the sword of his mighty arms ..........................................

Whose dutiful wife on earth was Hámã, the Satt Avalladaví, who has joined her beautiful body with his (the king's), whose virtues are as clear as those of Lakshmi, the daughter of king Jayasinha, sister of king Áhavamalla, of the Cháluksya dynasty, excellent in points which specially relate to the body.

King Seunachandra, born in this dynasty, was great in point of religiousness; by

---

This verse is full of attributes which make no sense, as the grammar is hopelessly bad. The general meaning is that the king killed Áhavamalla.

13. This means a department and áttarka is the functionary in charge of the Pátala department. What Pátala means is not known, but the word occurs in other copper-plates also.

14. This probably means what in other inscriptions is signified by राजस्वार्थ i.e. an officer acting for the king, or connected with (other) kings, something like our "foreign secretary."

15. वाल and महान are generally used to mean
belonging to Sind village and a banyan tree and to the north-east the Nigduiyāla pond of the Mahāya village and Sevai (2). The village marked with these eight boundaries should be reserved, crowned with rows of trees with its boundary and borders, with its wood, grass and water, with all its means productive of wealth, devoid of all such injuries as the destruction of vidula and other things made by his own or foreign armies, akasavatottarā, and with all its enjoyments.

Rāmabhadrā repeatedly solicits all future kings, that this is a bridge for merit common (to all kings) and should at times be continued by them. He respectfully and with folded hands says all this, that all virtuous kings, whether of my own or other dynasties, shall continue this my charitable gift. The gifts conferring merit, happiness and glory made by former kings are like something enjoyed (i.e., remains of offerings), and no good man takes them back. The earth has been enjoyed by numerous kings, Sagara and others; but the merit of the gifts goes to him in whose possession it is (at a particular time). All religious merit that is attained by (making) gifts at Gayā, Gōdavari Prayāga and other places, can be also attained by continuing (a gift of) land. There is no more happy provision for the next world than a gift of land; therefore one should continue a gift of land with all respect. Land contains jewels, corn, water and cows; therefore by making a gift of land one becomes a giver of all (these). Those men who, regardless of hell, take away the property (assigned to) gods, and who through stupidity take away the property of Brāhmaṇas, are tormented in hell. He who confiscates land assigned by himself or by others grovels a worm in dung for a thousand gods' (divya) years.

He who confiscates land does not become pure by (building) step-wells and reservoirs, nor by hundreds of Vājāpyā sacrifices nor by giving crores of cows. Both the receiver and the donor of land do what is meritorious and certainly go to heaven. The (divine) witnesses at day and at night to a gift are the Moon and the Sun, the Earth, the Sky, Wind, Stars, Fire, Dharmārjya, the three Sandhyās, the three Vēdas, the three gods and the three Fires. He who resumes land assigned to gods or to a Brāhmaṇa preceptor, whether by himself or by another, goes to hell. Undoubtedly confiscation of land means the confiscation of everything; therefore any one who confiscates land lives in hell for an endless period. A village (grant) should be made by all kings be continued to sons, grandsons, &c., as long as the Sun and the Moon, Mountains and the Ocean exist. A village should be continued by kings always pleased, with all grants made to Brāhmaṇas and gods by previous men. Grant finished. Written by Prekārya, a writer of Bhanāyaka, the Pātala Karaṇa. Engraved by Sekāreṇaṇyaṇa, son of Stambu. Welfare and great prosperity.

Remarks.

This being the first inscription hitherto known of this dynasty, and the language of the copperplate very inaccurate we are not able to derive from it much satisfactory information. Still what it gives, so far as I can interpret it, is of importance in bringing to light a Yādava dynasty of which we had previously no knowledge, and should the Nāsik zilla yield us more copper-plates of this dynasty, we may be able to extend our knowledge of the subject.

This inscription records the gift of Chincholi in the Sindi petty division of twelve villages by king Sūnachandra to the royal family priest Šravadvāchārya, the pupil of Šravlavačārya. The Achārya appears to have been a Pāśupata as he is described in the plate as ‘acquainted with the numerous principles of Śaiva lore.’ The grant is dated Śaka 991, on Thursday the bright half of Śrāvaṇa in the Saumya saṅvatar. About the first king Driḍhāparāhā the inscription says, Driḍhāppattanaśadāh ‘arrived from the city of Dvāravati and Chandrāditya puram prasiddhamakarat prakṣeṣambhavam yo bhūri ‘who made famous the already existing Chandrādityapura.’ It would appear from this that he was the first king of this dynasty, and that he made Chandrādityapura his capital.

---

81 The meaning of this expression is not clear. बलित means घरों. Probably बलित was one of the articles levied from every village is times of war, and the grant allows the doner an exemption from this taking away of arrows and other ammunition in times of war.

82 Exempt from कर and वाणी. The sense is not clear, but exemption from taxes is intended. वाणी is used in other inscriptions. Compare संस्कार-मूलनयाय. Ind. Ant. vol. IX., p. 298.
Though I cannot identify this Chandrādityapura with any modern place, it should be looked for somewhere in the present Nāsik zilla because Dridhaprabhārā ruled, I believe, over almost the whole of the present Nāsik collectorate. My reasons for this are (1), that the village of Chinholi, of which the grant is made, is still known by the same name, and lies about twelve miles south-east of Nāsik on the high road from Sangannār; (2), that I identify Sindērā in which Dridhaprabhārā’s son Senaḥchandra is described as having settled Senapura, with Sinnar, a place of antiquity about twenty miles south of Nāsik and still the headquarters of a tālūka; (3), I have another inscription of, probably, this very dynasty, from a Jaina temple at Anjanērā, about fifteen miles south-west of Nāsik, which shows that in Śaka 1063 (A.D. 1141) a Yādava king named Senaḥchandra was ruling there. And lastly, I believe, the most important of my reasons, is the following passage in the Nāslashakalpa, of Jinarābhāsūri:

“Now when the sage Divāna (Sk. Divyāna) burnt Brāhmaṇa (Dvāravatai) and when the Yādava dynasty was on the point of being exterminated, the sage respectfully rescued from the flames of the burning city the pregnant wife of the Yādava Kṣatriya Vajrakumāra. She came and lived under the refuge (i.e., in the temple) of Chandraprabhāsūmi (the eighth Tirthankara). When her burthen was mature, she gave birth to a son in the Kuntivihāra. He was named Daḥapahārā (Dridhaprabhārā) and when he came of age he grew a mighty warrior, able single-handed to fight a hundred thousand combatants. It so happened at one time that thieves stole away (the village) kine; and Daḥapahārā triumphed over the thieves brought them back. The Brāhmaṇas and other inhabitants of the

city, finding in him a great hero, gave him Tālāragnavatya. Subsequently Daḥapahārā punished the robbers and became a great king. In this city the Yādava dynasty took root once more, and with great respect they repaired the temple of Chandraprabhāsūmi.”

I do not see anything against believing that the Dridhapaḥārā of the grant, and the Daḥapahārā of this extract are one and the same. The plate simply says that he arrived from Dvāravati and made famous the old town of Chandrādityapura; this extract tells us also about how he was born, his great reputation for valour in his early years, how he got Tālāragnavatya (?) in reward for his heroic service to the village or city where he lived, and how finally he was appointed king.

What the original place was from whence he came is not stated, but it appears from our plate that he made Chandrādityapura his capital. If Chandrādityapura takes its name from Chandraprabhāsūmi it may be Anjanērā where there is a good large temple of that Tirthaṅkara, with the wall inscription noticed below; or it may, and I think with greater probability, be Chandrapura or Chandora, about forty miles north-east of Nāsik.

After Dridhapaḥārā came his son Senaḥchandra. He is described as tamakābhūt, ‘produced from him,’ and may, therefore, be supposed to be his son. The only thing else mentioned about him is that he founded Senapura in Sindērā. It may either mean that he founded the town of Senapura in the sub-division of Sindērā (Sinnar) or it may be, the suburb85 of Senapura in the city of Sindērā (Sinnar).85

The third king is Dvādiyappā, distinctly mentioned as Senaḥchandra’s son. After
him comes Bṛhadbhilla or 'the great Bhilla,' and there is a tatah at the end of verse 5, there is nothing against supposing that he is the son of Dvādiṣya, at least I have put him as such in the genealogical table. The next king is Śrīrāja. His relationship with Bhilla is not clearly given. The text simply has Śrīrājastadavanaraḥ Śrīrāja after him." He was perhaps Bhilla's brother. The fifth king is Vaddiga. His relationship with Śrīrāja cannot be made out from the text which runs, Arvāktasya bahūwa bhūtalakahāḥ Śrīvaddigāhyo nṛipah. 'After him the illustrious Vaddiga, a Hari on earth, became king.' Arvāktasya, or more correctly Arvāktya, would mean 'before him,' i.e. before Śrīrāja. This is possible if Vaddiga followed his father Bhilla, and his kingdom was usurped by his uncle Śrīrāja."

In describing Vaddiga his wife is said to be the daughter of Jhanjha, by name Lachchhaiyā. This Jhanjha was the fifth of the North Konkan Śilhāras, and his date, I think, fits well in with this. Lachchhaiyā is mentioned as 'of the Rāshtrakūṭa dynasty, who was dhārīta in the non-age of the young prince, and who was worthy of being revered by three kingdoms.' Literally translated verse 5 appears much confused, but some inferences may be derived from it. I think Bhilla's son Vaddiga died, leaving a young boy. After a time, Śrīrāja probably usurped the kingdom, but only temporarily, for the Rāshtrakūṭas, overlords of the Śilhāra Jhanjha, appear to have taken up the cause of the daughter of their feudatory, and assisted her in opposing Śrīrāja and recovering the throne, at the same time regarding Lachchhaiyā as their daughter, as appears to have been the custom for overlords in India.

The next verse (6), is still more confusing. The description of a queen is given without even name or a word about the king her husband. The queen is described as the daughter of the Chālukya noble, Gōgirāja and as the best of three sisters. Her name is Nāyiyāllā, and she is described as the crowned queen of a Sāmanta. It is usual in such grants first to describe the king and then his queen, but in the present case I think the name and description of the king, his husband, is perhaps dropped by some mistake of the original scribe. The mention of Tēṣukā below is a difficulty hard to explain. He is called tasyāṅgadāśithā, or taking śīśṭā to be śīśṭa the language being throughout ungrammatical, it would mean 'the embracer of her body.' In fact Tēṣukā would then be her husband. But it is such difficulties as these which prove the necessity of another inscription of the same dynasty, and till other evidence is forthcoming I take Tēṣukā to be the son of Vaddiga; but this I do with great hesitation as the language is too ungrammatical and inaccurate to make sense of. The eighth king, Bhilla II, is said to have come from him (tatah), and I have no doubt he was Tēṣukā's son. He is described as worshipping the feet of the destroyer of evil doers dshktāmrda. Probably this is the name of his Ishāṭēya, and it may have been used like Daityāsūkana to mean Vishuṇa. There are more details about this king, which seem on the whole to mean that he fought with Āhavamalla, a great Chālukya king (1040-1069). This king seems to have gained a victory over him, and the fact of his having assumed 'universal sovereignty, or chakravartiśāya among kings, would seem to show that he attained power and extended his dominions; at least that his kingdom was in a very flourishing state under his rule. And in connection with his victory, it seems quite in consonance with Rājput practice that he married the sister of Āhavamalla and daughter of Jayatīthā, by name Avvaladrā, such marriages being regarded as cementing ties after hostilities. The ninth king is Sena-chantra II. He is said to be 'born in the same family' (vāṃsodbhava). He may be the son of Bhilla II, or perhaps a son of a noble, or he may simply be one of the same dynasty.

The last appears to have probably been the case, since he is described as having obtained the kingdom, having conquered all the kings of the earth, which would seem to show that after his death Bhilla's numerous conquests were probably lost, his own kingdom was in trouble, and that it was regained by Sena-chantra after fighting with other kings.

Senachandra's date is given as Śaka 991 or A.D. 1069. Vaddiga is mentioned above as the son-in-law of Jhanjha, and Jhanjha's date appears from Ma'sūdi to be somewhere

---

84 It may be that Vaddiga succeeded his father and died in his infancy. But this does not appear probable.
about Ś. 838.** Jñanāja must have been a contemporary of Vaddiga, or perhaps a little earlier. Assuming Vaddiga's date, therefore, to be about Ś. 860, we have about 131 years left for four kings (assuming one to be missing) or 33 for each. Similarly counting for the previous four generations an average of about 30 years, we have Drīḍhaprahāra about Śaka 740 or A.D. 818.**

This would make Drīḍhaprahāra nearly contemporary with Kapardi, and it would seem that the Yādava dynasty in the north-east was contemporary with the Thāna Sihāras.

How many kings reigned after Senechandra and how long the dynasty continued to rule is not known, but further copper-plates will, it is to be hoped, guide us to more accurate information.

The second inscription of this dynasty is from a ruined Jain temple in Anjanēśvara, about fifteen miles south-west of Nāsika. It would appear that after Senechandra II, kings of the same dynasty continued to rule for nearly three-quarters of a century. The inscription is on a sand-stone slab fixed on the right wall of the mandapa of the temple. The letters are very clearly cut in good Nāgari, and are well preserved. A reduced facsimile is given in the accompanying plate. The language is Sanskrit, both prose and verse, but the grammar is faulty.

Transcript.

(1) ते पच परमेव{}े ्नमः। सति भीमस्करति 106। तुदुमितसारसःमन्दिरस्वरूपसंचायां रोमे अनु-

(2) राजानन्धे सिल्लमें अर्थां संसारसामाधिदिवस्तुपूर्णाः तियो समिधासामपर्यं भर्त्यार्थप्रकाशात्

(3) भर्त्यार्थप्रकाशात् कुंकुमकल्लीकाक्रमनानागाधिनं सामंतेनागाधिनं सामंतः जमरा इवादिसत्सम

(4) निजराजलीकाविजलमहादत्त श्रीसेवदेवविवर्जेये तवप्रनासारऽत्त्वमहाहमः: पवार्य मन्दिरस्वरूपम्

(5) संभागाः[•]: बूढ़ेरिघाटविनमिनकन्त्रीकः अनसुलाततान्धृजस्विन्दशिककंकौः निष्ठानिष्ठूर्वीराविवर्जितारामुक्तां

(6) विकरिकुं मस्यलालितमुक्ताकल्लीकारिता मामात्मिरान्नन्मुनानं मामात्मिरान्नन्मुनानं परममहेष्ठम: स्त्रीराज्यार्थादिवारायि

(7) भवम्भुगसा त्ताहंचवसलीलंसून्तरस्वरूपः[•]: प्रवागायनान्नद सपुरुषार्यान्नतिविन्दिततीतितिविति

(8) व्ययं वास्तविण्वते दृढ़वेदी कृत्यायामा दृष्ट्वा नमस्त्वपरमहमोक्ताईशुरवितर्गतिवित्तिज्ञानानं नुमुलनं: क्षिप्तादिवशिवारायि

(9) लावनकवियोगवन्दतिततारि: व्ययं कृत्यार्थायि भवाय: संभागविनम्यायसल्लं: राज्यां इत्यन्तरार: 

(10) भव्यानुक: हिमादिति: अपरिनिम्नपितिनिवित: पाहण्यसंपर्यातिवितर्गतिभवति: देवविज्ञेयार्थ यो साधुपुरुसारिन: दीनाना-

** See Ind. Ant., vol. IX, pp. 33-46; Pratibuddh d'or, tome II, p. 86.
** It would be more in accordance with other cases to give 210 years to eight generations, and carry back Drīḍhaprahāra to about Ś. 790.—Ed. I. A.

Read दे for दे. * Read दे for दे.  3 Read दे for दे. A This sentence does not make good sense. If a रे be supposed to have been omitted after ग्रामायन the reading would be ग्रामायन क्षिप्तादिवारायि: which make sense. 4 Read राज्यां.  5 Read दीनाना. * This sentence makes no sense. 6 For बाह्य read बाह्य.
Salutation to the five Paraméshtis. Hail and Prosperity! In the Saka year 1013 and in the Dundubhi sakavatesara on Monday the fifteenth of the bright half of Jyeshtha in the Anuradha constellation, in the Siddha conjunction, in the above mentioned year, month, fortnight and day, in the triumphant rule of the illustrious Śrīnādeva, who has obtained the five great titles, the lord of the city of Dwāravati, descended from Visuha, the sun expanding the lotus bud-like Yādava family (like) a Narayana among the Yādava, the grandfather of Sāmantas (feudatory chiefs) and the Jamara of Sāmantas, &c., thus adorned by all his royal titles, while the illustrious Pānunamaddauri, who has attained (the dignity of) a mahāmahattama by his (kind) favour, who, by his fierce majesty has put down his enemies,

Translation.

The five Paraméshtis are the principal objects of reverence to the Jains. Even their principal mantra ordains an obeisance, namasbhramah to the five Paraméshtis:

The custom of throwing water from the palm of the hand when giving gifts is well known.

Poets generally describe pearls dropping from the temples of elephants.
different enjoyments, royal policy and by good qualities in various matters, who foiled the intentions of his enemies, the dying post of the triumphant glory obtained in battles, possessed of (great) depth like the ocean, possessed of unmeasured greatness like the Himalayas, possessed of the six qualities, and upholding them without any change, devoted to the service of gods, Brāhmaṇas, elders, good preceptors and sages, able to deliver (from misery) the poor and helpless, like the sun, his rise increasing everyday, a fort of mirth (?), while he—possessed of these qualities, was managing all (state) affairs, at that time Seuṇḍēva the great king with (his) minister, having considered, gave, through devotion, to the lord (Tirathaka) Chandraprabha, two shops free from burdens. And to lord Chandraprabha, the destroyer of Kāma, whose body and features are pure, the benefactor of all beings, the merchant, Vatsarāja, the front mark (best) of his family, devoted to the worship of gods, Brāhmaṇas, elders and good preceptors, with merchants Lāhada and Dāśaratha gave their own shop and house. And in the city settled five Dharmaśastra a year. The giver of land obtains as the fruit, long life, sons, wealth, happiness, good luck, a permanent kingdom, greatness, glory and heaven. Earth has been enjoyed by many kings, Sāgar and others; he to whom it belongs at a particular period, to him goes then the fruit. The giver (of land) and adviser of the gift reside in heaven, (while) he who takes away or advises taking away land suffers torment in the Reuṛaśa hell. He who resumes land given by himself or by another, becomes a worm in dung for sixty thousand years. This, a commandment about shops, was written on stone by the illustrious Divākaru Paṇḍit, the son of the illustrious Kolaṣhvara Paṇḍit, a lion towards elephant-like bad astrologers, and like a bee covetous of honey given up to the lotus feet of good astrologers. Welfare and great prosperity!

Remake.

This would show that on Monday the fifth day of the bright half of Jyēṣṭha in Śaka 1063 Dundubhi saṅvatsara, king Seuṇachandra III gave three shops in the city (probably Anjanēri) for maintaining the temple of Chandraprabha the eighth Tirathaka; and that a rich merchant named Vatsarāja with two others, Lāhada and Dāśaratha, gave a shop and a house for the same purpose. The officer, mahāmahattama, in charge of the town where the temple stands, who has a host of useless adjectives, has a very old sounding name—Pānumaddaunu. I have never come across another so strange.

As the Seuṇachandra of this inscription has got the same name and attributes as the Seuṇachandra of the copper-plate, i. e., Deśātavāpuravarādhāvara, Viśvamangodaḥva, and Yādavakulakamaśvāśabhadākara, I make no doubt that he is a descendant of the same Yādava family. It appears that a period of seventy-two years has elapsed between the two Seuṇachandras; in other words, there must be two, probably three kings between them about whom we have no information. How long after Seuṇachandra III, the dynasty continued to rule is a matter for future inquiry.

From the materials already available the following genealogy may be traced:

1. Driḥhaprabāhā, cir. Śaka 740
2. Seuṇachandra
3. Deśādityappa
4. Bhillama 6. Śrīrāja
5. Vaddiga md. dr. of Jhanjha Silhāra, Ś. 838
6. Tēsukha md. dr. of Gōgirāja a Chālukya, Sāmanta
7. Bhillama (II.) md. dr. of Jayasimha Chālukya by the sister of Āhavamalla
8. Seuṇachandra (II.) Śaka 991
9. Seuṇachandra (II.) Śaka 1063

---

**The word in the original for merchant is śādhā. It is met with in medieval inscriptions. The modern corruptions from it are ṣāḍh and ṣāh, used as a title for merchants.**

**This coin seems to have been then current, and was almost certainly the Gadhaśaya coins, of the corrupt Saasanian type. These Gadhaśaya coins were current under that name under the Anhilvāda kings and the Mālwa Parmārīs.**
CHINGHIZ KHÁN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

BY HENRY H. HOWORTH, F.S.A.

(Continued from p. 86.)

XX.

Chinghiz Khán was now a very potent chieftain. He was the master of the wide steppes of Mongolia and Sungaria, from the Khinggan chain in the east to the Altai in the west, while Dauria and China formed his northern and southern boundaries respectively. Like previous nomadic leaders who had secured a like power, he now turned his attention to the great Empire on the south, which has survived so many catastrophes and changes, and the continuity of whose history is to-day one of the puzzles of the political philosopher. Chinghiz, in assailing China, was not merely satisfying the cravings of ambition, but had the further purpose of revenging private wrongs, and the murder of his not remote ancestors whose death we described in an earlier page. China at this time comprised two empires. Its southern portion was ruled by a native dynasty known as the Sung, while its northern portion was ruled by a race of foreigners known as the Kin, or Golden Tartars. The Sung dynasty was founded about the year 960, and for a while controlled the fortunes of a large part of southern China. Its Northern portion, comprising sixteen districts in the provinces of Po'chih-li, Shan-si, and Lian-tung, had for some time been occupied by the Khitans, a race who were closely allied to the Manchu Tartars but had some Mongol and perhaps Turkish blood mixed with them. They were masters of Tartary from the Altai to the Yellow Sea, and the Sung Emperors also paid tribute to them. About the year 1114 the power of the Khitans was shattered by the revolt of a people of Manchuria identical in race with the present Manchus, who, under their chief, Aguta, speedily conquered the districts of Northern China held by the Khitans, and, after numerous victories gained over the Sung Emperor, secured the cession of a large district hitherto ruled by the latter and the payment of a considerable tribute. Aguta gave his dynasty the title of Kin, or the golden, and his people are generally known as the Golden Tartars. The boundary between the Kin and Sung empires was fixed at the rivers Hoai and Han. The great provinces of Pe'chih-li, Shan-si, Shang-tung, Honan, and the southern part of Shen-si were dominated by the Kin Tartars. Their capital was Yencing, situated near the modern Peking, and they called it Chung-fu, i.e., Imperial city of the centre. The Mongols called it Khanbaligh, i.e., the City of the Khan, or the Imperial Residence. In addition to it they held four other cities which were dignified as Imperial residences, i.e., Liao-yang-chau in Liao-tung, called the Eastern capital (Tung-king), 2, Tai-tung-fu in Shan-si, called the Western capital (Si-king); 3, Pien-leang or Kai-fung-fu on the southern bank of the Yellow River in Honan, called the Southern capital (Nan-king), and lastly Ta-ning-fu on the river Loha, north of China, which was called the Northern capital (Peking). 4 The Kin Tartars, while they ruled a much larger area in China than the Khitans, were much less powerful than the latter in the steppes of Mongolia and Tartary. They were acknowledged as masters, no doubt, in Manchuria, the old home of their race; the Khitans, who still lived in Liao-tung and its borders also acknowledged their supremacy, but the various tribes west of the Khinggan range and north of the mountain buttresses limiting China on the north retained the very slightest ties towards the new masters of China; and were not, as in the time of the Khitans, immediately subject to them. It is from the time of the Kin domination in China that the Mongols, in fact, first began to assume shape as an independent community, and we have seen how they

showed their independence before Chinghiz Khan was heard of.

We will now turn to the latter's famous campaign against the Kin empire. Although the Mongols were virtually independent of the Kin Tartars, it seems that they paid them a certain tribute, and we are told that when the Kin emperor, Taiho, i.e. Chung-tsung, who reigned from 1189 to 1208, sent Yun-tsi, who was his uncle, and who held the fief of Wei, in Honan, to receive their tribute at Tsing-chau, i.e. Kuku Khoten, Chinghiz, who despised him, omitted the usual ceremonies of welcome, and when Yun-tsi returned home he tried to persuade his nephew, the emperor, to send an army to punish him. The latter would not consent. At length, in 1208, he was succeeded by Yun-tsi, otherwise called Chong-hei. On his accession an officer was sent to apprise Chinghiz, and to demand tribute. Instead of kneeling down to receive his orders in the usual way, Chinghiz asked him on whose behalf he had come. When he replied Yun-tsi; the Mongol chief turned towards the south, spat in the air, and replied scornfully that he had understood that hitherto an emperor of China was the son of heaven, but he did not see how an imbecile like Chong-hei could use such a title. He accordingly mounted on horseback and withdrew. When Yun-tsi heard what had happened he was much enraged, but he was afraid to declare war, and determined to put the Mongol chief to death when he came to do homage. Chinghiz having heard of this made up his mind to break completely with the Kin court. Chinghiz had grievances ready to his hand. We have seen how the Kin authorities had put to death some of his relatives in an ignominious way before his own accession. It would seem they had repeated the offence more recently, and according to the Yuan-shi-lei-pen, in 1208, when they put to death one of his relations named Ching pu-hai, called Sjen-pu-hai-han by De Mailla. We are further told that in the previous reign some Kin officers who had deserted had incited him to attack the Kin empire, on the ground that its ruler was haughty and proud and hated by his people.

Palladius reports a Chinese legend that a deserter incited Chinghiz Khan to march, on the ground that the Kin emperor was continually degrading and killing his relatives. Chinghiz having determined to attack the empire sent Chepe to make a preliminary raid, with orders to march eastwards if he should succeed in defeating the invaders. His duty was no doubt that of reconnoitting the country and he presently returned with the fruit of his pillage. The Yuan-shi-lei-pen says he was accompanied by the Khitan chief Yelu Kohai who, we are told, was a great Mandarin among the Kins, and had been sent as an envoy by them to Chinghiz with whom he was so charmed that he determined to join him, which he did after putting his wife and children in safety. Chinghiz now prepared for a vigorous campaign the following year. Before setting out, according to Rashidu’l-din, he called his followers around him, and recalled to them how his ancestors had suffered great indignities and hardships at the hands of the Chinese monarch. He said through the favour of God he had triumphed over his various enemies, and through the help of the same God he would conquer this empire also, and raise the reputation of the Mongols to the highest point. They applauded this speech, and it was determined first to send an envoy to the Altan Khan or Golden Khan, as the Kin Wangti was known to the Mongols, to bid him submit, and in case he should refuse, to apprise him that war must be the consequence. For this duty, Jafar Khoja was selected. The Tabakat-i-Nasiri describes him as a Musulman trader. Rashid speaks of him as one of Chinghiz Khan’s principal people. Rashid has reported his message in rhetorical language, and makes him remind the Altan Khan how God had selected him and his family to lead the other Mongols, and how his authority had in a few years extended over a wide area, and that the penalty of resisting him was the utter destruction of house and goods, wealth and dependents. His power was now so well established that he was ready to march against China with an army numerous as the waves, either to secure peace or to enforce war.

* Alluding to the title of Tien-tsi which the Chinese Wangtis affect.

* Douglas, pp. 58 and 60; Hayacinthe, pp. 43-45; De Mailla, tome IX, pp. 43 and 44; Gaubil, p. 14; D’Ohsson, vol. I, pp. 126 and 128 notes.
If the Altan Khân was willing, he invited him to a conference, where the affairs of China might be settled, and where he undertook to remit to him again the kingdom on his acknowledging him as his Padishah. If he did not care to meet him in person he was to send him some precious gifts, and also to send his sons as hostages. If he did this all would be well, if not they must appeal to the sword until God should deck whom he would with the crown of good fortune and sovereignty, and whom he would also with the mantle of indigence and wretchedness. This dictatorial message was naturally resented by the Wangtî or Emperor. He reminded Chinghiz in his reply that he would find him and his people very different to a tribe of Turks, that if he had the intention of attacking him he would not prevent it, but he was ready for him, and would make him suffer accordingly. Jafar Khoja, we are told by Rashidu'd-dîn, returned with this answer, and carefully took observations of the various roads, towns, and fortresses, mountains and men on his route. The Tabakat-i-Nasiri says he was imprisoned by orders of the Altan Khân, but managed to escape after he had been confined for some time, and rejoined his master by a secret route. This Jafar Khoja who is made a Muslim by the author of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri, and who, if he was a Khoja, was undoubtedly a Musalman, was perhaps no other than the Chapar, the Guebir or Fire worshipper of the Chinese writers, whom we have met at an earlier stage of this inquiry, and whom we shall meet again. Having made his various preparations for the campaign, Chinghiz, before setting out, we are told by Rashidu'd-dîn, climbed a high mountain, where loosening his girdle and hanging it about his neck, he untied the fastenings of his tunic and kneeling down, prayed in these words:

"O Thou who knowest the deepest secrets; Thou knowest the secret of this Thy servant, give heed to his ardent prayer! O Almighty God! to whom the truth is as patent as the sphere of Heaven! O Thou who orderest the light and the day as well as darkness and night! O Eternal God! thou knowest that it is not I who have begun the fight and the struggle of war, but that the dust of discord and strife has arisen from the Khitan Khân, who put to death my excellent forefathers Ukin Barkhak and Anbakhai Khân without their having committed any fault or crime. I only seek retribution and revenge for their blood. If right be on my side, grant me from above strength and victory, and order my generals and secret counsellors the Peris and Divs of the earth, to aid me." We are further told Chinghiz spent several days and nights in these ardent prayers, and then returned to lead his army. The author of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri, whose story just begins to be of service at this time, but who although an earlier is a very inferior authority to Rashidu'd-dîn, tells this tale more suau. He says that Chinghiz collected all the Mongols at the foot of a mountain and separated the men from the women, and the children from their mothers; and that for three days and nights all remained bareheaded and fasting, and no animal was allowed to give milk to its young. Chinghiz himself entered a kharga, or felt tent, and put a tent-ropo about his neck and did not come out for three days and nights, during which time the people called out continually, Tengri, Tengri, i. e. God! God! On the fourth day he came out of the tent and declared that Tengri had given him the victory, and that they should now get ready to attack the Altan Khân. Having spent three more days in fasting he accordingly set out. The mountain where this took place was perhaps the well-known Mount Darkhan, south of the Kerulon, which is closely connected with the traditions of the great conqueror, and is much revered by the Mongols. Its name of Darkhan ("smith") is said to have been given to it because Chinghiz Khân once forged iron at its foot. Timofski visited it on his way to China and mounted to its summit. He tells us that on its extreme southern height there is a great stone obo, erected by the Mongols, who go there every summer to celebrate the memory of Chinghiz Khân. He adds that from its summit there is a prospect over a boundless plain. Towards the east are eight salt lakes, further on the same side are the blue mountains of the Kerulon, while to the west is an immense tract covered with pointed eminences. The anvil of Chinghiz
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8 Erdmann, pp. 317 and 318; Abulghazi, pp. 94 and 95; Tabakat-i-Nasiri, p. 304. 9 i. e. the good and evil genii. 10 Erdmann, pp. 318 and 319; D'Olsson, vol. I, pp. 123 and 124.
is said to be still preserved on this mountain and to be made of a particular metal called Buryan, which has the properties of iron and copper, being hard and flexible. The Kin court was as usual deluded into a false security. Na-ha-mai-chu who commanded on the frontier warned his master Yun-tsi of the increasing power of the Mongols, how they had subdued the surrounding tribes; how the king of Hia had given his daughter in marriage to their leader; and how they were busy manufacturing arms of all kinds and exercising their young people in the art of war. Yun-tsi fatuously replied to his warnings that there was no ill-will between him and the Mongol sovereign, why then should he be afraid, and persuaded that Na-ha-mai-chu must have himself aroused the anger of the Mongols he had him arrested and put in prison. Meanwhile Chinghiz left the banks of the Kerulon in March 1211, and marched across the Gobi steppe. He was accompanied by his four sons, Juchi, Jagatai, Ogota, and Tului, and very probably also by the Idikut of the Uighurs and the chief of the Karluks, and he was certainly in alliance with the leader of the Onguts or White Tartars. To protect his ordus or heme camps, and to restrain the recently conquered tribes, he left the Kunkerat Tuguchar, also called Dilan Turkhan Tukhantar, who was probably a near relative of his, with a contingent of 2,000 (!) men. The Huang-Yuan merely says Chinghiz sent Tekhu-chan with 3,000 troops to watch the western frontiers.

So far as we can make out the Mongols on this famous march followed the route taken in our own day by the Russian traveller Timkofski, and described in his travels, and they doubtless passed near the same point—the low rampart of earth which is marked on the map as traversing the Mongolian desert from east to west near Mount Ougan, and which is said to have formerly divided China from independent Mongolia. Timkofski says this rampart extends very far from east to west, and seems to join the heights from which the Orkhon flows. "At the station of Tulga," (north of Chaghaz Balghassum) says Timkofski, "a caprice of nature has placed in a valley three rocks, turning towards the east, north, and south, which resemble great heaps of stones piled upon each other. At the foot of each of these rocks is a well, the water of which has a nitrous taste. The inhabitants call them Garban Tulgod, and pretend that Chinghiz Khan encamped here when at war with China. At a distance to the south-east of the station is a great obo." The approach to Chica from the Gobi has been graphically described by the same traveller. He says: "Two versts further we reached the chain of mountains which separates Mongolia from China. On their summits there is a stone rampart, with square brick towers, a certain distance from each other. They are nine sages high and three sages square at the base. From this point China presents its grandest forms. To the south-east and west the horizon is bounded by mountains covered with snow, the summits of which rise above the clouds. We descended for five versts by a narrow road, very dangerous at this season, as far as the Chinese village of Nor-tian; on the right hand the above-mentioned rampart runs along the heights; on the left side is a steep precipice; farther on towards the east are rude and lofty mountains, which give the country a wild appearance. Such is the aspect of the country at the place where we descend from the high steppes of Mongolia into the lower land of China."

The Mongol campaign is very difficult to follow, nor is it possible to reconcile the various authorities. It would seem that their plan involved operations against Ta-tung-fu, the Western capital, and also against Yen-king, and that two armies were employed for the purpose; one of them commanded by Chinghiz in person, the other by Chepe Noyan, who had made the preliminary raid the year before. We will first refer to the latter. Chepe's raid just mentioned frightened the Kin emperor, who released his general Na-ha-mai-chu, and sent Nien-khuru with a message of peace to the Mongols, but all his advances were rejected, and he therefore ordered the generals, Tangi Tsangianunu, Warnyan-Khosho and Khesheri-Khunshakhu, the
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18 Id. p. 173.
19 De Maill, tome IX, pp. 48 and 45.
last of whom was Governor of Tai-tung-fu, to watch the Mongol movements, and prepare to repel them. When these generals arrived at Wu-shau-pan (the Wu-sha-pka of Hyacinthe, and the U-chao-pao of De Mailla), which they had previously occupied, they had barely time to take defensive measures when the Mongols attacked and captured the place. The Mongols also occupied the town or camp of Wu-yue-ing, (called U-yue-ing, by De Mailla) and sacked the little town of Bai-ding-ten situated a league to the east of Tai-tong-fu, to which they proceeded to lay siege. In the course of seven days Khushakhu, who commanded there, made a sortie with the garrison and traversed the besieger's lines. He was hotly pursued by a body of 3,000 men as far as Tsai-ping-kheon. D'Ossou says as far as Chang-ping-chau, a little north of Peking. The Kang-mu, as reported by the authors just named, tells us the Mongols also captured the Si-king or western capital, i.e., Tai-tung-fu, but this is hardly reconcilable with what followed, and it would rather seem that Chepe having overrun the northern part of Shao-si joined the main army under Chinghiz, to which we will now turn.

The K'In emperors had a fortified post of some importance north of the great wall and about thirty English miles north-west of Kalgan, which was called Fu-chau. Palladius identifies this place with the ramparts now known as Kara Bughusun. We are told that this town was of great importance during the period of the K'In dynasty whose emperors had a palace there, while Ch'ang-ch'au in a poem calls it Little Yen. This frontier post was apparently the first point for which Chinghiz Khan made and which he captured. The Mongols now crossed the Ye-khu-lin, i.e., the mountains separating China and Mongolia, and captured the districts of Ta-shih-lo and Fin-li. These are probably the towns called Tai-su and Ba-un-i by Rashidu-d-din. The Kang-mu tells us the K'In generals Wanian Kieukin and Waian Wannu had received orders to post themselves near the mountains Ye-khu-lin. Douglas says at the meeting of the waters near Suen-ping in the modern prefecture of Siaan-hwa, a third general, Wanian Hosho, followed them with the main army. Informed of their advance, Chinghiz marched upon Kho-el-tsun. A K'In officer named Mengan, who was sent to reconnoitre his position, deserted to him and informed him of what was taking place in the opposite camp. He determined to attack at once, speedily defeated the enemy, whose cavalry trampled upon the infantry, and many of them were killed. Advancing further into the country the Mongol advance guard caused so much terror that Wanian Hosho with his men hastily withdrew, and were pursued as far as Khoikki-pkhn or Hoei-ho-pao, a fortress on the river Hoi, where they were cut in pieces and Wanian Hosho barely escaped towards Siaan-te-fu. Douglas has abstracted another account of this battle apparently from the She-wei, from which it would appear that it was Mu-khu-li, Chinghiz Khan's famous general, who was the hero of the struggle; we are told he chose a number of dare-death warriors with whom he charged the enemy who was speedily routed and pursued as far as the river Hwuy, i.e. the Hoi, and countless corpses strewn the line of retreat. The Huang-yuan refers at some length to this struggle, which it says took place in Ye-khu-lin. It calls the two K'In generals in command of the main army, the Jaotao Gingin and the Tsian-Tsian Vein. The commander of the reserve he calls the Tsan-Jen Khusha. This account makes a Khitan general address Gingin and say: "It is reported that they have just destroyed Fu-chau and are dividing the spoil among the troops; their horses are grazing on the steppe; let us attack them when they don't expect us; we shall have to surprise them with swift cavalry." Gingin replied that this plan was dangerous, and said it was better to move the cavalry and infantry together which would be completely successful. Chinghiz, hearing of their approach moved to Khuan-err-
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30 Kang-mu in Hyacinthe, p. 50 and 51; D'Ossou, vol. I, pp. 130 and 131; and De Mailla, tome IX, p. 47.
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33 The editor says in a note that Jaotao, Tsian Tsian, and Tsan Jen are titles.
tsui to meet them. Gingin addressing Min-an-ni-iec. Mingan, one of his officers said, “Thou wast formerly an envoy to the North and knowest Tai-tsu Khuanda.” Go forth in front of the army and ask him the reason for his invasion. In what the Kin empire has offended him that he has undertaken the present war. If he will not listen then abuse him. Mingan accordingly suddenly whipped his horses and went over to the enemy. Chinghiz told his men to bind him, and that he would interrogate him after the battle.” The battle which followed was a very bloody one, and ended, we are told, in the destruction of the Kin army. After the fight Chinghiz, addressing Mingan, said, “I was not at variance with thee, why didst thou defame me before every one.” Mingan replied, “I long entertained the intention of submitting myself, but fearing it might be difficult I merely did what I was ordered, otherwise how could I have seen thy celestial face?” Chinghiz was content with his answer, and had him set free. Rashidun-din, as usual, tells a very similar story. Erdmann reads the names of the Kin generals as given by him, Kiukin Nazdu, Haju-tai-wanch, Wuta-naud and Gengun, and says they posted themselves in the mountain Hın-ngan-dian near Karanjiun close by a Khitan force commanded by Bakhu-seh who had the conversation above reported with Kiukin Nazdu. He says when Chinghiz heard of the enemy’s march his men were eating their food. They set out at his orders, laying down their kettles, and marched with two tucks or standards to Kon-yuen-chau, where they halted and ranged themselves in battle array. Here took place the incident already reported, of which Mingan was the hero. The slaughter was so great in the fight which followed that the beasts and birds of prey had a grand feast for a whole year. The Mongols afterwards pursued the enemy, had a struggle with the rear-guard of the Khitan division commanded by Nashteh, at a place called Khubtu Khabu, and put this also to flight. These battles, in which some of the principal officers of the Kin and Khitan troops fell, became very famous in the traditions of the Mongols. After his victory Chinghiz Khan advanced upon and occupied Siuan-te, now called Siuan-khau-fu. Bretschneider tells us that under the Kin dynasty this town was called Siuan-te-chu, after the Mongols captured it it was called Siuan-ning-fu. In 1263 it was called Siuan-te-fu, but in 1266 its name was again changed to Shun-ning-fu. Marco Polo calls the town Sin-da-chu, and tells us it was famous for its manufacturers of arms. Colonel Yule tells us that it is said to have been a summer residence of the later Mongol sovereigns, and fine parks full of grand trees remain on the western side. It is still a large town, and the capital of a Fu, about 25 miles south of the gate on the great wall at Chang-kia-kan, which the Mongols and Russians call Kalgan. There is still a manufacture of felt and woollen articles there. Timkofski passed through the town and tells us the crenellated wall which surrounds it is thirty feet high, and put him in mind of that of the Kremlin. It consists of two thin parallel brick walls, the intermediate space being filled up with clay and sand, the wall is flanked with towers. The travellers passed through three gates to enter the city, the first was covered with iron and large nails. At the second was the guard-house; thence there stretched a broad street bordered with shops of hardware and warehouses of carts, along which is the great triumphal gate. The town is called Sume by the Mongols. Timkofski describes it as thinly peopled, but during the Ming dynasty it was much more populous, and contained a garrison of 100,000 men to restrain the Mongols. The best felts and other woollen articles such as the caps worn by the Chinese peasants are manufactured here. Klapproth describes the town as of the first rank, and as the capital of the 16th and last district of the province of Chihli or Pe-chihli, having under its jurisdiction three cities of the 2nd rank and seven of the 3rd. It is 24 li in circumference, and has seven gates. Its walls were covered with brick in 1440, and repaired in 1676. It is situated on the left bank of the river Yang-ho, a tributary of the Sang-kan. The Yang-ho is crossed by two bridges, and there is a third five li to the south of the city. The district produces gold, silver, rock crystal, agate, marble, loadstone, lime, coal, alum, blue
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vitriol, mushrooms, and a great quantity of
musk, while small leopards, bears, chamois, and
another kind of wild goat" are found there.46

The Mongols next captured the city named
Tsin-ngan-hien in one place and Te-heng-fu
in another by De Mailla, who has made two places
out of the two names. It is called Te-sing-fu
by Hyacinthe and Tih-hing by Douglas. It
is now called Pao-ngan-chau, and is situated
north-west of the bifurcation of the rivers
San-kang and Yang-bo. Timofkofski tells us
this town is surrounded with an excellent
stone wall, and that it is pretty well built
according to the rules of Chinese architecture.

It has in the centre a large triumphal gate
with four entrances. The principal occupation of
the inhabitants are carpenters and joiners' work.47

Here Chinghiz seems to have been joined by
Chepe, who had overrun Northern Shan-si as we
have described. At all events we find the latter
mentioned in the next operations. The Kang-
mu tells us the Mongols laid siege to the
town. They met with a more serious
resistance than they expected, and were defeated
at the first assault. Chinghiz Khan's fourth son,
Tului, and Chiku-fuma, called the Khan's
Chiki by Hyacinthe, piqued at the resistance,
led the way on to the ramparts covered by their
shields, and cut a way for their soldiers, who
poured a volley of arrows on the defenders, and
the place was at length taken. Its capture was
followed by that of several other towns of the
department, but eventually the Mongols with-
drew, and these places once more fell into the
hands of the Kin.48 After reaching Tsin-ngan-
hien the Mongols advanced as far as the fortress
of Kiu-yung-kuan whose governor, Waniar Fu-
chau, frightened by the fugitives who arrived there, fled.49

Douglas adds to the other accounts
that Chepe pursued the fugitives southwards
through the wall and advanced on the capital.50

The Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi, in describing these
events, tells us that Chepe and Guigmika
were sent forward. Chepe arrived at Tsui-
yun-kuan. Noticing that the garrison had
fortified itself, he said they must be enticed
out. He therefore pretended to lead his army
back. The Kin troops noticing this retreat led
their forces out and pursued Chepe, who drew
them after him as far as Suian-de-fu into a
mountain hollow, where he turned upon them
and defeated them, after which the main body
of Chinghiz' army arrived and obtained a victo-
ry over the strongest regiments of the Kin,
namely, the Khitans and Churchit.51

When Chinghiz reached Tsui-yun-kuan the roads were
covered with heaps of the bodies of the slain as
with rotten trees. Chepe took Tsui-yun-kuan,
and Chinghiz traversing the pass encamped on
the Lunkhutai.52 The Kiu-yung or Tsui-yun-
kan or pass here named is the famous pass
leading into the plain of Peking, called the
Nan-kau pass by Europeans. It is situated
about 40 miles from Peking, and is remarkable,
inter alia, for a famous Mongol archway figured
by Colonel Yule,53 containing an inscription
in six languages, which has been illustrated in
more than one paper by my learned friend Mr.
Wylie. Timofkofski passed through the place,
and describes it as commanding the defiles
between the two branches of the great wall.
He has a graphic description of it: "After
having passed an arched gate," he says, "which is
under the principal tower, we entered a
large court. I felt a degree of pleasure in
climbing upon the wall, the ascent to the top
of which is by steps made for the use of the
soldiers on duty." "Notwithstanding the
many centuries which have elapsed since the
erection of this wall it was built with so much
skill and care that, far from falling to ruin,
looks like a stone rampart produced by
nature itself to defend the northern provinces
of China, Po'chihi, Shan-si, and Shen-si, from
the invasion of the Mongols, who have not
entirely lost their warlike character."

"The wall is properly composed of two thin
walls the tops of which are crenated; the interval
is filled up with earth and gravel. The foun-
dations consist of large unhewn stones; the
rest is of brick; its height is 26 feet, and
its breadth at the top 14 feet. Towers, in

which the Kin Tartars were known when living in Man-
charia. Palladius tells us the Khitans formed whole
corps in the service of the Kin, and were quartered on
the frontiers of China and Mongolia.

47 This name means a dragon and a god. Yuan-ch'ao-
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49 It was built about 200 B.C.
which there are many cast-iron cannon, are placed at about one hundred paces from each other. The great tower is decayed from age, the gate is much damaged, as well as the adjacent wall. No care is taken to keep it in repair." This great barrier, as Timofoski says, no doubt formed a very formidable barrier to the nomad horsemen of Mongolia, but the mountains and defiles which it traverses form an almost equally efficient protection. Especially difficult is the road where the fortress of Kiu-yung is. Our traveller tells us that the interior of the famous gate there is finely built, and that its walls are adorned with sculptured representations of heroes. He adds that Chinghiz Khan was not able to make himself master of it, but was obliged to return to Mongolia and to enter China by forcing a passage from the west. This statement is at direct issue with the evidence furnished by the Yuanshi, as we have seen. The capture of the Kiu-yung Pass naturally caused considerable panic among the Kin authorities, who began to fear even for their capital, and an order was issued forbidding any of the young men capable of bearing arms from leaving the place. It would seem that the invaders suffered some minor reverses in the district, for we read that the Kin emperor, frightened by the Mongol approach, their scouts having advanced as far as the walls of Chung-tu, determined to retire to Kai-ping-fu, but his troops having promised to oppose the enemy to the death, and having defeated them several times he changed his mind. The Huang-yuan, in describing these events, again corresponds to some extent with Rashidu’d-dhu’s narrative. It merely tells us in regard to Chinghiz Khan’s advance that he took Dashi-li and conquered Ushapu, and the three Jous (i.e. chaus) Chan, Khuw and Fu. Rashid says the Mongols first advanced to the river II, or Ti, and took the towns of Tai-sun and Ba-u-i. To revert to the more profitable Chinese authorities, we are told that discipline was now breaking down sadly in the Kin empire. It is true that the pusillanimous general, Wanian Hoaho, was punished by being degraded, but the army deemed the punishment too light. The emperor himself was a very weak person. Tu-shan-i, who commanded at Hoei-ning-fu, having learnt that the Mongols had advanced as far as the Department of Yen-king (i.e. of the modern Peking) sent an army of 20,000 men under Uksun-nutan to the rescue. The emperor was so pleased with his zeal that he summoned him to the Court and created him a minister, but he would not listen to his warnings when he urged upon him the importance of protecting Liau-tung, which was so far away, and argued that if attacked by the Mongols it must succumb unless succour was sent to it, and advised that one of the principal officers should be sent to put it in a proper state of defence. His easy master merely said there was no necessity to create alarm among the people.

Meanwhile the Mongols were not idle. Chinghiz Khan sent his three sons, Juchi, Chaghatai, and Ogotai, who each took a separate force and a separate route and captured the towns of Yun-pei, Tung-sheng-chau, Vu-chau or U-chau Su-chau or Sho-chau, Fong-chau or Fun-chau and Kin-chau or Sing-chau, six districts north of the great walls of Shan-si, and, as suggested by D’Ohsson, probably situated between the frontier mountains of Onga and the Chinese border in the country watered by the river Turgen which falls into the Yellow River where Koko-Khoten and the ruins of other towns still remain. They also secured the towns of Te-hing or Te-sing, Kung-chau or Hong-chau, Chang-p’king, Khuai-lai, or Hoai-lai, Tsing-shan, Fong-shan, Mi-yun, Fu-ning, and Tai-ning. Towards the east they conquered all the country of Ping-chau and Luan-chau, towards the south they advanced as far as Tsang-chau and Tsang-chau. Thus from Lin-khan in Lian-si south-westward as far as Sin-chau and Tai-chau all the country was subject to the Mongols. The Huang-yuan tells us that the three sons of Chinghiz above named destroyed the towns of Tuin-pei Dun-shen, Vu, Siuan, Nin, Fin, and Tasen-chau. Rashid tells us that after conquering Tai-su and

---

59 De Mailla, tom. IX p. 47 and 48.
62 Erdmann, 319.
65 Hyacinthe and De Mailla, loc. cit.
66 Hyacinthe, p. 40. De Mailla translates this last clause differently, and reads from Lin-chau and Hoangchau as far as beyond the river Lian, south-west as far as the country of Fin and Tai, all was subject to the Mongols.—Op. cit. vol. IX, p. 46.
Ba-u-ini, the Mongols went further and secured the towns of Nu-chau, Tu-khing-chau, Kin-chau, Suk-chau, and Khi-chau, names corresponding pretty closely to those above quoted from the Kang-mu. He says the three princes also secured the towns of Wei-chau, Ton-chin, Nu-chau, Sun-chau, and Yen-kin-chau. They also conquered the great city of Sebgin whose district furnished 70 towns, i.e. 700,000 fighting men. It was not besieged, but the inhabitants surrendered themselves freely. Raverty says it was the country of Khurjah or Khurjat, by which he understands Corea, which furnished 700,000 fighting men. If the name is reliable it seems to point to Manchuria, the country of the Churchis; if it be not in fact a mere synonym for the Kin empire, the name Sebgin of Erdmann, he reads as Sukin or Sunkin. The Yuen-shi adds that the success of the three brothers brought many adherents to the Mongol side, including several Kin officials. The most important ally, however, secured by the invaders was Yeliu Liuko, a chief of the Khitans, who is called Yelui-uga by Hyacinthe, Yaylu Lewko by Douglas, and Yelii-leuco by De Mailla.

The Yuen-shi tells us that the Khitans had their chief seats in the province of Liau-tung, and after they had lost their empire in China they seem to have retained a certain solidarity there under their own chiefs. At this time the most important Khitan chief was Yeliu Liuko just named, who was a tributary of the Kin empire. The Kin Tartars were naturally somewhat dubious about the loyalty of these Khitans, and we are told the emperor Yong-tai had given orders that wherever there were any Khitan families there should be settled at least twice the number of those of their own race, the Churchis. This surveillance caused great irritation among the Khitans, of which Chinghiz Khan heard and determined to avail himself. When he planned his campaign against China he accordingly sent Uachin, Prince of Hongkila, i.e. of the Konkurats, who was his brother-in-law, to Liu-tung, to rouse the Khitan chiefs on that side, and arrange for a joint attack upon the empire. He found Yeliu-liuko at the head of 100,000 men. Yeliu-liuko had been in the service of the Kin emperor and was in command of a thousand men and lived at Tsien-y on the northern frontiers. Fearing that his suspicious patron might blame him if the frontier post he commanded should be lost, he fled to the district of Long-ngaan, written Lan-an by Hyacinthe, where he speedily collected 100,000 men and took the title of grand general. Douglas says he proclaimed himself generally supreme with a general named Eta as second in command, and that his movement met with such success that the tents of his troops covered more than a hundred Chinese miles of country. Chinghiz heard of this rebellion while he was meditating an attack on China, and we are told he sent Uachin, Prince of Hongkila, to make inquiries and arrange a common plan of operations against the empire. De Mailla says he sent Anchin Noyan and Hontoko. The two were doubtless the two brothers of Chinghiz Khan's wife Burteh, who are called Alj Noyan, and Hukh Noyan by Rashidu'd-din. Douglas, by mistake, makes Chepe the envoy on this occasion. We are told that having questioned Yeliu-liuko he professed that he had rebelled against the Kin and in favour of Chinghiz, and that he would ere this have been to do homage to him if his horses and herds had been in a fit condition to make the journey. Anchin Noyan asked for some token of his good faith, and they accordingly climbed the mountain Yen-shan. Gaubil, who calls the mountain Kin, says the Chinese geography puts it 45 or 50 leagues north of Mukden the capital of Liau-tung. Here they sacrificed a horse and a white cow, turned towards the north, broke an arrow between them, and the Khitan chief swore to be faithful to the Mongols, who in turn swore to help him, and Anchin promised to propose to Chinghiz that after its conquest Liau-tung should be made over as a fief to Yeliu-liuko. When the Kin emperor heard of the outbreak of Yeliu-liuko he despatched Wanian Husha with an
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army of 60,000 men against him which was purposely exaggerated to a million. Douglas says that a reward was offered of a pound of gold for every pound of the rebel's bones, and a pound of silver for every pound of his flesh. De Mailla adds that a large sum and also a post was offered to any one who would bring his head. Yeliu-liuko sent to inform Chinghiz Khan, who despatched 3,000 men commanded by Anchin Noyan, Putuhoan, and Alutuhoa to his aid. They joined him in the district of Taisinoor, and it was not long before the Kin troops appeared. Annu, the nephew of Yeliu-liuko, who commanded the advanced guard of the Khitans, began the fight, and broke the ranks of the Kin troops, who were presently in full retreat, abandoning all their baggage, which Yeliu-liuko sent to Chinghiz Khan, retaining nothing for himself. He now took the title of prince of Liau. Douglas says Chinghiz Khan conferred on him the title of king, while that of queen was conferred on his concubine, Yoloshe. Finding force unavailing against the rebel, the Kin emperor sent an envoy to buy him over, but neither was this manœuvre successful, and the envoy returned strongly impressed with the opinion that Liuko was too firmly seated on his throne to be easily overturned. This report only added to the rage of the emperor, who, determining to make yet another attempt at coercion, despatched an army of 400,000 men against the rebellious province. This was also defeated, and its commander Wannu fled with the remnants of the army to the Tung-king or Eastern capital, the city now called Fung-tin-fu or Mukden. Liuko now took up his residence at Hien-ping, to which town he gave the name of Chung-king or Central Capital. Chinghiz Khan now apparently sent Chepe to his assistance. He proceeded to attack Liau-yang, the capital of Liau-tung, which was then known as Tung-king or the Eastern capital. After several efforts to secure it, finding that it did not yield to a direct attack, he had recourse to a ruse and retired for a while as if he was giving up his design. After having retired for six days he left his baggage and returned by forced marches with some of his best mounted troops, ordering each trooper to take a led horse with him, surprised the town, where his advent was not expected, and captured it. The Huang-yuan says that Chebi (as he is there styled) knowing the place was fortified within, having with his men destroyed the wall, retired 500 li. The Kin thought he had withdrawn altogether. He then ordered each of his men to take a led horse and having returned in 24 hours attacked the place and laid it waste savagely. Bashid says the same thing virtually, merely adding that he was induced to return by hearing at each station on his retreat that the citizens had given themselves up to security. He withdrew for fifty parasangs, and then returned. Liuko now definitely took the title of king of Liau-tung and adopted the style of Yuen-tung as that of his regnal years.

Let us now return to Chinghiz Khan. He seems to have left his son, Jagatai, with an army in the neighbourhood of Sian-hwa-fu, with which he captured the sub-prefectural city of Fung-shing. The Mongols also secured during the year 1212 the towns of Chang-chau and Huan-chau, situated north-east of Peking. When the general Heshelie-i-hushahu abandoned the western capital to the Mongols he went to Yu-chau, and having taken 5,000 taels, together with many robes and other treasures from the treasury there, and also appropriated a large number of horses belonging to private people and mandarins, which he, without orders, distributed among his followers, he went on to the fortress of Tsi-king-kuan whence he went to the Nan-king or Southern capital, where the emperor instead of reproving him declared him to be one of the best generals in the army. He became elated with this, and asked for an army of 20,000 men with which to march to Sian-ti. He was only given 3,000, and was ordered to encamp at Hoci-chuen. This is the account given by De Mailla apparently from the Kang-mu. In the Yuan-shi we read that after his campaign already described, Chinghiz Khan had to meet a fresh Kin army, 300,000 strong, under Hoheleu and Kiukien, called Keshere and Gunjan by Hyacinthe. The two armies met at Kuanertun (written Tanan-ell-tsun) by Hyacinthe, and called the
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mountain Ye-hu, 7 or 8 leagues west or west-north-west of Sian-ho-fu by Gaubil), and in the subsequent fight the Kin troops fled. Following up this success Chinghiz, in the autumn of 1212, laid siege to T'ai-tung-fu, the western capital, and enticed the Kin general, Gotun,** who had been sent to raise the siege, into the Meyu Pass,*** where he exterminated his troops. Chinghiz now renewed the siege, but was presently wounded by an arrow from the walls in an assault in which he lost many men, and accordingly drew off his troops and withdrew northwards into Mongolia.*** The Kin troops profited by his retreat and reoccupied Paogan, Sian-ho, i.e., Sian-ti-fu and Kiu-yung.*** Douglass says they reoccupied Seun-ping, Terhing-fu, and several fortified positions. The result of the campaign was, therefore, rather a gain of prestige than of territory. The Kin troops were beaten in several important engagements. Several of their most important positions were captured, and their internal weakness was amply proved.

As Gaubil says, the order of the Mongol conquests in the years 1211 and 1212 is not the same as told in the Tong-kien-kang-mu, Nian-ssu, and other histories. The order of events is, therefore, in some respects conjectural, and I do not profess to have cleared up all the difficulties of the story, which is, in fact, very involved.

ON DR. HOERNLE'S VERSION OF A NĀSIK INSCRIPTION AND THE GĀTHĀ DIALECT.

BY PROF. RANKEISHA GOPAL BHANDARKAR, M.A., FOONA.

In the middle of 1874 I spent about six weeks in deciphering and translating the inscriptions in the caves at Nāsim, and prepared a paper and submitted it to the International Congress of Orientalists held in London in that year. The paper has been published in the Transactions of the Congress. The reading of these inscriptions was a work of great difficulty, since some of them are in the Pāli or Prākṛit dialect, and others contain a mixture of Sanskrit and Prākṛit. The letters, too, in several of them, are faintly cut. I could derive very little assistance from the labours of my predecessor in the field, for, except the one which is almost entirely in Sanskrit, the inscriptions were misread by him. I could, therefore, never look upon my work as final, and was aware of its imperfections. Besides, the paper was printed in London, and as I could look over one proof only, there are a good many misprints. I have, therefore, long been thinking of revising the paper, and publishing it separately; but no opportunity has yet presented itself, and I now learn that Dr. Bühler has re-read and re-translated the inscriptions. What I have been able to do is to re-write my remarks on the relations between the Andhrabhṛtyas and the Satraps kings; and these I have embodied in a paper I have written for the Bombay Gazetteer. Since the time my translations appeared in the Transactions of the Congress, I have found one or two better readings proposed by other scholars. Similarly there is one proposed by Dr. Hoernle in his paper, published in the Indian Antiquary, ante pp. 27 f, to which I should attach great weight if I were to revise the paper. But that scholar has at the same time found fault with my translation of the inscription which is the subject of his paper, and which is one of the easiest in the series. He thinks I have mistranslated it. I desire therefore to discuss the matter here, so that scholars at large may be able to judge whether Dr. Hoernle has mistranslated it or I.

The inscription is No. 17 of Mr. West's series. Dr. Hoernle thinks he has discovered an important fact, viz. that the inscription is in the Gāthā dialect. This, in my opinion, does not come to more than saying that it contains a mixture of Sanskrit and Prākṛit, or that there are some ungrammatical forms in the inscription. For I believe the Gāthā dialect does not deserve to be called a dialect with distinctive characteristics. My views on it as well as on the language of these inscriptions, both of which I also consider alike, I have given in the Wilson Lectures which I delivered in 1877, but
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which, owing to several unfortunate circumstances, I have not yet been able to publish. I quote them here from my manuscript.

"In many other ancient monuments existing in the country, we often find inscriptions which are principally in two languages, the Sanskrit and the Pālī or Prākrit, understanding by this last term a dialect derived from Sanskrit. Those in the latter (Pālī) are mostly connected with Buddhism, though some Buddhistic inscriptions also—such as those discovered by General Cunningham at Mathurā several years ago—are in Sanskrit. In the caves at Kāñcheri, Nāsik, Junar, Nānaghat, Kārṇā, and some other places in this Presidency and in the Bhilsa topees, we have Pālī or Prākrit inscriptions. Most of these are short, but at Nāsik we have long ones in the caves of Ushavadā and Gotamiputra. The language of these latter is Pālī, and but a few forms are peculiar, such as datta and kīta for which the Pālī has dipna and kitā,—past passive participles of the roots dā and kṛi, and be for the numeral ‘two,’ instead of the Pālī dve or dvē. In Ushavadā’s cave we have one inscription (almost) entirely in Sanskrit, the rest are in Pālī or Prākrit, but we have an intermixture of Sanskrit words, and the conjuncts pra, tra, and khe often appear. In these and the smaller inscriptions we have such words as bāra for dēdra, kdrasaka for vārṣikha, bārisa for varsha, udīsa for uddēśya, while the Pālī forms of these words are dēdra, vāsīka, vāsīsa and uddēśvet. Some of these inscriptions were engraved so late as the third century, when the Pālī could hardly have been the vernacular. It had, however, become the sacred language of the Buddhists,—the mendicant priests, for whom the caves were intended, and even educated lay members of that persuasion understood it, and hence it was used in these inscriptions as Sanskrit was in others. The style of Gotamiputra’s charters, abounding as it does in long compounds and elaborate expressions, is very unlike the plain and simple language of Aśoka’s edicts. And at the end of these and that of his son, we are told that the officers of the kings who caused the charters to be engraved acted under the command of, i.e. wrote to the dictation of, “respected persons who were the compilers of all such documents.” It thus appears that the Pālī was at that time a sacred and a literary language among the Buddhists. And as to the language of other inscriptions which, like those of Gotamiputra and his son, were not composed by learned men, one can easily understand how ignorant persons not knowing Sanskrit or Pālī well, but still not ignorant enough to know nothing of both, would confound together Sanskrit, Pālī and vernacular words. Even in our days we find this phenomenon in the pātrikas or horoscopes written by our Jōśa or astrologers, which are neither in pure Sanskrit nor in pure vernacular, but contain a mixture of both, and the Sanskrit words and forms in which are incorrectly written. And an explanation of this nature I have also to give of another variety of language that is found in the writings of the Northern or Nepalese Buddhists. Unlike those of the Singhalese and Burmese Buddhists these are written in Sanskrit, but in such works as the Lalitavistāra, or the Life of Buddha, we find along with prose passages in pure Sanskrit a number of verses which contain words or forms which are not Sanskrit. Thus, for instance, we have—

वर्णमाला भरितोऽद्विव न अनुवद्ध द्वमनयत्वः
पुष्पार्को भण्डित अनुवद्ध इमनयत्वः

"You will here see that Karmasya, yuge, and yakṣā are, as in the Pālī, treated like nouns in a. Arha is dissolved into araha, and there are a few other instances of this process, such as kilūka for kiloka, iri for īri, hiri for īri, &c. But generally the conjunct consonants are retained as they are in Sanskrit, and not assimilated as in the Pālī. So also you have chodenā for chodanati, Māyā,1 gen. sing. of Māyā, upajnātāt,2 śunishyati,3 nīśabhatā,1 imperative second pers. pl., Samethā for Samayata, &c., and even such words as manapā,4 which are Pālī in every respect. But along with these Pālī characteristics, there are other peculiarities which must be attributed simply to carelessness. For instance, the case terminations are often omitted as in kāma sevati5 for kāman sevate, sugata6 for sugataḥ, when governed by pujyamit, moksha bhavhyati for moksha bhavishyati, &c. Such con-

3 Ib. p. 41, l. 9. 4 Ib. p. 42, l. 4.
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6 Ib. p. 42, l. 17. 7 Ib. p. 51, l. 15.
8 Ib. p. 42, l. 17. 9 Ib. p. 51, l. 15.
10 Ib. p. 51, l. 11.
11 Ib. p. 41, l. 10.
stractions as kṣāntyā ṣaurabhayasanapānāḥ for kṣāntiṣaurabhiyaḥ, Śilasamāḍhi tatha prayānayān for Śilasamāḍhiprayānayān are often to be met with.

"This language has, therefore, no fixed characteristics at all. We have seen that in such words as karma, jaga, and yaks above, the final consonant is dropped, and these as in the Pāli and the Prākrits made nouns in a. But yaksas, the original Sanskrit form, is also used as in kāriyākāśika, and there are instances in which other final consonants are preserved. Along with such a Pāli form as śunishyāti noticed above, such a Sanskrit one as śṛṇavanti is found. It therefore appears to me that this is not an independent language; but that the writers of the Gāthās knew the spoken language or Pāli, and that they were imperfectly acquainted with Sanskrit, knowing enough of it to see that the assimilation of consonants was a vulgarity, but not acquainted with its grammar. They intended to write in the more polished or literary language, but not knowing it well often used unconsciously the grammatical forms and the peculiar words of the vernacular. At the time when the Gāthās were written, the claims of the Pāli to be considered a separate language were probably not recognized, and it constituted the speech of the un instructed. Those who in this condition of things wished to write could not think of doing so in that form of speech, and therefore wrote in what they considered the language of educated men, but they knew it imperfectly, and hence produced such a heterogeneous compound as we have seen."

I give this rather long extract to show that in my opinion we should not in these inscriptions look for the characteristics of a settled or fixed dialect. The inscription under discussion was composed by one who wished to write Sanskrit, but did not know the language quite in the form which was finally given to it by the great grammarians and other authors. Hence, along with Sanskrit, we should expect to meet with a few Pāli or vernacular forms of words. I will now proceed to consider Dr. Hoernle's translation, and his objections to mine.

In the first line occurs the compound swaravadānātīrthakarena, used as an epithet of Ushavadāta. I translate it, "that presented gold and constructed flights of steps." Dr. Hoernle calls this a curious juxta-position. Why, I do not know. The inscription attributes such gifts and charitable deeds to Ushavadāta as have been considered peculiarly meritorious by Hindus from that to the present day, and are laid down in works on the Dharmaśāstra, with certain rituals to be used in making them. The giving away of a hundred thousand cows and of villages, feeding a hundred thousand Brāhmaṇa, furnishing Brāhmaṇa with the means of marrying, and all the rest, which are credited to Ushavadāta, are such; and among the meritorious deeds of this nature is the deed of giving swarva or gold, which is quite an independent gift. Swarva is mentioned as one of the ten chief dānas or religious gifts, in all treatises on the subject, and among them in Hemādri's Dānakhaṇḍa (p. 564-75, Ed. in Bibl. Ind.). Tīrtha is a flight of steps to a reservoir or stream of water, and is so explained by the native lexicographers, and is used in that sense in literature. Mallinātha, commenting on a verse in the Kīrtārjuniya, which contains that word, says, "as there are many people to enter a reservoir of water to which a tīrtha has been constructed but the maker of a tīrtha is rare, so &c." The making of a tīrtha, like that of constructing a bridge, is considered a meritorious deed. In a passage from the Āditya-Purāṇa, quoted by Hemādri, in the work mentioned above, tīrtha is named along with tadāy a tank, bāṇa, a well, setu a bridge, &c., as a thing the maker of which goes to heaven and lives there for crores of years (p. 155). Swaravadāna or the gift of gold and the construction of a flight of steps or a ghat, were the two religiously charitable deeds of Ushavadāta at Bārbarāyā, and therefore they are here put together. The inscription is an historical record, and not a work of imagination. If it were the latter one might well ask what is the necessary connection between them which led the author to put them together. But the muddy state of the river might have led the son-in-law of Nahapāna to construct a ghat there, and swaravadāna, being one of the several modes of charity which Hindu opinion held sacred, was made by him there as he made other gifts in other places.

The other objection brought forward by Dr. Hoernle is that dānakarena is, he imagines
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a rather unidiomatic expression." I suppose he means that the use of the root kṛi with dāna is not sanctioned by idiom. But in Hemādri’s Dānakhaṇḍa we have (p. 3, v. 17), tatkṛitadakṣṇāvīlakahari, "the waves of the water [poured on the occasion] of the gifts made by him"; (p. 34), yat kanyāṇaḥ pītā mātā yā yā mātā yā dānāḥ pījānam archanam, quoted from the Brāhma Purāṇa; (p. 90), dānāmaṅgalaṇaṁ, &c., pravṛddhānaṁ na kurya, quoted from Sātāyana; (p. 688), yat kṣīṁit kurya dānātadānuntyāya kalyane, extracted from the Vāmi-Purāṇa; and (p. 996), dānanaḥ teṇa prakārāyam, quoted from the Bhaviṣṭyottara. In these and a variety of other instances the root kṛi is used with dāna and therefore my way of dissolving the compound cannot be objected to on the score of idiom.

Now Dr. Hoernle’s translation of the compound which, he says, is also Dr. Bühler’s, is—"gave gold to build a sacred bathing place." This destroys the religious sense of dāna and makes the expression swarnaḍāna quite useless. Certainly the other works of Ushavadā, the rest-houses, tanks, wells, &c., were not constructed or dug by him with his own hands. He paid gold or money to get them also constructed or dug. Why then should the expression swarnaḍāna be used here, and not in those places? And what are bathing places as different from the ghātaś or flights of steps, and whence do you get them?

The next expression with my translation of which Dr. Hoernle finds fault is chatsuḍādva-sadhanapratīrṇa. He thinks that one kind of building only is intended by this compound, but beyond saying that in this Dr. Bühler agrees with him, he gives no reason whatever. But pratīrṇa, as I have stated in a note, is what in these days is called an annasattra, i.e., a house where travellers put up and are fed without charge. Dr. Hoernle calls it a rest-house. I have no objection to the word, provided he means what I mean; for Hemādri, (p. 152), explains pratīrṇa as pravāsinām dārayah, i.e., a shelter-house for travellers. Again, the Vāmi-Purāṇa as quoted by him, (p. 673) has—

"Having caused to be constructed for poor and helpless persons a pratīrṇa [in the shape of] a good house, very commodious (wide), having food and plentiful water, provided with a good door, and charming, he should dedicate it to travellers."

The establishment of such houses for poor travellers, i.e., the founding of pratīrṇa, forms an independent charitable deed of great merit (see Hemādri, Dān. pp. 673-677). There is another in the shape of giving houses to poor persons (pp. 646-663). Houses so given are sometimes spoken of as āvasathas. Thus Vēdevāsā, as quoted by Hemādri (p. 646), has—

रमणयासौ यथै दनायूष लोकसमाधिति।

"Having given away a charming house, āvasathas, he attained the other world." In the Ānuśāvanī-purāṇa of the Mahābhārata an account is given of several former kings having performed certain charitable deeds and obtained their fruits in the next world, and among them one is spoken of as "having given away charming houses to the twice-born and gone to heaven—"

रमणयासौ वरस्यद्विजया दिशाधृतो दिमागातः।

Ānuś. chap. 137, v. 10, Bomb. ed.

Similarly the Brāhmāṇḍa Purāṇa as quoted by Hemādri (p. 162), says that by giving away charming āvasathas or houses, one attains the fruit of the Rājasya sacrifice. The extract from the Mahābhārata given on the next page by the same writer contains a verse in which the giving away of vihārāṇa or pleasure houses, is associated with the giving away of gardens and wells.

Thus then, āvasathādaṇa and pratīrṇadāṇa are two different things, and therefore the compound does not express one thing only. Now chatuṣḍālā might be taken as an attribute of āvasathā, but even here, seeing how gifts of different things are associated in the other compounds used in this inscription, I think it is better to take that also separately.

The next expression in dispute is Ibā-Puṇḍarīka-Dāmanī-Tāpi- Karabera-Dhākamukhā śrīpratāparakarēṇa. Dr. Hoernle takes nivedārpanārakorēṇa as one compound, and Ibē—Dhākamukhā as another. This last is, according to him, in the accusative case. I would ask 'What is the accusative governed by?' But this is not
a difficulty with Dr. Hoernle, for he says "the accusative is used for the locative." He thinks this is a rule of the Gāthā dialect; and to prove that rule he adduces four instances only,—two from the Mahāvastu and two from the Lalitavistāra,—though he says this substitution of the one case for the other is "particularly frequent." I am sorry the Mahāvastu is not at hand, but the first reference to the Lalitavistāra I have verified. There the words are yathābhikṣeśu Rājagrihas vihṛtya, "having diverted or enjoyed himself in Rājagriha in accordance with his wishes." Now Rājagriha is, according to Dr. Hoernle, by a Gāthā rule, an accusative used for the locative. In Sanskrit proper the accusative, he thinks, would not be put here. He appears to me to follow the Editor of the work, and since the latter professes to explain what he considers peculiar Gāthā expressions in the footnotes, and since here in a footnote the Editor does give Rājagriha as an equivalent for Rājagrihain, his conclusion is that the accusative is here used for the locative. But Patanjali, the great grammarian, commenting on a Kārikā to Pāṇ. I. 4. 51 says:—

देवशास्त्रंकरणोऽपि भवति चक्षूषयोऽष्टि

i.e. the place where an action denoted by an intransitive root is performed is to be called a karma or object, and as such should be put in the accusative case. The instances he gives are Kariṇa svapati, 'he sleeps in the Kurus', Pańchālaṁ svapati, 'he sleeps in the Pańchālas'. This observation of Patanjali and the first instance are given in the Siddhānta Kauṣumī. In virtue of this rule of Sanskrit then, not of the supposed Gāthā dialect, Rājagriha, in the passage from the Lalitavistāra, being the place where the action denoted by the root ḍhi with ei, which is intransitive, is performed, the name of the town is regarded as an object and put in the accusative case and so we have Rājagriham. In the other reference to the Lalitavistāra the line mentioned is at page 476 instead of page 467. Here Dr. Hoernle has quite misunderstood the editor's note. In the text we have the compound tvacchamānānah. In a footnote the editor explains this as tvachmānāna, which he must have meant for the dual nominative of the Dvandva compound of tvacch and māna. But from the termination e, the Doctor thought the editor meant it to be a locative.

The locative would make no sense here, the case wanted is the nominative. In the text, though tvacch is treated like a noun ending in a, the compound is somāhāradvandava, as it should be according to Pāṇ. II, 4. 2; but the editor seems to have thought it wrong, and so has given the ordinary Devandva instead. Now in the two instances from the Mahāvastu given by Dr. Hoernle, the words in the accusative are avēchihā, which is a kind of Buddhistic hell, and dharaṇihā, which, I suppose, is the word that signifies "the earth." If these are governed by verbs or participle implying "motion," they are regular Sanskrit accusatives; if not, they also must be brought under the rule we have been considering. It is possible that the rule which primarily is taken by Patanjali's commentators to apply to names of places, such as Kurus, Pańchālas, Rājagrihas, &c. may in later usage have been extended, and made applicable to places generally, such as the earth and the Buddhistic hell; but that the accusative in these cases is to be accounted for in either of these two ways and no other, appears certain. Then again, Dr. Hoernle thinks that there are two accusative forms in this inscription itself which violating the rules of Sanskrit grammar, prove his Gāthā rule. One of them is ṭvram in the expression ubhāto ṭvram. This, however, is in perfect accordance with the rules of Sanskrit grammar, for, under Pāṇ. II, 3. 2, Patanjali gives a kārikā, and comments on it thus:—

उभयस्य इत्यतः परस्य तथा विशेषी वक्तमः

i.e. a noun that is in syntactical connection with ubhayataḥ and sarvataḥ should be put in the accusative case: in other words, ubhayataḥ and sarvataḥ govern an accusative. The instance given by him is ubhaya grāham. The kārikā is given in the Siddhānta Kauṣumī. The other accusative form relied on by Dr. Hoernle is varṣhāraunā in the expression gato'ī varṣhāraunā. This accusative is to be explained by Pāṇ. II, 3. 5, which teaches that a noun expressing duration should be put in the accusative case. The sense then would be that Ushavadāta went to the place mentioned for the rains. Now if it should be objected that in gato'ī varṣhāraunā, duration is not what is meant, but simply the time when he went, this might be considered to be an extension of the original Sanskrit rule, but not a violation of it. This is what I meant by saying in a note.
in my paper that varshāratam is used for varshārītav.

Thus then the rule laid down by Dr. Hoernle that the accusative is promiscuously used for the locative is not at all proved; nor do I think there can be such a rule. There may be an extension in a few cases of some of the special rules about the use of the accusative, as must be expected from the operation of the law of analogy but a promiscuous substitution of the one case for the other is not possible under any ascertained laws of the growth of human speech. In the case in dispute, therefore, the supposed accusative Ibā—Dāhūṇkā must be justified on other grounds. It should be stated what it is governed by. An accusative must be governed by a verb, a participle, a preposition or a particle of that nature, and if it is an accusative expressive of length, distance, or duration, it must depend on the word, the length, distance or duration of the thing denoted by which it expresses. None of these requisites exists in the present case, and therefore to take Ibā—Dāhūṇkā as an accusative is clearly a mistake.

So then, if we take nāvā to be the Pāli form of the Sanskrit nāva, we shall have to consider the whole expression given above as one compound, and there is no question the compound would be awkward and unintelligible; while if we take nāvā as an instrumental, and Ibā—Dāhūṇkā as a compound with the genitive termination nāva omitted by mistake, the construction is natural and simple, and the sense plain. Besides, if the names of the rivers are to be taken as parts of the compound, and consequently attributively joined to the word tara, and thus subordinated to it, they cannot be referred to by the pronoun etasun immediately afterwards. And since the rivers are independently spoken of by the genitive etasūṃ, it is very likely that their names were independently put in the genitive case before. And the omission of nāva is very natural; for the engraver did actually cut one nā in the stone, and thought he had cut both. Dr. Hoernle translates the expression nāvāpuyātaraḥkaraṇa by “maker of a sacred ferry of boats.” He thus takes the first part as a genitive Tatpurusha equivalent to nāvānā

puyātaraḥ (supposing nāva to be a word ending in ā). Now taraḥ means “crossing,” wherefore the compound would express “the sacred crossing of boats.” This to my mind conveys no sense. Tara has hardly a conventional (rūḍha) sense as distinguished from the etymological (yugika). And even supposing it denotes “a boat,” which it does not, what can “the sacred boat of boats” mean? And why should the ferry-boats be called sacred? Dr. Hoernle says, because “they were set apart for a special sacred purpose, viz. to carry pilgrims across.” But what is the necessity of restricting the good done by Ushavädāta to pilgrims? Ferry-boats are a necessity in the case of all, just as water is, and as an establishment for giving water is opened by charitable persons for all human beings, so are ferry-boats placed for the use of all. There is no ground whatever for supposing that their use was so restricted, nor is it reasonable to suppose it was. But Dr. Hoernle’s objection to the interpretation of puyās as “religiously meritorious,” is that the establishment of boats is “no more so than the other acts specified in the record.” The objection has force no doubt, and therefore I would divide and read the words thus nāvā apuyātaraḥkaraṇa. Puyās is used in the sense of something one has to pay in exchange for what he purchases15; and taraḥpuyās is a word given by the native lexicographers in the sense of what is paid for being taken across a river, i.e. the fare of a ferry-boat. Aputara, therefore, is a tara or crossing for which one has to pay anything, i.e. a free carriage across; and that is what Ushavādāta provided by placing boats on the rivers. The translation of the whole expression therefore is lit. “who by means of boats caused a free passage across the rivers Ibā, &c.,” i.e. “who established free or charitable ferry-boats.” This is the sense of the words I have used in the translation of the inscription in my paper, though I do not now remember whether I read and construed the compound as I do now, and cannot understand how there is no note on it, and how the translation of a few words in this line has dropped away, as Dr. Hoernle points out. The sense this construction gives appears to me to be so appropriate, that here again I must accuse

15 Hemachandra notices such an extension in his Prakrit grammar.
16 भट्टा कुष्ठराज व्यास कालवीरय i.e., “You have purchased this boat of your body by paying a heavy price for it in the shape of good deeds.”
the engraver of a mistake. Instead of stopping after he had cut a square with the upper line wanting, to represent a, he prolonged the right hand side below the line and made pu of it. He was more familiar with the word puṇya than puṇya, and had to engrave it once before, and hence his mistake is not unnatural.

In the transcript of the inscription in my paper ya appears in brackets after ubhato. Thereupon Dr. Hoernle thinks I read udbhaya for ubhato and construe udbhayatirah as a compound. But if taken as a compound it would have to be considered as in the accusative case. The accusative, however, cannot be syntactically connected here. I do not think it was difficult to make out that what I meant was to give the correct Sanskrit form of the word, which is udbhaya and not ubhato, and that the bracketed ya was printed after to instead of between bha and to by a mistake.

The next expression is sabhā-prapā-yā-kareṇa. Dr. Bühler and I understand sabhā-prapā as a Dvandva, but Dr. Hoernle thinks the compound may be explained much more simply as a common Tatpurusha, and takes it to be a dative Tatpurusha. Why is a dative Tatpurusha much more simple than a Dvandva? On the contrary, I should think it one of the most difficult, since Pāṇini and his commentators allow it only in a few cases. A dative Tatpurusha is possible only between two nouns, the first of which, having the sense of the dative, denotes a certain material, and the second a thing made of that material, and between any noun in the dative sense and artha, baiś, kīta, or raksita.

It is wrong to suppose that we can compound any words in any sense. The Sanskrit idiom sanctions certain compounds only, and in a certain sense, and rules about these have been given by the grammarians, and they are generally followed by Sanskrit writers, though not invariably. A compound that violates the rules strikes the ear at once as bad. You cannot, for instance, form such a compound as Brāhma-puṇyayā in the sense of Brāhma-puṇyayā; and no more can you have sahā-prapāh in the sense of sahāya or sahābhyaya prapāh. Both the compounds would be quite unidiomatic. And what is the sense that we get? Ushavaddāta constructed *watering places for the assemblies, i.e. for those assembled to cross over the rivers.* Why need persons assemble in numbers to cross a river, and even if they did, who would think of calling them a sabhā, except metaphorically? A sabhā is much more formal than that. The word has the sense of "a regular assembly," or "a meeting," with a certain purpose. A crowd of persons who have casually gathered on the road do not constitute a sabhā. The word denotes a "hall," or "a house." The first sense does not answer here, but the second is appropriate.

The clause to be next discussed is the one beginning with pūnditaśvādeṣe, and ending with parashabhyat. Dr. Hoernle translates Rāmatirthe charakaparashabhyataḥ by "the Parshads (or congregations) going to Rāmatirtha." He takes charaka as a verbal derivative like kāraṇa and hāraṇa, since he understands it in its etymological sense, and attaches to the root its primary signification, viz. "move or wander." But if it is used as a verbal derivative, the vowel should have taken vṛddhi and the word become cāraṇa. Cāraṇa, therefore, has a special sense, and I believe is never used simply in the sense of "one who moves." In the quotation from the Brihadāraṇyaka given by Böhtlingk and Both in their Lexicon, sub voce, which is Madreṣu charakāḥ paryavastava, the word cāraṇa is explained by Śaṅkarāchārya and others as a bhāyanārthān vata-charaṇāḥ cāraṇāḥ, i.e. "they were called Charakas, because they were observing (char) a vow for the sake of study"; and the very use of the verb paryavastava, which means 'we wandered,' shows that charaka had even then acquired a secondary and conventional (rūkha) sense. It has other special senses also, but the word I maintain is not used in the primary and etymological sense attached to it by the Doctor. Besides, the compound is by no means good, since the word charaka which has been subordinated to parashad, is what is called sāpeksha, i.e. connected with the word Rāmatirthe, which is not in the compound. A subordinate member of a compound should not, as a general rule, be thus connected with an independent word, though a sāpeksha compound is allowable when the sense is not rendered obscure thereby. Rūkhasya rāja-paruruṣasah, for instance, in which rāja is connected with rūkhasya will not do, though Devadatta sarupakalam is admissible.

Dr. Hoernle here says that "in Sanskrit we
should expect the accusative Rāmatīrthāṁ,” instead of the locative Rāmatīrtha, which he accounts for by a Prākrit usage; i.e., according to him the rules of Sanskrit grammar require that the expression should be Rāmatīrthāṁ Charakaparshadibhyāḥ. I suppose he means that the accusative will be governed by the word charaka. Here there is a double mistake. When a verbal or participial form of the root char is used in the primary sense of the root, viz. “wandering,” the place wandered over is often put in the locative than in the accusative. ¹⁹ So that the locative is not only not wrong according to the idiom of Sanskrit, but is decidedly better. But even if we suppose that the “place wandered over” is always considered as the object of the action, and put in the accusative, as in the case of the root gam, still by a general and very rudimentary rule of Sanskrit grammar, the agent or object of an action is put in the genitive case when any verbal derivatives are used (Pāṇ. II, 3.65), except those enumerated in Pāṇ. II, 3.69. Thus ghaṭaṁ kāraṇaḥ is certainly not Sanskrit, and so Rāmatīrthāṁ charakaḥ cannot be. They ought to be ghaṭasya kāraṇaḥ and Rāmatīrthasya charakaḥ, supposing this latter word were unobjectionable in other respects, as it certainly is not. And now as to the sense of the expression. Why should “going to Rāmatīrthaḥ” have been rendered a sine quó non of the recipients of Ushavādā’s gift? The congregations resided in Govardhana, Śrīpura, and other places. Why should it have been considered necessary that they should be in the habit of going to Rāmatīrtha to be fit to receive the coconut trees? Thus, in every way Dr. Hoernle’s construction and translation are untenable.

I still think charaka is a mistake for charana; for then the expression charanaṁ parshadibhyāḥ would mean “to the conclave of learned men belonging to the several charanas or bodies of students of each Vedā or Sākhā.” But Charaka also will make sense, though it is not so appropriate; for it would mean “the bodies of persons who had undertaken certain vows,” or “of persons belonging to the Charaka sākhā.” In the last case the sense is restricted, and in the other I do not understand why the observers of the vows meant should be spoken of as forming a parshad which is rather a technical term as applicable to the learned leaders of a sākhā.

Then Dr. Hoernle sees no reason why Dr. Stevenson and I should read parshadibhyāḥ instead of parshadibhyāḥ. For myself I may state that I visited the caves in person, and compared Mr. West’s transcripts with the originals. On looking into my copy of the transcripts I now find bhyaḥ corrected to abhyāḥ, though there is a mark of interrogation against this. I am not sure therefore that abhyāḥ exists there, but I thought I saw it, and hence put it in.

Again, the Doctor says:—“the word ndī̄gera has greatly puzzled Dr. Stevenson and Prof. Bhandarkar.” Though his identification of the word with the Sanskrit nārīkola is not improbable, so far as the sound of the word is concerned, I must confess I still continue to be greatly puzzled. For, if Ushavādā presented thirty-two coconut trees in the village of Nārāṇaṇa, this village must be on or near the sea coast, for coconut trees do not grow above the Ghats. But among the grantees was the body of the learned Brāhmaṇa of Govardhana near Nāsik, and it was one of the four congregations at least to whom the thirty-two trees were given, so that about eight must have fallen to its lot. Now the presentation of eight coconut trees at a place more than sixty miles distant from where the persons to whom they were presented lived, and separated from it by a high mountain range, is a thing of a very unusual character. The Brāhmaṇas of Govardhana would have preferred some other trees or something else nearer home, if Ushavādā really wished to confer a favour upon them. And if the Govardhana conclave consisted of several individuals, the grant was of hardly any practical value to any one of them. And what could be the reason why thirty-two coconut trees in one and the same village were given to bodies of men living in different places?

Dr. Hoernle thinks it objectionable to take dharmātmāṇa as an epithet of Ushavādā in the sense of “benevolent,” or “charitable,” and translates it “out of religious principle.” In Sanskrit usage dharmātmā is always used as an epithet of a person, and taken as a Bahuvrihi in

the sense of dharmah atmā yasya, i.e. “one whose very self, or soul, or nature, is charity or benevolence, or virtue.” In our modern vernaculars also, the word is used in that sense. If understood as dharmāchāsa atmā cha, i.e. as a karmādhyērama, it would mean by (his) self or nature, viz. benevolence, &c., which comes to the same thing as before, though the compound and its use would be axiomatic. If taken as a genitive Tatpurusha, ‘dharmaśya atmā,’ the sense would be “by the nature or self of benevolence &c.” In this sense it would not do here at all; for Ushavadātā gave away what he did because benevolence was his nature, not on account of the nature of benevolence, which would be unintelligible. Dr. Hoernle is “inclined to think that it is probably a Buddhistic technical term”; but he gives no reason for this. I wish he had given one instance at least. He says dharmātmāna is very widely separated from Ushavadāta, whose epithet it is taken to be. The same objection might be brought against the epithet that immediately precedes, viz. “sahasrapradēna; but notwithstanding that, Dr. Hoernle himself construes it with Ushavadāta. The thing is, after the word Ushavadāta, you have in the inscription nothing but a string of epithets, and dharmātmāna is the last of them. Between this and the preceding epithet you have only the name of the place where the monastery was excavated, so that really the epithet in question is not far removed. The other objection is, that the word occurs in another inscription (West’s No. 11, note 4), where the Doctor thinks it impossible to construe it with the person named. To be able to construe it with the person, I have taken the word to be dhanaumātmano,–led to it by some stroke above the na. But if this reading is not allowable, we should complete the first sentence with Indrājanidatasa, and translate:—“Of Indra junkidatta, the Northerner &c.” i.e. after the genitive some such word as dūvan or deya-dhamma, should be understood, as it has to be done frequently. The second sentence begins with dhanaumātman, and the instrumental is to be connected with kāṇunītasi, the sense being “this cave was caused to be excavated by the pious one.”

Then Dr. Hoernle speaks of my reading of two words in the last line, Bhaitāraka dūnatiya, and thinks the final d of Bhaitāraka is unintelligible. But it exists in the original notwithstanding. The initial d of the next word is that which is written below the line. I transferred it to its proper place, taking it to be a correction, as Dr. Bühler does. Dr. Hoernle and he, however, read it as a, but in my correctly copied of Mr. West’s transcript I find d, and there is no query after it as in the case of prakshālākya noticed above, and that it must be d I will show presently. Dr. Hoernle thinks that the a below the line is meant to indicate the division of the compound. Why was that considered necessary here and not in gatojīna, which occurs immediately afterwards and in chauśūlīvatasa, which we have in the second line? It appears to me that the engraver first cut the words Bhaitāraka dūnatiya, and somebody afterwards found that it was capable of being taken as Bhaitāraka dūnatiya, equivalent to Bhaitāraka dūnatiya, meaning “without the knowledge of the lord,” but that was not what was meant. What was intended was Bhaitāraka dūnatiya for Bhaitāraka dūnatiya, i.e. “by the command of the lord”; and in order that there might be no mistake about it, he thought the best way was to separate the words, as he had done in the case of taṇḍa gandapana in the second line, and put in the initial d which was so important. After he had done that, it was necessary to obliterate the stroke representing d in the last syllable of Bhaitāraka, but as this was difficult he did not attempt it.

Now as to the gap between Mālaye and Hirudkāh, I thought I saw some letters like skṛī in it when I visited the caves, and therefore it did not occur to me to say the gap contained nothing, and to connect ki with Mālaye. Dr. Hoernle’s reading Mālayehīna is however very likely and good, and I feel no hesitation in saying so, as I have felt none in expressing my disagreement with him on every other point except, to a certain extent, the identification of nādyera with nārika, and in pointing out his mistakes.

Poona, 14th March 1883.

V. 45, vipuružvati dharmātmā &c. &c.

V. 81. See No. 1 Karle, and No. 21 Janur. Arch. Surv. W. India.—Cave Temple Inscriptions No. 10; Bhules Tope Nos. 100, 136, 147, 174, No. 1 Tope &c.
THE FIRST PLATE OF A VALABHI GRANT OF UNKNOWN DATE.

BY E. HULTZSCH, Ph.D., VIENNA.

The subjoined incomplete Valabhi grant has been edited from a paper-cast which I owe to the kindness of Professor Bühler, to whom it was sent by Rāo Bahādur Gopalī S. Desai, Deputy Educational Inspector of Kāthiāvād. The plate from which the cast is taken was found at Gopāth, and measures 14 by 10 inches. To judge from the facsimile, the preservation of the plate is not particularly good, and the letters of the first and last line and at both ends of most other lines are somewhat damaged.

The grant is dated from Vālabhi. Like other Valabhi grants, this one must have originally consisted of two plates. The second plate, which was fastened to the first by two rings as the holes at the base of the latter prove, has been lost, and altogether with it the date and the names of the donor, the grantee, and the object granted. By comparing the preserved first plate with the first plates of other Valabhi grants already published, it will be possible to fix its date within certain limits. Our first plate contains the usual vānīdvālī of the later Valabhi kings from Gūhasena downwards, and breaks off in the description of Dharasena III, of which about one line must have been engraved on the lost plate. The grant cannot belong to one of the sons of Dervabhāṣa, as the first plate of the grant of Kharagraha II dated Val. S. 337, bring the vānīdvālī down to Dharasena IV. Thus it must have been issued by either Dharasena III, or Dhrusasena II, or Dharasena IV. This conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that the first plates of the grant of Dhrusasena II, dated Val. S. 310 and of the grant of Dharasena IV, dated Val. S. 330 break off almost at the same point as our first plate, while the first plate of another grant of Dharasena IV, dated Val. S. 326 comprises about two and a half lines more of the vānīdvālī.

The characters perfectly resemble those of the published grants of Dhrusasena II. and Dharasena IV. It deserves notice that the superscribed repa (T) at the beginning of a group of consonants is placed at the right side of the group if there was no room left for it at the top;* in yudhyone, l. 10, and *yudhyone, l. 14.

For the same reason the secondary form of the vowel ʾ (O) has once been placed at the right side of a group, in "yudhyone, l. 6.

Transcript.

[1] ओँ स्वयं वर्मयः प्रसभ्रष्टाभिमित्रणम् नवक्षणामतुत्तमवल्लक्षममदांमक्षमागसनक्षमनहारसदलः
[2] वर्मपालावल्लक्षमावलिकाकाखनानाधकाद्भुजत%रथात्रिप्रतिभाजनसत्कारिणिः परमाधि
[3] भर शैवांमहस्तिकारे दोष्टव्युप्रवर्तनानामवर्मार्का वास्तविकीर्तिनिषीदितमहस्तिकारे श्रीवारामभृति खड़गिकि
[4] यवहेंत सातपरम्रवर्मार्काल्पकालपरीक्षातिविनिर्देशसहिष्णुस्वस्तकितविविकाराधकाद्भुजत%रथात्रिप्रतिभाजनसत्कारिणिः
[5] वास्तविकीर्तिनिषीदितमहस्तिकारे श्रीवारामभृति खड़गिकि
[6] [भ]धिभविद्धतमिनः समरसाबारिनिः नोदविविकाराधकाल्पकालपरीक्षातिविनिर्देशसहिष्णुस्वस्तकितविविकारिणिः
[7] वास्तविकीर्तिनिषीदितमहस्तिकारे श्रीवारामभृति खड़गिकि

[4] The modern Telugu alphabet has gone one step further by placing the repa behind the group before which it is pronounced.

Line 1, Read ओँ स्वयं वर्मयः; "वर्मस्य वर्मस्य" and "मदांमक्षमागसनक्षमनहारसदलः"—L 2, the second 4 of "नरांगम" and the 4 of "नीहस" obliterated.—L 3, 4 of "प्रतिभाजन" obliterated.—L 4, 4 of "प्रतिभाजन" faint; read "विनिर्देशसहिष्णुस".  
—L 7, read फळ: "प्रतिभाजन" and "विनिर्देशसहिष्णुस".
[9] यन्त्राधिकराणेति: परमात्मा: श्रीमहादिश्ययास्य गुरुवत्तादनावः शूलस्त्रावानिधीज्ञान: ।
[9] जलगतसंविपक्षाशिवायस्य: प्रणालीसत्तंत्रस्य श्रीपुत्रश्रीमा दिवासिः।
[10] [भूषण:]स्तहस्तरसंशालीपरिविश्वापिषाधिलोकोद्: प्रथममनस्तसत्तंत्रस्य उद्यानमुपाल्यितः।
[11] नामपाकारं प्रजीपादाभावकरणामुपाल्यानां दशेयिताः श्रीसरस्योरकारविसायस्य भिलारात्वाशिकाः।
[12] रिमोदशका: विकासमप्रनविहितालिपिक्षा: परमात्मा: श्रीमहादिश्ययास्य गुरुवत्तादनावः।
[13] लक्षागगानन्दनायामुपरममुप्राणसार्वभौतिकं: समसतविपिपादोपाल्यास्यमुहुल्लमनः।
[14] श्रीमाताराजनागिनकारुपितारितिष्ठानारोपिताः। सब्रविश्वाविराजविभागिनाशिकाः।
[15] श्रीमाताराजनागिनकारुपितारितिष्ठानारोपिताः। सब्रविश्वाविराजविभागिनाशिकाः।
[16] मुनिकप्रनजाताशातावः कलिहत्युजः पुण्यपरिविनवाहिनीपाल्योपरिनांत्तंत्रस्य त्रिविश्वाविराजविभागिनाशिकाः।
[17] दलजितोकारुपितारितिष्ठानारोपिताः। सब्रविश्वाविराजविभागिनाशिकाः।
[18] तन्वादनायामुपरांगुरुमुरुद्वारावताः समसतविपिपादोपाल्यास्य राजस्तःस्य न्यायास्यकाः परः।
[19] महत्त द्वा पुरुस्तात्तंत्रस्य नैकोरसत्तंत्रस्य:।। तन्वादनायामुपरांगुरुमुरुद्वारावताः समसतविपिपादोपाल्यास्य राजस्तःस्य न्यायास्यकाः परः।
[20] दशीकुंंतिप्रत्येकस्य: सत्यस्य:।। तन्वादनायामुपरांगुरुमुरुद्वारावताः समसतविपिपादोपाल्यास्य राजस्तःस्य न्यायास्यकाः परः।
[21] को प्रतिप्रत्येकस्य: सत्यस्य:।। तन्वादनायामुपरांगुरुमुरुद्वारावताः समसतविपिपादोपाल्यास्य राजस्तःस्य न्यायास्यकाः परः।
[22] परिश्रमित्तंत्रस्य रुपममुरुद्वारावताः: सत्यमात्रां:।। तन्वादनायामुपरांगुरुमुरुद्वारावताः समसतविपिपादोपाल्यास्य राजस्तःस्य न्यायास्यकाः परः।
[23] परमात्मा: श्रीमहादिश्ययास्य गुरुवत्तादनावः।
[24] म: परमात्मा: श्रीमहादिश्ययास्य गुरुवत्तादनावः।
[25] मन्त्रार्थार्थितास्य: सत्यविनिविश्वारोपिताः।
[26] [र]वत्साभ्य: समस्या:।। तन्वादनायामुपरांगुरुमुरुद्वारावताः।
[27] [ल]मन्त्रार्थार्थितास्य: सत्यविनिविश्वारोपिताः।

L. 8, सी. of "रोमोद:" obliterated. — L. 11, amaenit of दलजितोकारुपितारितिष्ठानारोपिताः very faint; read रोमकीवारोपिताः. — L. 12, read विकासममुपाल्यास्य. — L. 14, read "समसतविपिपादं: भावाणि।" looks like श्रीमहादिश्ययास्य गुरुवत्तादनावः. — L. 17, read "विश्वासः" and नरादेवारणावताः. — L. 18, read राजस्तःस्य: - L. 19, read नीलां जान विधि. — L. 21, read "कालिः" - L. 22, read "शाखे". - L. 23, read "नतालवः" and नरादेवारणावताः. — L. 25, a dot stands over the line between शूलस्त्रावानिधीज्ञान: and शूलस्त्रावानिधीज्ञान: All the facsimiles of the earlier grants read शूलस्त्रावानिधीज्ञान: महाराजाः. Later on this lectio doctior was changed into संबंधानाम् (Grant of Śūklaśītha III., Ind. Ant. vol. V., p. 207) and संबंधानाम् (Grants of Śūklaśītha V. and VI., Ind. Ant. vol. VI., p. 16, and vol. VII., p. 79). — L. 26, f. read परमात्मान्त्रिकारूपः. — Line 27, Most letters obliterated read "समस्तविपिपादोपाल्यास्य राजस्तःस्य न्यायास्यकाः परः."
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THE DATE OF TRIVIKRAMA.

Sir,—In Mr. Pāthak's interesting paper on Pājapādadante, p. 21, occurs the following statement: "Trivikrama; Saka 800 (A Prakṛt grammar)." Would Mr. Pāthak be so good as to inform us, (1) Whether this Trivikrama is the same as that mentioned by Prof. Pischel as posterior to Hemachandra (see his edition of Hemachandra, preface, p. vi, and Dissertatio Inauguralis, p. 8)? (2) If so, what grounds has Mr. Pāthak for placing Trivikrama in Saka 800? (3) Does "Saka 800" mean that Trivikrama lived in the 8th century of the Saka era or that he wrote his grammar in that particular year (i.e. the year 800 of the Saka era)? (4) Where does Trivikrama mention Pājapādā? Will Mr. Pāthak quote the work and the passage where the mention occurs?

3rd February, 1883.

R. H.

A short reply to Dr. H.'s queries.

(1) As I have no copy of Prof. Pischel's Hematicandra, I am not in a position to answer this query. (2) My opinion as to the date of Trivikrama is based on the prakāsita of the Adipurāṇa, the Uttarapurāṇa, and Trivikrama's grammar. (3) The statement referred to means that Trivikrama was a contemporary of the rāṣṭrakūṭa emperor Amōghavarsha I. and his son. (4) In the first pāda of the first adhyāya, we read kāmā śṛṅgāra śānista mātāś ca śrī-bhaktā dayā kṛttavya. Here the mention of the Jājāyadra is equivalent to the mention of Pājapādā, according to Bṛhaviśeṣa.

Belgaum High School.

K. B. P.

AWĀN, A DERIVATION.

The Awāns are a Muslim tribe in the Rāwāl Pindī District. The name is variously spelt in Panjābī, Awān, Uān and Awān. General Cunningham (see ante, vol. X, p. 244, and Proc. A. S. B. 1881, p. 50) wishes to identify them with the Jodhs of Bābar, but Colonel Johnstone has shown that the Jodhs are a part of the Muslim Rājāū tribe of Jānūs in the Rāwāl Pindī District. (See Sherring's Hindū Tribes and Castes, vol. III, p. 69.) Whoever they may be, it is more than probable that they are aboriginal Panjābīs, converted to Islam like their neighbours the Gakhsars, Dādās, Satsī, &c. Like the other tribes they give themselves a fanciful Muslim origin, and say they are descended from the persons who had charge of Mahmūd of Ghānī's camp. (See Calcutta Review, vol. CL, pp. 272-275.) In accordance with this view the derivation of their names is thus given. In Persian aśvād means primarily a portico, veranda, gallery, balcony; and thence a palace, or more properly the women's part of the palace and grounds attached; thence the women's part of a royal camp, a long or large tent. The Awāns and their neighbours say that their ancestors accompanied Mahmūd's camp and settled in the Rāwāl Pindī District, and thus got the name aśvād, camp-men. It is pretty obvious, that there is no historical foundation for this derivation of the name, but as these native derivations are often seriously received as 'true', it is just as well to record them if only to show their improbability.

R. C. Temple.

RĀJAPITĀMAHA—THE SĪLĀRA TITLE.

Rājapitāmaha, which literally means 'Grandfather of kings,' occurs along with their other titles in three copperplates of the Sīlārās.1 Mr. Waten who translated one of these suggested 'Like a Brahmadēva among kings' as the meaning of the title; Mr. K. T. Telang who translated another, rendered it as 'the grandfather of the king,' but observed:—"May rājapitāmaha, then mean 'like a Brahmadēva among kings'—first ancestor?"

I think the following passage from the Kumārapāda Charita leaves no doubt that the literal meaning of rājapitāmaha is the meaning intended:

अथायदार चरितम विद्वानो व यातिंस्य स्वयंः
कौशीत्याः प्रत्येक यात स्वयं स्वयं अन्तः
एतिहासिक स्वयं चरितमाणि स्वयं अन्तः

One day, while the Chaulya universal ruler (Kumārapāda) was sitting at ease, he heard a bard pronounce "Rājapitāmaha" as the title of Mallikārjuna, king of the Konkana (in the verse), Thus shines king Mallikārjuna, (like) Arjuna in wielding the bow, who bears the title Rājapitāmaha, heard from universe to universe, having conquered all great kings by the irresistible might of his arms and made them obedient to himself like grandsons.

Mallikārjuna, so far as is hitherto known, was the seventeenth king of the North Konkana Sīlar dynasty, and two of his grants are recorded on stones found at Chipul in the Ratnagiri zilla, and Bassein in the Thāna zilla, which bear date respectively Saka 1078 and 1082. 2 Mallikārjuna's defeat by Āmbada the general of Kumārapāda, (Saka 1065-1096) is noticed by K. Forbes, and a pretty long account of it is given in the Charitha.

Ratīkām Durghārāṁ Davā. 3

3 Bass Māla (New Ed.), p. 147.
THE DHINIKI GRANT OF KING JÀIKADEVA, TOGETHER WITH SOME REMARKS ON THE VIKRAMA, VALABHÌ AND GUPTA ERAS.

BY DR. G. BÜHLER, C.I.E.

I.—The Grant of Jàikadeva.

The subjoined grant of Jàikadeva, lord of Saurâsana, was dug up during the famine relief operations of 1879-80 in the Undkètalás, a tank situated a mile to the north-east of the present village of Dhinikà,


1

but close to the ruins of old Dhinikà, in the Okhàmàapàl district of the Kathiàvatá peninsula. It was subsequently, in 1881, brought to the notice of my friend Colonel Watson, President of the Râjâstânâkî Court, by Ajám Vajeshankar G. Ozhâ of Bhaunagar, who furnished to the former a paper impression of the plates. About the same time another rubbing was sent to me by the Deputy Educational Inspector of Kathiàvatá, Râo Bahâdur Gopâlji S. Desai. On my communicating with Colonel Watson regarding the document, I received from him successively another rubbing, a photograph, and finally the original plates themselves, as well as numerous important notes on the historical and geographical questions connected with the grant. Colonel Watson also generously relinquished his intention of editing the grant and made over to me, when he learnt I was anxious to publish the grant, a valuable manuscript article which he had already written.

The grant is written on the inner sides of two plates, measuring 9¾ inches by 5, the thinnest and smallest I have ever seen used for a sàsana by a ruler of Western India. A small hole through the bottom of the first and the top of the second, shows that they were originally held together by a ring. It is doubtful if the ring bore a seal, because the cognizance of the king, a fish, is engraved at the bottom of Plate II. The preservation of the plates is very good, in spite of the muddy bed in which they must have lain for a long time. Only very few letters in line 2 of Plate I and in the first five lines of Plate II, have been partly destroyed by verdigris. Nevertheless the grant is difficult to read, and some of the names contained in it remain either very doubtful or absolutely undecipherable. One cause of this fact is the extreme slovenliness of the execution. A great many letters have been formed inaccurately and carelessly, and some have not even been finished. In a few cases the punch has also completely gone through the thin sheet of copper. It is perfectly clear that the kansar who transferred the grant to the plates, must have been unskilled and unaccustomed to delicate work. Another circumstance which contributes to the difficulty of the document is that the clerk or a Kârkûn who wrote the MS. copy must have been careless or in a hurry. This is shown by the displacement of the ndstras, or e strokos, which, as often happens in modern official documents, repeatedly stand over the wrong syllables, e. g. in vade for veda (I. 6), likkyenta for likkyante (I. 10), and by the omission of many superscribed repkas and anusvâras. The alphabet used is the literary alphabet of Western and, probably also, of Central India, which first occurs in the royal sign manual of the Gurjara grants of the 5th century A.D. A few years ago most epigraphists would have unhesitatingly condemned the Dhinikà sàsana, on account of the modern appearance of its characters, as a forgery of the 11th or 12th century. Now that Professor Max Müller's great discovery of the old palm leaves from Japan, the Valabhi plates of Śilabitya II, dated Śa. 352, and the excellent facsimile of Dantidurga-Khadgâvaloka's Sàmangâj plats, dated 675 are before the public, it is no longer possible to fall into such an error. On the contrary, it must be conceded that an alphabet closely resembling the modern Dēvañâgári was in general use certainly during the 7th and 8th centuries, and probably at a much earlier date. Though it would seem that this alphabet was regularly used for literary purposes only, it cannot be denied that it sometimes was employed for sàsanas also. In order to test a new grant which shows not the archaic "cave characters," but a more modern looking

Śilabitya V. Ind. Ant. vol. VI, p. 17, seqq. and my Eddhor grant, No. IV, to be published shortly in this Journal.

2 Ind. Ant. vol. XI, p. 305 f.

3 Ind. Ant. vol. XI, pp. 110-112.
alphabet, it is only necessary carefully to compare it with the undoubtedly genuine śāsanas of the same period, which show the literary alphabet. If we apply these principles to the Dhiniki grant, which is dated Vikrama saṅvat 794 or A.D. 738, the undoubtedly genuine grant in the literary alphabet which comes nearest to it in point of age is Dantidurga's śāsana of Śaka saṅvat 675 or A.D. 763 (the Sāmangadhi plates). If due allowance is made for the difference in the size of the letters and the careless execution of the Dhiniki plates, the characters of the two documents are almost identical. The only real differences which I can find occur in the shape of the letters ṣa and tha. In the Dhiniki grant the ṣa in ākṣaḷā (I. 9) has the older round form with a horizontal top-stroke to the right of the letter, but twice in glāṭā (II. 1) and mahā-kakṣapataki (II. 6), the modern Devanāgarī form ṣ. As regards the tha, it has once, in karaṇāṭha (I. 9), the older form ṭ, and once in paripatithanīyaḥ a very peculiar shape ṭ, which possibly may be intended for the modern ṭ, though it is not impossible that it is merely owing to a blunder of the unskilled Kāñcā. However that may be, these peculiarities cannot be used as arguments against the genuineness of the grant. They are merely instances of the rule to which I have repeatedly called attention, that in Indian epigraphy those forms which are constant in the later documents, occur sporadically in the earlier ones. The truth of this assertion for the case of the form  sat is proved by the fact that my unpublished Rāthor grant of Dhnavarāja, Akalavatasha of Bharoch, dated Śaka saṅvat 789 or A.D. 867 shows no other form of sa but Š.

The language of the Dhiniki śāsana is not quite grammatical Sanskrit, interspersed with a few Prakṛt forms and words, e.g., apekṣhya (I. 6) for apekṣhya and the Gujarāṭi dhārā (I. 11-12), instead of pāda, "a hill-spur." Its wording differs considerably from that usually adopted by the rulers of Gujarāṭ. For it begins with the date, gives no particulars of the donor's and the donee's families, and its chief

portion (I. 1-9) consists of a single sentence. As regards the first and second points, the published grants of Bhūmādeva I. and Visaladeva, and some other unpublished Gujarāṭ inscriptions furnish analogies. With respect to the third point, I am not able to adduce instances from Western India. But a good many grants from other parts of India, e. g., the ancient Kadamba śāsanas published by Mr. Fleet, especially Nos. I, III, VI, and VII, likewise omit the usual phrases ajñāpayati, sañbodhayati or anudarāpayati, astu vah saṁvādītum yathā mayā &c., and contain in their stead the simple dattavān. Some other minor peculiarities, such as the constant use of the word nāman after proper names (I. 7; II. 1, 6), the omission of the syllable sa in the compound muntalla-(mudgala)-gotra, the use of the verse mayi rājāni vyatikrānte, &c., of a maṅgala at the end of the inscription instead of the repetition of the donor's name are likewise not unusual in Gujarāṭ grants, but common enough on the śāsanas issued by kings of various other districts. It appears, therefore, that the official who composed the text of the Dhiniki grant did not use one of the old forms current in Gujarāṭ, but, for some reason or other, invented a new one, which, however, does not depart from the general traditions regulating the formalities to be observed in royal edicts.

The donor of the Dhiniki grant is the illustrious Jāikadeva, the lord of the province of Saṅrāṣṭra, who assumes the prad titles paramabhātārakā, maṅhdṛṣṭāhīrā, and paramēvarā, and thus claims to be an independent ruler, not owing allegiance to anybody. His capital was Bhūmiliṅkā, and his cognizance a fish. The name and the fish emblem connect him, it would seem, with Jāikā the donor of the Morbī grant, and the fact that he held court in Bhūmiliṅkā indicates that he belonged to the Jēhāvās, one of the ancient Rājput clans, whose present representatives are the Rājās of Porbandar. For the word Bhūmiliṅkā exactly corresponds to the modern Bhumili or Bhūmibālī. Though the map of Kāthiāvād shows several towns and villages of

---

3. See e.g. Dr. F. E. Hall's Chedi grant, *Jour. Rend. As. Soc.* vol. XXXI, p. 120, l. 11; p. 129, l. 12; the Kadamba grants and the Sāmangadhi plates referred to above.
that name, Bhūmilikā in Saurāṣṭra can only be the deserted capital founded by the Jēthvās in the Bardā hills, which is still called Bhūmī, Bhūmihī, or Ghūmī, ⁹ and at the time of the Jēthvā ascendency must have been the capital of Saurāṣṭra, i.e. the whole of south-western Kāthāvād. The conjecture, on the other hand, that the donor of the Morbī plate is in some way connected with the granter of the Dāniki śāsana considerably gains in probability by a tradition, prevalent among the Jēthvās and in Kāthāvād generally, according to which Morbī was the oldest or one of the oldest seats of the Jēthvā Rājputs, long before they founded Bhūmī. This story, which Colonel J. Watson, the first authority on the mediæval history of Kāthāvād, considers to be perfectly trustworthy, explains how it happens that the Bhūmilikā fish emblem and the identical name Jāika have been found at Morbī. This is, however, the only point in which the Jēthvā traditions can be made serviceable to the interpretation of our grant. In other respects the information derived from records of the Porbandar bards and from the present state of things, are rather puzzling than helpful. For though the bardic list enumerates 177 predecessors of the present Rāṇa Vikramāditya, who are stated to have ruled at Morbī, Bhūmī and other places, there is no Jāika among them. ¹¹ As this list is evidently “made up,” and as it is well known that Indian princes often bear many names, the absence of the name Jāika from the Porbandar list is not a very serious obstacle to the conjecture that Jāika of Bhūmilikā belongs to the Jēthvā family. But it precludes the possibility of our learning more regarding him.

Another matter is of somewhat greater importance. The modern tradition derives the origin of the Jēthvās from the monkey-god, Hanuman, and it is asserted in Gujarāt that, until recent times, the Rāṇas of Porbandar were pāṇḍ hurricane, i.e. carried in token of their descent a caudal appendage which was lost of late only, owing to the influence of the degenerate Kali age. Owing to his intimate connection with the Jēthvās Hanuman is at present the emblem on the Porbandar flag, which does not show a fish. The solution of the difficulty which is thus raised may be attempted in several ways. We may either assume that the Jēthvās have changed their cognizance, or that their coat of arms contained of old several emblems, both the fish and Hanuman, and that the latter has alone been retained in modern times. It seems to me that the second explanation is the more probable one. For both the fish and Hanuman belong to the cycle of the Vaishnava legends, the former referring to the Matyaśāvatāra and the second to the Rāmāvatāra of Viṣṇu. If the Jēthvās, as is presumable, were and are Vaishnavas, it is not improbable that they originally used both the fish and Hanuman.

Colonel Watson, who agrees with me in this view, points out that the first mythical descendant of Hanuman is called in the bardic list Makra ḍhaj, i.e. “he who bears a makara in his banner.” If makara denotes in this case a shark or other large fish, it is not impossible that the name refers to the Viṣṇuistic legends and to the fish emblem on the banner. It deserves also to be noted that on the brackets of the columns of the Naulikhā temple at Bhūmī, ¹² the fish emblem occurs several times, side by side with representations of monkeys. These remarks will suffice to show that the modern tradition is not irreconcilable with the inference drawn from the statements of the two sets of plates, that their donors were Jēthvās.

According to Dr. Burgess (loc. cit. p. 181, seqq.), the ruins of Bhūmī furnish also some evidence that certain buildings of the town possess a high antiquity. He assigns the temple of Hanuman or Gauḍapati and some of the Vaishnavāya temples at the neighbouring Son Kanvas, on archaeological grounds, to the eighth or ninth century A.D. This collateral evidence as to the age of the towns of Bhūmī, and consequently of the Jēthvā rule in Kāthāvād, is so much the more valuable, as the oldest inscription on funeral monuments at Bhūmī dates from Saṅ. 1118 or 1061-2 A.D. and the name of the Jēthvās is mentioned in inscriptions and books of the 13th and 14th centuries only. The oldest mention of the name of the clan,

¹² Burgess, Reports, vol. II, pl. xiii.
known to me, occurs in the *Vastupulacharitas* of Rājaśekharas and Harshagranī where it is asserted\(^{12}\) that Śiṅhā, the maternal uncle of Viśaladēva Vāghēlā (Vikrama saṁvat 1300-1318) was a Jeṭhāvā. The evidence of the style of the Bhūmil temples, taken together with that of the two grants is, however, strong enough to show that the advent of the Jeṭhāvās in Kāthihāvād must fall at the latest in the sixth or seventh century. The question whether the Morbi and Dhiniki grant belong to the same person or have been issued by two homogenous kings will be discussed in the second part of this paper. It may suffice to state here that the data contained in the two grants alone do not admit of a definitive settlement of the question.

The date of the Dhiniki śāsana is given as Vikrama saṁvat 794, new-moon-day of Kārttika, Sunday, under the Naksatra Jyesṭhā. The figure for the year probably refers, as is usual in Indian dates, to completed years, and the grant was therefore issued at the end of Kārttika (in Gujarāt the first month) of Vikrama saṁvat 795. On this supposition the day of the week and the Naksatra have been given correctly. For Kārttika vadi 15, 795 Vikrama, corresponds to Sunday, Nov. 16, 738 A.D., when the Naksatra was Jyesṭhā. The grant further states that an eclipse of the sun occurred on that date. But this is a mistake. An eclipse of the sun, which, however, was not visible in Kāthihāvād, happened on the new moon of the preceding month Āśvina, i.e., on Saturday, October 18, 738 A.D.\(^{14}\) The well-known fact that the grants were rarely written on the day when the donation was made,\(^{13}\) permits us to explain the error with respect to the eclipse. It may be safely assumed that the village was given on the last day of Āśvina 794, when the calculated eclipse occurred,\(^{15}\) and that the document was drawn up a month later, on the last day of the following month, Kārttika vadi 15, 795. The Kārkān forgot to give the two dates separately, and thus made the same muddle as the writer of the Morbi plate, who asserts that the grant was made on the fifth day of the bright half of Phālguna, on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun.

The object of our grant is to convey the village of Dhinikā to a Brāhmaṇa, called Śivaraṇa, who belonged to the Muṇaḷāra, (read Muṅgaḷa), goitra and to a race the name of which is not decipherable. The correctness of the reading Muṅgaḷa is attested by the fact that the Mudgalaś really have three pravesas as asserted in the grant. Dhinikā is, of course, the name of the ruined village, now called "old Dhiniki," where the plate has been found. According to the information collected by Colonel Watson and Rao Bahādur G. S. Deśai, it was a place of great antiquity. The Rao Bahādur informs me that the ruins contain a pāṭha, or funeral monument, which shows the date Saṁvat 779 Āśā Sudi 2, or 722-23 A.D. If this statement be correct, it certainly furnishes collateral evidence that the village existed in the beginning of the 8th century. The uncertainty in the readings of the names of the boundaries given in the grant makes it difficult to identify them. If it is really true that the ocean is mentioned as the northern boundary, this statement may refer, according to the authorities quoted, either to a large creek, into which some streams, rising northeast and north of old Dhiniki, fall, or to the Raṭ between Okhāmandal and Kāthihāvād, which formerly seems to have been more extensive than at present. There are also a good many dhārā "hills or ridges" near Dhiniki, though none of them now bears the name Roḥara which the plate mentions. As regards the remaining localities mentioned, I abstain from all attempts at identifications, because the basis afforded by the plate is too unsafe.


\(^{13}\) The astronomical data in this grant have been kindly calculated for me by Professor Jacobi of Munster, Dr. Burgess, and Mr. Hutchison, of Stonehaven, and Dr. Schram, of the Vienna Observatory. All four gentlemen have independently obtained the same results. A separate calculation has also been made in order to ascertain if "Vikrama" could stand for Śaṅka, and a decidedly negative result has been obtained.


\(^{15}\) *Ind. Anti.* vol. VI, pp. 199-201; vol. XI, p. 99.

\(^{16}\) It may be noted that according to the modern treatises on dāna, bathing and gifts are unnecessary on the occasion of calculated eclipses which are invisible in India. But it is, of course, very possible that a king who wished to make a present, chose, in case no visible eclipse was available, the day of a calculated one, in order to secure greater spiritual merit.

TRANSCRIPT.

Plate I.

[1] एस्वसिनिनिकनमवसंकालः सत्यसुचनुर्विभिक्कुलः ४६३ कार्तिकमासापूर्णः
[2] अमावसायां आदिवर्षे ओषधिशास्त्रे रविदिर्गणयारीः। अस्तो वसंकालसः
[3] क्रियासपूज्यां तिघोष्यं भूमिलकायां शुरूआधोगोपालितं: परमभद्रं
[4] रक्षिताराजाधिपायमते: श्रीवालजीतः महाभाषमनारायणः
[5] यथमाहात्मायां संस्कारसारायां शब्दार्थमवशोभितः रत्ने
[6] संप्राप्यमेवं धर्मकालमेंवं च चुनुधिविदे च संतानाय मन्त्रलः
[7] गौतमवनिप्रसारधरानि वर्हतीमायामायारुपमानि तस्यः
[8] राजकुमारां सरसालकर्कुले देवदायेष्वरे उदकपूर्वे भूमिलकायमुद्द्वः
[9] च वेदन्तः! इदर्मी कालावधुपकपियमकरणमध्यमेक्षम च यान्य
[10] रामाधारः लिखितः। उत्तरायणें सामायकेः सुमुः। पूवभागः सवनः
[11] गृहः नालिका रोपेयायारातेता दविगमणे सत्तवायाकालः
[12] रिचा नदी यातः। पञ्चमयाम् पञ्चमस्य भारा सुमुकारामेणी दी

Plate II.

[1] एवं च चुनुढीनिकुल्न्यान्त: तदानन्त्रमामुमीमीन्तर: नामः बाल्रूः मुनि
[2] न भोजवा न नातनाय परिप्रवर्त्यायं। वहुभिन्नसुखु युक्ता राजभाषा
[3] भगवाधिष्ठि:। यस्य यस्य यदा भूमिलकाय तथा तदा फले।। शवः
[4] राज्य व्यवस्थाले गौरी: राजार्थिताभिश्च तस्याती सदर्म्यानिसि शासन
[5] न व्यज्ञितेऽतर्किन्तु लिखितमदिन्तु भासन महाविद्यालय नेरहेर[नाम]।
[6] धा मंगीत।। श्वामवतुः

Translation.

Om! Hail! (When) seven hundred years of Vikrama, exceeded by ninety-four, (in figures) 794 (had passed), in the second half of the month Kartika, at the new moon, on a Sunday, under the constellation Jyeshta, on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun—on that lunar day, which is preceded by they ear, month, half-month and solar day (above mentioned)—the lord of the province of Saurashtra, the supreme sovereign, king of great kings, and supreme lord, the illustrious Jāikadeva, gave—confirming the gift with a libation of

water—to-day here in Bhūmilikā with the approval of his chief minister Bhata Ārya, his associate in the fulfilment of his duties, knowing the instability of worldly affairs and having regard to (the fact that) the occurrence of an eclipse of the sun is a time for charity, for the increase of his own merit and fame, to the Brähmaṇa, called Iśvara (Iśvara) who knows the four Vedas, belongs to the Madgala gotra and to the line of...and invokes Agni by the names of three ancestors, the village, called Dehikā (situated) in the province of Bhūmilikā, together with the n... Read karānaṃ... Chaturthiṃ. L. 10. All the names are exceedingly uncertain; read (विभवस्यः; पुष्पः) L. 11-12. The names are very uncertain.

L. 1, read चुरूः।। L. 2, read भोज्यम्।। L. 3, The first letter of पुष्पः has not been finished, being only ।। instead of ॥। read चुरूः।। L. 4, read गृहः।। L. 6, The two न of भूमिलकायाः have not been finished; read भूमिलकायः।। L. 9, these three akṣaras omitted look like वृक्षोऽपि, which, however, is nonsense. L. 7, read श्रीमः।। L. 8, read कृपाः।। पुष्पः।। L. 9, जा looks like बाका because two vīrāmas have been attached to
enjoys the land of that village of Dhanikā, which is defined by these four boundaries, or causes it to be enjoyed (by others), he must not be disturbed by anybody, (for the Smṛiti says):—"The earth has been enjoyed by many kings, Sāgara and others, &c. (and also): "I beseech as a suppliant that other ruler who will be king when my kingdom has passed away, that he may not act against (this my) edict." This grant has been written by me, the chief keeper of the records, called Narahari. May it be auspicious! Prosperity!

(To be continued.)

SANSKRIT AND OLD-CANAARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

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

(Continued from p. 95.)

No. CXXVII.

I revert to the Rāsthra-kūta dynasty, of which the last inscription published by me is the Wapi grant of Gōvinda III. The present inscription was published originally by Mr. H. T. Prinsep, in the Jour. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. VIII, pp. 292, &c. I re-edit it now from the original plates, which belong to the British Museum. They were handed to Mr. Prinsep by Mr. W. P. Grant, who got them from 'Beni Ram' of Baroda; "and whose account of the method of their discovery, as derived from that person, was that they were dug up in excavating the foundations of a house in that city."

The plates are three in number, each about 11" long by 8" broad at the ends and 7½" in the middle. The edges of the plates were fashioned slightly thicker, so as to serve as rims to protect the writing; and the inscription is for the most part well preserved and legible throughout. There are two rings to this grant. The left-hand ring is a plain ring, about ¾" thick and 3½" in diameter; if ever the ends of it were joined together at all, it had been cut again before the grant came under my inspection. The right-hand ring is about ¾" thick and of an irregular shape, not circular; it had not been cut when the grant came under my inspection; but it was possible to pull one of the ends out of the socket and so to detach it from the plates. The seal, on this ring, is circular, about 1½" in diameter. In the centre of it there is a small countersunk surface, about ¼" in diameter, on which there is, in relief, a figure of the god Śiva,—like the figure on the seals of Nos. CXXI. CXXIII. and CXXXI.,—with perhaps some small and now quite illegible letters under it. The language is Sanskrit throughout.

In this inscription the genealogy commences with Gōvinda I. He and his son Karka I. are mentioned without any historical references. Karka's eldest son, Indra II., is not mentioned. His younger son, Kṛishṇa I., is spoken of as ousting his relative, i. e. his nephew Dantidurgā, in consequence of the latter having fallen into evil courses, and then appropriating the sovereignty to himself. And an allusion to his coming into hostile contact with the Chalukyas is made in the statement that he turned into a deer, i. e. repulsed and put to flight, the Mahāvara or 'the great boar,' which was the family-emblem of the Chalukyas; but, whether it was the Eastern, or whether it was the Western Branch of this family that he thus conquered, is not apparent. It is also said that he established himself at the hill or hill-fort of Eḷaṭpur, his settlement on which is compared with, the abode of the god Śvayambhu Śiva. This place has not been identified, I believe; but it seems to me not unlikely that it is Yellāpur² in the North Canara District, in the Western Ghauts. I understand, however, that Dr. Burgess is more inclined to identify it with the modern Ellār, near Daulat-

¹ Vol. XI. p. 166.

² Lat. 14° 59' N., Long. 74° 47', E.; the chief town of the Tīkōk of the same name.
ābād in the Agraṇābād District, where there are such famous architectural remains. Ėlī
pura is called ēlaṇī, or 'encampment,' of Krishṇa I.; which seems to indicate that it was a
place occupied by him on his campaign against the Chalukyas, who are referred to in the pre-
ceeding verse. Accordingly, the choice of one or other of the above two places for identifica-
tion with it will depend on a great deal upon whether it was the Western Chalukyas, or whether it was
the Eastern Chalukyas, against whom he was then warring. On the one hand, the Eastern
Chalukyas were then in full power, and must have been formidable and active foes; and the
Rādhānāpur grant shows that by Śaka 729 (A. D. 807-8) they were attacked and subdued by Gōvīnda III., which makes it probable that one of his immediate ancestors should have had hostile dealings with them. On the other
hand, we have as yet no authentic and detailed accounts of the Western Chalukyas having
continued to possess any real power after Kṛ-
tivarmā II., for whom we have the dates of Śaka 669 (A. D. 747-8) and 675, and who is
clearly the ruler of the Karnāṭaka whose power-
ful army was defeated by Dantidurgā, the
nephew and predecessor of Krishṇa I. I have
already published an inscription of Krishṇa's
second son and successor Dhrūva, from Paṭaṇḍakalī in the Kālāḍi District;* and I have
recently obtained another of the same king
from Narēgal in the Hāṅgal Tāḷukka of the
Dhārvād District. The two together show
that Dhrūva quite established his power in the
Western Chalukyas dominions; but there is no
evidence that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas had by that
time penetrated further to the south, as they
subsequently did, or to the west. And Yellā-
pur, thirty miles to the north-west from Hāṅgal, is just the place where a stand would be
made against them, or which they would be
anxious to occupy as an important outpost.
I do not, however, know of any remains at Yellāpur such as to answer to the buildings,
whether temporary or permanent, that seem to
be referred to in the present inscription.
Without making any mention of Gōvīnda

---

* No. CXXII. Vol. XI. p. 124.
* Not. LXXVII. and LXXVIII. Vol. IX. pp. 129 and
130.
* See the full transcription of this passage in Vol.
VII. p. 244.
* Vol. V. p. 142.
* The form of this name in the present and other

II., the eldest son of Krishṇa I., the inscription
continues with his second son Dhrūva, and
with Gōvīnda III., the elder of Dhrūva's
two sons. It refers to the fondness of Gōvīnda
III. for invading distant countries, and also
speaks of him as taking away from his enemies
the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā,—which state-
ment must be taken to indicate his conquest of
the countries in that direction,—and also ac-
quiring insignia of royalty in the form of
those two rivers. Here, again, there is a dis-
tinct allusion to the Chalukyas, whether
Western or Eastern. The Nṛṛ grants of
Vijayāditya* mention the banners or signs of
the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā among the insignia
of Vinayāditya; and they are mentioned also in
the Purāṇa introduction to the grant of
Rājarāja II.,* one of the Chōḷa successors of
the Eastern Chalukyas, as being some of the ancient
and hereditary insignia of the Early Chalukyas.

Thus far the inscription follows the main
line, down to Gōvīnda III.,—as far as we have
already gone with the other inscriptions. It
now introduces us, in the person of Gōvīnda’s
younger brother Indra III., to what Dr.
Bühler has named the Gujarāt branch of the
family. Indra III. is spoken of as becoming
the ruler of the province of the lord of Lāṭa, which was given to him by Gōvīnda III. Dr.
Bühler has pointed out† that “Lāṭa corresponds
to what we now would call ‘Central and South-
ern Gujarāt,’—to the country between the
Māḥi and the Kośāna”; but also that,
“to judge from the position of the traceable
localities in the Kāḷi and Baroda
inscriptions, Lāṭa was confined in the ninth cen-
tury by narrower boundaries.” He has also
indicated that the expression of the text, which occurs in exactly the same form in the
Kāḷi grant, implies that Gōvīnda III. had
only recently conquered Lāṭa. The conquest
of the Gurjara* king by Gōvīnda III. is
not mentioned in the Waqi grant, which is
dated on the full-moon of Vaiśākha of the
Vṛaya saṅvatēra, Śaka 728; whereas it is
mentioned in the Rādhānāpur inscription, which is
dated on the full-moon of Śrāvaṇa of the
Rāṣṭrakūṭa inscriptions, and in inscriptions in the
Canarese country, is Gurjara,—with the vowel of the
first syllable long by nature, ă, but in the Gurjara
inscriptions themselves, the vowel of the first syllable
is short by nature, ă; and this form, which is accepted
by Dr. Bühler and by Prof. Monier Williams, is doubt-
less the correct one.
Sarvajit saṅkatsara, Śaka 729. This suggests the inference that it was between the dates of the two grants that Gòvinda III. conquered the Gurjaras, by whom Dr. Bühler understands the Chāpōktaśa or Chauḍas of Aṇhīlwaḍ, and annexed their outlying province of Lāṭā,—i. e. only five years before the date of the present inscription, which is one of the son of the Indra to whom Gòvinda III. gave the government of the province. In the present inscription Indra III. is also said to have himself, alone and unaided, defeated the Gurjaras king; this must have been on the occasion of some subsequent attempt by the Gurjaras to recover the province. And he is also represented as entering into some alliance, protective or defensive if not offensive, with the Mahāsīlvantaśa of the south against Śrīvallabhā, i.e. Gòvinda III., who was then in the course of subduing them. The inscription then mentions Karka or Kakka II., also called Śuṅgavasāra I. and Lāṭēvāra, the son of Indra III. As pointed out by Dr. Bühler, the fact that Kakka II.,—as also his younger brother Gòvinda IV., in the Kāvī grant,—does not use the regal titles, but styles himself simply Mahāsīlvantaśa, implies that he and Gòvinda IV. were not paramount sove-reigns, but only vassals of the Rāṣṭraśaṇa king of the main line. A further confirmation of this view is given by the present inscription in the verse that states that Karka’s svāṁti or “master” made use of his, Karka’s, arm, for the protection of the king of Mālav, as a door- bar to prevent an invasion by the king of Gurjaras who had become puffed up by conquering the lords of Gauḍa and Vaṅga. The submission of the king of Mālav to Gòvinda III. is recorded in the Waṇi and Rādhānur plates. And the svāṁti or “master” of Karka II., here spoken of, can be other than Gòvinda III. himself; and the term is quite explicit as to the relations between him and Karka. Dr. Bühler says4 that the manner in which this inscription speaks of Gòvinda III. indicates that he was dead at the time of its issue, i.e. in Śaka 734. But I do not see on what passage he puts this interpretation. And, as a matter of fact, this was not the case; for the Kādab grant, published by Mr. Rice at p. II above, shows that he was alive on the tenth day of the bright fortnight of the month Jyaśāthā of Śaka 735; and the next inscription that I shall publish will show that his son and successor, Amogaharsha I., succeeded to the throne in Śaka 736-7, and consequently that he himself was still alive up to that date.

The present grant is of the time of Karka II., and is issued from Sīdhaśaṁ.5 It is dated Śaka 734 (A. D. 512-3), on the full-moon day of the month Vaśākha.6 And it records a grant of the village of Vañçapadra, in the Ankotaka Eighty-four circle of villages, to a Brāhmaṇ named Bhānu or Bhānubhāṣa, of the Vatsyayana gōtra, and belonging to the Čaturvedīya or society of Čaturvediśa that had originally started from the city of Vālaḥi. Dr. Bühler7 has identified Anckoṭaka and Jam-bavivikā, one of the villages by means of which the boundaries of Vañçapadra are defined, with the modern Ankūṭ and Jamnāv, five or six miles to the south of Baroda. The other places mentioned remain to be identified.

Lines 70 to 74 contain a kind of postscript, to the effect that this same village had been given by some former king to the society of the Čaturvediśa of Anckoṭa,—that the enjoyment of it had been interrupted by some evil king or kings,—and that Śuṅgavasāra, i.e. Karka II., wishing to allot it again to any excellent Brāhmaṇ, as the reward of learning, selected Bhānubhāṣa, and gave it to him.

Transcription.10

First plate.

[1'] Sa vṛ-tyād-Vēdihaśa yē(ɪh śa)na(ma) yan-nabhī-kamaṇaḥ-kṛitaṁ | Harnas-cha yasya kānt-ēndukalaya sa(ka)m-alalukṣaṁ || Svasti svakṣṭ-ānva-
[a] ya-vāśa-karttā Śrī-Rāṣṭrakūṭ-āmāla-vāśā-janmā | pradāna-sūraḥ samar-aika-virō
Gōvinda-rājaḥ kṣiti-pāta babhūva || Yāsya-ā-

[2] [u]ga-mātra-jayāsāḥ priya-sāhasasya | kṣaṁpāla-vēsa-phaḷam-eva tabhūva saṁyāṁ
muktvā cha Śaṅkaram-ādhaṁvaram-īśvārāṁān | n-āvandat-ā-ā-

bbabhūva guṇa-rājār-udārā-kṛityāḥ ā-

[5] [yō] gauipi(na)-nāma-parivārām-uvaḥa mukhyaṁ | Śrī-Karka-rāja-subhaga-
vyapadeśām-uṛchchaiḥ || Saurāja-jalpō paṁtō prasāṅgā-

[8] n-nidēśanāṁ viśvajanaṁ-saṁpat | rājaṁ Balē paṁvam-ahō babhūva | kṣhiṭāv=
idāṁ-tu nṛipasya yasya || Atyadṛhnu-ā-

kriyāvān-idāṁ | bhūyāśa-chataś-pādām-avighnas-chā-ā-

[10] [raś] || Chitrān na ch-ādam yad-asau yathāvāḥ chakre prajā-pālanam-ētad-ēva |
Vishṇuḥ jagat-[t]ārā-parē maṇas-sthō tasya-ōchī-

utaḥ su-dharmmā khalu Krishna-rājaḥ yō vaṁśya-

[1] mūnulyā vimārgga-ṛṛgaḥ-bhājaḥ [*] rāyaṁ svayaṁ gōtra-hītāya chakre ||
Brāhmāṇyata tasya cha kāpi s-āḥbūd-vīprā yayā || [1] kē-

kriyāḥ || Ichchhā-āśīrkeṣa ā-

[14] krishna(va)lānāṁ | payō yathā muṇchati jātu mēgōh | bhavēn-manaṁ-tad
vīratau tathā-ābhub-aymin-dhanam varshha(raha)ti sēvakaṁān ||

maḥ-vaṁrapam hariṇiḥchakrā | prājya-prabhāvah

[16] khalu rāja-sīgūha(tiha) b || [[]] Elāpur-āchala-gat-ādbhuta-sannivēśanā |
yad-vīkṣhyā
vismāṇāchar-āmarēndrah ēta-ā-

[17] [v] Svaṁyambu-Śiva-dhāma na kriyin(maṁ) Šrī-dṛiśhād-ēdiṣṭī lī saṭataṁ bahu
charchchhayanti || Bhūyās-tathāvīdīha-kriyau vyaya-

[18] sāya-kānir-ētān-mayā katham-ahō kriyam-īty-akasmaṁ | kart-āpi yasya khalu
vismamayā-āpa śī-

[19] [l] pl tan-nāma-kriyantam-ā(h)nākaṁyata yēna rājā ah [[]] Gaṅgāpravāha-himadākhiptī-kālakū-

Second plate: first side.

[19] tair-ātyadbrhūt-ābharaṇakaṇaṁ-kṛita-maṇḍanō-pi | muṇikya-kaṇḍhana-purussara-sarvva-

[20] tyā | tatra sthitāḥ punar-abhūṣyata yēna Śambhūḥ | Nṛipasya tasya Dhrurvarāja-

dvīhatō dādā-ā-

[22] ha || Lakṣmī-prasādhana-vidhāv-upayogī kṛityān | yaś-chintayan-svayaṁ-abhūd-anīśaṁ
kṛit-ārthāḥ | kūṁ v-ātra chitrān-ē-

[23] [n] pēkṣhyā saṁhāyam-īśaḥ sarvashā mūnā-maṇḍe(dha)(v)ḥūṁ svavāśā vīdētāṁ ||
Yō Gaṅgā-Yamūṇo tanāga-su-

[24] bhage gpṛapān-paribhāṣa samaṁ | sākṣeṣe-chhiṁa-nibbēna ch-ēttama-paṁān̄ tata-
praptavān-āśvaram | dōḥ-śasmiita-vaibha-

Gōvinda-rājaḥ sutaḥ ā-

[26] Pradēṣa-vṛttī-tyaṅgasya-bhājāṁ purāṇanāṁsā-āpi pārtvī(tthi) vāṁnāṁ | yaśāṇi yō nāma
jahāḥ bhūpō bhagana-prachā-

[***] The reading of the Kērā grant, nidōśīnam, is prefensible to this.
[11] This mark of punctuation is out of place. Its
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hāsāmanta-chakram[a[n] yatā rakhāṁ-apā vilūnya(qthya)māna-vibhauma Śrivallabhōn-ādārat || Tasya-satmajā prakītita-

vikrama-vairī-varggatra-kshuru-hathahara-santata-labha-kirtiḥ || Śrī-Karkkarajā iti samārita-pūrit-āṣah16 sastrā-śṛttal-vehda-

parīplita-suvva-lōkāḥ || Rājyā yasya na taskaraśa vasatīr-vyādhēḥ peṣutīr-mītā durbhikshaṁ na cha vibhramasya mahīṁ

n-aiv-ōpaśarg-ōdbhavah kṣipā dōśa-gaṇaḥ prātā-vinātā(tō)śēb-āri-varggas-tathā nō vidvat-paripātanāḥ prabhavati krū-

rā khalānāḥ matiḥ || Gauṇadra-Vaṅgapa-nirijaya-durvidagdaḥ-sad-Gūrjāravara-dig-arggalatāḥ cha yasya || nītvā bhujāṁ vihata-

Mālava-rakṣa-aṛtēna svāmī tathā-asya m-āpi rājya-chha(pha)lāni bhuāktē ||Tēn-eḍamā vidyuch-caṇčhalaṁ-ālōka jīvitaṁ kṣiti-dāma-

ēn-cha parama-puṇyaṁ pravarttiṁ-yah dharmaṁ-dāyaḥ [|*]| Sa cha Lalēśvaraṁ samadhyagataśaḥhamahābhadhamahāsamanatā-

dhipati-Suvarṇāva[rasaḥ Śrī-Karkkarajādvō yathā-sambadhyamānānāh rāṣṭrapati-vishayapat-grāmakūṭa-ādha-

kārīka-mahattar-ādīn-samamabādhatay-aṣṭa vaḥ saṣviditaṁ || yathā maya Śrī-Siddḥasamāmāvadēna mā-

tāpirārā-śamanās-ekahīk-āmushrika-puṇya-yaśō-bhividdhaye śrī-Valabhinirṛgga-tachhutīrvidyaśasamānyena-

Vāṭṣyaśāmadghōṭra-Mādhyaṇīnabādā(au)hacḥārī-ṛhmanā-Bhānavo bhaṭṭa-Sōmadityaputrāy-Ā-

ukotākā-chaturāṣṭy-anma(nte)ṛgṛgata-Vaḍapadraak-ābhidhanā-grāmed(ma)ḥ yasya-āghaṭa-
nāmī pūrvvato Jambu-
[vāvikā-grāmāṁ-tathā dakhshipātō Mahāśēnaka-ākhyāna taṭāgaṁ || tathā paschimaṁ-konṭakān ||
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May he protect you, the waterfily in whose navel is made a habitation by Vēdhas; and Hara, whose head is adorned by the lovely crescent moon!

(L. 2.)—Hail! There was a king, Gōvin-darāja, the maker of his own lineage,—born in the spotless Sṛ-Rāṣṭrakūṭa family,—a very hero in making gifts,—pre-eminent in war; whose army, he conquering single-handed and being fond of deeds of daring, had for its result (only to be) a mark of (his being) a king; and who, being possessed of wisdom, worshipped no other, even among the gods, save Śaṅkara, the supreme lord of lords.

(L. 4.)—And when he was wishing for a son,—through the favour of Bhava, there was born to him a son, abounding in virtuous qualities and possessed of great fame, who bore, (as his) principle (title), the lofty and charming appellation of Sṛ-Rāṣṭrakūṭa, together with (another) secondary and attributive name. In talking about good governments, formerly, in sooth, the kingdom of Bali, the prosperity of which was for the welfare of all mankind, was (that which would be cited as) an illustration in discussion; but now (it is the kingdom) of this king in the world. And mankind considered it extremely wonderful that he made Vṛisha,—who, by association with Kali, had come to have only one foot,—to be now possessed of four feet again, (and so to be) unimpeded in his motion. And it is not wonderful that he accomplished in a proper manner the protection of his subjects; for,—since Vishyā, who is pre-eminent in protecting the world, dwelt in his mind,—this (conduit) befitted him, whose mind was (thus) identical with that same (Vishyā).

(L. 9.)—Of that king, of virtuous disposition, there was born a pious son, Kṛiśna-darāja, who, having uprooted his relative who had resorted to evil ways, appropriated the kingdom to himself, for the benefit of his family. He possessed a certain friendliness towards Brāhmaṇa, by reason of which even those who were (only) once-born, (becoming as it were) Brāhmaṇa and being incited by (his) gifts which were worthy of the most excellent twice-born, performed the rites (which are usually) celebrated (only) by those who can recite the sacred texts. Just as, when a cloud discharges rain in excess of the wishes of the cultivators, their minds are (intent) upon the cessation of it, so was it when he showered down wealth (in excess of the least desires) of his servants. He, the most mighty one, a very lion of a king, transformed into a deer the great boar.
which was seized with an itching for battle, and which, kindled with the warmth of bravery, attacked him. Having seen his wonderful encampment situated on the mountain of Ėlla-pura, the astonished immortals, who travel in celestial cars, always take much thought, saying:—"This is the abode of Svaṁbhuv-a, and no artificially made (dwelling); Śrē, (if she could be) seen, (would be) such as this." Verily even the architect who built it felt astonishment, saying:—"(The utmost) perseverance would fail to accomplish such a work again;" aha! how has it been achieved by me?" (and), by reason of it, the king was caused to praise his name. By means of it, Śambhu, who abode there—though decorated (already) with the very wonderful ornaments which are the torrent of the Gaṅgā and the rays of the moon and the kālākūṭa-poison,—was still further decorated with rubies and gold and all other wealth.

(L. 19.)—Of that king there was born a son, of great dignity, named Dhruvārāja; the fire of whose splendour burned up his enemies, who were turned into grass by his prowess. Thinking in person what it was useful to do in propitiating Lakshmi, he was always successful; and what wonder is there in that?, since every man, (even) without depending upon assistance, is able to reduce his own wife into a state of submission to himself.

(L. 22.)—Of him there was born a son, Gōvinḍarāja, the personification of fame, who, taking from his enemies the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, charming with their waves, acquired at the same time that supreme position of lordship (which was indicated) by (those rivers in) the form of a visible sign,—and by whose virtues, wandering about, as if possessed of superhuman power that was not provided with a (corporeal) body (so as to be impeded), the (distant) regions were pervaded. Verily he, the king, who destroyed all the fierce hostile heroes, took away the reputations even of kings of former times who applied themselves to traveling in foreign countries. Truly he, the king, imitated the behaviour of Fate,—uprooting races of lofty kings; making his humble servants into great kings; and disposing (everything) in accordance with his own will. He performed a wonderful achievement, making his enemies in a moment to have their feet jingling with the rattling of chains that are used for fastening the feet of elephants; verily not even Pārtha, the greatest hero in the three worlds, accomplished so quickly the slaughter of his foes. Driven forward by the speed of the fierce shower of arrows discharged by him, the troop of the lordly elephants of his foes, which came against him in battle, imitated the kula-kaila-mountains which are easily caused to swing to and fro by the wind that arises at the moment of the destruction of all things.

(L. 30.)—His brother Indrarāja, equal in bravery to Indra; a glorious king on the earth; the source of the production of wonderful fame,—became the ruler of the province of the lord of Lāṭa, which was given (to him) by that same (Gōvinḍarāja). Even to-day, through their partiality for (his) merits, the gods, the Kinnaras, the Siddhas, the Bādbhas, and the lords of the Vādyākharas, sing his fame, which has the glory of jasmine-flowers, (through absence of mind) placing their hands upon the breasts of their female companions, as if they were in their own homes. And by him, (even though) alone, the leader of the lords of the Gūrjaras, who prepared himself to give battle, bravely lifting up his neck, was quickly caused, as if he were a deer, to take to the (distant) regions; and the array of the Mahā-sāmantas of the region of the south, terrified and not holding together, and having their possessions in the course of being taken away from them by Śrīvatlabhas, through (showing) respect obtained protection from him.

(L. 35.)—His son (is) Śrī-Karkarāja, who always acquires fame by violently ravishing the goddess of the fortunes of his enemies, who are renowned for their valour; who fulfills the desires of those who betake themselves to him; and who protects all mankind by his knowledge of the meaning of the sacred writings. In his kingdom there is no dwelling for any thief, and the production of disease has died out; there is no famine, and no excess of perturbation, (and) no occurrence of evil portents; all faults have disappeared; all his enemies have been reduced by his prowess; and no cruel thought of wicked people prevails.
to cause distress to the learned. And having, for the purpose of protecting (the king of) Mālava, who had been struck down, caused his arm to become the excellent door-bar of the country of the lord of the Gūjjaras, who had become evilly inflamed by conquering the lord of Gauḍa and the lord of Vaiṣṇava,—his master thus enjoys (his) other (arm) also as (embodying all) the fruits of sovereignty.

(L. 40.)—By him, having seen that life is as unstable as the lightning and that the giving of land is the most pious act of all, this religious gift has been effected.

(L. 41.)—And he, Lāṭhīvara, the Mahārāja Mānadhīpata, who has attained all the mahā-bhāsas, SuvarṇavaraśaŚrī-Karkarājadēva, informs the vākṣṭātīti, vākṣṭāpatiś, vākṣṭāpatiś, ādīkārīkaś, mahātattanās, &c., according as they are concerned:

(L. 42.)—"Be it known to you that,—by me, settled at the city of Śrī-Siddhasamī,—in order to increase the religious merit and the fame, both in this world and the next, of my parents and myself,—seven hundred and thirty-four years having elapsed from the time of the Śaka king, on the great full-moon day of (the month) Vaiśākha,—the village named Vaḍāpadraṣa, which is included in the Aṅkoṭṭaka Eighty-four (villages), and the boundaries of which are, on the east, the village of Jambuvāṇī; on the south, the tank named Mahāsēnaka; on the west, (the village of) Aṅkoṭṭaka; and on the north, the village of Vaghāchāchha,—this (village), thus defined as to its four boundaries,—together with the udgāga, the uparīvara, the bhūvāḍaṇga, the right to fines and the proceeds of punishments inflicted for the ten (classes of) offences, (the right to) forced labour as it arises, (and) that which is receivable (in kind) in grain and gold; not to be pointed at with the finger (of appropriation) by any of the king's people; to last as long as the moon and sun and ocean and rivers and mountains may endure; to be enjoyed by the succession of sons and sons' sons; with the exception of grants previously made to gods and Brāhmaṇas; (and to be held) by the rule of bhimiśīchḥhidra,—has, after bathing, been given, with copious libations of water,—for the purpose of keeping up the sacrificial rites of the five great sacrifices of the bali, charu, vaisvadēca, aśvinīkātra, and atithi, and other (rites),—to the Brāhmaṇ Bhānu, the son of the Brāhmaṇa Sūmāditya,—who belongs to the society of the Chaturvediś who started from the (city of) Śrī-Vaiṣṇavaḥ; who is of the Vaiśāyana gōra, (and) who is a student of the Māhāyandinā (śaṅkha).

(L. 54.)—"Wherefore, no obstruction is to be made by any one to him who, according to the proper condition of a brahmādāya, enjoys (this village), or causes it to be enjoyed, or assigns it (to another), or cultivates it, or causes it to be cultivated. And so this, my gift, is to be assented to and preserved, just as if it were a gift made by themselves, by future [kings], whether of my lineage or others, recognising that [the reward of*] a grant of land belongs in common (to him who makes it and to all who preserve it), and bearing in mind that riches are as transient as the lightning and are not enduring, and that life is as unstable as a drop of water on the tip of a blade of grass. And he will be invested with (the guilt of) the five great sins, together with the minor sins, who, having his mind obscured by the thick darkness of ignorance, may confiscate (this grant) or assent to (its confiscation)."

(L. 59.)—And it has been said by the holy Vyāsa, the arranger of the Vedas:—"The giver of land dwells for sixty thousand years in heaven; (but) the confiscator (of a grant of land), and he who assents to (such confiscation), shall dwell for the same number of years in hell!" Verily those 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. Gold is the first offspring of fire; the earth belongs to Vishnu; and cows are the children of the sun; (the whole of) the three worlds would be given by him who gives gold and a cow and land! The earth has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sagara; he, who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the fruits of it! Those gifts (of land), productive of religion and wealth and fame, which have been made here by kings in former times, are like that which is vomited forth from the remains of an offering to an idol; what good man would take them back again? O king! O best of kings!
carefully preserve land that has been given, whether by thyself or by another; the preservation (of a grant) is better than making a grant! Verily the reputations of others are not to be destroyed by men of very spotless minds, regardless of their own advantage, reflecting that wealth, and also human life, is as unstable as a drop of water on the petal of a waterlily! And it has been said by the holy Rāmabhadra:—“Rāmabhadra again and again makes his request to all these future princes, (that) this general bridge of piety of kings should at all times be preserved by them!”

(L. 68.)—And the Dātaka in this matter is the Bājaputra Śrī-Dantivām. This is (the signature of) the own hand of me, Śrī-l-Ka-kka-ra-jā, the son of the glorious Indra-ra-jā. And this has been written by me, Nēmāditya, the son of the high-born Durgabhaṭa, (who am) entrusted with the great (office of the) authority of peace and war.

(L. 70.)—And this same village was given by the Parīkṣa of a former king to the society of the Chaturdāsa of Aṅkoṭtāka. Therefore, also, when (this grant), the enjoyment of which had been broken off through the interruption produced by evil kings, was being given by Śuvaṃavasra, who resolved that it should be the reward of learning of some excellent twice-born man, (this village) was allotted to Bhānu-bhaṭa, an inhabitant of Vaṭapura. Having taken .............. and, with gifts of betel-leaves on account of the Tālādvērika and other classes, having said and ordered that it should be preserved according to desire, (the king said)—“Though (this) town is a natural and spontaneous (gift), yet he knows that (the gift of) it originates from (my devotion) to the feet of (the god) Triyāgātavāra, the supreme lord.”

CHINGHIZ KHĀN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

BY HENRY H. HOWORTH, F.S.A.

(Continued from p. 139.)

XXI.

We have seen how the Mongols during the year 1212 forced the frontiers of the Chinese empire and ravaged its northern borders, retiring again when their great chief, Chinghiz, was wounded. On their retreat the Kin troops reoccupied the districts they had lost, but their advantage was only of short duration. Their general, He-she-rie Hu-sha-hu, notwithstanding his ill-conduct, which we described, was partially reinstated in his command by the Emperor, and was ordered to post himself north of Yen-ching or Yen-king, 1 or 4 leagues north of the pass of Ku-yong. 2 In vain the Emperor’s counsellors, especially Chang-sing-sien, and the minister Tu-shan-i, governed the capital, called Tukan-i by Hyacinthe, deprecated this step: he proceeded to the camp and there began to make arrangements with his creatures Wanian Cheouou, Pu-sha-lukin and Ukulun-tula, (called Vanian-chie Fucha-liegin and Ukuri-dola by Hyacinthe,) to revenge the affront which had been put upon him after his withdrawal from Tu-tung-fu. Instead of making an effort to recover the pass of Ku-yong, he gave himself up to debauchery and hunting, awaiting an opportunity for revenge, and when the Kin Emperor sent to complain he threw down one of his falcons in a rage and killed it. He put to death Fu-hai, who commanded another division of troops, and who was devoted to the empire, amalgamated his army with his own, and then went to the capital pretending that its governor Tu-shan-i was meditating a revolt. He entered

---

23 Mr. Prinsep translated this word by “presumptive heir and brother of the king," thus introducing another name into the genealogy. But this translation cannot well be upheld.
24 Kulaśāpata. This, however, may possibly be a Dukkha-pratikova. This, however, may possibly be a Dukkha-pratikova.
25 The meaning of ṣāḍēsūppaḥ is not apparent.
26 This is perhaps another name of the Vaḍapaḍaraṇa mentioned above, the village granted.
27 The meaning of ṣāḍēsūppaḥ is not apparent.
28 Pāndit Bhagwanlal Indrapal considers that Tālādvērika may be equivalent to "Tālādvēra, an officer similar to the Tulāṭi of the present day." Tulāṭi, or rather Tulāṭi, in the Marāthi and Canarese countries means "a stipendiary (i.e. not hereditary) village-accountant." Tālādvērika may be connected with tāla, 'a leathern case worn by archers on the left arm; the hilt or haft or handle of a sword,' or with tāla, 'a musical instrument of bell-metal or brass; a sort of cymbal played with a stick.' But I am inclined to look upon it as having much the same meaning as the Canarese tāḷavēra, ancient form tāḷa, 'a village-watchman.' At any rate some class of officials is clearly meant.
29 Prākṛtikas. Or perhaps it may mean belongs to one of my subjects.”
30 i.e. the granted.
31 Situated north of the Great Wall.
32 Gaubil, p. 15, note 4.
the city two hours before daybreak by the gate Tong-huen-men and penetrated as far as the gate Kuang-yang-men, which was in its western part. He was preceded by some horsemen who sowed alarm by crying out in a loud voice that the Tache, i.e. the Mongols, were at the gates of the town. Tushan-nanping and his son, Tushan-mulielei, who were known for their zeal, and were related to the murdered Fu-hai, having rushed out on hearing this noise were put to death. Shan-yang, son of Fu-hai, and Shekunai, lieutenant-general, put themselves at the head of 500 Chinese, and tried to appease the tumult and laid about them, as did their men. Meanwhile Hu-sha-hu advanced to the gate Tong-hoa-men, which he forced, and having entered the palace and driven out the guard he took the title of governor of the empire and generalissimo of all the forces. He then had the King Emperor removed to the palace where he was born, and guarded by 200 men. One of the princesses, named Ching-shi, who had charge of the Imperial seal secreted it, but was forced to give it up, and armed with this potent authority Ha-sha-hu used it to make several appointments. He then ordered the eunuch, Li-se-chong, to put the Emperor to death. His intention was to seize the throne, but fearing the animosity that such a step would give rise to, he consulted Tu-shan-i, the governor of Peking, who had been wounded in the foot in the recent mêlée, as to whom he should appoint. He was astonished at the coolness with which the latter said there could be no question about this, since Utuba was the elder brother of Chong-hei and grandson of the Emperor Ulo, in addition to which he was universally beloved and would bear the sceptre gloriously. Ha-sha-hu sent to find this prince at Chang-te-fu in Honan and had him proclaimed Emperor. Gaubil calls Utuba "the prince Sun;" so does Douglas. These events took place in the spring and summer of 1213. At the same time we read how Yeiul-liuko, the Khitan chief, whose rebellion we have described, had himself proclaimed king of Lian and took for the title of his reign the name of Yuen-tung. He speedily conquered the whole of Liau-tung, and took up his residence at Hien-ping. In the autumn of the same year Chinghiz Khan having recovered from his wounds, once more assailed northern China. He again captured Suan-te-fu, now called Suan-hwa-fu, and thence advanced upon Tse-sing-fu now known as Pao-gan-fu. The army were led at the attack on this latter town by his youngest son Tului, and by his relative Chiki, the son of Alju, who scaled the walls at the head of their troops and captured the place. Chinghiz now advanced upon Hwai-lai, situated 15 leagues to the southeast of Suan-te-fu, where he attacked the Kin troops under Wanian-king and Kaoki, called Chuhnkaoki by De Mailla. The latter were speedily defeated, and forty of the ground were covered with their corpses. The Mongols now detached a force against Ku-pih-kow, a fortress on the Great Wall on the main route from Peking to Kara Khoten, and situated at the northernmost point of Pe'chihli. Knowing that the Kin had a strong garrison in the difficult pass of Ku-yung, which they had occupied after the withdrawal of the Mongols the previous year, and where, according to the Yuan-shao-pi-shi, the Kin Emperor had sent Ira and two other generals to occupy the fortress and the force Khulaaniegele to guard it, Chinghiz masked it with a force under the general Ketebi. The Huang-yuan makes two names out of the word, viz., Ketai and Bocha. He himself advanced upon Cho-lu, which is situated 40 li to the south-west of Pao-gan-fu. He then continued his march westward, keeping north of the Great Wall as far as the pass of Tse-king, called Tse-tzin in the Huang-yuan. This authority tells us further that the Kin Emperor sent the great general Aodun to prevent Chinghiz forcing the pass and emerging on the plain, but he had scarcely arrived when the Mongols forced the barrier. They defeated a Kin army near the mountain Wu-hoi-ling, called Wuh-wel-ling by Douglas and Uhnei by Gaubil, who tells us it is a small mountain near the town of Kuang-chang-hien.

---

6 Douglas, pp. 70 and 71; De Mailla, tome IX, p. 54.
8 Douglas, p. 58.
9 De Mailla, tome IX, p. 52.
10 Called Tokepoe by Douglas and Kote-pucha by De Mailla.
on the borders of Shan-si and Pe-chih-li. Chinghis now captured the towns of Cho-chuan and Yih-chuan, both well-known places in Pe-chih-li, to the south-west of the modern Peking.

The Yuan-chao-pi-shi says that he now arrived at Saari-keer, by which Palladius understands Shara-gol, the Yellow river, that is, the Khun-khi flowing near Peking. Meanwhile the pass of Ku-pih-kow, already named, was surrendered by its commander, a Khitan general, named Wu-lan-par, who retired without striking a blow, while the Mongol general Chepe was detached by Chinghis to march by way of Nan-keen to attack the pass of Ku-yang from the south. Having taken it, he repaired to that of Ku-pow, where he joined Ketebji. The capital was now threatened, it will be seen, on two sides, and Chinghis having selected 4,000 picked men, sent them under Kieitai and Hatai to invest it. Gaubil and D’Ohason say that Chepe and Ketebji despatched 5,000 picked men to reinforce Khota and Khata, who were investing the capital, which seems a more reasonable story.

The Huang-yuan calls the two commanders Kieitai and Bocha. This investing army having reached the river Ho-ho, intended to cross it by the bridge Gao-tsiaio, so Hyacinthe, p. 62, reads the passage in the Keng-nu. De Mailla in his translation, and Gaubil call the river Tsaio, and Gaubil says it was not really a river but a canal which came from Chang-ping-chuan, and passed near the capital. When the later city of Peking was built, a number of fresh canals were cut, and the face of the country was much changed between the Hoen-ho and the river passing by Tong-chuan. Hu-sha-hu, who had been wounded in the foot, had to travel in a chariot to prevent the Mongols crossing the bridge. He nevertheless defeated them, that is, doubtless defeated their advanced posts. They renewed the attack the next day, when he was not well enough to go out, and accordingly ordered the general Kaoki with 5,000 men to oppose them. Kaoki arrived too late and Hu-sha-hu would have put him to death, but the Emperor forgave him on account of his ancient services. Having given him some more troops he said to him, “If you

---

11 Yuan-chao-pi-shi, p. 141; Dougias, p. 70; Hyacinthe, pp. 55 and 56; De Mailla, tome IX, pp. 54 and 55; Gaubil, p. 18; D’Ohason, vol. I, p. 156.
12 De Mailla, tome IX, p. 55.
15 De Mailla, tome IX, p. 55; Gaubil, p. 19, note 1.
16 De Mailla, tome IX, p. 55; gaubil, p. 19, note 1.
chau also in Shen-si. The Mongols had captured a large number of Chinese officers who readily took service in their ranks, deeming it doubtless a small offence to transfer their allegiance from one set of Tartars to another, both of them strangers to themselves. Chinghiz Khan was much attached to them, and entrusted some of them with commands; and, as we are told, formed 46 brigades out of the Chinese whom Yang-pe-yu and Lieoa-lin had brought him. He now determined upon a systematic attack upon the Kin empire, and divided his forces into four divisions; one of them under Kota and Khaïa, were ordered to post themselves north of the capital and to invest it. His three sons, Juchi, Jagatai and Ogota were ordered to ravage the districts to the south and south-west of Peking as far as the Yellow River. They crossed the mountains Tai-hang, called Qhah-kin by Hyacinthe, advanced as far as Leò in Honan, and captured 28 cities, namely, Poou, Sui, Gansuh, Gan-ting, Hing, Ming and Tsze in Chihli; Seang, Wei-hwuy, Hwai, Mang and Leò in Honan and Tsh, Loo, Lesou, Tsan, Ping-yang, Tai-yuen, Keih, Heen, Pâ, Fun, Shih, Lan, Hin, Tai and Woo in Shen-si.

A second army under Chinghiz Khan's brother, Juchi Khasar, with whom were Kwantsin Noyan and Chotseteposhti (called the General Pocha by Gaubil), advanced towards the east and laid waste the maritime districts of Pe-chih-li, the province of Liau-si and all the country between Liau-tung, Peking and the sea. The Yuan-shi says they conquered Souchang, Ping-luan and Liau-si. The Huang-yuan calls the commanders of this division Khasar, Olyni-nayan and Bocha.

The third army, under Chinghiz Khan himself in person, with his youngest son Tului, marched southwards towards the province of Shan-tung as far as Tang-choon on the Shan-tung promontory, and also captured twenty-eight cities, namely, Heung, Pâ, Mo, 35 li north of the modern Jinchew-heen; Gang, 26 li to the north of the modern Woo-kenou-heen, Ho-keen, Tsâng, King, Heen, Shin, Ke, Le, Ke, and Kae in Chih-li; Hwa, 20 li to the east of the modern Hwa-heen in Honan; Gân, Pâh, Pö Tae Tae-gan, Tseenan, Pin, Tae, Yü-tou, Tsze, Wei, Tang, Læe and E, in Shan-tung. Meanwhile Mu-khu-li laid siege to Me-chau, situated in Choo-ching-heen in Shan-tung, which he captured after a severe resistance, and slaughtered its inhabitants. We are told that the desertion of Shetteen and Secowpoter at this time was a serious loss to the Kins, and so high was the value set upon their services that Mu-khu-li conferred on them the rank of Wan-hu, i.e., commanders of 10,000 men.

We can hardly realize the terrible surroundings of a campaign on this scale by the Mongols, whose policy was to exterminate wherever resistance was offered. The systematic trampling under foot of three such populous and flourishing provinces as Pe-chih-li, Shan-tung, and Shaan-si must have involved a complete carnival of slaughter and destruction. The Yuan-shi says:—"The Kins, in order to protect themselves, sent their best troops to guard the mountain passes and the fords, and summoned into the towns those capable of bearing arms. When Chinghiz heard of this he ordered his generals to take the old men, women and children whom they met with in the undefended towns and villages, and to put them in front of the army. The peasants and others who manned the walls of those towns where defence was contemplated hearing the voices of their fathers, mothers, wives and children, were unwilling to fight when it involved the slaughter of their relatives. Desolation reigned everywhere in Shan-si, in the part of Honan, north of the Yellow River, in Pe-chihli and Shan-tung. The Mongols pillaged and destroyed more than 90 towns. They reduced to ashes an infinite number of villages, carrying off all they could in the shape of gold, silver and silk, massacring thousands of useless persons, and carrying off a multitude of women and children." The booty which they swept away in the shape of cattle was inestimable, and in the wide district we have named only about ten towns escaped.

---

22 Gaubil, pp. 20 and 21; De Mailla, tome IX, p. 57.
23 Names otherwise given as Kietai and Hatai.
24 De Mailla, tome IX, pp. 57 and 53; Hyacinthe, p. 65; Gaubil, p. 21.
25 The modern Lewching-heen.
26 The modern Tsing-chow.
27 The modern Tse-su-heen.
28 The modern Tsung-chou-heen.
29 Douglas, p. 72; Hyacinthe, pp. 56 and 57; De Mailla, tome IX, p. 55; Gaubil, p. 21.
30 Called Sc-tkiai and Subut by Hyacinthe.
31 Douglas, p. 73; Hyacinthe, p. 57.
capture. These included the capital and the town of Tung, in the district of Shun-tian-fu Shun, Chin-ting, Tsing, Wuh, Ta-ming, Tung-ping in Chih-li; Tih in Shan tung; Pei and Hae-chau in Kansu.

The various divisions of the Mongols reassembled in April 1214 at Ta-keau, a few leagues to the west of the capital, for the purpose of investing it more closely. The Huang-yuan calls the place Jen-dian. Chinghiz Khan's generals asked permission to be allowed to storm the town, and undertook to capture it. He refused, however, and sent Ilich and Chhepa to inform the Emperor Utuba that he had conquered all the towns of Shan-tung and Ho-pe, and that there only remained Yen-king which he had not subdued. "Heaven," he added, "has reduced you to such a feeble condition, and has exalted me so much above you, what do you think of its intentions towards me? I wish to retire to Tartary, but can you let my troops depart without appeasing their anger with presents." Kaoki, the Kin commander, called Gao-tsi in the Huang-yuan, urged that the enemy's army was stricken with sickness, that their horses were worn out and unfit for service, and he proposed to march out and attack it. Wanian-chin-hoei, another minister, argued on the other hand, that they would be running too many risks acting thus, since the larger portion of soldiers in Yen-king had their families elsewhere, and could not therefore be depended upon to stay. "If we suffer any check," added he, "they will certainly disperse. In that case what advantage shall we gain over the enemy. We cannot retain them, they wish to return to their wives and children, the fate of the empire depends on this decision. My advice is, that we accept the peace which the Mongols propose." Utuba followed this counsel, and sent Chin-hoei to the Mongol camp, to conclude peace. Chinghiz Khan demanded a Kong-chu or princess of the Kin Imperial family, and he was accordingly given the princess of Tsu, daughter of the late Emperor Chong-hei, as well as presents of money, silk, 500 young boys, as many girls and 3,000 horses. He now returned home again. The Kin Emperor sent his minister Fu-hing or Fu-sing to conduct him through the Ku-yung pass. When he had traversed this he slaughtered the prisoners of both sexes whom his troops had captured, and who amounted to a prodigious number. The Huang-yuan says, Fu-sing conducted Chinghiz as far as lake Yema. The Yuen-chao-pi-shi, which tells the story of the Chinese campaigns in a jejune fashion, has an interesting paragraph about the episode last mentioned. At the time when Bei-pin was attacked, the Kin minister Van-gin said to the Kin ruler: "By the will of heaven it seems that the time has arrived for giving the throne over to others. There are many tribes which have strengthened themselves exceedingly, they have extinguished our bravest armies, and taken our most hopeful fortress Tsiun-kan. If we again engage them in battle and lose the fight our armies will disperse. It is better to submit to the ruler of the Dada—let him lead away his army. When he has led it away we may gain time. Moreover, we hear that in the armies of the Dada an infectious disease has broken out on account of their being unaccustomed to this climate. Now give the ruler of the Dada your daughter, gold, silver and stuffs, and see whether he will consent to go or not. The ruler of the Kin consented, and submitted to Chinghiz, and sent the princess to him with Van-kin and with gold, silver, and stuffs. After that the besieging armies left the city. Van-kin personally accompanied Chinghiz to the defile which is between Motjou and Fujou, i.e. between Ma-chau and Fu-chau, and bidding him farewell returned again. The warriors tied up the gold and silver and other things in strong cloth, and having heaved it up, rode away." The last sentence has a certain epical flavour about it.

In regard to the princess who was given in marriage by the Kin Emperor to Chinghiz, and who is called the daughter of Veisha Obana, in the Huang-yuan, Rashidu'd-din has apparently

---

misunderstood the descriptive title of Kung-chu, and made a proper name of it. He tells us the princess was called Kacha Khatun, and adds although Chinghiz had no children by her he held her in high honour. She lived until the time of his grandson Arikbuka. This campaign added immensely, no doubt, to the prestige of Chinghiz. To break down the frontier defences of the renowned Kin empire, to capture so many of its towns and to butcher so many of its people; finally, to secure a princess of its Imperial family as his bride, was assuredly, to a leader of Asiatic nomades, drinking deep from the cup of glory and success, and we may well believe that the loads of treasure which his people carried off wrought a strange social revolution among the unsophisticated shepherds and herdsmen of the desert.

The condition of the Kin empire on the other hand was most critical. It is true the Mongols had withdrawn, but they had only done so after ruining the land and squeezing it of its wealth and resources, while Lian-tung, that frontier province which lay between China and the ancient home of the Churchis or Kin Tartars, was in the hands of a rebel prince, who was sustained by the Mongols, and to whom his province formed an easy gateway into China. We are not surprised that the Kin Emperor, who had seen the various vaunted defences of the empire crumbling at the assault of the Mongols, should have felt that his capital city of Yen-king was no longer a safe residence; and should have suggested a migration of the court to Pien-leang or Pien-king, now called Kai-fung-fu, situated on the southern bank of the Yellow River in Honan, and which was the Nan-king or southern capital of the Kin dynasty.

Tuk-tan-i urged upon the Emperor that by this policy he would lose the northern provinces of the empire, while the Nan-king to which he proposed to retire was surrounded by enemies on all sides; having the Sang on the south, the empire of Hia on the west, the Mongols on the north, while Lian-tung which was the cradle of the Kin empire was strong by situation, being protected by the sea and by inaccessible mountains. He urged that advantage should be taken of the peace to make new levies to reinforce the troops and train them well, and to replenish the magazines and arsenals. This advice was seconded by that of the other chief ministers, but the Emperor would not be convinced, and shortly after Tu-phan-i, whose fidelity, sagacity and uprightness made him universally respected, died. He now nominated Wanian-fu-hsing or Fu-sing, generalissimo of the troops. With him was nominated as a colleague, Monian Tsin-Chong, and the Tzgosyan, i.e. second minister, called Tsin-juna in the Hoang-yuan and Muyen-tsin-chung by Douglas. They were to defend Yen-king, and to assist by their counsel the heir to the throne, Shen-shun (called Shochung by Douglas), who was to remain behind and encourage the citizens. Having made all his preparations, the Emperor set out in the sixth month of 1214 for Pien-leang, with the people of his household and those officers who were not disposed to run the risk of another encounter with the Mongols. When he arrived at Leang-hiang, a town situated five leagues to the south-west of the modern Peking, he demanded from his troops the return of the horses and cuirasses which had been supplied to them for the defence of the capital, and which inasmuch as he had no more enemies to conquer he deemed would not be wanted. This caused a mutiny. The cavalry which was escorting him put to death their general Seowen, and chose three others extend to us, we will always pay you the products of our country as tribute, camels, woolen stuffs and falcons. Having collected from his people so many camels that they could not be driven straight he presented them to Chinghiz, who now returned to Saari-kheer (i.e., the Yellow Plains, by the Oono), and encamped there. All this, as I have said, must be understood to be a parenthesis introduced here by accident, and properly referring to the years 1200 and 1210.

32 De Mailla, tome IX, p. 62; 33 He is called Fusun by Haicinthe, and in the Hoang-yuan, Bashida'd-din, styles him Peking Ching Sung, (i.e. the minister Fu-sing) by De Mailla and Gaubil he is called Wanian Chinhoei.

Haicinthe, p. 65; Douglas, p. 74; De Mailla, tome IX, p. 65; Gaubil, pp. 23 and 24; Hoang-yuan, p. 186.
named Choda or Kanta, Fisher and Chalar to lead them. They then retraced their steps, and seized the bridge over the Lu-keon, the modern Hoen. Gaubil says this beautiful bridge is situated two leagues west-south-west of the modern Peking. Wanian Chin-hoei who was in command at Yen-kien sent an army against the rebels which was defeated, but Choda did not feel himself strong enough to continue the struggle alone, so he sent a courier to Chinghiz Khan to offer him his services and to ask for his protection. The Huang-yuan and Rashid-u'd-din as usual are very closely alike here. They both call the mutineers Khitans. They agree that the Emperor had reached Ju-jau when the mutiny took place, and that the body of troops which mutinied was behind and broke out into rebellion at another place called Lian-sian in the Huang-yuan, and Lin-pi-hien in the copy of Rashidu'd-din followed by Erdmann, both referable to the Leang-hiang above named. The murdered general is called Saunia by the Chinese author, and Seguneh by the Persian one. The former agrees with De Mailla in the names it gives the three substituted leaders, namely, Kanda, Bisher and Chalar, while Erdmann's MS. of Rashidu'd-din is naturally very corrupt in preserving these names which it gives as Jined, Niran, and Bilan.

According to the Huang-yuan Fu-sing hearing of the mutiny closed Lu-gu, i.e. the bridge Lu-keon above named, and would not let the rebels pass through; whereupon Kanta sent his officer Tataran with a division of light horse, 1000 strong, which crossed the river secretly and fell upon the men who were guarding it from behind and destroyed them. They seized all the clothes, armour, and weapons, and the horses grazing near the bridge. Rashidu'd-din tells the same story, only that instead of a general Tataran, he speaks of a contingent of Tartars who were found by the Khitans near the bridge and were in the pay of the Kin Emperor, and who joined them. The Huang-yuan dates the withdrawal of the Emperor in the fourth month, and says that in the fifth month the young prince whom he had left in charge of Yen-kien went south and joined his father. Rashid-u'd-din makes him do so after five months. On retiring from China, Chinghiz doubtless intended to give the empire only a respite, and meant to avail himself of the last excuse to return. He went to pass the summer near lake Yurli in Tartary, which, according to Hyacinthe, is situated in the district occupied by the Mongol tribe of Khorlos. The Yuan-shi-lei-pien says Chinghiz went to the town of Hoan-chau in Tartary which is probably a mistake. He professed great indignation on hearing of the withdrawal of the Kin Emperor to Pien-leang, saying, "We have only just made peace with one another, yet he changes his court. This proves the suspicion and bad feeling which he entertains. He has only made peace with me to deceive me, and in the hope that I shall not be on my guard." He was therefore glad to receive Choda's envoy. He sent an army to help him. This was commanded, according to the Yuan-shi, by the generals Samaka, Shumulu and Mingan. De Mailla makes two names of them, namely, Sannoho and Simominga. Rashidu'd-din likewise only speaks of two generals whom he calls the Saljut Samukha Beladur, and the Churchit Mingan. The Huang-yuan says that in consequence of the submission of many Khitan chiefs Chinghiz ordered San-juuru and Mukhabdu, who led the advanced guard of the Khitans, and the brothers Min-an and Taibao to unite their troops with those of Kanda and together to attack the Middle Capital.

Meanwhile we must turn for a short time to another district. We have seen how the Khitan prince, Yeliu-liuko, secured the kingdom of Liao-tung. It would seem that after the withdrawal of the Mongols the Kin troops had recovered Liau-yang which was then the Tung-king, or Eastern capital of the Empire, as well as the capital of Liao-tung, and some other places in the province. Chinghiz thereupon sent Mu-khu-li to assist in recapturing them. As he passed the district of Lin-hoang, Lutsong-
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54 De Mailla, tome IX, p. 64; Gaubil, p. 24; Hyacinthe pp. 68 and 72; Douglas, pp. 74 and 75.
55 Huang-yuan, pp. 186 and 187; Erdmann, p. 327.
56 Huang-yuan, p. 157; Erdmann, p. 328.
57 The Mongols call it Chagassatui, and it is also called Baiur-chagan-nor. Hyacinthe, pp. 65 and 438; Douglas, p. 75; D'Ossian vol. I. p. 145 note.
59 De Mailla, tome IX, p. 63.
60 The Huang-yuan says the envoy of Kanta and Bisher.
61 Erdmann, p. 328.
62 The Huang-yuan says...
tainpo, the commander of Kao-chau, went to him with the principal people of the place and submitted. Mu-khu-li had sent a flying corps under Siaoyesien to explore. He is called a Uighur of the horde of Shantsu by Gaubil. Having learnt from some prisoners that the governor of Tung-king had been changed, and that the new governor was en route to occupy his post, Siaoyesien waylaid him en route, and killed him. He seized his letters of appointment, rejoined his own people and informed them of his plans, after which he went to Tung-king, where he persuaded the officer of the guard that he was the new governor whom they expected. Suspecting no treachery he conducted him with due honour to the governor's palace, where all the officers went to salute him. Siaoyesien had noticed on entering the town the number of troops on the ramparts, and on asking the reason was told that being posted on the frontier it was necessary to be very vigilant. "I come from the court, he replied, and everything there is peace. Why sow alarms by such great preparations?" He then summoned the officers of the guard, told them to have their minds at rest, that it was not necessary to uselessly fatigue themselves, and that they might dismiss the troops and send them home, as he would keep himself well informed of the march of the enemy. Three days later Mu-khu-li arrived before sunrise with all his army, and occupied the town without a single arrow being fired. By this conquest the Mongols secured several thousand li of territory, 180,000 families, 100,000 soldiers, and an immense quantity of riches. Of thirty-two towns in the district there was only Tai-nung, which had time to put itself in a state of defence and which the Mongols could not capture. 48

The Yuan-shi says Mu-khu-li in this campaign captured Lu-tsung and Tsing-gua in Giao-chau and Tsin-chau. 49 Douglas gives the names as Kowcho, 48 Lu-tsung, and Kinpo. 49 Setientsien, a Mongol officer, made Wanian-husen prisoner, and sent him to Mu-khu-li, who wanted to put him to death, but Setientsien dissuaded him, saying he would not diminish the number of the enemy by putting them to death, but would rather irritate people against him. Besides which he had promised this prisoner to spare his life if he surrendered, and he urged him not to oblige him to break his word, but rather to set him at liberty and to give him a command. Mu-khu-li followed this advice. 46 He now penetrated into Lian-si where the Kin general In-tsing went against him at the head of 200,000 men. They met in the country of Hon-tao. The fight lasted for many hours, when the Kin troops were defeated and fled, leaving 80,000 corpses on the field. In-tsing now withdrew to Ta-ting-fu, which was then the Peking or Northern Court, which he intended to defend, but the provisions becoming exhausted his officers mutinied and killed him and put one of his subordinates in his place. He is called Ukhuri Illukhu by Hyacinthe, Wukne Eletuha by Douglas, In-khuakhai in the Huang-yuan and Intanh by De Maille. Mu-khu-li now summoned the new commander to surrender. The latter did not wish to injure his reputation by giving in without a struggle, so he allowed Setien-seung to beat him and then surrendered the town. Mu-khu-li, irritated that it had not surrendered at once, wished to destroy the place, and to slaughter all its inhabitants. Siaoyesien was horrified at this cruelty, and said to him: "The northern capital is the most important place in Lian-si. If you exercise the severity you threaten, do you think you will find other towns surrendering?" Mu-khu-li assented to this, and urged upon Chinghiz to allow its late commander who had surrendered it to retain his post, while he recommended the Uighur (i.e. Siaoyesien), to be made a general of cavalry, and to be appointed Inspector of the Tribunals in that district. 11 Gaubil says, on the other hand, that Mu-khu-li after capturing the northern capital did put to death many of the enemy's troops on the pretext that they had surrendered too late, but he ceased the slaughter when it was urged that this conduct would prevent other towns from surrendering. 72 He adds that in order to defend his kingdom the Kin Emperor had to levy heavy contributions, which caused some of his officers to go over to the Mongols and others to remain inactive. 73

46 De Maille, tome IX, pp. 65 and 66; Gaubil, p. 26.
47 Situated to the south-west of the right wing of the Kartsin Mongols, who lived west of the Chakharas.
events we have been describing took place, so far as we can be certain of the chronology of this difficult period, during the year 1214. The next year was even more disastrous for the Kin empire than the previous one. Fuchs-tsékín⁷⁴ who commanded at Tung-chau on the Peiho, and was one of the best Kin generals, deserted to the Mongols with all his troops. Chinghiz Khan gave him the rank of general in his own service and rewarded those who had followed him.⁷⁵ Rashidu'd-din calls him the Treasurer Kheda, and says he gave his grandson Jungshai as a hostage for his behaviour, and went back to Tung-chau.⁷⁶ After capturing the northern capital as we have mentioned, Mu-khu-li sent two of his officers named Kaotêyn and Lien-possonnor to summon Ulipu, the governor of Sing-tsong-fu, called Hing-chung-fu by Douglas, who says it is a city of the Tumed tribe, situated to the north-west of Ning-yuen. Ulipu put Lien-possonnor to death, and would have done the same to Kaotêyn if he had not escaped. The officers and citizens blamed this truculence, and, afraid that Mu-khu-li would make reprisals, they united against Ulipu and deprived him of the command of the place which they made over to Sitienag, who submitted to Mu-khu-li, and was given command of the troops in the place.⁷⁷

We will now return to the operations of the Mongols against the central capital Yen-king. We have seen that Samuka and Mingan, with the Khitan general Choda, were ordered to lay siege to it. It was defended with persistent valour, but the minister Chahu Kaoki who had accompanied the Emperor when he moved to his southern capital was jealous of Wanian Fu-sing,⁷⁸ and of his colleague Monian Tsín-chong, who commanded at Yen-king, and took care that the reinforcements they sent for did not reach them. Wanian-sulan informed the Emperor, and accused the minister of fomenting disturbances on the frontier, and of treating his faithful people badly, but such warnings were useless, and the minister retained his credit. The two commanders now sent one of their officers to Pien-liang, and having gained access
to the Emperor informed him of the condition of things at Yen-king. Utubu professed surprise, and ordered Yong-si and King-chau, two of his best officers, to collect the various detachments scattered in the departments of the southwest and of Ho-pê as well as a large stock of grain. The general Li-ing was entrusted with the task of conducting these reinforcements and provisions to the beleaguered capital of the empire, but he was without experience, devoted to wine and had not control of his men, and one day when he was drunk a body of Mongols met him north of Pa-chau, and his army was completely beaten. He was killed, and the grain he was conveying was captured.⁷⁹ Two other generals were marching after him, and, according to the Huang-yuan had charge of the convoy. It calls them the Tsian-dian (revisor), Tsin-shou and the Yuan-shna Liin. The Huang-yuan says further they were to furnish provisions by different roads, and each man was to take three don of bread. Liin worked himself and encouraged the others, but when Tsin-shou reached the Jo-jou fortress Siyan-fin-jau and Liin reached those of Bajou and Tain, all the grain was seized by our troops.⁸⁰ The last phrase shows the Huang-yuan was written under Mongol auspices. Rashidu'd-din, in the text followed by Erdmann, says there were three commanders in charge of the convoy, namely, Gung-su, Rim-gan-che and Li-ting, besides a divisional commander of troops. He says the convoy was of rice, and that each man had to carry three Kujin, which in Chinese were called Siner. The divisional general marched along the road to the fortress of Su-chau-wei and the others with the convoy by another route. He was met and beaten at Sing-pi, while the convoy was captured at Pa-chau.⁸¹ From this time the communication between Yen-king and Pien-leang was severed.

Wanian Fu-sing having learnt of the collapse of the effort to relieve the city, and losing all hope, proposed to his colleague that they should both march against the enemy and die sword in hand for the glory of their country. The latter, who had immediate control of the

⁷⁴ Called Fuchs-tsék in Hyacinthe and Pussa-taitzin by DeMailla, the Huang-yuan calls him the fujinchai, i.e. assistant of the commander of the forces.
⁷⁵ De Mailla, tome IX, p. 68; Douglas, pp. 76 and 76; Hyacinthe, p. 75; Huang-yuan, p. 187.
⁷⁶ Erdmann, p. 330.
⁷⁸ De Mailla, tome IX, pp. 68 and 70; Douglas, p. 77; Hyacinthe, p. 75; Ganshi, p. 27.
⁷⁹ The King-chau and Yong-si of De Mailla.
⁸⁰ Op. cit. p. 188.
⁸¹ Erdmann, Temudshin, pp. 328 and 329.
troops, would not consent. Fu-sing quitted him in anger, and not wishing to play the part he had assigned himself alone, first repaired to the Hall of Ancestors of the Kin Imperial family, to which he was related, and after making the usual prostrations and going through the customary ceremonies he summoned one of his officers named Chasoeouen, to whom he confided his intention of committing suicide. On the first day of the fifth month he wrote a memoir which he confided to a mandarin named Se-gan-shē to remit to the Emperor. In this document he set out the measures which he deemed necessary to save the empire, exposed the treachery and intrigues of the minister Chahun-kaokü, and finished by deploring his own misfortune, and declaring himself worthy of death for not having been able to preserve Yen-king. He then arranged his affairs, summoned his household, and distributed his property among his domestics, as if it was the happiest day of his life. He alone in his palace was not in tears. He then took a cup full of wine which he offered to Se-gan-shē, and taking one himself he addressed that mandarin, saying:—"It was from you I learnt the beautiful maxims contained in the King, and it would not be seemly that you should have taken all this pains in vain. I ought to put your precepts into practice." After having drunk several cups with him he bade Se-gan-shē good-bye. The latter had scarcely left the house when cries and lamentations there induced him to return, and he then found that Fu-sing had taken a deadly poison, and was dead. His servants buried him in the court-yard of his palace.82

When the Emperor read the memoir which Fu-sing had prepared for him he gave him the posthumous title of Wang. Gaubil adds that it is an ancient custom in the empire to punish and reward the dead. Titles, Mandarinats, and extraordinary honours are freely given to the dead, and sometimes they are as freely tried for offenses, deprived of their titles or degraded, or the monuments put up to them destroyed.84 The same day on which Fu-sing committed suicide some princesses and the ladies of the harem whom the Kin emperor had left at Yen-king when he went away, having learnt that it was Mönian Tsin-chong's intention to abandon the capital and to withdraw southwards, prepared their carriages and told him they intended leaving with him. Fancying that he could not well escort them without himself falling into the hands of the Mongols, he bade them wait till he had made way for them. They believed him, whereupon taking with him only some of the women to whom he was attached and some relatives and friends, he left that town without looking behind him. When he reached Chong-shan,83 he told his companions he could not have escaped from his difficulty if he had taken the ladies of the harem with him. His treachery and meanness did not serve him long however. Se-gan-shē, who had gone ahead to the court at Pien-leang, duly informed the authorities there of what had occurred at Yen-king, and when the craven governor arrived the Emperor would not speak to him about the place, and shortly after had him tried and condemned to death for treason. On the withdrawal of its governor the Mongols entered Yen-king, and killed a vast number of mandarins and people. During the confusion some soldiers set fire to the palace, and the conflagration lasted for a whole month.85 This is partially confirmed by Rashidu'd-din, who tells us that during the siege the famine became so severe that the citizens fed on the living and the dead.86 Carpini has a romantic account of the siege, largely imaginative. He makes the besieging army the victims of the famine, and tells us how Chinghiz ordered one man in ten to be set aside to feed the rest with. The garrison, he goes on to say, fought bravely, and fired weapons from their machines and also arrows, and when stones failed them they threw silver and also melted silver. The city, he says, was full of various kinds of treasures. Eventually the Mongols made a great subterranean road opening into the middle of the place, through which they suddenly emerged and made an attack from within, while those outside assailed it from without, broke open the gate, killed the Emperor !!! and captured the city.87 Minhaj-i-Siraj, the author of the Tabakat-i-Nasiri, has a similar account. He calls the Chinese capital the city of Tamgháj, and tells us Chinghiz

82 De Mailla, tome IX, pp. 70 and 71; Gaubil, pp. 27 and 38; D'Ohsson, vol. I, p. 147.
83 Gaubil, pp. 29 and 39; De Mailla, pp. 71 and 72.
84 i.e. Psu-lang-tu, a town of Fw-chib-li.
besieged the city for a period of four years, until every stone that was in the city had been discharged from the catapults by its defenders, and when the stones, bricks, &c., were exhausted, everything made of iron, brass, lead, copper, tin, and pewter was similarly used, and then balisars or ingots of gold and silver were thrown instead of stones. It was reported that Chinghiz Khán had issued orders that the soldiers were to pay no heed to this shower of precious metals. After an attack of four years the city was taken. All these fantastic details help us to understand the importance of the great capital of Cathay in the eyes of western authors and travellers. One of the latter, the Sayyid Baha-ud-din, the Kázi, who, at this time went on an embassy from the Khwarezm Sháh Muḥammed to Chinghiz Khán, and to whom we shall revert in a later paper, says:—

"When we arrived within the boundaries of Tangháj, and near to the seat of government of the Altan Khán, from a considerable distance a high white mound appeared in sight, so distant, that between us and that high place was a distance of two or three stages, or more than that. We, who were the persons sent by the Khwarezm Sháh government, supposed that that white eminence was perhaps a hill of snow, and we made inquiries of the guides and the people of that part [respecting it], and they replied, 'The whole of it is the bones of men slain.' When we had proceeded onwards another stage, the ground had become so greasy and dark from human fat, that it was necessary for us to advance another three stages on that same road, until we came to dry ground again. Through the infections [arising] from that ground, some [of the party] became ill, and some perished. On reaching the gate of the city of Tangháj, we perceived, in a place under a bastion of the citadel, an immense quantity of human bones collected. Inquiry was made and people replied, that, on the day the city was captured, 60,000 young girls, virgins, threw themselves from this bastion of the fortress and destroyed themselves, in order that they might not fall captives into the hands of the Mongols, and that all these were their bones."  

FOLKLORE IN THE PANJÁB.
COLLECTED BY Mrs. F. A. STEEL.

(Continued from p. 104.)

No. 19.—Lambikin.  
Once upon a time there was a wee lambkin who frolicked about on his little tottering legs. One day he met a jackal who said: "Lambikin, Lambikin, shall I eat you?"  
But Lambikin gave a little frisk and answered:—

Náá nol jáwáñá :  
Motá tájá áwáñá :  
Pher túñ maín nún kháwáñá :  
To Granny's house I go:  
There I shall faster grow:  
And you shall eat me so.

The jackal, thinking this reasonable, let the lambkin pass, and soon afterwards the lambkin met a vulture, who said:—

"Lambikin, Lambikin, shall I eat you?"

But the lambkin answered as before, and the vulture, thinking it was only reasonable, let the little fellow pass.


The lambkin is a small lamb. B. C. T.

And so on with a tiger, a wolf, and a dog, until all the wild animals and birds had let little lambkin pass to go to his granny's house and get fatter. And they all licked their lips at thinking what a nice little mouthful he would be on his way back.

Now when the lambkin reached his granny's house, he said to her, "Granny, please put me into the corn-bin, for I have promised to get fat." When Granny heard this, she, of course, put him into the corn-bin at once, and there the greedy little creature remained for seven days and eat and eat and eat until he was so fat that he could scarcely waddle.

Then his granny said it was time for him to go home, as he was fat enough for anything. But the cunning little lambkin said:—

"If I do, Granny dear, some wild animal may eat me on the way back. The best plan will be for you to make a little drumkin by stretching a leather across a wide-mouthed earthen cup (piśčála) and by Ját a' a piece of hollow wood, 6 inches by 3 inches, with its ends covered with leather. Cf. jamrā, Hind. jamaka, Skr.—R. C. T.
out of the skin of my little brother that died, and then I can sit inside and trundle along. I am as tight as a drum myself."

So his Granny made a little drumkin, and lambkin sat inside and trundled along. By-and-bye he met the vulture, who called out, "Drumkin, have you seen Lambkin?" Then the lambkin called out from inside—

_Wan pïd tekkhët: wan pïd l._
Chai, dhëmkërdëd! Dham! Kë! Dhâ!*

Lost in the forest and so are you!
On, Little Drumkin! Tam! Tam! Too!

"How very annoying," replied the vulture, and sighed to think of the nice mouthful he had lost, while the crafty lambkin trundled on gaily giving the same answer to all the animals he met, and chuckling at his own cleverness. At last he met the jackal, but the jackal was not to be done. He recognised the lambkin's voice and said, "Oh, you've turned yourself inside out, have you? Come out of that!" Then he tore open the drumkin, and gobbled up lambkin.*

**No. 20.—The Tiger, the Brähman and the Jackal.**

Once upon a time a tiger was caught in a trap. He tried in vain to get out through the bars, and rolled and bit with rage and grief when he failed. By chance a poor Brähman came by.

"Let me out of this cage, Oh pious one," cried the tiger.

"Nay, my friend," replied the Brähman wisely, "You would probably eat me if I did."

"Not so," swore the tiger with many oaths.

"I would be for ever grateful, and serve you as a slave."

Now when the tiger sobbed and sighed and wept and swore, the pious Brähman's heart softened and he opened the door of the cage. Out popped the tiger and seizing the poor man, said:—"What a fool you are! Now I shall eat you, for I am famished after having been coped up so long."

In vain the Brähman pleaded and prayed. The most he could gain was a promise to abide by the decision of the first three things he chose to question as to the justice of the tiger's action. So the Brähman first asked a _pïpal_ tree that was standing by, but the _pïpal_ tree replied coldly:—"What have you to complain about? Don't I give shade and shelter to every traveller who comes by, and don't they tear down my branches to feed their cattle afterwards? Don't whimper, but be a man!"

So the Brähman went sadly further afield till he saw a buffalo turning a well, but the buffalo gave him no better answer, saying:—"You are a fool to expect gratitude! Look at me! Whilst I gave milk they fed me on cotton seed and oilcake, but now that I am dry they yoke me here, and give me refuse for fodder."

The Brähman sighed, but wandering on asked the road what it thought of the matter.

"What nonsense!" cried the road, "to expect anything else! Here am I, useful to all, yet everybody, rich or poor, great or small, tramples on me as he goes past, and gives me nothing but pipe* ashes and grain husks."

So the Brähman returned sad and sorrowful. On his way he met a jackal, who called out:—

"Why, what's the matter, Mr. Brähman? You look as miserable as a Jaṭṭ in a shower!*"

The Brähman told him all that had happened.

"How very confusing," said the jackal, when the recital was ended: "Would you mind telling it me over again, for everything has got mixed up so."

And the Brähman told it all over again, but the jackal only shook his head in a distracted sort of way, and could not understand.

"It is very strange," said he sadly, "but it all goes in at one ear and out at the other. I will

---

3 Pronounced sharply to represent the sound of beating a drum.—F. A. S.
4 A common baby story all over the Panjâb. Told at much greater length by repeating the verses on meeting the various animals. It has been tried on English children with great success.—F. A. S.
5 Told with great perception of the humorous points by a Jaṭṭ boy in Chohar Khana, Gujranâwl District. I have heard it also in the Firozpur and Lâhor Districts, but never so well told. The text is a free translation of the tale.—F. A. S.
6 The tale is found in the _Gol Bakhsh_—p. 11 of Jwâlâ Parshâl's edition, Mereât (Meerut), 1890.—a well-known fairy tale, where it is introduced to point a moral. The tale there told differs in no way from this one except that the _pïpal_ tree becomes the banyan tree (Hindî _bar_; Panjâb, _bohar._ I am told also that it is to be found in the _Bhagyândē_ with the variation that the _pïpal_ becomes the sandal-wood tree (chandran).—R. C. T.
7 Buffalo are very dirty feeders and are constantly one might almost say habitually—fed on stable litter and farm-yard filth, a fact which becomes of practical importance when it is considered that their filth-tainted milk is more than frequently mixed with cow's milk by the milk vendors in all bâsars.—R. C. T.
8 In allusion to the eternal _chillâm_ (or bubble-bubble) of the native.—R. C. T.
9 _Mandâ kî waing Jaṭṭ kharâ de_: a well-known proverb in the Southern Panjâb.—R. C. T.
go to the place where it all happened, and then perhaps I shall be able to give a judgment."

So they came to where the tiger was waiting for the Brāhman, and sharpening his teeth and claws.

"You've been away a long time," growled the beast, "but now let us begin our dinner."

"Our dinner!" thought the Brāhman as his knees knocked together with fright; what a very delicate way of putting it!"

"Give me five minutes, my lord," he pleaded, 
"in order that I may explain matters to the jackal here; who is somewhat slow in his wits."

The tiger consented, and the Brāhman began the whole story over again, not missing a single detail, and spinning as long a yarn as possible.

"Oh, my poor brain! oh, my poor brain!" cried the jackal, wringing its paws. "Let me see! How did it begin? You were in the cage, and the tiger came walking by and——"

"What a fool you are!" interrupted the tiger.

"I was in the cage."

"Yes, of course!" cried the jackal, pretending to tremble with fright; "I was in the cage. No, I wasn't! Oh, dear, where are my wits? The cage was in the Brāhman, and the tiger came. No, the tiger was in the Brāhman and the cage came walking by. Oh, don't mind me! Begin your dinner, for I shall never understand."

"Yes, you shall," cried the tiger in a rage with the jackal for his stupidity. "You shall understand me. Now look at me! I am the tiger."

"Yes, my lord."

"And that's the Brāhman."

"Yes, my lord."

"And that's the cage."

"Yes, my lord."

"And I was in the cage. Do you understand?"

"Yes,—no,— please, my lord."

"Well," cried the tiger impatiently.

"Please, my lord, how did you get in?"

"How? In the usual way, of course."

"Oh, dear me! My head is beginning to whirl again. Don't be angry, my lord, but—please—what is the usual way?"

At this the tiger lost patience, and jumping into the cage, cried—

"This way! Now do you understand?"

"Exactly so," grinned the jackal, deftly shutting the door; "As we all were!!"

No. 21.—The Jackal and the Tiger.

An old tiger was in the habit of hunting in a particular jungal.

One day he caught a jackal and was proceeding to eat it when the jackal said:

"Before you eat your dinner, had you not better kill that other tiger yonder, or whilst you are lazily asleep he may hunt your forest, and perhaps kill you."

"What tiger?" asked the king of beasts.

"Come with me and I will show you," answered the jackal.

So he led the tiger to a well, and bid him look down. When the tiger saw his reflection in the water he hemmed and hawed, saying:

"That's a poor old beast, and he isn't doing any harm. He won't rob me: why, he looks half-starved."

"He has caught a fine fat jackal though," said the wily prisoner, looking over the well too.

"So he has," cried the tiger, "what a horrid old thief!"

And without pausing a moment he leapt down the well, and was killed on the spot.

And the jackal went home laughing.

A noteworthy variant of this tale is told in the Firozpur District, entitled:—

The Vixen and the Tiger.

An old tiger was in the habit of hunting in a certain jungal, and killing and eating any animal he might chance on. At last matters became so intolerable that the animals met together, and agreed to give up to him daily one of themselves, on condition that he ceased his hunting. One day it came to a vixen's turn to be eaten, but when she reached the tiger she represented to him that a similar arrangement had been made by the animals with his brother, and that it so happened that it was her turn to go to him, too, that day. This made the tiger very jealous, and he demanded to be shown his brother, whereupon the vixen showed him her own image in a well, and the tiger in his wrath jumped in and was drowned.

Edition of the Persian version, and p. 41 of the Meerath (Meerut) Urdu Translation. It is there known as "the Hare and the Tiger."—H. C. T.
DATE OF 'ABDU'L-WAHHĀB.

Sir,—In an article on the Wahhābys, published in the Indian Antiquary, vol. V. p. 67, Fazl Lutfullah states that the founder of this sect, 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb, was born in the year 1691 A.D. In a note on this date the editor remarks that it "is disputed by some writers; if he were 95 years old according to the Arabic Lunar Calendar when he died in 1787, he could only have been born about 1695 A.D.," or four years later than the time attributed by Mr. Fazl Lutfullah. A very elaborate paper on the "History of the Wahhābys in Arabia and India," is printed in the Jour. R. Br. As. Soc. vol. X1. (1880), in which the author, Mr. E. Rehatske, writes as follows regarding the probable date of the birth of this Muhammadan reformer—"The founder of the Wahhāby sect, Muhammad 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb, was born at Horeymulah in Central Arabia, in the little province of Nejd, somewhat before the middle of last century, according to Captain Palgrave," who travelled in 1862-63 (Travels in Central Arabia, vol. I. p. 363).

Both Mr. Fazl Lutfullah and Mr. Rehatske agree in the year of the death of 'Abdu'l-Wahhāb in 1787. As it is only a quarter of a century since this sect of Islam made itself known in India, and as Captain Palgrave saw a grandson of its founder so recently as 1863 at Riād, I think the date of his birth could be ascertained. Mr. Rehatske's date—"somewhat before the middle of last century"—appears to be more probable, and as no history is definitely known of his early life, it is not likely that he lived to the great age of 95 years.

S. R. Bunshah.

ASIATIC SOCIETIES.

The Journal of the Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society appears irregularly, the average period between two successive numbers being about twelve months. The recent issue contains the Proceedings of two years, 1881 and 1882, and the papers read between July 1881 and December 1882. Among these are a second and third instalment of the Rev. A. Bourquin's translation of the Dharmasindhu, which would have been much better if printed together, than separated as they are by other two papers on other subjects. So also with Dr. Führer's two papers on the Manus漂流hamasatham, between which one article is inserted. The editing generally is also indifferent: Jovianese and Gilechristian spellings are used together, long vowels are marked as ṣ, a, a, or ṭ, at random, the palatal sibilant in one paper is represented by sh, in another by s, and in a third by s;—surely some uniformity might be aimed at. The illustrative plates also are mostly of very inferior execution.

The translation of the Dharmasindhu of Kāśīṅātha extends as far as the end of the first part of the original. The second is a third instalment of the Dr. J. Gerson da Cunha's "Contributions to the study of Indo-Portuguese Numismatics," bringing down the history of the Portuguese coinages in India from 1580 to 1723, and containing a very complete discussion of the subject with much important collateral information. Mr. J. C. Liabo's "List of Plants seen at Mahābālsēvar at the end of last hot season," is an important contribution to local botany, the intro-

duction to which is, however, of more general interest. The fifth paper in this number is Bhagvânālī Indrajī's "Antiquarian Remains at Sopārā", which has already been noticed at length (ante, p. 114.) We find, on p. 311, a reference to a "frontispiece," but no such plate appears with this issue.

Dr. Führer's two short papers give some account of the Burmese Buddhist Law-book Manusشاهدhamasatham, probably originally compiled in the time of king Vymodhā about the end of the 3rd century A.D. and several times revised since, and of its relation to the Brahmanical Dharmāstras on which it has been founded.

Dr. Codrington, one of the secretaries, contributes an article of 72 pages, "On a hoard of coins from Broach." This large find consisted, he tells us, of 448 gold coins and some pieces, and about 1,200 silver coins and pieces, including coins of Genoa, Venice, Egypt, Armenia, Persia, and Dehli, dating, with one exception, between A.D. 1260 and 1380. Of the gold coins 367 belong to the end of the Mamluk Sultāns of the Bahri dynasty; 33 are Venetian sequins; 1 coin of Genoa; 47 of Dehli Sultāns;—these make up 448, exclusive of other 8 which the author describes (pp. 350-352) as Ayyubī, and Persian. No statistics are given of the silver coins. The four plates with which this article is illustrated are deplorable specimens of lithography. The last paper is a short one by Mr. J. F. Fleet, on "A copperplate grant of the Dévagiri-Yañava king Śīlaṅga II.," dated Ś. 1160, with photozioagraphic facsimiles.
RÁTHOR GRANTS No. III.—A GRANT OF DHRUVA III., OF BHAROCH.

BY DR. G. BÜHLER, C.I.E., AND DR. E. HULTZSCH.

THE subjoined grant was found in 1881, together with a considerable number of older and later inscriptions, by a labourer of Surat, who was engaged in excavating the pro tempore kitchens for a large wedding party at Bagnuma, (Zilla: Balear) in the Gaikovád’s territory. My old friend, Rāo Saheb Mohanlal R. Jhaveri, Deputy Educational Inspector of Surat, brought the find to my notice, and kindly purchased for me a number of the plates.

The grant is written on three strong plates, measuring twelve inches by 10\(\frac{1}{2}\), which are held together by a stout ring, passed as usual in Ráthor Sásanas, through holes in the left sides of the plates. The third and first plates are inscribed in the inner sides only. The ring bears a seal, which shows the usual Ráṣṭrakúta emblem, a figure of Śiva, seated on a lotus and holding snakes in his hands. The preservation is tolerably good, though some letters here and there have been injured or destroyed by the formation of verdigris, and the carbonisation of the copper. A triangular piece has been cut off from the right-hand lower corner of the first plate, but has been preserved.

The letters which have been carefully incised by a skilled kānśār, on the whole, closely resemble those of Dantidurga’s Sāmangaḍh plates of Śaka Saṅvat 675, but show in some particulars more modern-looking forms. Thus, as I have stated already in my paper on the Dhiniki plates, τa is invariably represented by the modern τ. Further the, which on the Sāmangaḍh plates consists of a circle only, shows the additional topstroke, τ. Finally, the ḥāndas or ḍ strokes, are made, as in modern Devāṅgari, fully as long as the akṣaras. The letters of the sign manna (Pli. II. 1. 19) are somewhat larger than those in the body of the grant, but their shape is exactly the same. At the end the peculiar flourish or mark occurs which is also found on the Kāvī plates.

From an epigraphic point of view the Sásana possesses considerable interest, because it is the earliest grant of the Gujarāt Ráthors that shows throughout the literary, or Kāyastha-Nāgari alphabet. The Bārodá plates of Kárka II., and the Kāvī plates of Góvinda IV., dated Śaka Saṅvat 749, still imitate the old Gujarāt characters. It is also interesting to note that in this grant no attempt is made to introduce here and there antiquated forms, such as we find side by side with the real Kāyastha letters, in the Rádhanpur and Van Dindori grants of Góvinda III. The wording of the grant closely resembles that of the other Ráṣṭrakúta edicts, and those portions of the Vaiśṇava which refer to the earlier kings, literally agree with the Kári, Bārodá, and Sāmangaḍh plates. The new portions, too, are written in that turgid style of Sanskrit poetry, in which all the court-poets of the Ráthors seem to have excelled.

The Ráṣṭrakúta Vaiśṇava stands according to our grant as follows:—

A. Dekhan Line.

1. Góvinda I.

2. Kakkā I.


4. Dantidurga,

Vallabha. 6. Góvinda II. 7. Dhruva I.


Prithvivallabha. 1. Indra II.

9. Śaṅkara. 2. Kakkā II. (Śaka 734).

Amoghavarsa. 3. Kakkā III.

Amoghavarsa. 4. Dhruva II. Nirupama.

5. Akalavarsa, Subhatunga.


Nirupama. Dhárávarsha, rebel.

About the kings of the main or Dekhan line we learn two important particulars (vs. 12-13). First, it appears that Kṛṣṇa I. bore also the Biruda Śubhatunga, and derived his titles ‘king of kings and supreme lord,’ from his victories over one Rāhāpya or Rā-

1 The original plates of the grant under notice will be presented to the Oriental Museum at Vienna, and there be open to inspection.
hapa. Both these points, it is evident, were also mentioned in the Kavi grant. But as the corresponding verses, 13 and 15 are mutilated, they were not intelligible. I am unable to say who this Rāhapya was. The only list in which I find a similar name is that of the princes of Mvāl. Professor H. H. Wilson mentions a Rāhu, who reigned about 1300 A.D. Of course that individual cannot be identical with the enemy of Kṛishṇa I. Secondly, we hear (vs. 23, 24), for the first time the real name of the son of Gōvinda III, who is usually called Amoghavarsha. According to our plates it was Saṇva. If we turn to the history of the Gujarāt line, it is interesting to note that the statement of the other plates, according to which Indra II. received Gujarāt from his brother, is repeated in somewhat different terms. The district is here (vs. 26) called lāṭyaṇa mandalam, ‘the province of Lāṭa,’ not lāṭesvaramandalam, as the Bāroḍ and Kāvi plates have it. This new version shows clearly that my formerly proposed rendering of the latter expression, ‘the province of the lord of Lāṭa,’ is correct, and that the idea of the earlier translators of the grant, who speak of a “province called Lāṭesvara,” is erroneous. The dependent position of Indra II. and of his successors is plainly admitted by our grant, which calls Gōvinda III, the svāmin or master, of his younger brother. Another highly interesting point is that our grant does not name Gōvinda IV, the second son of Indra II., who, as the Kāvi plates show, ruled after his brother, Karka or Kākka II. As he was the uncle of Kākka III, whom our grant places immediately after Kākka II., it is very probable that the latter died while his son was a minor, and that Gōvinda IV, deprived his nephew of his rightful inheritance. The evasion of his name from the list of Gujarāt Rāthors in a grant issued by the great-grandson of Kākka III, is probably intentional, and meant as a punishment for his disloyalty. The information, too, which our grant gives regarding the hitherto unknown four Rāthor kings of Gujarāt is very valuable. We learn that in the short space of forty years between Śaka Śāṃvat 749 and 789, no fewer than five princes ruled who belonged to five generations. This fact alone is sufficient to show that the period must have been a time of troubles and wars, and that Kakka III., must have come to the throne late in life and have died or have been killed soon after, when his son and grandson were already grown up. Else it would be incredible that five generations could have ruled within less than half a century. The few details given regarding the reign of each of the four new kings, fully bear out the assertion that they had a hard life and with difficulty held their own. Vs. 29 says of Kakka III., surnamed Amoghavarsha, that he conquered the tributary Rāśtrakūṭaś, who were firmly allied and occupied districts according to their own will (see ekkudhikātavaiya, drīhhasaṅghabhājāḥ śūleka-Rāśtrakūṭaś). His son, Dhrūva II., called also Nirupama, according to vs. 32, lost his life in battle ‘after putting to flight the army of a king named Vallaḥa.’ But the victory must have been as doubtful as it was dearly bought. For, as vs. 34 asserts, Dhrūva’s son, Akālavarsha or Subhatinga, “whose wicked servants were disloyal,” had ‘to recover’ his paternal realm ‘which had been attacked by Vallaḥa.’ This can only mean that Vallaḥa, though he may have been checked by Dhrūva II., remained powerful enough to renew his attack, and used the confusion arising on his adversary’s death to win over the ministers or generals of the latter, and became by their help, for a time at least, master of the Bharoch kingdom. Though Akālavarsha, according to our grant, subsequently conquered both Vallaḥa and the treacherous officials, still matters did not mend. For his son and successor, Dhrūva III., the donor of our grant, according to v. 37, had again trouble with ‘hostile’ (vimukha) Vallaḥa, and with seditionary kinsmen (vikritikātasyabābāhavād). Moreover, he was assailed by ‘the very powerful army of the Gurjaras,’ (vs. 37-38), with whom an unnamed younger brother of his had allied himself. Finally a king, called Mihir, attacked Dhrūva, but suffered defeat (vs. 41). Though the verses 38-42 repeatedly assert that Dhrūva resisted all his enemies unaided, the contradictory statement made at the end of the grant (vs. 58-59), that another brother given formerly wrongly represent the Gōvinda IV as the son of Karka II.
Gôvinda, assisted him materially in making his rule firm, seems more credible. The poetical bombast with which the war with Mîhira is described, makes it impossible to say who this assailant was. As regards Vallabha, it seems not improbable that one and the same individual of this name was the foe of the three kings. If so, it is perhaps not too hazardous to assume, because the name Vallabha was a common biruda of the Dekhan Râdhra-kâtas, that the son of Gôvinda III, Sârva, alias Amoghavarsha, is meant by it. For it is not in the least unlikely that the suzerain power may have had difficulties in obtaining the tribute from Gujarât, or have had other reasons for interfering in the affairs of the province. The fact that Dhruva III even was a tributary prince, may be considered certain on account of the epithets, mahâsûmantâdhipati and samadhigatsâsthânamahâsabda, which are applied to him in our grant. Moreover the reign of Amoghavarsha, to judge from the Râthor copper-plates and the Kâpheri inscriptions of the Silâhâras, extended just over this period. On the other hand, we have no evidence that Amoghavarsha really bore the biruda Vallabha, like his father and his remoter ancestors. The third enemy, the powerful Gûjrasar, are, in all probability, the Chânâdas or Châpokthas of Anhilvâd. For we know of no other kingdom during the 9th century, which could have been called Gûjra. According to Krishna's Raiûmâlâ Anhilvâd was governed from 841 to 865 A.D. by Khemrâj or Kshemarâj, who had no servants of ability, was passionate of temper, but in good fortune equal to Indra. Most probably he was the Gûjra, who, with Dhruva's younger brother tried to gain possession of Bharoch.

The object of the grant is to convey the village of Pâráhânak, which belongs to the 116 villages connected with Karmântapura, to a Brâhma, called Jogîbhu, a member of the Lâkskâyângotra and a student of the Adhvaryu or Ajûrvâda, for the maintenance of a Sattara, i.e. a so-called Sâdârâ, where daily doles are given to strangers, and in order to defray the expenses of religious rites. The donee's father was called Nenappya (perhaps Nenappa), and his grandfather Dhôdhi. The virtues of the latter are described in two verses, 44-45, and it is said that he had obtained from Dhruvâraj, (probably Dhruva II) the village of Treñnâ, and had founded the charity, mentioned above.

Among the boundaries of the village of Pâráhânak (Pl. II, B.10-12), we find the 'Brâhma settlement' of Mottâkâ. Everybody who is acquainted with Gujarât will know at once that this can only be the town of Mottâ, on the road from Surat to Bârdol which is famous as the original seat of the Motlâ Brâhma. Though I am at present unable to identify, for want of trustworthy maps, the other villages and towns mentioned, I have no hesitation in asserting that our grant refers to a village south of the Tapti, and proves that Southerm Gujarât formed part of the dominions of the Bharoch Râths. That is a point which the Kâvi and the Bârdol plates left undecided. But I have for some time considered it probable that the Râthors held Southern Gujarât also, because in the present days Râthor cultivators are found also south of the Tapti.

Owing to the circumstance that an eclipse of the sun is mentioned in our grant, it is possible to accurately determine the day on which it was issued. Professor Jacob and Dr. Burgess assure me that the astronomical data have been correctly given, and that the date is the sixth June 867 A.D., on which day an eclipse actually happened. The last part of the last verse of the grant brâmâgovindarâjó nirupamavishito bâsane dâtakotra 'the illustrious Gôvinda was made by Nirupama dâtaka with respect to this edict,' shows that those who like Mr. Fleet took dâtaka to mean 'messenger' for conveying the king's orders are right. The translation 'executive officer' in the province where the village granted lay, which I have used until lately, must be given up.

Transcript.

Plate I.

[1] ओ सारवल [II] स बोद्धिमे कत्रा याम ग्रामिकामकहललं कर्य || हरस्व का तीर्थकः कर्मलकला कर्मलकलालकर्मल || [1] आतिशिष्यमित्रमुखकंवतलायो ज्ञातिनयः

* The transcript has been prepared by Dr. E. Hultsch.
[49] मासिद्धिपरे गुणामूर्तिविना तम्मताधिक्षित || [47] रक्तता चन निविषय चुरिमोघिसंयुक्त || रायाय धर्मन्य लोकानां कथा वृद्धि परा हः
[48] दिः || [46] तस्यास्मात् नागति सत्याविद्यार्चिनिगुणिकोविन्दराङ्ग श्रीति मोहलामभूतः । स्यागी प्रारम्भमथानः प्रकटप्रतापसतत्पिताहि
[49] तत्तथे जनतिनभोगी || [45] पुष्चितलब्धि श्रीति च प्रतिविन्द्यापर्र गगनति नाम । यथायुद्योगिशचार्मेको वसुधायो वाक्यो चके || [48]
[50] एकेष्विकलनरकलसतिकायक्ष्यतस्तत्तसम्यविनिप्परे । नवकम्यावृत्तां चांका
[51] र विलसनासामायितिः (I) संस्कृत-हस्तक्रियानमानसुजन्दुर्मूल्यो मुद्यी || [44] तत् चके च खो नामाक्षामेतरियोड़े ||
[52] श्रीमहाराजाधिकीक्ष्यः क्ष्याते राजाधुषुयोः || [42] अथायं यथार्थतः यस्मात्ति यहात्कलावित्वतोष्पुषु

Plate IIa.

[2] जी गुणाम्यनिरकारासदाकारानां । राजायाहन्यन्ययदु प्रकटीतवक्ष्या यो नुषाय गोमयाना राजाश्रीरी चक्से संकार
[3] नकरिन्द्रोऽजितित्वस्मि । [41] निर्वाचनाविवाचनातिशिष्ठितत्रेण नाम यथे समान: सूर्पत (I) कृतं चनकालार्जार चरितमूद्यवाय
[4] नवकम्यावृत्तां कथे । एकाकी गृहरुपितोऽस्वनकृतिसहितमार्गविशिष्ट द्वारकादेशविशिष्टतिः (I) लाभतीमंडलेन वत्स्यापि द्वितीयादमिदम
[6] तथा महानुभवान: चारुचारुगृहसुस्तवितिविनमुनिः । यो गृहायायपरागायुग पुरुषो श्रीवाहः
[7] जयराज(पुम)गणपदसमुखः || [26] श्रीकारण श्रीति राजाराजार्चः सारे क्तस्य तमयो नयिसाधिर्याः । त-
[7] स्थानायिनन्दनदितत्व-प्रस्तावः मचा: संदेश प्राप्ति प्रथम: युजिनाः || [27] दर्शन मानन सदात्मा व बौद्धम भृजापि च कोपी
[8] भृषु: । ए[त]नु स्वययोस्त्व न वेति कीर्ति: सकोतुका भायम्यि यथ लोके || [28] सूर्दासूरदासीविवाद मदुदासिदमान: (I) महुरुसूराधि
[10] कुज्ज्ञ: । कृतविशेषीति: वर्षीयाश्रवस्त्राद्वृद्धो बृहतः गुरुलोकाननामा । || [30] चन्द्रो जद्राह इतिहिंगिरि सहित: प्रकृत्यावा वाचकमभाष

* L. 23, read विद्यारम्भ, कहा। Plate II a. L. 2, read (I) संस्कृत: L. 6, read नामसाहित्य, ल. 8, read विश्वनाथ राजसमरक, गुणानुपर राजयः। L. 4, read महिल, राजयः || L. 9, read कृतविशेष, वर्षात्, राजनः
[19] लक्ष्मणं पराकृतिःकृत् [1] शष्णशास्त्रशुद्धदेह:
सर्गसामान्दें एवातौ [23] तस्याशेषनराजप्रवत्तयासं गधर्मलोकः
[13] गतकर्त्री ॥ श्रीमानकालवधेनयः
सम्भूतालेवं। [35] वल्लभदर्भकांतं विकटितदुर्दाहनीविविधां। पि।
[14] नृपमणिर्गुरुवन्दमधुसूदनमथासितं
माण ॥ [31] श्रीमानानुगणितसः मान। प्रतिष्ठा ॥
[19] क्षेत्रकरः श्रुत्वमुः श्रुय्यकरः
सुहृदं ॥ [33] तासि श्रीमाणं गुणावति गुणावते गुणाविरलमिति। सम्भूतवर्जसः
[19] मौ धुरारसनुविन्दलोकः ॥ [30] श्रीमितिमुमकान्तत्वालमूर्तिरणां ज्ञा (1) इति विमुखकाव्योऽ
विकडितमाधवाय वाण्वय: ॥
[17] इत्तथानाविकृत्वं काममातात्मसं भयान्तो सुभुमण्डुतं निष्ठपरस्मुः खड़य
ते ॥ [37] गूःकर्तव्यवतिकः
[19] क्षमावर्ता वृहितं च कुलेन। एकाकिनैव विहितं पराकृतं ललित्य येन ॥
[19] यधाधिकारिकमाण: परं
[19] यश: गाभीर्यनोत्तराः। श्रुत्वमुःकर्ततिवृल्लं परं पद्मालो नाचिव्र ॥ [39]
यथा सम्भूतवल्लोतिमधीध राध च
[19] अव भिमस्य भूमणाः। भयप्रवृत्ति: विविधप्रवृत्ति: वर्तिने परं ददाविने काम ॥ [40]
प्रायः सम्भूति: गुर्दर्शारभोजः
क्षमामयं गुंटो भामातुद्दायिरोपि मिहर: सदर्शाधानित:। यतः
शोषिष्ठोण्मृत्कालमानातानात्
किं गुष्ठे नैवेद्यते विहिता हीनाः धीनाः भूवि ॥ [41] यं
प्रायः विनिवृत्तुर्वकलमुक्तमुक पालिता
[29] पि समायः: [1] विनिबललमुबुद्धि बुध्यपि सकामानाम ॥ [49]
सेणदुमलिविपुष्यं चलमलोकः जीविः

Plate II b.

च समपिगात्ष्यसमाधाशब्दमहाः
[4] सामताविधिपितारावर्जः श्रीवर्जः: सामर्थ्यो वयास्वर्णमानाकाव्यः
तितिवप्ययात्या
[34] महाकुटायागावर्जनकाव्यकाव्यकाव्यवस्तपत्रहरादीसम्भूतिश्रीपत्रुः। साधितव यथा मया
[19] मातापितानामवृहीकुपास्तरस्यावित्विद्ये ॥ विनिवृत्तुर्वकलमुक्तमुक पुष्यानां समुधाराय ध
[4] रायो: (1) स्वयं: श्रीद्विजनामा अभिन्नतन्त्रुनो उच्चपुर्वसारः। सक्षमाधित्य: (1) दद
ूपितसंवकः
[4] अव कुताचारिकं (1) नित्तितोद्दरपूरणं: सम्भूतवल्लोतिमधीध ॥ [44] केषाः स लभ्या
धुरारसन जाकाः

* L. 13, read चौरीं र्य. L. 15, read तरिषन स्थर्मसुते. L. 19, read वरस्माम ॥, प्रयास भूति नौ. L. 21, read सांकाः, L. 22, read भ्रुन ॥.
Plate III.
Translation.

1. May he protect you, the lotus on whose navel Bráhman made his dwelling, and Hara whose forehead is adorned by the lovely crescent of the moon.

2. There was a prince, called Góvinda-rája, a royal lion among kings, whose fame pervaded the universe, and who, of pure splendour, lifting his scimitar and marching straight forward, destroyed his enemies, just as the clear moon, whose radiance pervades the universe, raising the tip of its orb (above the horizon) and (sending its rays) straight forward, destroys at night the darkness.

3. When he saw an army flashing with gallant warriors, coming to meet him, forthwith he always, biting his lip and knitting his brow, raised his sword, his family, his own heart and courage.

4. When his enemies heard his name (pronounced) in a great battle three things un-

---

11 L. 11 read नायकम्। L. 15, read दानाक्षिं। दानाक्षेऽ परमेयोऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्। दानाक्षेऽऽम्।

12 L. 16, read राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों। राष्ट्रीयों।

13 कृति in. inscr. vs. 1.

14 कृति in. inscr. vs. 2.—My previous translation of this verse has been modified according to Mr. Fleet's rendering.
8. He conquered quickly with a handful of servants the countless host of Kārṇa which was unconquerable by others, and was expert in defeating the lord of Kānci, the Keralas, the Chōja, the Pāndyas, Śrīharṣa, and Vajraṭa.¹⁸

9. By his valour he brought under one royal parasol this world up to the bridge (of Śrāma) where the water of the rows of rolling waves flashes among the line of large rocks, up to the snowy mountain where the pile of rocks (of) spotless (brilliance) is stained by glaciers, up to the boundary marked by the sandy shores of the eastern and western oceans.³⁰

10. When that Vālīvarāja had gone to heaven, Kṛiṣhṇarāja, the son of Kākaraṇa, who did not oppress his subjects, became king.³¹

11. The life of that Kṛiṣhṇarāja, by the valour of whose arm his countless foes were utterly destroyed, was blameless like that of Kṛiṣhṇa (the son of Vasudeva).³²

12. The whole sky in which the rays of the sun were obscured on high by the clouds of dust (raised) by the large steeds of Suhbatunga, looked, even in summer, distinctly (as if) the rainy season (had come).³³

13. He conquered in battle Rāhapya who had become proud of the strength of his arm, by the blows of his sharp sword-blade, and quickly gained the titles 'king of kings and supreme lord,' which were made resplendent by numerous pādīdhanjas.³⁴

14. He was the protector of the earth that is adorned by the girdle of the four oceans, and also of the threefold (sacred science); he gave much gītā to Brāhmaṇa, worshipped the immortals and honoured his Gurus; he was liberal, proud, the first among the virtuous, the favourite of fortune; in consequence of his great asturities he went to that dwelling where death enters not, in order to enjoy the rewards of heaven.³⁵

15. His distinguished son was the illustrious Gōvindarāja, called (also) Vālībhā, who was expert in making widows of the wives of the conquered world's enemies, who in one moment split in battle the temples of the most elephants of his foes, and who, his head whitened by the dust of the vanguard, ever walked in battle with sportive gait, since the heat of the sun's rays was warded off by a white parasol.³⁶

16. His younger brother was the illustrious Dhruvārāja, of great majesty and uncheckd prowess, who, conquering all kings, gradually became (in fierce brilliance) like unto the morning sun.³⁷

17. When that jewel among good princes had become the chief of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and he, who was intent on righteousness, an ocean of nectar-like virtues, and faithful to the vow of ever speaking the truth, ruled the earth up to the shores of the ocean, then the whole world daily felt deep joy on account of that good lord, (exclaiming) 'Forsoth, the age of truth (has returned)!'³⁸

18. Highest joy filled the hearts of men when he righteously ruled his whole kingdom, together with the four oceans.³⁹

19. His son was Gōvindarāja, an ornament of his race, a liberal (prince), dear to mankind, keeping fortitude as his only riches, who, by his great valour harassed his enemies, and whose fame was spread far and wide in this world by the virtuous.⁴⁰

20. His second name, famous in the world, was Pīthvīvalikaṇha. Unaided he made subject to himself the earth that is bounded by the four oceans.

21. Then, without assistance he bound them all together with crowds of kings, who were distressed by the blows of his drawn sword, in a great battle, made even fortune stable on earth (forced her) to hold his excellent glittering chauri, and made her enjoyable for his suffering gurus, for Brāhmaṇa and virtuous men, for his friends and relatives.⁴¹

22. When this (hero) before whom his enemies trembled, had gone to heaven, his son, "favourite of fortune," may also mean that Kriṣṇa bore the birula āravikābhā.⁴²

²⁸ Kāvī inscr., vs. 8.
²⁹ Kāvī inscr., fragments of vs. 10.
³¹ Kāvī inscr., fragments of vs. 11.
³² Kāvī inscr., fragments of vs. 12.
³³ Kāvī inscr., fragments of vs. 13.
³⁴ Kāvī inscr., fragments of vs. 15. The name of the conquered may also be read Rāhapya. Regarding the term pādīdhanja, see Mr. Fleet's remarks, Ind. Ant. vol. VII, pp. 111, 246.
³⁵ Kāvī inscr. vs. 17.—The epithet śriya vallībhāḥ the
³⁶ Kāvī inscr. vs. 18.
³⁷ Kāvī inscr. vs. 19.
³⁸ Kāvī inscr. vs. 20.
³⁹ Kāvī inscr. vs. 21.
⁴⁰ Kāvī inscr. vs. 22.
⁴¹ Kāvī inscr. vs. 23.
⁴² Kāvī inscr. vs. 24. The verse is not easily intelligible, as it stands. It refers to the twelve kings, Śrīharṣa and others, whom Gōvindarāja vanquished. Kāvī plates, vs. 37.
called the illustrious Māhārāja Śarva, became king (and) famous for his virtues.

23. As (all) mendicants were satisfied by receiving (from him) the fulfilment of their desires, he made the etymological import of his (other) name Amogha varsha (i.e. he who showers gifts not in vain) fully appropriate.

24. His paternal uncle, fortunate Indra rāja, who was the sole cause of the non-appearance of wealth in the houses of his foes, and who, by his virtues astonished the hearts of crowds of princes, became a king. Royal fortune, putting away other kings, through love (for him) served him, showing her inclination for sensual enjoyments, and caused his real character to be loudly sung by all poets.

25. From whom did that (prince) fear hostility against his rule—he whose friends, skilled in (the use of) the bow and willing to die (for him) were the Māñas—he whose behaviour was virtuous—he who was in the ascendant in all the quarters of the world, because he surpassed the deeds of all other kings—he who singly was able to bring his proud enemies to fall (and) who, resembling the sun, protected the province of Lāṭa, given to him by his lord ?

26. His son was (a prince) of great majesty, whose mind revelled in the pleasure of the knowledge of the Sāstra's meaning, and who openly bore the ancient auspicious appellation, Śrī-Kakkarāja as well as (other) secondary names.22

27. To him was born a politic and heroical son, the quintessence of his race, called Śrī-Kakkarāja, who took care of the burdensome duties of government, gladdened his numerous relatives by making them wealthy, ever resembled Pārtha (Arjuna) in (the skilful use of) the bow, and was the first among pure men.

28. His fame wanders through the world, curious (as it were to learn), if there is any prince equal to him in liberality (proper) pride, just rule, heroism and valour.

29. After he conquered by the strength of his arm that unshathed his sword, the exceed-

ingly ill-conducted tributary Rīshtrakūṭas, who, puffed up with excessive pride (and) firmly allied to each other, occupied provinces according to their own will, he ruled, known as Amogha varsha.

30. To him who longed for male offspring was born a virtuous, grateful son of great majesty, called Dhruvarāja, who equaled Kṛitavirya in valour and subdued the whole crowd of kings.

31. Because neither the moon who is destitute of intellect, nor the snowy mountain that is naturally cold, nor the unstable wind, nor the sun whose nature it is to torment by his heat, nor the salt ocean can be compared to him, he has been called Nirupama (the peerless) in (the poet's) song.

32. (Standing) in the van of battle and alone putting Vallabha's forces to flight, he went to heaven, his body being purified by (the wounds inflicted with) hundreds of weapons.

33. The son of him who took their fame from all kings, whose renown (even) reached heaven, was the illustrious Akālavarsa, a prop of his race.

34. He whose wicked servants were disloyal, quickly recovered his paternal empire that had been attacked by the army of Vallabha.23

35. Śubhāntunga (was) kind of speech, truthful, fortunate, loving towards his servants, proud, the terror of his enemies (and) a benefactor of his friends.

36. When that virtuous (prince) had gone to heaven, virtuous Dhruvarāja whose delight is virtue and who resembles Dhruvarāja,22 gladdened the world.

37. Here the host of the powerful Gūrjara-s, hurrying up to encounter (him), there hostile Vallabha; (here) the kinsmen who had become seditions, there the treachery25 of his younger brother—(all) became quiet through fear (of him). Ah! wonderful was the flashing of thy sword (peerless) king, Nirupama!

38. Quite alone, he put easily to flight the very strong army of the Gūrjaras that was eager (for the fray) and reinforced by his kinsmen.

---

22 I think that śarva must here be a proper name. Wilson gives the meaning 'a barbarian' for it.
23 Kavi inscr. v. 31.
24 Tapaśāhita 'disloyal' is a synonym of bhūma, and probably has the same technical meaning.
25 Either Dhruva, the son of Nahusha, or the hero who assisted the Pāṇḍavas, is meant.
26 I am unable to propose a grammatical explanation of the word viharāda, but its meaning appears plain. Compare also Vīharāda. Pet. Dict. sub voce.
39. It is no marvel that the son of Śubha-tunga reached a very exalted station; for, just anointed, he gained highest fame through his liberality and his bravery.

40. And, after dividing his kingdom here, though it had been gained by the strength of his own arm, among his servants, he caused terror to his enemies and gave wealth to the needy according to their desires.

41. Though Mihira was united to Fortune and surrounded by crowds of noble kinsmen, though owing to his courage, he conquered (all) the regions of the world, he, nevertheless, disappeared, his face being covered by the darkness of defeat, after he had looked upon the eminence of Dhāravarsa that was greater (than his own); how much more (vanish before him) timid men on earth who are destitute of brilliant fire and loyalty? 37

42. Though the Earth had been protected (formerly) by Sāgara and other (mighty kings), she nevertheless felt, rejoicing over the gain of a dear husband, only then that her desires were fulfilled, when she obtained him who surpassed all the virtues of his ancestors.

43. He, recognising that this life is unstable like the wind, or a flash of lightning and worthless, has granted this most meritorious charitable gift.

And he, the lord of the great feudal barons, the illustrious Dhrūvarājadēva (surnamed) Dhāravarsa, who has obtained all the great titles, addresses this order to all lords of provinces, lords of districts, heads of villages, employés and officials, persons in authority, vādāpakas, 38 great men and so forth, however they may be connected with him: Be it known to you that I have given for the increase of my own and my parent's merit and fame in this world and in the next—

44. In Bhadrāpāli, in a rich and well-peopled district there was a Brāhmaṇa, famed by the name of Śri-Doḍhī, a student of the Adhvaraya—(vedā) who gave much happiness to men. As incessantly he gave much cooked food and other (gifts), the needy had no cares about filling their stomachs even in times of famine.

45. When he received Trennā from Dhrūvarājadēva, he founded a sattrā for the good of all men. Both Brāhmaṇas and men of royal descent dined daily by thousands in his house.

His son was the lord of the sattrā, Nēnapya—

To his son, named Jojibhā, a member of the Lākshāyana gotra, the village, called Pārāhāṇaka, which belongs to the hundred and sixteen villages connected with Karmāntapura. Its boundaries (are) to the east, the village called Kūndiravaliṅkā, to the south the village called Khurāchchhaka, belonging to the zillā (dhāra) of Trennā, likewise to the south, the village called Joṇandha, to the west, the Brāhmaṇa settlement named Mottaka, to the north, the village called Moivāsaka. This village which is defined by the above four boundaries (has been granted by me) with heartfelt devotion, together with its udṛtanga, 39 together with the rent paid by outsiders (soparīkara), together with its rows of trees, up to the extremity of its boundaries, together with (the right of) punishment and (of deciding suits arising from) the ten faults, together with (the right of) forced labour, together with the immunity from billeting (on it) the regular and irregular soldiers, and from interference by royal officials, in accordance with the reasoning from the familiar instance of the ground and the clefts therein, to be enjoyed, with the exception of former gifts to the gods and to Brāhmaṇas, by (the donee's) sons, grandsons, and their descendants, as long as the moon, the sun, the ocean, the earth, the rivers and hills endure, when seven hundred and eighty-nine, in figures 789, years of the era of the Śaka king (had passed) on the new-moon day of the month Jyēṣṭha, on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun, after I had bathed in the river Nāmarā at the Mūlasṭhāna bathing-place, at Śrī-Bhirugukachchha. (This grant has been made) in order (to enable the donee) to

---

37 I have given only the chief meaning of the first three phāsas. There is also a secondary one, the comparison of Mihira to the sun that is obscured by Dhrāvarṣa, the cloud, and all the epithets applied to Mihira have likewise a double meaning.

38 I am not able to explain this term which occurs also in Vijayārāja's Khēdā grant Pt. II, 33, where we read Nama-nāpaṇādikātākā (Ind. Ant., vol. VII, p. 240.)

39 Regarding udṛtanga, see now Zacharia, Śāñcīkosa, pp. xix.—260. The explanation udāhāra and udgrāntih (udgrāha) seem to indicate that it means 'the share of the produce collected usually for the king.'
continue the (above-mentioned) sattra and (to perform his) Bali, Charu Vaśvadēva, Agnihotra and other ceremonies and (has been confirmed) by a libation of water. Wherefore nobody shall cause hindrance. 40

58. The illustrious Govindarāja, the son of the illustrious Subhātunga, the younger brother of Dhārāvarsha, who conquering the foe in battle, made the rule of his brother firm;

59. He, the fire of whose wrath, brilliant with broad and lamber flames, Brāhmaṇ and the other gods, stationed in the sky, observed to be not contented with reducing to ashes the enemy’s army that was crowded with elephants and horses (but) anxious to pervade the universe—was made by Nirupama his messenger, with respect to this grant.

And this has been written by the minister for peace and war, the illustrious Kalyāna. This is my own sign manual (viz, that) of the illustrious Dhruvarajadēva, the son of the illustrious Akālavarsahadēva.

A GRANT OF DHARANIVARĀHA OF VADHVĀN.

BY DR. G. BÜHLEB, C. I. E.

A facsimile of the subjoined grant, which was found a good many years ago by some Kolis near Hadjál, a large village on the old road from Dholkā to Dhandhukā, but belonging to eastern Kāthlavād, has been furnished to me by Dr. Burgess, while a paper rubbing reached me through the kindness of Colonel Watson of Rajkot, who, I believe, succeeded in getting hold of the original plates. For the second half of the grant I had also an impression on lead which I acquired six years ago from a Soni or goldsmith at Hadjál. Immediately after the plates had been discovered, they were taken to this man by the finders, who, as is usually the case, suspected that they contained particulars regarding buried treasure. The Soni, who held the same belief, was unable to read the document, but secured before returning it, a copy by beating thin strips of lead into the plates. He probably hoped to get it explained by some competent person and to use the information which it contained for his own benefit. Ultimately he sold his copy to me, through the intercession of Rao Bahadur Gopalji S. Desai, Deputy Educational Inspector of Kāthlavād.

The grant is written on two semi-elliptical plates, measuring twelve inches in height. At the bottom they are eleven inches broad and at the height of the first line six inches and three-quarters. Above the first line there is a space of one inch which bears no letters. On the first plate it shows the rude conventional representation of the moon and the sun, while it is blank on the second. No holes for rings are to be seen. The shape of the plates seems to have been chosen in order to make them resemble the stones with semicircular tops which are frequently used for land grants and other inscriptions. No other instance of the kind is known to me.

The preservation of the document is nearly perfect, and the execution very good and careful. A remarkable detail shows very clearly that the inscription was first written in exactly the same characters on a piece of birchbark or cloth, of exactly the same dimensions, and that the kansār afterwards copied it stroke for stroke. For in line 20 of the first plate a large blank space has been left between the fifteenth and sixteenth aksharas (dri and gva), because the corresponding akshara in the next following line 21, (rā) reaches so high that it occupies a portion of the space in the upper line. It is evident that the kansār could only leave a blank space in the upper line, if he had before him an original from which he slavishly copied. The indication furnished by this fact fully agrees with what I pointed out in my article on the forged śāsana of Dharasena II of Valabhi,1 and shows that the kansārs did nothing but copy in a purely mechanical manner what they found in the originals before them.

The alphabet of our grant is the Kayastha-Nāgarī which we find in the Rāthor inscriptions of Dantidurga and of Dhruva III of Brosch as well as on the Dhinikī plates of Jāika. Only a few letters show differences. Thus the lower part of the letter ya in compound aksharas is frequently made angular and its top usually left open. Again the letter pha has not the old form ग, but the latter one प.

Mahābhārata.

1 Ind. Ant. vol. X, p. 277.
which is the precursor of the modern Devanāgarī and occurs in ancient Jaina MSS. and on the plates of the Paramāras of Mālavā. This form is paleographically interesting, because it shows that even in late times the origin of the letter ṭha, which consists of a pa with an inward turned curve attached to the right side, was perfectly well known to the scribes of the middle ages. Theinterpunction in this document is very careful. Besides the long single and double vertical strokes, a vertical stroke which is only half as long as the letters is used to mark the pādas of verses, and to serve the purpose of our comma. At the end of the vaiśādvati and of the body of the grant we find a ṣ, which I think corresponds to the ṣ of the manuscripts. I may add that for some time I have been of the opinion that the curious sign on the Rādhanpur plates of Gōvinda III, which looks like an old tha, has the same meaning, and is not, as I formerly supposed, the numeral sign for 20. I cannot consider it a superfluously, as Mr. Fleet does.*

The historical portion of the Haḍḍālā āṣana reveals the existence of a hitherto unknown dynasty of feudal chiefs of Vārdhāmana, called Chāpa, which is said to have sprung from Śiva’s bow (chāpa). The legend regarding its origin bears a close resemblance to that which derives the Chālkuyas or Chaukuyas from the waterpot (chuluka) of Brāhmaṇa, and clearly belongs to the order of etymological myths. If we omit the first ancestor Chāpa, the vaiśādvati stands as follows:

1. Vikramārka
2.Addaka
3. Pulakesi


As Dharaniparāha’s grant is dated Śaka saṃvat 839 or 917-18 A.D., and as the duration of an Indian generation is about twenty-six years, Vikramārka may be placed about 800 A.D. Though three amongst these rulers bear names of princes who are famous in Indian history, they do not seem to have rivalled their great namesakes by their exploits. Our grant, at least, does not give a single historical fact regarding any one of them. It merely describes the last in the usual bombastic style, and asserts that he was liberal like Kṛṣṇa, brave like Arjuna, and handsome like Cupid, as well as that he destroyed cities—a feat which formerly most Rājputs accomplished in their day. We further hear (Pl. ii. l. 2) that this paragon of a prince resided at Vārdhāmana, and may safely conclude that that town is the modern Vādhvāna in eastern Kāśmīr. This follows partly from the fact that Vādhvāna is called Vārdhāmana by the Jaina writers of the 12th and 13th centuries as well as by the Brāhmaṇas of the present day, and that there is no other town in Western India which bears the same name. It agrees with this identification that in the māṅgalācharana Śiva is invoked as Dhandheśvara, an appellation which points to a connection with the ancient neighbouring town of Dhandhūka (zillā Ahmadabād), and that one of the districts over which Dharaniparāha ruled was the province of Addaṇa (Pl. ii. l. 4), called so after his grandfather Addaka. It is not difficult to recognise in the name Addaṇa that of the modern village of Haḍḍālā, near which the plates were found. The existence of Haḍḍālā can be traced as far as the 13th century, as we find it mentioned in the history of Vastupāla and Tejapāla, the ministers of Rāṇa Virādhavala of Dholkā (about 1220-1241 A.D.) The superfluous initial h of the modern name is no obstacle to the identification. For in Gujarāti an inorganic h frequently appears both at the beginning of words and between vowels in the middle. If the maps at my disposal allowed me to identify the other towns and villages mentioned in our grant I should, no doubt, be able to furnish still more certain proofs, that Dharaniparāha’s barony included portions of the present Vādhvāna and Līmāḷ states. According to our grant the Chāpas were, like the later Thākors of Vādhvāna, vassals of a greater neighbour. This fact is not merely indicated by Dharaniparāha’s titles samadhikatākashamarāhaḥ and śīvantādhipati, but plainly admitted by the statement (Pl. ii. ill. 4-5) that “he ruled by the grace of the feet of the king in the grant of Śūlaṭiya IV, dated Sāvat 404 or 594 A.D., Jour. Bo. Br. As. Soc. vol. XI, pp. 345, 355.

* The oldest mention of Vārdhāmana-Vādhvāna occurs

*
of kings and supreme lord Mahipalaśēva."

The answer to the question to what dynasty the latter belonged can only be that he must have been one of the Chudamānas of Girnar-Junagadh, to whom the Gujarāt chroniclers usually apply the contemptuous designation Ábhira Rāṇaka, 'the Ahir Rāṇa.' For that is the only dynasty of Western India which included kings bearing the name Mahipala, and it is evident from the statements of the Jaina chroniclers that even in the eleventh and twelfth centuries A.D. the power of the Chudamānas extended as far as Vadhvān. Dr. Burgess' list of the Chudamānas, printed Archael. Rep. vol. II, p. 164, shows two Mahipalas and another more complete one which Colonel J. Watson has kindly furnished to me, contains five kings of that name.

As regards the extent of the Chudamāna kingdom, it appears from Hemachandra's statements that in the times of the first Solakāki king of Amihvān, Mūlarāja I (942-998 A.D.) it included the whole of eastern Kāthiāvād. Hemachandra, who in the Dryāśrayakosha describes the first attempt of the Gujarātis to subjugate the peninsula, narrates how Mūlarāja on his expedition against Grāharipa or Grāhāri the Ábhira of Vāmanusthali (Vanthali) and Girnār advanced to the river Jambumāli, there awaited the enemy and fought a battle in which he remained the victor. It appears that this river marked the frontier of Grāhāri's realm, and there can be little doubt that Jambumāli is a name of the Bhogavati or Bhogia to which the east from Vadhvān passes the large village of Jambu. Though, according to Hemachandra, Mūlarāja gained an important battle and the people of Soraṭ submitted to him, his victory cannot have led to a permanent annexation. For a little more than a hundred years later the armies of the great Solakāki king Jayasimha were eleven times defeated, as Merutunga tells us by his Chudamāna or Ábhira opponent Navaghaṇa and "Vadhvān and other towns were fortified," it would seem in order to repel the attacks of the rulers of Soraṭ. These details will suffice in order to show that the power of the Chudamānas extended not only in the tenth century, but even much later, over a great part of Kāthiāvād, and that they presumably were not weaker before the Solakākas began to press upon them. It is, however, a pity that even Colonel Watson's remodelled list of the Chudamānas which has been compiled from the records of the bards and later inscriptions, does not show a Mahipala in the beginning of the tenth century. It shows a Dyaśas, alias Mahipala I, who ruled from 1003-1020 A.D., while the rulers in the beginning of the tenth century were Mūlarāja, 907-915, and Viśvavaraśa, 915-940. It is possible that one of these kings may have also been called Mahipala, or that the bardic tradition has not preserved all the names of the earlier kings. Be that as it may, I do not think that the first figure of the date can be read otherwise than I have done, or that the Mahipala of our grant can have belonged to any other dynasty. I do not remember to have met in any other document referring to the history of Gujarāt, with the name of the Chāpā race; but I think it probable that the Jābānvaya which Merutunga mentions is the same. After describing the destruction of Navaghaṇa of Girnār by Jayasimha, Merutunga narrates that a Dvāndvikapati, called Sajjana, who belonged to the Jāba family (Jābavaya) was appointed Governor of Soraṭ. The substitution of soft consonants for hard ones is so common in the Indian Prākrits that I am inclined to look upon Jāba as a Prākrit form for Chāpā.

The object of our grant is to convey the village of Viśakala as a reward for his learning (vidyādhanam) to Mahēśvarāchārya, the son of Śivadevāchārya, who belonged to the Āmardakaśaṁtṝa. As Āmardaka is a name of Kālabhairava and the title ēchārya shows that the two individuals mentioned possessed a religious character, it would seem that the word saṁhāra refers in this case to a spiritual family, the line of teachers of a Śaivism sect called Āmardaka. Though Śaivism is not now a favourite creed in Gujarāt, it flourished formerly in the province. Ruins of several considerable Mathas of the Nakullās exist in Central Gujarāt. Śaivism was also the creed of the old Solakāki kings of Amihvād and has only been supplanted later by various forms of Viśānavism.

*Ind. Ant. vol. IV, pp. 76-77.
* अभिभिज्जितें नवगच्छिन्नान्मानंक (नवगच्छि) करण्यमाणे (करण्यमाणे) ुा ।
Translation.

1. May that forest of braids on the head of the divine Dhandhesvara, which is sanctified by the flowing water of the stream of heaven, which is cooled by the rays of the moon, which (bees) excellent flowers in (the shape of) a multitude of golden lotuses and fruit (in the shape of) the happiness of salvation, which borders on the row of serpents, on the poison-kandali (of the throat) and on the tiger (ekis), (yet) causes no pain, bestow bliss on you!

2. The Earth bowed to Sambhu before (he gave himself up to) deep meditation and spoke with an echoing voice; "When meditation rules thy eye, oh lord, I am unable to bear the torment caused by the Asuras." (Then) the supreme ruler created for the sake of the earth out of his bow (chāpa), a powerful prince, called Chāpa, who, being of lofty stature, was able to protect her.

Moreover—

3. The illustrious Chāpa race, before which no (other) excels, which has no weak points (and) no thorns (in its sides), possesses an unseathed body, and excellent splendour, which though possessing excellent swords (it is always) satpatra, has reached the condition of being vipatra, because it protects from misfortune, which, though it ever gives the fruit of happiness to others, yet exceedingly increases its own prosperity, which, though it chooses its location on the heads of (other) princes, (nevertheless) is humble (before gods and gurus), is worthy to be served and cannot be conquered by its foes.

4. In that (race) was born the illustrious Vikramārka, a prince resembling the sun, possessing all the "regal powers" and the six qualities (of a king); from him (sprang) king Adakā. From him was born the illustrious king Pulakesi, a crest-jewel among the protectors of the earth. From him king Dravabhāta was descended, an incarnation of justice.

5. His younger brother is Dharanivaraha, at whose lotus-feet all princes bow, who finds happiness in the embraces of royal Fortune, who has become a (wish-granting) tree of paradise for all his friends, who is high-minded and a royal swan among the lotuses of the faces of the beauties (of his harem).

6. Why describe his valour, regal power, his destroying cities, his depth (of understanding), his truthfulness, great energy, or his unequalled great majesty? (There exists) a

L. 15, read तन्त्रस्त्र:। वर्ण:। L. 29, read श्रमार्कवः। L. 24, The second akshara is not certain.
certain magnanimity, an exceeding respect for the sons of noble-born kings through which, alas! the pure understanding of poets is frequently confused.

7. This prince, proud of his liberality, bravery and beauty, easily puts to shame, as it were, Karna, Partha and the god with the flowery arrows by his exploits that surpass theirs.

And he, though he gained immutable prosperity, reflected thus with innate discernment: "Life, health and so forth resemble the flame of a lamp that has been placed in a courtyard and is struck by the wind. Since, lo! of the former kings of my own and other families, though they were endowed with such power, nothing is left but their fame, renown and names, in consequence of such a wonderful play of fate, therefore it is preferable to set one's heart on (the acquisition of) spiritual merit alone. And while spiritual merit may be acquired by liberality, virtuous conduct, anstates and abstract meditation, ruling princes have usually made gifts or had recourse to meditation."

Therefore, considering that a gift of land and the like is a ladder to heaven, that illustrious Dharanivaraha, the lord of the great feudal barons, who possesses unmeasurable virtues, who has obtained all the great titles, who resides at Vardhamana, who rules through the favour of 'the feet' of the king of kings and supreme lord, the illustrious Mahipala Dva, the Adgaanaka country which is called after the name of his own grandfather and a great many other (districts), has made a gift in such a manner that he issues (the following) orders to all future kings, (both to those) connected with himself, and to (those of) other (dynasties) to the lords of provinces, the lords of villages, the Inamdaras, the head-men, the villagers, the scribes, the policemen, the middle-men and so forth. "Be it known to you that I have given with greatest devotion, on the day of the winter-solstice (confirming the gift) by a libation of water, for the increase of my parent's and my own merit and fame, likewise in order to obtain the (due) reward in the next world, to Sri-Mahesvaracharya, the son of Sri-Sivadevacharya of the famous Arda line, as a reward for his learning, the village called Vinkala, which is connected with the sthal of Kanthikaka, up to the extremity of its boundaries, together with the dant, the bhoga, and the share (of the produce), together with the (right of) punishing and (deciding suits arising out of) the ten faults, together with its rows of trees, together with the immunity from interference by royal officials and from obstruction. And its boundaries (are): to the east the village called Uttarakaka to the south the village called Kikkhrana, to the west the village called Kurula, to the north the village called Saichehanka. Nobody must hinder Sri-Mahesvaracharya, when, in accordance with the maxim regarding sons, grandsons and (remoter) descendants, he enjoys or causes to be enjoyed this village called Vinkala, which is defined by the above four boundaries, which is not to be entered by the regular or irregular soldiers, which (has been granted) together with the right of forced labour resting thereon, but with the exception of former grants to gods and Brahmans, in accordance with the reasoning from the familiar instance of the ground and the clefts therein, for as long (a period) as the moon, the sun, the ocean, the earth, the rivers and hills endure. For it has been declared by the divine Vyasa, the compiler of the Vedas..."

On the day of the winter-solstice, on the fourth of the bright half of Pausha, Shaka-samvat 836. And as this is, even so the donor of the village attaches his sign-manual. This is the sign-manual of the illustrious Dharanivaraha.

And this has been written by the minister for peace and war, Mahindaaka, the son of Parthiha.
Sanskrit Grants and Inscriptions of Gujarat Kings.

No. V.

A Copperplate Grant of King Trilochanapāla Chaulukya of Lātadēsa, (dated Śaka 972, A.D. 1050)

Edited by H.H. Dhrupa, B.A., LL.B.

The grant of which a version is given below is in the possession of a coppersmith of Surat, and was obtained on loan for me by Mr. Narbheram Mansukhrām. The owner had done great pāja to the copperplates, and the letters were much filled with saffron and sandalwood unguents; they have suffered also from rust, and it took some days to clean them.

The plates are three in number, and are secured by a strong copper ring, bearing the royal seal upon it,—an image of Śiva, in an attitude of meditation, with his accomplishments. They weigh between 9 and 10 lbs.

These plates throw considerable light on that period of the history of Lātadēsa and of Gujarāt, that followed the downfall of the Gūjjaras and Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the one district and the Valabhās and Chāpotaṅgas in the other. It belongs to the Chaulukya king Trilōchanapāla of Lātadēsa, fifth in descent from Bārappa, the contemporary and rival of Mūlarāja Solankī of Gujarāt, and is dated in Śaka 972 (A.D. 1050.)

The inscription is metrical, but only the first 32 verses are numbered, containing an account of the donor and his family history. The verses following these are descriptive of the donee, and the object of the gift, with the customary injunctions and quotations. The inscription is correctly written with the exception of the substitution of the letter स (s) for श (ś) and vice versa, which is also the peculiarity of the present Suratī to our day. The language is highly eulogistic of the patrons of the poet, as is generally the case.

Although the authorities vary in details, yet their account of the origin of the Chaulukyas is almost identical, whether we look to the poet Bīlaṅga, or the author of the Kumārapālacharita,—the Jaina monk Jayasimhādēsvirī about the fourteenth century of the Christian era,—or to the Vadanagar Prakasati of king Jayasimhādeva of V.S. 1208, or to the present grant. These Chaulukyas or Chaulukyas are sprung from a “Man-jewel” formed by the Creator of the Universe from a handful of sacred water. The Chaulukyas of the south are said frequently to allude to this. The Chaulukyas of Lātadēsa here claim that descent. The Sālākiṣis of Anahilavatā, too, derive their descent from the same source as the following fragmentary verse from the Vadanagar Prakasati of king Jayasimhādeva of Gujarāt, dated V.S. 1208, indicates:

“&c., &c., &c.;

The Creator, throwing his glance, into his Chuluka, filled with the sacred waters of the Ganges, at once created this warrior, by name Chulukya, who by the streams of his fame,”

The name of the first parent is variously written—as Chulukya here and in the Kumārapālacharita, and Chaulukya in the present grant. The poet Bīlaṅga does not give the name. None of the Gujarātī chroniclers, bards or Jaina Prabandha writers,—so far as my information goes,—is ambitious enough to proceed beyond Bhubaṅga, with the exception of Jayasimhādeva-sūrī. This Jaina Yati informs us that the progenitor of the race was Chulukya. He ignores the supernatural origin assigned to him by the Brāhmaṇical poets and writers of inscriptions. He wants to elevate his hero by ascribing to him a descent from king Vikrama of traditional fame and glory—the originator of the Sañvat era. The verses are as follow:

पुरा सुरारिति अविदो दारुपरः
चुलुक्य तिति विस्मयः संजयः श्रवेयतमः || १६
पैरारसमिह नां चारुर्वर्षीयां धारपरः गुणाः
श्रीता द्व जगद्राम्य द्वारांतिष्ठितायम् || १७
व सांपोषाराकर्मभद्रसेवानिन्न्याणां
राज्यार्क्योपाधिपत्यानुपाध्याय सीतानाथिना
निरम्गायकुसोमयं कुलं बलायैवासितात
श्रीकर्त्ता जातमितिनिहितकलिक मुहूपाभिषेकप्राप्ते || १८
चुलुक्य तिति बंबोभुताभाय विषायक्विवृतं
आकृति नरसायं वृष्णाग्रीनिष्रकृतम् || १९
Formerly there came into existence the best of the Kshatriyas known as Chaulukya, who was like the enemy of the demons, Indra, bearing the yoke of the regeneration of the whole world. (v. 16). The virtues of fortitude, gravity, prudence, heroism, generosity, &c., overcome with fatigue after roaming all over the world, took rest with him without exhaustion. (v. 17). Who, having destroyed with the sharp sword of his mind hardened with the acts of war, the hosts of enemies, causing great and terrible annoyance to (all) animals like the Daityas, and having rendered the terrestrial orb fearless, and smiling with the prosperity of his Svārya, fixed his capital in the town, by name Madhupagana (or Mathura) (v. 18).

There arose a race known by his name, Chaulukya, a mine of men-jewels, endowed with good shoots and branches (v. 19).

There were many rulers of the earth of his family, whose splendour was praised by all (v. 20).

In course of time there was born the king, by name Śrī Vikramasimha, to whom was granted the golden charm, Svarṇa—Siddhā, by Mahāśvarā, who, having freed the whole world from debt, proclaimed his own era to the very shores of the sea! (v. 21). There sprang forth Harivikrama his son, the head-jewel of the valiant, who, with the Keta flowers of his fame, rendered fragrant, (all the) directions. (v. 22). From him were 25 kings of admirable splendour, the fire of whose prowess was not borne by the families (in another sense bamboo) of the Śakas, even though they were very firm (deeply rooted and long established) (v. 23).

In that family was king Rāma, like Rāma, the home of justice, who had destroyed the majesty of the wicked (Kharadāha),

Cf. also the attempt of the chroniclers and genealogists of the south who count 50 kings as having ruled at Ayodhya, and after them 16 more before Pulikēla. See the verse from an inscription of king Vikramasidhi VI, dated S. S. 999 Ind. Ant. vol. VIII, p. 119.—

As applied to the mythical Rāma, who destroyed the greatness of the demons named Khera and Dāhaha.
From that natural Rāma was a warrior Bhatā, who destroyed the lord of the Śakas, master of three hundred thousand cavalry, with his infantry (v. 25). His son was Śrī Daṣṭaka, the giver of prosperity, who shone with his splendour, who lion-like conquered Gaja, the ruler of the kingdom of Pipāśa (v. 26). His kingdom was occupied by the king Kāmbikavyāla, by whose gifts the Arthīs, the suppliants and donees were intoxicated as with the dānā of the celestial tree (v. 27). Then there shone, bright like the moon, king Raṇi, the conqueror in many battles, who, having performed the pilgrimage to Devanagara, there, at the injunctions of the auspicious lord of the moon (Śrī Somandhika Mahādeva), married the princess Līlā by name, who was like Lakhsmi, sister of Śāmanastīna, the ruler of the Gūrjara, mother of the single hero of the world! (v. 28).

Their son was known as Mūlarrāja of incomparable splendour, who, not being born from the uterms, was the result of a great miracle (v. 29). Who having killed with his sword his incomparable uncle Śāmanastīna, and having obtained the kingdom of Gūrjara, destroyed likewise Lakhya, through the greatness of Somāśa, who was prepared for war (v. 30). Then was king Chamunḍa... who killed in battle the Sinhdhurāja who was as ungovernable as the ocean (v. 31). From him was Vallabharāja, the king of Avantimunja, scorched by the heat of his prowess could not hold his patience even in the prison-house (v. 32). Then Durlabharāja, having obtained his kingdom, a cloud of the forest, having destroyed the lord of Lātadēsa, enjoyed his land with his fortunes (v. 33). His son was Bhimadeva. At the setting in of the frost of his greatness the arm of Bhūja faded away like the lotus (and that) very properly (v. 34).

The poet Bilhaṅga in detailing the life and exploits of his patron, says (verse 34): —

शापिनिनिमाधिनिमुत्यथार्थः कर्षणः कर्षणतः कर्षणिन्

The ruler. Can the kingdom of Pīpāśa, be the regions bordering on and beyond the Biyaz,—the Panjab and Kabul territory of the king?

* Can this be the same with the Bhūjaya (Sana, Bhūhūsu), of the Gaujar chroniclers. The verse in the original is very doubtful. This question needs further elucidation.

* Can this be Daṣṭaka, brother of Bāja (Bājī, father of Mūlarrāja) and Bīja? But if the king mentioned in the last verse be Bhūhūsu, Daṣṭaka, according to the chroniclers, was fifth in descent from him.

* In other sense the ichor, or the juice flowing out from certain trees.

* Here is one of the many quaint similes used by the poet. Here he compares the family of the hero to a bamboo-staff, taking advantage of its double meaning—on which rest all the directions—the sky firmly like an awning spread all about and held up.
From them rises up a warrior, who is described in the next six verses.

The three next verses describe the prowess, glory and achievements of the other monarchs of the family in general terms.

The Rād Mālā states that Mālarāja was attacked in his newly acquired kingdom simultaneously, by the Rāj of Nāgar from the north, and "Barp, the general of Tailip, the sovereign of Tehlingana" from the south. Further we are told that at the time of this invasion Mālarāja retired to Kanhtkot in Kachh, which, according to Dr. Bühler, may be inferred from his published inscription, dated V. S. 1043. He had killed Laksma or Lakhā Phulāni before this.

The version of the story, as given by the Prabandha Chitāmanī, is that followed by the Rād Mālā. The Kundārapādā-bhupāla-charita or Vastrapūpāla-charita have nothing to say to this. The Kirtiśaumudrī gives the following:

"Who, of incomparable valour, having killed Bārapa, the general of the ruler of Lāta-dēsa, that could with difficulty be repulsed, took the tribute of a troop of elephants." And here Rāja-Purohitā Somaśavara, the author of the work, gives this event the precedence of the war with the ruler of Kachh. According to this authority, then, Bārapa was a general of the Lāta-dēsa, meaning thereby Tailapādēva, who had but recently overthrown the Rāshtrakūta Kakkala, and made himself master of his territory. But the brother-poet and contemporary of Somaśavara, the Jain chronicler, Arasūha, gives the following, on the subject, in his poem of Sukraja-Saṅkṛtiśāna:—

"Who, having conquered in battle the general Bārapa, of the king of Kanyākubja, wrenched the tribute of elephants from his hand (whose) fire of valor blazed up by that act." Canto II, v. 5.

The present grant simply states that Bārapa was born in the family of Chaulukya, that he was related by marriage to the Rāshtrakūta, Mahārāja of Kanyākubja, and that he obtained Lāta-dēsa, not by conquest, and by his wise and

---

*Ratnākara, in the case of the Ganges may mean the ocean, the storehouse of pearls and gems.
politic rule won the hearts of the people, and
destroyed the enemies of the realm, which
last is a mere rhetorical flourish! And it
makes no mention of the defeat and death of
the founder of the family by Múlarája. We
are again informed by the Bás Máda, that
at the time when Násarañás were being
poured in from every side, and presented to
the ruler of Sáravata Mádhála,—that from
Látañása was an ill-omened elephant which
greatly incensed prince C h á n ú d á. The king,
thereupon, with Chāmuñxa the heir-apparent,
marshed hastily upon Látañása and surprised,
defeated and killed (Dvárap) in a battle.13
He is here named Dvárap, an attempt to
Sanskritize the name. I think this Dvárap
must be the same as the Bárp of pp. 51-2, who
may not have been killed on the first occasion
as there stated. From the parallel institu-
tion between Agnirája, (Goñirája? Goggirája? or
Goñirája?), the “first home of the family”,
that recovered the land submerged under the
waves of foreign conquest and overwhelmed
by the demons of enemies (meaning the
Cháruñyvas of Asáhiláváda), and the Varáha
Avára or boar incarnation of Vishnú,—the
relationship and close connection of the Láta
Cháruñyvas with the Cháruñyvas of Kályána,
who had for their cognizance the Boar, may
be inferred (v. 11 of the grant). If this
Goñirája be the same “Cháruñya noble Gojir-
rája,” of the grant of the Yadava king
Senañachandra II., dated S.S. 991 (A.D. 1069),
we shall be able approximately to fix his
period. The grant mentions that a Yadava king
Tésséka, of Chandó (whose family had settled
there, emigrating from Dvárapati or Dváriká
about 850 A.D.) had for his wife, princess
Náyíylla, daughter of a Cháruñya noble Gojir-
rája. This Gojirája’s son-in-law, Tésséka, is said
to have succeeded Vádig, who was married
to the daughter of the Síhlára king J h a n j h á,
whose date is put down as A.D. 916. The
successor of Tésséka is one Bhiñlama, who is said
to have conquered Áhavamalla, son of Jaya-
sínha Cháruñyá (1040 to 1069 A.D.) So the
date of Gojirája falls somewhere between 916
and 1040 A.D. Thus Agnirája, whose name
may be read as Gojirája, strengthened his
position, by securing the alliance and support
of the rising family of the Yadavas of Chandó.
But he did not live to be king; it was his
son, Kíttirája, who was the first king of
Látañása.

The reign of this Kíttirája seems to have
been uneventful, but the last few verses
concerning him speak of his enemies and of
wars in general terms, and we are informed by
the Kumárapála-bhashá-charita, in one of the
verses quoted above, that king Durlabha-
rája, having destroyed Láta-nátha or the
ruler of Látañása, (Kíttirája) enjoyed his regal
fortune with his land. And this is borne out
by the Vádanagara Prakásci thus:

स्त्रिः कृत्तिराजस्य के निकृष्टः भुक्तरि संग्रहं
त्योऽहंशब्दं लोचनव ग्रंथस्था संस्कृता पत्रः॥

“The wavy creeper of the brow of him (Dur-
labhärája), the ocean of anger, exhibited soon
the fruit in the form of the destruction of the
kingdom of Láta” which clearly indicates the
death and destruction of Kíttirája, that is
concealed by the writer of the grant, as would very
naturally be the case. Kíttirája was succeeded by
Vátsarája. This Vátsarája presented the
god Somañatha of Pañtha in Sora with a
gold umbrella, resplendent with jewels. He also
founded charitable institutions for the poor and
the helpless (v. 27). His son Trilochanápa-
lá, the donor of the grant, seems to be the
last of his line, for we do not hear of any
kingdom of Látañása subsequent to this time.
The country in the time of Kára and his
glorious son Jayasínha and their
successors being comprised within the empire
of Gújjaráta.12

The minister of war and peace is Sankara.
Trilochanápalá bathes in the western sea
at the port of Agastya-tirtha and makes the
grant, from which I conclude that it or some
place near it was most probably the capital
of the kingdom of the monarch. Agastya-tirtha, I am informed,
what is now called Bhagvá Dádgi.
Erathâna, the village granted, is situated in the Olpad taluka of the Surat district. Five kos from Erathâna is a place called Karan Pârdî. Near Karanj is a hillock called Mehe-larun Tekro, and a tradition there goes that it was a place of resort of the Padâhâs of old in the Bâdahâb times. It contained once a palatial building which was a place of takhat, meaning thereby the metropolis of the country. At about a kos and a half from Karanj is Bhagvâ Dândî, and they are separated by a creek running inland. Nâgâmâ is Nagâdâ (?). Vadathâna, lying to the south of Erathâna. Nagâdâ is desolate now. Vatapradra is Vadodra lying to the S.E., Lingavata is Lingoda or Nagâdâ in the S. of Erathâna, or it may be Lingastâra in the Chorâjâ taluka, belonging to the Sachin State? Siva is Siva still. Can Indothâna be modern Narathâna? Tembarukâ is Timburvâ in the Chorâjâ taluka. Talapradra is Taloda or Talada to the S. of Erathâna. The other places cannot be identified.

Transcript.

Plate I.

(1) 9 ölçü nume vinâpakkâ || śītāt jiyoṣµudrâ || wān śīnâkâlae kâllâmabhîmâyô
(2) śीने मूर्तिः बिंदुसारो बांलादेश दानहसोसलगभिकाराः: पाणीयो वापरण्यः: || राकूत वायन- ||
(3) yagya tâkhat-sandâya yeyevântâh pîntâ nioche-vâsan kânaa || kâllâmabhîmâyô pâltânti dān-
(4) kâye: || 11 || dâpanâi tâdhamay chakâlaksâµê gâtâmâyô śântâ-turnâ pâkân || hârti-
(5) t ātâ० ṇâdâpâthiye mûkâ rêseu sãbênî niṣâphâmâyô: || 2 || kâllâmabhîmâyô
(6) y şrûcâ śîmûbâdâmbhī mālāi jâpâmâyô: || hâmâno lêkâpôhitî pî registrado- ||
(7) sâbhô râtîkhôs vîshâkṣat: || 3 || kâdâbhâdeśhâbdeśhâdâvântâdârâmâyô: || vîrîbhu-pâ- ||
(8) lâkâmpêre râjârâta pâmâmu: || 4 || dêv hînsârâmâyô: nityâ pâh tâmst s: || samâ-
(9) hînâsare-sîshîgîmâyô gû: lâkârâbîve tân: || 5 || kâllâmabhîmâyô mahârâjâ rajâkùtâs kâna-||
(10) kânaa lâmây xâmu: || kâye tânî nambû pâmâmâyô: || 6 || hâmâno lêkâpôhitî pî registrado-
(11) viñâsê kâye || cîlûnâmâyô pâmâyô nitya sthôstàµê || 7 || tânârâjâ dîphat-
(12) hînâsare-sîshîgîmâyô gû: lâkârâbîve tân: || 8 || kâllâmabhîmâyô
(13) mânâyô râjâ bhumû: mûbî nâmâvâlîkâmâyô: || 8 || kâllâmabhîmâyô
dâphat-
(14) yam mâmâyô nâmâvâlîkâmâyô mûbî dâphat-
(15) bhumû: mûbî nâmâvâlîkâmâyô: || 9 || tâsâstāmâyô viñâsare-sîshîgîmâyô: ||
(16) sahâyô dâphat-
(17) pállum: ye: prânâna: ye: šārâmuṇâmâyô || tâmstâ mûbîtâ pâdâ vânap || 10 ||

Plate II. A.

(1) bhumûdânta yam nâmâyô(nê!) m || hînâmâyô: || 11 || pâmâvâlîkâmâyô: ||
(2) vânapmâyô mûbî nâmâvâlîkâmâyô: || 11 || pâmâvâlîkâmâyô: ||
(3) sâbhô tâkhat-sandâya yeyevântâh pîntâ nioche-vâsan kânaa || kâllâmabhîmâyô: ||
(4) hâmâno lêkâpôhitî pî registrado- || 12 || kâdâbhâdeśhâbdeśhâdârâmâyô: ||
(5) hâmâno lêkâpôhitî pî registrado- || 13 || tânî kâye: ||
(6) kâllâmabhîmâyô: || 13 || pâmâvâlîkâmâyô: ||
(7) tânî kâye: ||
(8) bhumûdânta yam nâmâyô(nê!) m || hînâmâyô: || 11 || pâmâvâlîkâmâyô: ||
(9) vânapmâyô mûbî nâmâvâlîkâmâyô: || 11 || tâmstâ mûbîtâ pâdâ vânap || 10 ||
Plate II. B.

Plate III.

Plate III.
Translation.

Om! Salutation to Vináyaka! Hail! Victory and prosperity!

May the arms of the god of all gods (Siva) protect (you or us),—bearing (in his eight hands) the arrow, the śiva, and the rosary, the lotus, then the serpent, the citron, the trident, and the club (khaṭvāṅga,14)—gift-conferring and at the same time terrifying (!)—making clearly manifest his mind, all sentimental as it is. Otherwise how could he have protected the world, from the Dānavas? (v. 1).

May that Hārī, the lord of the celestials,—his mind full of all (poetic) favours,—preserve the world,—who bears the Pādā, the discus, and the gem Kaustubha, the mace and the conch-shell, and here again the lotus! (v. 2).

The unborn lord (Bṛāhma) bears the kamādaka12 and the struk,14 and the rosary, telling the mantras (on its beads). He, the more particularly tinged with (poetical) feelings, creates mankind to keep off the enemies! (v. 3).

Once upon a time there arose a man, a jewel of a king, from the ocean of his chuluka,17 by the churning of it with the mount Mandara of anxiety arising out of the depression (caused) by the Dāityas (v. 4).

He, having saluted him, said, —"What shall I do, O lord?" And to him the well-pleased creator replied on the matter of the fulfilment of the object (v. 5):—

O thou Chaulukya, king of kings, marrying the princess of the Rāṣṭrakūtās in Kanyākūbja, bless thou (the world) with offspring obtained of her (v. 6).

Thus here there may be for certain a far extending race of the Kshatriya—born of Chaulukya, like the many streams of a river from a mountain (v. 7).

In that family was known a king, a renowned name Bārapa, beloved of Fame, who avoided the wives of the enemy, afraid as it were of even (their) touch (v. 8), who having obtained the country of Lāṭa, verified to the delight of the people, the maxims of the science of politics: and who winning over his subjects and destroying his enemies, always obtained the fruit of the replenishment of his treasury (v. 9).

From him was born Gōngirāja,—the native land of victory,—from whom all kings learnt the duties of royalty,—the first home of the family, the guardian of his subjects, who planted his foot on the crest of the enemies of unbounded splendour (v. 10), who relieved his own land like the greater Viṣṇu, the land that was seized upon by powerful enemies like demons (v. 11).

From him was the glorious Kṛttirāja,

12 Khaṭvāṅga is a club or staff with a skull at the top, considered as the weapon of Śiva, and carried by ascetics and Yogis.—Vide Mon. Williams' Sans. Dict.
13 The wooden ewer for carrying water used by Yogis and Sannyasins. Ib.
14 Struk is a sort of wooden ladle used for pouring clarified butter on a sacrificial fire, made of Palāka or Khadira wood. Ib.
15 Chuluka may mean the hand hollowed to hold water, as Adjal, or a waterpot—kumāda. Vide Ib.
as beautiful as the god of love, as Pradyumna was of Achyuta, who, gaining the throne of Lātādeśa, by righteousness made the directions bright white with (his) fame. (v. 12).  

King Kṛttī was the central gem (nāyaka) of the diamond necklace, on the threads of generations of kings the precious gems of the Chaulukyas (v. 13). (His) mother out of all women gave birth to him, as some indistinguishable vein in the great, material body of the cow, the resting place of the padārtha (or elements) gives birth to milk (v. 14). All people were filled with delight, at the sight of him, from his birth, who was so beautiful that they were not emptied even though they dropped out drops of ambrosia like an ewer of ambrosia. (v. 15).  

Equally alluring though they be (viz. beauty and dainty viands)—yet he avoided the enjoyment of others' wives, like the tasting of the leavings—left after eating (v. 16). They (i.e. the virtues) adhered to hands and feet, as the best gems stuck fast over his chest, they (clung), through the instrumentality of the Sruti Kuṇḍalas—the earrings, adopting (it or them) as the principal step or seat (pada), eschewing the secondary or unessential one; but alas! they could not keep themselves (there) (v. 17).  

The collections of virtues, spurning the princes that served as supports (to him),—chose the alighting (as above): otherwise how could they have been natural, and how could they have grown up with him? (v. 18)? He caused his mind to be slain, running from the side of the infuriate elephant of youth, since without it the herd of senses could not step over the borders of carnal desires (v. 19). The soul of man is like dhūtas enclosed by his body, like a house, &c. So he, seeing himself to be present ever in others, enjoyed his wealth equally with needy suitors (v. 20).  

Looking to whose agile hands, the home of great anger, so also the heart and the bent bow,—the warrior (king) lopped off the heads of the enemies, tossed on high through pride (v. 21). Who did good by bending low the bow towards the enemy. So his best arrows shot at the foe, hitting right the mark, gained their end thereby (v. 22). He, sword in hand, had a thoughtless beloved in kṛttī (fame) who alas! afraid as it were, went over to the house of the enemies, and censured to return, she, bearing the celestial lustre of the circle of earth (watered) by the seven seas, bewildered of old, was sung by the gods as pure (v. 23).  

From him was born Vatsaras ā, the great ocean of the precious gems of virtues—the valiant (one) famed as mount Mandara for the churning of the ocean of war (v. 24). Here rests from infancy downwards in the mansion of statues this Śrī, the goddess of fortune with the auspices, and here is chaste Modesty, too, like the bride, well concealing her passion, knowing the mind of her lord bringing about uninterrupted greatness. She rests here without a rival with king Vatsaras ā, as with Vivasvat (v. 25).  

Some quarters of the world, as all of them cannot be accommodated in a single ambara (i.e. sky or cloth) nestled into a corner. So the bounteous king Vatsa dressed them up with the robes of (his) glory (v. 26).  

He dedicated an umbrella resplendent with gold and jewels as an ornament to the god So maṇātha, and instituted an asylum unpimpered for the poor and the helpless (v. 27).  

His son the glorious king Trilochana-pati the ruler of Lātādeśa a Pāṇḍava among the kings of the Kali age (v. 28).
Whose solicitations (or arrows) even in giving over (or discharging) went on discriminating the virtues (or proceeded from the twanging of the string of the bow): he was Dharma or justice to truth,—and cross with the cheat; in valor like Vishnu (v. 29). Oh, the old enemies of him were very much confounded. Strange it was they were marked with the stain of enjoyment while he was the enjoyer (v. 30).

He, having lopped off with his sword the head of the enemy, who (was) the ornament of the field of battle,—and sufficient of the streams of blood flowing fast from the ring about his neck (by the swordcut): certainly the body of him (i.e. the enemy) changed in colour, all of a sudden all its members heated with the fire of his splendour, flashed forth quick with the armed hand30 (v. 31).

That very pious (king) perceiving that the three worlds were transient, gave here land, cows and wealth to the twice-born (v. 32).

In the Śaka year 900 and 72 more, in the year Vēkṣa, in the month Pausha, in the dark fortnight, on the day of the new moon, that of the solstitial festival, on Tuesday,—king Trilochana, going to the shores of the western sea, to the sacred place Agastyaśirtha, gave to Madhava, a Bhārgava, of the gotra Kuśika, having for his Prasaras Vaiśvāmitra, Dévarāja and Andala, a village, with water in hand, in the Erawālaka Nine-handed in the sub-district of forty-two and the district of (Vī or) Dhīllisvāra. This all entire, properly bounded, with the trees, (but) without the claims of gods and hereditary Brāhmaṇas.

To the east of it is the village of Nāgāmbā and also Tantikā; south-east Vatapdraka; south Lingavatā Śiva; southwest Indotthana; west Bahunadāva; north-west Temarāka; north Talapatraka; north-east Kuruvagrama. Thus the eight villages bounding it. Therefore the four skirts with the products therein, the Brāhmaṇa (shall) enjoy: so no one should make any hindrance to him of the communities known as Śādhus or Saṅkaras. And if there be any transgressor he will be affected by him. There is great merit in keeping (this) up—in the robbing of it great sin. And so it is said. 'This bridge of righteousness is common to all kings, and you should from time to time keep it up, whether of my race or of another's. Thus Rāma beseecheth future kings: a bride, a cow, ground even as much as half an inch,—one that usurps them, goes to hell till the time of the universal destruction.' Those objects of charity, utility, or pleasure, &c., that are instituted of old by kings,—taking them as sacred, what good (is there if) man resumes them?

Many have enjoyed the earth, Sagara and others. His is the merit whose it is at the time.

This is written by me, the great minister of peace and war, Saṅkara.

Of Śri Trilochanapāla,

CORRESPONDENCE

PROF. BHĀNDĀRKAR AND THE GĀTHĀ DIALECT.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

Sir,—I have read Professor Bhāndārkar's review of my paper on the Nāsik Inscription with great interest, and, I will add, with much pleasure; for it is a pleasure to have to deal with an antagonist so able and so courteous. I will not occupy your valuable Journal with a controversy; for as to the main point, the Gāthā-character of the Nāsik record, I shall have an opportunity elsewhere of setting forth and defending my views in detail; and as to minor matters, the construction of particular compounds and the like,

30 This verse describes the valor of the enemy of Trilochana engaged in a combat with him. The enemy is proud, noble and valiant. A dexterous blow from the king's sword cuts off his head, yet his trunk instead of falling dead and motionless on the ground, not quailing under his superior power, burns with it, and moves on brandishing the sword in his hand.

AND MISCELLANEA.

Mr. A. C. H. Huxley has expressed my view, I do not care any further about them. In the meantime, however, I may briefly state the difficulty which I feel regarding the line of argument adopted by Professor Bhāndārkar, in appealing to Pāṇini's authority. That argument is plausible enough to suggest itself at first; but the difficulty is this, that if we hold, as the Professor does, that the so-called Gāthā-dialect is due to "ignorant persons not knowing Sanskrit or Pāli," and therefore presumably innocent of any knowledge of Pāṇini, we preclude ourselves from the right of appeal to Pāṇini's authority, in support of the peculiarities of the Gāthā. A little reflection, I think,
will show that the two lines of argument are mutually destructive. The difficulty is enhanced, if we meet with peculiarities, for which even Professor Bhanjārkar cannot adduce Pāṇinian sanction. He, therefore, calls them “extensions” of Pāṇinian rules, but not violations. Now I have no quarrel with a name; I call them anomalies (from the Sanskrit point of view); but let them be called “extensions” if only we agree that they are instances (e.g., accusative in place of nominative), which have not the sanction of either Pāṇini or the ordinary Sanskrit usage. As to the so-called “promiscuous” use of the cases, there seems to be some misunderstanding. It seems hardly necessary to explain, that when we say that in the Gāthā the accusative may be used for the locative or even for the nominative, and the like, this is simply said from the Sanskrit point of view. From the Gāthā point of view we have simply a general inflection which may express different relations of words to one another. It is similar with the so-called genitive case in Prakrit.

There is another point on which I should like to enter a protest, and this not without reference to Professor Bhanjārkar’s review in particular. We ought not, I think, to attribute errors to ancient records, unless absolutely compelled to do so. I have shown, I think, that this particular Nāsiq record may be explained without importing into it any errors at all. If we once allow ourselves to correct and revise ancient records, according to what we fancy the author ought to have written or intended to write, we open a way for a dangerous license of criticism. I do not deny the possibility of error; indeed I have insisted on it myself in a previous number of your Journal, but I think it is a sound canon of criticism, from which we ought not to depart, that we should not have recourse to the plea of “error,” unless under absolute necessity.

Only one word more, with regard to the expression Bhaṭārakādāttiḥ. The question put to me by Professor Bhanjārkar, he has answered himself. The Sandhi is explained by the subscribed a, because the compound might have been, as the Professor shows, misunderstood. In fact, the Professor’s explanation of the subscribed a does not appreciably differ from mine, as he will probably see on reconsideration.

Literary warfare would be something different from what it often is, if it were always carried on in the spirit of Professor Bhanjārkar’s review.

A. F. Rudolf Hoernle.

---

ADEN EPIGRAPH.—(ante p. 88.)

The text is given below and can be translated:

Bein ala al-rum al-rum

Bishreth rum bradda ma al-erwa o-waxat ibm

Fabi nibay qalimat ibn-indin ibini raids ans al-lij

Ejiruqaim

Rhati wali kari ma adaam ibadi

Wali qadedi ina zah al-qalima

Fabi nabi qaledi rahiti biqi

Wali zaiz al-ilama

Translation:

In the name of Allah the merciful, the clement.

Their Lord sendeth them good tidings of mercy from him, and good will, and of gardens wherein they shall enjoy lasting pleasure; they shall continue therein for ever; for with Allah is a great reward. [Qurān, ch. IX. v. 21 and 22].

[Verses.] I departed and had not prepared a provision,

And I sought not [the] lasting provision;

So that I verily departed without provision

But I have alighted near [the] munificent

[Allah].

This is the tomb of the free and excellent Omm-Abdullah, manumitted female of the glorious Sultan Yehia bin Abissaad al-Muwaffaq al-Thag’ari al-Islami. She died at A’wan (perhaps it is A’don) on the last day of the month Ramadān of the year five hundred and sixty-three (8th July 1168) May Allah have mercy upon her! [This inscription was carved by Muhammad bin Barakāt bin Abi-Harami.

E. Rehatsek.

written in parenthesis, constitute a part of the epitaph also on the stone. Whether any other additions or changes have been made by the scribe I cannot say.
ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE PRINCIPAL HINDŲ ERAS, AND THE USE OF THE WORD SĀṆṆATSAṆA AND ITS ABBREVIATIONS.

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

A GREAT deal of the confusion that runs through the different arguments that have from time to time been put on record in respect of the Gupta and Valabhi era or eras is to be attributed—in the first place, to the want of uniformity that prevails in naming these and the other eras that have to be mentioned in the discussion—and, in the second place, still more to the strained and restricted meaning that has unfortunately been put upon the word saṅkavataśa and its abbreviations, especially in the form saṅkavat. In this latter connection, one of the most specific—and yet, if tested, one of the most untenable—remarks, is made by Professor J. Dowson in his Further Note on a Bactrian Pāṭī Inscription and the Saṅkavata Era, in the Journ. R. As. Soc., N. S., Vol. IX, pp. 144 ff. Disputing the position taken up by Mr. Thomas, that the word saṅkavataśa does not involve or necessitate a preferential association with the era of Vikramāditya, he there says:—“My contention is that the word Saṅkavataśa, or its abbreviation Saṅkavat, wherever used alone, must be understood to mean the Saṅkavataśa of Vikramāditya only, the contrary is shown. Saṅkavat and Saṅkavatśa have designated the era of Vikramāditya for at least a thousand years; and it is not to be assumed without any proof that the word was ever used absolutely for any other era. There have been other Saṅkavats, but then they have been called by their specific names, as Valabhi-Saṅkavat; and the word saṅkavataśa has been used simply for the word year, but then the era has been distinctly stated, as I before pointed out. The word Saṅkavat has been so long absolutely used for the era of Vikramāditya, that it has the right of a lengthened possession, and it is not to be set aside without distinct proof.” Professor Monier Williams seems to attach the same value to the word and its principal abbreviation; in his Sūtras Dictionary he gives saṅkavataśa as meaning, without any qualifying expression, “a year of Vikramāditya’s era,” and saṅkavat (which he suggests is a contraction of saṅkavataśa) as meaning, equally without any qualifying expression, “a year of Vikramāditya’s era, commencing B.C. 57, as opposed to a year of the era of Śālivāhana commonly called Śaka or Śāka.”

On a previous occasion (Vol. VIII, pp. 151 ff.) I have shown that saṅkavat is an abbreviation, not of the base saṅkavataśa, but of the genitive plural saṅkavatāraṇāṃ, ‘of years.’ The passage that establishes this, by using the full word saṅkavatāraṇāṃ exactly where other inscriptions use the abbreviation saṅkavat, is given as No. 3 below. And in the same paper I gave four other instances in which saṅkavat is used to denote years of the Śaka era. In each of these instances, it is true, the word is in a passage that refers itself specifically to the Śaka era. And for comparatively modern times, say from the commencement of the eleventh century A.D., general usage is certainly in favour of the position assumed by Prof. Dowson in respect of the particular abbreviation saṅkavat.—viz. that, if used alone, it must primâ facie, if not absolutely, be understood to denote years of the era of Vikramāditya. But the case is quite otherwise in respect of the earlier times with which we have to deal, in considering the original nomenclature of this and other Hindū eras. And the instances that I shall quote in illustrating the nomenclature, will show amply that, in those earlier times, the word saṅkavataśa and its abbreviations had no such restricted meaning at all, but were used freely, whether with or without qualifying expressions, to denote years of any of the eras that were in use. In his paper from which I have quoted above, Prof. Dowson goes on to say, in respect of the unlucky saṅkavataśa or saṅkavat:—“This word has offered a tempting gap in the tangled mazes of Hindū chronology for escaping difficulties and arriving at a conclusion, right or otherwise. A more strict adherence to the meaning it has so long borne is due to it, and will, it is to be hoped, lead to more satisfactory results.” But, it is just by restricting the meaning of the word in the way in which he seeks to restrict it, that such difficulties, which would not otherwise exist, are created. If once it is fully recognised that there is no authority whatsoever for so restricting the meaning of the word saṅkavataśa, and if once the present
purely artificial use of the abbreviation sāhvat by itself to denote the era of Vikramādiya is by general consent abandoned,—a great advance will have been made towards clearing the way for determining the starting points of such eras or successions of dates as are still doubtful.

I. The Śaka Era.

The earliest technical expression for this era, furnished by an epigraphical record as to the interpretation of the date of which there is no uncertainty, viz. simply

Sauvatsara

or ‘the year’, is supplied by—1, the first Kāra grant of the Gūrja-ra king Dadda II. The date, which is given in both words and numerical symbols, is expressed (ll. 50-1) by Sauvatsara-kata-trayāsotsiy-adhikē Kārttika-kudāliga-paṃcharāśiyāṃ 1 2 3 4 5 [Saib 380 Kārttika su 75. And the same expression is used in—2, the second Kāra grant of Dadda II., in which the date is given in the same way (ll. 49-50) by Sauvatsara-kata-trayās-paṃchāśiyāṃ 1 2 3 4 5 [Saib 333 Kārttika bāṣu (su) 75. That these are Śaka dates, is shown by Nos. 3 and 4 below, inscriptions of the same king, which refer themselves specifically to the Śaka era. Here, therefore, at the outset, we have two instances in which the word sauvatsara and its abbreviation sāh are used, without any qualifying expression, to denote years of the Śaka era. These instances suggest that by that time either the era had not received any specific name, or that, if it had, its name was not a widely or very well known one. But, however this may be, they are enough to set us free to refer to the Śaka era, quite as much as to any other, any epigraphical record of the same early period, in which the date is expressed in the same simple way.

The next technical expression, viz.

Sāhvatika-vārāhī

or ‘the time of the Śaka king’, is furnished by—3, the Umētā grant of the same Gūrja-ra king Dadda II., in which the date is given (l. 22) by Sāhvatika-vārāhī-suvaṃvachchāḥ (su).

ra-kata-charuṣaḥya Vaiśākhā-paunamāyaṃ. And the same expression is used in—4, the IIā grant of the same king, (ll. 18-19), Sāhvatika-kāḷa-dīta-suvaṃvachchāḥ (su) Ra-kata-charuṣaḥya sapta-dāda-sūlabhāya Yṛṣyāsha-kha-ānāma-majāya-sa-vārāhīvārāhī.

After that, this expression seems to have fallen for a considerable time into desuetude. But it was revived by the Rāṣṭra-kāṭasi, who must have brought it with them from the north, and who made it their dynastic expression, and adhered to it almost quite uniformly. Thus, to select a few instances only, we find it used in—5, the Canarese Country grant of Gōvinda III., (ll. 1-3) Sāhvatika-vārāhī-suvaṃvachchāḥ (su) Vaiśākhā-paunamāyaṃ;—in—7, the Kārtā grant of Kaqka III., (ll. 47-9) Sāhvatika-kāḷa-dīta-suvaṃvachchāḥ (su) Catur-ma (nava)-udāhītho-sūlabhāya Vaiśākhā-paunamāyaṃ;—in—8, the Śāngi grant of Gōvinda V., (ll. 44-6) Sāhvatika-kāḷa-dīta-suvaṃvachchāḥ (su) Catur-ma (nava)-udāhītho-sūlabhāya Vaiśākhā-paunamāyaṃ; and in—10, the Lakshmēśvar inscription of Māra-simha-Sāyavarya-Kōṅguvārmā, (ll. 24-25) Sāhvatika-kāḷa-dīta-suvaṃvachchāḥ (su) Vaiśākhā-paunamāyaṃ. We find it next used by the Western Śāhā-


1 Kaliyuga-Sāhvat, Vikrama-Sāhvat, Sākha-Sāhvat, Gupta-Sāhvat, Valabhi-Sāhvat, Kāshmiri-Sāhvat, Śiṭhita-Sāhvat, etc., would be uniform names for the different eras, and quite unobjectionable if it is borne in mind that sāhvat is not a declinable base meaning ‘era’, but is only a technical abbreviation of saṃvatrādyaṃ.


4 Or ‘kings’; this applies throughout.


19 Kāḷa-kāḷa is written through carelessness for Kāḷa-kāḷa.


16 To be shortly published in this Journal.

The same expression was used sometimes by the Śilāhāras, both of the Kōṇākaṇ and of Kōlāhpūr; thus—20, the Bāhāpūr grant of Chhitarāja, 15 (II. 32-5) Sa(ī/ka)-nīpā-kālāḥita-saṅvatara-sa(ī)kāśa mahā-ativa-śvām-dhikṣeṣu kṣaya-saṅvatara-āntaragata-Kārttika-su(ō)dhā-paśča-bhāya-saṅvatara-āntaragata-hūlāparvāṇi;—21, the Miraṅ grant of Mārāsiṣa, 16 (II. 44-6) Sa(ī/ka)-nīpā-kālāḥita-saṅvatara-āśeṣaḥ | aśi(ī/y)-adhiṅkāra-nava-saṅvatara-śaṅkṛāṇī | pravartatayita(si) Viśnū-bhāya-saṅvatara | Paśuṣa-māravaya | śudha-paścā | saṅvatara-māravaya | pravartatayita | udaganya-parvāṇi;—22, the Kārīpāta grant of Anantapāla or Anantādeva, 17 (II. 73-5) Sa(ī/ka)-nīpā-kālāḥita-saṅvatara-dāka-sa(ī)kāśa | śudha-saṅvatara-āntaragata-Māgha-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Viśvākṣa-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Mahāvlas-āśeṣa | Bhāva-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Viśvākṣa-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Mahāvlas-āśeṣa;—24, an inscription, now in the Hall of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, of Mallikārjuna, 18 (I. 3-6) Sa(ī/ka)-nīpā-kālāḥita-saṅvatara-śāleṣu daṇga-[su *] aśiṣa-saṅvatara-āntaragata;—25, Kālāhpūr grant of Betkiya, 19 (II. 2-3) Sa(ī/ka)-nīpā-kālāḥita-abhyantaraya-dāka-[su *] aśiṣa-saṅvatara-āntaragata;—26, the Bāhāṣṭi grant of Śīlāha, 20 (II. 59-61) Sa(ī/ka)-nīpā-kālāḥita-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Viśvākṣa-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Mahāvlas-āśeṣa;—27, the repetition of the date in figures, however, was omitted.

This expression was used sometimes, but not as a rule, by the Kālāchuris, e.g.—26, the Bāhāṣṭi grant of Śīlāha, 20 (II. 59-61) Sa(ī/ka)-nīpā-kālāḥita-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Viśvākṣa-saṅvatara-āntaragata | Mahāvlas-āśeṣa;—27, the repetition of the date in figures, however, was omitted.
It was also used sometimes by the Hoyasa kingdom. For example, in 34, the Kaśā grants of the Rāṣṭras family are expressed by Śaka-niripā-sahavat-sara karṣa-sahāsra-mulukā yādū-grahayāṁ 7174 (1) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ; and in 32, another Gadgad inscription of the same king, a Śaka-niripā-sahavat-sara-kālaṁ-galā 7175 (2) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ; and in 33, a Gadgad inscription of another king, 7176 (3) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ.

The same expression was used occasionally by the Yādavas of Dvāri-giri. For example, in 32, a Gadgad inscription of the Sungarama, 7177 (4) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ and in 33, a Gadgad inscription of the Sungarama, 7178 (5) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ.

Almost identical with the preceding is the expression

Śaka-bhāpāla-kāla


In the same category with the preceding two expressions we may classify that of

Śaka-niripati-sahavat-sara

or 'the years of the Śaka king,' which is supplied by—33, the Haidarābād grant of the Western Chāluka king Pulikēśa II, (1) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ; and in 33, a Gadgad inscription of the Gōvān III. of the Nikumbha family, (1) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ; and in 33, a Gadgad inscription of the Gōvān III. of the Nikumbha family, (1) Vartamāna-Pāravindas-sahavat-sara-bhāgātā Mārgagārāha-paurṇaṁ-saṁ-yuḥ Sāvakāraka-sārāṁ bōma-grahadeśaṁ.
This passage does not furnish anything in the way of a technical expression for the era. But we may note that it speaks of the years of the Śaka kings,—as if the establishment of it was connected, at any rate by the tradition of that time, with more than one king.

The next technical expression for the era, viz.

Saka-varsha

or 'the years of Śaka or of the Śakas,' is furnished by—46, the 'Togarshode' grant of the Western Chālukya king Viniyāditya,

and—47, the Wokkalerei grant of Kirttvarama III.,

with the preceding we may class the very similar expression

Saka-samaya

or 'the time of Śaka or of the Śakas,' which is furnished by—43, the Eastern Chālukya grant of Amma II.,


After the Haidarābd grant of the Western Chālukya king Pulikēdī, the next record that we have is—44, the Aiholeshvara inscription of the same king,

in which the date, referred to both the Śaka and the Kaliyuga eras (the latter under the name of the Bhārata war), is expressed (L.16) by Trāhāru tri-sahasreśu Bhāratadāvādvadālā śapt-āsakata-yuktēśu sa-gaṁēśe-abhīdēśe paṁchāsa [||]* Paṁchātātē Kālau kālē shātes paṁcha-kāḷān cha samāsē

In instances in which this expression was used by the Rāshtrākūtas are but few. We have only obtained the following three:—48, a Kaḷā inscription of Gōvinda V.,

[S]a[ka]-varsha 88tneya (for 852) Viṁśaṁvatsararada Māghada puṇyāneya Ādityavārām Aśtēśa(shā)-naksatrād(?) (??) sōma-grāhāya samāsē tu[ld-pu[ruḥ][ama=]??]tu tattvamad[ol];—49, an Āśur inscription of Kṛṣṇa IV.,

[S(a)]ā[ka]-varsha=ṣu niṣṭa epatṭeṇ[ganey]a Na[a]-viṁśaṁvatsarada Vaiśēka bahula paṁchame(m)i Su(su)kravāra . . . . . . . . . . . ;

and—50, a Gōndūr inscription of Kakā III.,

[S(a)]ā[ka]-aka-varsha=ṣu niṣṭa tōṁbhatt-āgane[ya (for 895) Srimukha-viṁśaṁvatsar- Āśē[śa]-dakeśinīyana(na)-Saivaṁ[āny]īyāna = Ādityavārānd-ānau.]

The expression was revived, as their dynastic

stones,—the use of this expression Saka-varsha in the Lakshmśivarinscriptions of Viniyāditya, Vījyaāditya, and Viṁśaṁvatsaradīyī, (Vol. VII. pp. 101 ff.) is sufficient to show that, though these inscriptions were engraved, as we now have them, in the tenth century A.D., they are correct copies of genuine originals,—being probably put on stone from copper-plates.


expression, by the Western Chālukyaśas; e.g.—51, a Bhairanaṃśa inscription of Taila II.⁴⁴ (L. 4) Sa(a)ka-varsha 911 Vikrī(kti)-tan=ndha sanāvatara pravarttis;—52, a Munawalli inscription of Satyāśraya II., (Ll. 10-11) Sa(a)ka-varsha 930 K[ī]laka-[sanva]-te[ra]dā[da] śṛṇvāṃ bahuḥ taddā(śi)[ge]* Soma-vārad-andhū;—53, the Balagāniva inscription of Jayasimha III.,⁴⁶ (Ll. 25-26) Sa(a)ka-varsha 937 neya Śūdākārāti-sanāvatara Pushya śūḍha bīdige Ādiṅṭya(tya)vārad-andhun=uttarāyaṇa-sanākrānti parbha(reva)-nimittādhi;—54, the Balagāniva inscription of Sōmēsvara I.,⁴⁴ (Ll. 12-13) Sa(a)ka-varsha 937 neya Sarvadāhā-sanāvatara jyē(jyē)ahṛtha śūḍha traya[da]ji Ādiṅṭya[da]vārad-andhū;—55, a Balagāniva inscription of Sōmēsvara II.,⁴⁴ (Ll. 12-13) Sa(a)ka-varsha 937 neya Vivira-vārāhita-sanāvatara [Bhā]drapada ba 73 Śravakāra mahātithi yugāṇi-andhū;—57, an Ingliśuvar inscription of Sōmēsvara III.,⁴⁴ Sa(a)kha(varsha) 943 neya (for 1050) Kīlaka-sanāvatara Kārttiṅka-paurṇamāṣeṣaḥ sūṃ-grahap-yāvattvā;—58, a Yemmanar inscription of Jagadākanalla II.,⁴⁶ Śrīmach-Chālukya-bhakṣavartti — Jagadākanalla — varṣahaśa sāśira=ṣapatiṇaṃya Vihara-sanāvatara Pushyāṃuttarāyaṇa-sanākrānti-vatpāda Sōmāvārad-andhū.

This expression was also used by the Kālkahuris; e.g.—59, a Balagāniva inscription of Bijjala,⁴¹ (L. 62) Sa(a)ka-varsha 943 neya Bahu-dhānya sahačhara(ī)ra[dā] Puṣya(śuḥ)da puṇṇam Sōmāvāra=uttarāyaṇa-sanākrānti-vatpāda sōmāgrahapya=andhū.

It was also used by the Hōysalas; e.g.—60, the Bōurr grant of Vaihupwardhana,⁴³ (Ll.11-20) Sa(a)ka-varsha śūdrīvada māvat-tontvahasa


And it was also used by the Yāḍavas of Dēvagiri; e.g.—61, the Munawalli inscription of Sīnghaṇa II.,⁴⁴ (Ll. 24-25) Sa(a)ka-varsha 744 neya (for 1144) Chaitra[tro]bhā-dīnu-sanāvatara Kārttiṅka su(su)[h]dhaha(ḥdha) puṇṇama Sōmāvara sōmāgrahapa=vyatipāda=andhū.

It was also used freely by the feudatory families,—the Raṭṭas of Sandattii and Belgaum; the Kādambara of Banawasi and Hāṅgal, and of Goa; the Śīkṣas of Erumbare; the Śilārhas of Kōḷum; the Guttas of Guttal; etc.

It was also used by the Kākatiya kings of Anakonḍa; e.g.—62, the Anakonḍa inscription of Rāndrēvā,⁴⁴ (Ll. 6-7) Sa(a)ka-varsha 1084 yumēṣa Chitralākhana sanāvatara Māgha śu 73 Vaiṭdāvaramandhūdū.

And finally it was used, though not so frequently as their properly dynastic expression which will be noted further on, by the Vījaya-nāgaras kings; e.g.—63, the Bāddami inscription of Harīhara I.,⁴⁴ (Ll.1-2) Sa(a)ka-varsha 724 neya (for 1206) Vikrama-sanāvatara Chaitra su(su) 7 Gū;—64, a Chitralud inscription of Bukka,⁴¹ (Ll. 13-14) Sa(a)ka-varsha 727 Munamathu-sanācchoka(ī)ra[dā] Jī(jī)ya=naḥtha śūḍha(ḥh)da Suṣṭha[da] 78;—65, a Bōurr grant of Harīhara II.,⁴⁴ (Ll. 37-9) Sa(a)ka-varsha śūdrīvada mi-nirṛta adhānyo Dūk-hūbhi-sanāvatara Kārttiṅka bhāla daśāmi Adīvēṇa;—66, a Hāṣan grant of Dēvarāya,⁴¹ (Ll. 21-3) Sa(a)ka-varsha 733 varlampuna-Vaṣya-sanāvatara Kārttiṅka-maśa-kṛṣṇa-pakṣe daśaṃyāḥ Sa(f)ra(ḥ)vaṛ U(?)[t]a(ḥ)ra(ḥ)da-Bhādṛapadā pṛti-gṛhī bavakaraṇe ****** paṭṭabhisahkha-samayē.

Analogous to the preceding is the expression Sa[k]-dāna

or the years of Sa[k] or of the Sa[kas], which is furnished by—67, a Gudūkiṣṭha inscription of the Western Chālukya king Jayasimha III.,

---

⁴⁴ P. S. and O.-O. Inscriptions, No. 86.
⁴⁶ P. S. and O.-O. Inscriptions, No. 129.
⁴⁷ Elliot MS. Collection, Vol. I. pp. 818 ff.—I transcribe the date as it is given; but the number of the years seems to show that the original stone has Sa(a)ka-varsha instead of śrīmach-Chālukya gc.
⁴⁹ id. No. 18.
⁵³ P. S. and O.-O. Inscriptions, No. 149.
⁵⁴ id. No. 23.
⁵⁵ id. No. 25.
NOMENCLATURE OF HINDU ERAS.

(11. 13-14) Sa(ia)kam=da(a)bda gaaja-dvi-nidhi
(for 939) Pavanagadoja. The same expression occurs in—68, a Hangal inscription of the Western Chalukya king Someshvara IV.," (ll. 74-5) Jayatī-Sak-abāha dvidrātaka hāra k’hannan- 
daniya Saumya-Sak-abāha vinat-tattva karu 
kute nepadathipade sya-byavatya idita-dinah. in—69, the Chikka-Beglevā grant of the 
Dēvagiri-Yādava king Krishna," (ll. 19-22) 
Ekasaptatya uttarā. sat-dhi(ka)ka-saharsa-
sankhyāśū Suśā-dvīda(hi)khi-attāsthya prava-
tramāne Suinh"nya-sahvasthā tatt-sat[r=] 
gat-ahārā-purva-prāṇamāyāän Samāichārānāā 
Parśva-Dhāta(hi)-naksahā Vaidhīrī-śaṅk. 
and—70, aHHā grant of the Vijaya-
nāga king Haribara II.," (ll. 36-8) Sak-sveda-
(bh) rishi-chanḍi-bhīmbi-widhun-dya-val-
rasaḥ Yuvākhyā Māgha(?)-ma(?)n(?) na(b?) del con 
śeulha-pakṣiñā svaha(hi)dīn(e) saptamyān chā 
mahī-parvāṇa.

Almost identical with the preceding is the expression—

Śak-abāha

or ‘the years of Śaka or of the Śakas,’ which is furnished by two grants of the Chōja successors of the Eastern Chalukya kings—71, a grant of Kubottunga-CHOJadevā II., (ll. 49-51) Śak-abāha pranə̄ śrana-viśīkha-viṣay- 
chandra-sahākhyāṃ prakrta ... 

Śak-abāha is found with the same meaning in the following grants:

1. A grant of the Chōja Chakradityapura, e.g.,—73, the Bassein grant of Sēnugāna or Sēnugāna II., (ll. 24-5) Sa-

2. Śak-svēita śrāvāna sāvatīrāhāva-sa(ka)- 
tāhā śrāvāna 977 Saumya-svāmaṭārāya Śrāvāna 
su(h) di chaṭadaśi-yādha śrāvāna; and— 
3. The Śrāvāna grant of Sēnugāna or Sēnugāna III., (ll. 1-2) Śrī Śaka sāvatīrā 1063 

The next technical expression, viz., simply

Śaka

or ‘the era,’ is furnished by—81, a Kōñhpūr inscription of the Dēvagiri-Yādava king Śiśigāna II., (ll. 1-2) Śrī Śaka 7757 Māmāthaka-
svātārā Śrāvāna bahuha 30 Gura. It occurs again in—82, another Kōñhpūr inscription of the 
same king, (ll. 1-2) Śrī Śaka 7758 Dur-
mukha-svātārā Māgha-su(h)adha-purpa-
masāyañ śrāvāna bahuha 30 Gura; and again

The remaining details of the date are illegible in the photograph. 


P. & O. C. Inscriptions, No. 29.

Almost identical with the preceding is the expression

Saku\textsuperscript{11} or ‘the era,’ which is furnished by—84, the Ambai-inscription of the Devagiri-Yadava king Sinhasana II.,\textsuperscript{12} (l. 27) Sri-Sakka 7762 Savaevari-sahasaratkar | Kiritaka suddha da 70. It occurs again in—85, the ‘Terwan’ grant of Kamvadasavarya, who claims to be of the Western Chaul ky a family,\textsuperscript{13} (ll. 1-2) Sri-Sakka 7782 varhi Raukha-sahasaratkar | Pushya va(ha) di sapamani(m) Sandhina; and again in—86, a Revadi inscription of the Devagiri-Yadava king Mahidhara, (l. 1) Sri-Sakka 7793 Dim- (du) runnati-sahasaratkar.

Again almost identical with the expression Saka, is that of

Saka

or ‘the era,’ or perhaps ‘(the era) belonging to Saka or the Sakas,’ which is furnished by—87, a Harhara inscription of Harhara II. of the Vijayanagara dynasty,\textsuperscript{14} (ll. 39-40) Sakka-tri-thiti-chandrasamiti Sakka Sidhodhaddha-rthi-thiti-sahajjita-chabala Kiritaka-kausalya sita-ladaksiyad Bhaskarar vastra. It occurs again in—88, a Harhara inscription of Dvaraya of the same dynasty,\textsuperscript{15} (ll. 15-16) Sakka tri-dhyaya-vahnu-sahajadhana Viku(kr)ti-namasak varaha Nabhaya-sahasratkara-sukhadaya Dvambara-Krita-Vikrama; and in—89, a Harhara inscription of Achyutarya of the same dynasty,\textsuperscript{16} (ll. 2-11) Sakka chandrasamiti Amari-nittra-ganita.... Bhakrapalya..... dvara-sahasratkara-Hauminya.

Finally,—and, with the exception of the preceding term Saka, last in chronological order, as far as I am able to determine,—we come to the expression by which, through accepting too freely the statements of the Puranas as authority for early times, it has too frequently become the custom to speak of this era, viz. Saliwahana-Saka or, ‘the era of Saliwahana.’ The name in the first part of the compound is sometimes Saliwahana, and sometimes Saliwaha; and, in the latter part of the compound sometimes simply Saka is used, sometimes Sakawara, and sometimes Sakaboda. The earliest instance of the use of this expression that I have been able to obtain is—90, the Thaha grant of the Devagiri-Yadava king Ramachandra,\textsuperscript{17} Sri-Saliwahana-Sakka 7774 Agyir-sahasaratkar Avina suddha 75 Ita. It occurs again in—91, another Thaha grant of the same king,\textsuperscript{18} Sri-Saliwahana-Sakka 7782 (for 1211) Vriksha-sahasaratkar Vaiuktha-suddha-paurushamrtyath Bhameti. But it does not occur with such frequency as to show that it was fully established, until the time of the Vijayanagara kings. It was used by them in the large majority of their inscriptions; and, whatever may have been its origin, it was plainly adopted by them as their dynastic expression. Thus, we have it in—92, the Harhara grant of Bukka,\textsuperscript{19} (ll. 19-23) Sri-jayabhuyadaya-arjuna-Saliwahana-saka 7275siva (for 1275) Vijaya-sahasaratkar Madhya suddha(dhina) 75 Chandravara samaparvam(a) parvam vu(u)shana-kadala-; and in—93, the Dambha grant of Harhara II.,\textsuperscript{20} (ll. 100-2) Sakaboda Saliwahana-sahasrotva tribhivana satavaikri bharata-vahna niyam-dharm-karageti;—94, the Hampre inscription of Krsnaprabha,\textsuperscript{21} (ll. 27-8) Sri-vajayabhuyadaya-Saliwahana-saka-varsha 7450 suvad u velu nadana Sukla-sahasratkar Maha su 75ru;—95, the Harhara grant of Achyutarya,\textsuperscript{22} (ll. 3-5) Sri-jayabhuyadaya-Saliwahana-saka-varsha 7453 Vriksha(krta) sahasaratkar Srimati bahulu tya(ya) Srima sripati Jaya-vanipu uyasa-katala-vatara-mayadali;—in—96, another Harhara inscription of the same king,\textsuperscript{23} (ll. 15-17) Saliwahana-nirnita-saka-varshana(sha) kram-dhatu | vyoma-tarkika-chatus-chandrap-

\textsuperscript{11} "I do not feel certain whether the k is intended to be vocalised, or whether it is used to represent the Puranas, and the word is to be pronounced Soka.
\textsuperscript{12} Archaeological Survey of Western India, Third Report, pp. 85 ff.
\textsuperscript{17} id. pp. 329 ff.
\textsuperscript{18} ind. Ant. Vol. V. pp. 73 ff.
\textsuperscript{20} This Assurvara is superfluous.
\textsuperscript{21} Ind. Ant. Vol. IV. pp. 223 ff.
SANSKRIT AND OLD-CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

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

(Continued from p. 105.)

No. CXXVIII.

Gōvinda III. was succeeded by his son, Amaṅghavarsha I. This is only a title; but it is the appellation by which he is best known. The present inscription gives him also the titles of Aṭīṣayadhavala and Nyāpatuṅga I. The only historical facts recorded of him, and in the other inscriptions of his dynasty, are that he defeated the Chalukyas, Abhyāsakhas, and others, at a place named Vīṅgavalli, which is evidently a Canarese name, but which I cannot identify, and that he built the city of Mānyakheta, which became the capital of his descendants. This city has been satisfactorily identified by Dr. Bühler with Mālkhē in the Nizām’s Dominions, about ninety miles in a south-easterly direction from Shōḷāpur. Mānyakheta, however, would appear to have been a Rāṣṭrakūṭa city even before the time of Amoghavarsha I. Dr. Bühler’s grant of Drhuva III. (of the Gujarat Branch) explicitly gives Subhataṅga as one of the titles of Kṛiṣṇa I. The same title, though, owing to the fragmentary nature of the inscription the full bearing of it could not then be seen, has already occurred in connection with Kṛiṣṇa I., in verse 13 of the Kāvī grant, where the original reading probably was Subhataṅgu-tuṅga-[nāma]. And a MS. of the Kathakāśa, belonging to a Jain priest of the Śetīkārī street in Belgaum, in it, at page 40a, the verse:

Aṣṭāva bhavati Mānyakhē-ākhyā-nagarē varē
rāj-ābhūch-Chhuhbhattaṅg-ākhyā = tan-mañtri
Purushottamaḥ

"Here, O lady! at the excellent city named Mānyakhēta, there was a king named Subhataṅga; his councillor was Purushottama."

We have two inscriptions of the reign of Amoghavarsha I. in the Kanheri Caves, which are dated Śaka 775 for 773 (A.D. 851-2), the Prajāpātri saṅvatara, and Śaka 799, and record that, in the time of Kapardī II. of the Šilāhāra branch of the Šilāhāra family, the whole of the Šilakana was presented by Amoghavarsha, apparently to Kapardī II. The second of these two inscriptions gives the latest date that has as yet been obtained for

---
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Sanbhāyād chi samanitē Vīḷāṇibhi-ṇāmakē varēhā māhī Kārttikeya-ṇāmade puramāṇyān sitē pakhē varē Śaṅkalpa jayē; and in—97, the Bāhdāmi inscription of Sadāśiva, ll. 1-5 Śrī-jayabhādaya-Sāliyādhana-sāka 747-nēya Plavunāya saṅvataraṇāda Aṭīṣayadha-vuṇjaī tāyēl.

No. 96 above speaks of the era as being established (niṣṭapa) by Śāliyādhana. I have met with no inscription which states, as the Purāṇas do, that the era was reckoned from his birth. In fact, the only epigraphical passage that speaks of the epoch of the era, No. 96 above, refers to his coronation, and not to his birth. But I quote a passage to that effect published by Professor Max Müller. It is—98, a verse at the end of the Mukhāntamārtṣaṇḍa, recording the date of its composition; Try-ākhyā-Āhitrā-pramāṇa varē Śāli-

3 Ante. Vol. VI. p. 64. This identification was first suggested by Prof. H. H. Wilson, Jour. R. AS., O. S., Vol. II. p. 300. At any rate, by ‘Mankhas in the Hyderabad country,’ he seems to mean Mālkhē.
Amoghavarsha I. More to the south, in the Canarese country, his inscriptions appear to be fairly numerous.

The present inscription, unfortunately a good deal damaged at the top, is from a stone-tablet standing to the south of the húde or ‘village-bastion’ at Sirur, in the Nawalurgund Taluká of the Dhárwád District. I have no information as to what sculptures there may be at the top of the stone. The writing covers a space of 3' 7' high by 3' 3' broad. The language is Sanskrit down to line 6, and Old-Canarese from there.

This inscription is dated in Śaka 783 (A.D. 866-7), the Vṛayā sahásatra, and the fifty-second year of the reign of Amoghavarsha I. It accordingly fixes Śaka 736 (A.D. 814-5) or 737 for his accession to the throne. The genealogical portion commences with Nirupama, or Dhruvā, —this verse, and the one that precedes it, being taken from the copperplate grants. It then mentions Góvinda III., as having conquered the Kēraḷas, Mālavas, Sauts, Gurjaras, and some other dynasty at the hill-fort of Chitrakúta,—possibly the Kālačhuris or Kālas of the north—but unfortunately the name is destroyed. And it then speaks of Amoghavarsha as having homage done to him by the kings of Vaiṣṇa, Aṅga, Magadha, Mālava, and Veṇī. In the further description of Amoghavarsha, the form of the dynastic name used is ‘Ratīs’; this is the earliest instance that I have as yet obtained.

Also, as with the later Ratās of Saundatti and Belgam, he is called the supreme lord of the city of Lātalur, and is said to have the sign of mark or banner of Garuda, and the sound of the musical instrument called tiviti. The inscription then mentions Dévaṇāya, a feudatory of Amoghavarsha I., who was governing the Belvola Three-hundred, at Anigere. And it then proceeds to record

that, in the year mentioned above, at the time of an eclipse of the sun, on Sunday the new-moon day of the month Jyotishā, Dévanāya, having laved the feet of the Two-hundred Mahājanas of Śrivār, made a grant of the tax on clarified butter. As a prohibition is entered against destroying the ordinances and consuming the clarified butter, it is plain that the tax was a percentage levied in kind; and Dévanāya must have made the grant for the benefit of the priests of some temple at Sirur at which the inscription originally stood.

Mr. K. B. Pāṭhak has furnished me with an interesting literary reference to Amoghavarsha I. and his son Kṛishṇa II., from the Jain Mahāpurāṇa. Part of the Adipurāṇa, or first half of this work, was written by Jinaśemāchārya; and that part was finished, and the Uttarapurāṇa or second half of the work was written, by his disciple Gūpahadhra. The reference to Amoghavarsha I. and Kṛishṇa II. is in the Praśasti of the Uttarapurāṇa. The MS., which is on palm-leaves, belongs to the Jain Sāmaṇḍrakōḷhpur, and is worshipped and held in such veneration by him that Mr. Pāṭhak was not allowed to read the Praśasti for himself, but had to write it down from dictation. The consequence is that the version of it obtained by him is evidently not altogether correct; but it is sufficiently so for present purposes.

The Praśasti opens by mentioning the Sāna anśaya, or ‘succession’ of teachers and disciples, which was a part of the Māṅsaṇagar sect (v. I), and in which Viraśenabhāṣṭāraka became famous.

His disciple was Jinaśemā (v. 7):—

Yasya prāṇān naḥ kṣiṣnā jāla-vieṣavara-dhāraiḥ-anantar-āvirbhabo-pādaṁbhoja-rajaḥ-piśaṅga-makuta-pratyagranat-ratna-dyutih

11 Mentioned also in the Mulgund inscription of Kṛishna II. (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. Vol. X. pp. 190 ff.), and in one of the Śravana-Belgola inscriptions (Ind. Ant. Vol. X. pp. 202 ff.) The correct transliteration of the latter is:—

[1] Sura-kṣapann-bhūva vidyut-iśanāga tera-vŏlmatnua-

[2] pāṭhaṁ bhagn

[3] pāṭhaṁ bhagn

[4] param-śrīmaṁ bhagn

[5] pradānaṁ-mārṇyaṁ bhagn


[7] bāgkkam sandān [a]

saṃśmartā svam-Amoghavarsha-priyathī pūtō-
ham-adhyātma-lāna
sa ārdman Jinaśāna-pūjya-bhagavat-pāḍo jagan-
maṇgalam || (v. 8)
“When the fresh lustre of the jewels in his
diadem was made of a reddish colour by the
pollen of the water-lilies which were (his)
feet, appearing between the streams that
flowed forth from the rays of the high nails of
his (feet), the glorious king Amoghavarsha,
—whose holy feet were worthy to be worshiped
by Jinaśāna, (and who was) the embodiment
of the prosperity of the world,—thought of
himself, ‘I am purified to-day; it is enough.’”

The Āditya12 of Jinaśāna was Dāsāratha
(v. 11). And the disciple of these two was
Gunaśātra (v. 13), who finished the Mahāpu-
rāpa that had been already (partly) declared
by Jinaśāna (vv. 16 to 20).

The chief among Gunaśātra’s disciples was
Lokāśāna (v. 29), whose merits are described in
the next three verses.

The Praṇaṣṭī then continues:—
Akālavāra-bhupalē pālayat-sakilam-ilān |
taśmin-vidhasta-nilśēna-dvishiv vidhura14-
jaśi || (v. 29)
Padmālāya-kula-mukula15
pravikṣa-saka-satpratā-tata16-mahasi |
śrīmati Lokāditya
pradhvasta-prathita-satru-aśāntamasē || (v. 30)
Chellak-tāna-tenāṭē |
Jainendra-dharma-vrśddhi-vi-
dhānyi vidhu-vidhura-prithu-yaśasi || (v. 31)
Vanavasa-dēsam-akilam
bhūjāri sati niḥkāntaka-sukha-suchiraṃ |
tat-piṭri-nīma-kritē
khyāṭa Va(b)ākāpurē purēśv-adhikē || (v. 32)
Śaka-nripa-kāl-ābhyaasānata-
viśmati-adhikāṣaṭa-mit-ābād-āṃti |
maṇgalā-mahārāhā-kārini
maṇgalā-nāmani samasta-jana-sukhādē || (v. 33)

12 Sadāhrma, or sukhara, also sahādhrma, following the same duties, customs, or religious prac-
tices.
13 Possibly here, and in v. 31, the Sadāhrma read this out by mistake for vihara.
14 The copy reads Padmālāya-mukula-kula.
15 The copy reads Paṭaṭhā.
16 The copy reads Chelladhāṇaṇaṇaṭē.
17 The copy reads yubē.
18 By the Tables in Brown’s Carnatic Chronology, Śaka 820 was the Kālayanki saṃhūtsara. This Praṇaṣṭī, how-
ever, seems to indicate rather the Siddhārthi saṃhūtsara, Śaka 821.

Sri-paschamanyān Budh-Ārāḍra-yuga17-divasa-
karē Maṅtrivārā budh-āṃśē
pūrvāyām sīmha-lagnē dhanashī dharapijē
vṛṣchikā-kau talāyān
sarpē śukě kulē gavi cha suragurau
nāhitān bhavya-vāryāṅ
prāp-tāyām sarvā-sāraṇ jatāi vijayate
punyam-śat-purāṇaṅ || (v. 34)
“Victorious in the world is this holy Purāṇa,
worthy to be worshipped by the best of good
people (and) possessed of all excellence, (which
was) completed at the end of the year which
is measured by eight hundred increased by
twenty (years) in the time of the Śaka king,
(and) which causes prosperity and great
wealth, (and) which has an auspicious
name,18 (and) which confers prosperity and great
wealth, (and) which was governed by the
whole earth:—

“(And) while the glorious Lokāditya,19
whose greatness, enhanced by (his) excellent
splendour, caused the bud which was the
family of Padmālāya to blossom; who dispelled
the dense darkness which was (his) illustrious
enemies; who had the Chellapatiñaka-baner; who was the younger brother of Chelladhava;
who was the son of Chellakētana; who caused
the increase of the religion of Jainēnmi; (and)
who was possessed of great fame as luminous
as the moon,—was enjoying the whole country of
Vanavāsa, which had had for a long time
the happiness of being free from troubles, at
the famous city of Baṅkāpura, the greatest
among cities, which had been made by his
father by his own name.”20

Mr. K. B. Pāṭhak has also brought to my
notice a short poem named Praṇāṭararatanā-
mālā on the rules of good behaviour, consisting

17 The fifth day of the bright fortnight of the month
Māgha.
18 Vasan 34 seems to have several mistakes in it. I
cannot translate it as it stands.
19 Mentioned in inscriptions as the feudatory of Krish-
na II. He was a Maṅṭrīpatra, of the Chellapati-
ika or Chellakētana family. (See Dynasties of the
Kanara Districts, pp. 33-37 and 85).
20 Lokāditya’s father, therefore, was the Baṅka or
Baṅkēyara, who is mentioned in inscriptions as a fe-
datory of Amoghavarsha I.—The expression in the text
does not make it plain whether Baṅkēyara founded
and built Baṅkāpura, or whether he only named after
himself a city that was already existing.
of thirty verses, a MS. of which is in the possession of a Jain inhabitant of Shâhâpur near Belgium. The concluding verse is:—

Vivêkât-tyakta-râjyâna râjû-sâyaîn Ratnamâlikâ
râñhit-Amôghavarshepa su-dhiyâ sad-alaîn-kriîhit (v. 36)

"This Ratnamâlikâ, possessed of good decorations, was composed by the learned king Amôghavarsa, who through discrimination had laid aside the sovereignty."—The Amôghavarsa mentioned here, however, may be the first or the second or the third of that name.

We have already seen that Govinda III, subjugated the lord of Veûgîl,—probably Vijayaîitya-Nârândramaîgarâja, of the Eastern Chalukya family, who reigned from about Íaka 710 to about Íaka 750. And it is either to the latter part of his reign, or to the early part of the reign of Amôghavarsa I., that we must refer the long war between the Râshtrakûtas and the Eastern Chalukyas that is mentioned in a grant of Amma I. from the Krihâna District. It is there-in said of Vijayaîitya-Nârândramaîgarâja:—
Gaûgga-(ga-) Râçâ-balais-sârddham dvâdasâ-âkdân-ahâ(ha)r-uniîam
bhu-[â*]rrjîita-bala-khâda-sahâyô naya-vikramaîhit

Asht-ottaram yuddha-âtama yuddhâvâ Śâmbhôr-mmah-âlayân
tat-saîkhyâ(khya)-yâkôrdô-vîrô Vijayaîitya- bhû-patiît

"Aided (only) by (his) sword, the strength of which had been acquired by (his) arm, the brave king Vijayaîitya during twelve years fought day and night a hundred and eight battles with the forces of the Gaûgas and the Râçâs, which were possessed of discipline and prowess, and built the same number of great temples of Śâmbhu."—The Gaûgas here referred to were Mahâmaîdeçâras, feudatories of the Râshtrakûtas, whose inscriptions are found in the Belgium and Dhârâvâd Districts.

Transcription.**

Prabhûtsvarsha-Govinda-râja[b[*] saûryyâhuv vikramami
[1] — — — — — st... Jagat[t[*]uînga iti ârutas[ha[*] [][*] Kêreî-Mâîa-Mâîa-Śaûtân sa-Gu[*]ljara[n[*]
Chitrakûta-giridurgga-thehán=bâ-
[1] — — — — — sa...nasha sa kartî-Nâryag[ô*] jagati [][*] Arînîpati-makuta-
ghâtita-charanças=sakalabhûvan-va-
[1] [laya-vîdita]-saûryy[ô*] Veîgî-Âûga-Magadhâ-Mâîa-Veîgî-lsarî=archchîto=Tîsâya-dhavaîâh [][*]
Svasti Samadhîgarî[ta](ta)aîpacha-
[1] maî[na]hâsabda=mahârajâdhirâja[m[*] paramêsvara[m[*] bhaîtâraka[m[*] chatur-udaiti-
vâyavâlî=yuta-sakalâ-dharâtalâ-
krita-ganîk[â*]sahasra-
[4] châmar-ândhakarâ-vâdi(dhl)[r[*]yîya-vî[r[*]yîya-mâma-âsâtapatratraya-kahâsaîkha-pâli-it-
vâj-â(o)kâîétu-patâk-âchchhâdita-
[4] digantar-ella[m[*] sri[sa]ehî-sahipti pûrasvâl-tala-vargga[m[*] daçanîyaka-samant-âdy-
aî[na]mî-saîhaya-vînâ[na]mn[mr=]ô-
[4] tînîga-kîrtâ-makuta-grîshtâ-pâdâravindayugma[n[*] nirjîita-vairi ripu-nivaha-kâlaîça-
dâ[na[*] dushta-mada-bhajî[na]-[na-
[4] na[na][m[*] amôgha-râm[n[*] para-chakra-paîch[â*]naîî sur-aśra-marîdanaî vairi-
bhayakaraîbaddi(pîddîe)-manâharaî abhîmânâ-mandirâî
paramêsvara[m[*] Sri-Nîripatunîga-

** From an ink-impression.
This ðâ is visible through having been at first omitted and then inserted below the line.
This second ðâ is an unnecessary repetition.
[**] nām-āñkita-lakshmivallabhāndra(mā) chaundr-ādityara kālaṁ varegaṁ mahā-Viṣṇuva rāyaṁ-bōl uttārāraṇa rāya-ābhi-
[††] vri(vry)dhi salutt-ire [††] Śaka-nripa-kāl-ātīta-sahvatsarāṅga=ôj-nūr=egbhatt-enṭaneya Vayam=emba sa[m*]vatsaraṁ prava-
[††] ritise [††] Śrī(śrī)mad-Amoghavarsha-Nripatunāga-nām-āñktiṅānā viyaya-rāya-pravardda-
(rddha)māna-sahvatsaraṁ=ayavatt-erdu-
[††] m-uttārāraṇa rāyaṁ iy-ābhivṛddhi salutt-ire [††] Atiśayadahvāla-narēndra-prasan(a)dadinda[m=ā*m]moghavarsha-
[††] dēva-padpaśikajā-bhramara[ṁ*] viśiṣṭa-jan-aśraya=appa śrī(śrī)mad-Dēvānāya[ṁ*]
Belvola-mānūrama-
[††] n-aluttum=Anu(śaḥ?)*geṛya[(l)=ire [††] Jē(śa)ṁaḥ(śaḥ)a-māsad=ama(mā)=seyum=Ādityavāra[mu*]m-āge śurya-grahanad-andu
[††] Śrīvārada Rāvikalaya modal-āgī i-j-nāvvo(ṛvva)raṇ mahājanada kālaṁ kajchi tuppa-
derēyaṁ bhitōn [††]
[††] ī stiṣtityaṁ kādāt(a)ṁ Ørānāsivadāt[a*]s[ā*]sira kavileyaṁ koṭṭa phalam-akkum[*]
(ī)dan-alūjum tuppam-unḏataṁ Ørānāsīya[††] sāsira kavileya[ṁ*] sāirvar=
pp[a*]vvaranman[a*]sidon-akkum [††]
[††] Nimibhichhara-Ban[m*]jaya beagesisdo Mādhatvaryana likhitaṁ Nāg[ā*]rjunaṁ
bhe(bē)ageyo
du [††]
Sirigavundana eḷu puḍi(di)dud [††]

**Translation.**

Hail! May he protect you, the waterlily in whose navel is made [a habitation by Vishnu]; and Hara, whose head is adorned by the lovely crescent-moon!

(L. 2.)—Since, with his pure actions, he [quickly] drove far away [Kali, who had established himself] on the earth, and made again [complete even] the splendour of the Kṛitayagna,—it is wonderful how Nīrapama became (invented with the name of) Kali valīabhā.

(L. 3.)—The king Praḥbhūtavarsha-Govinda,................. his prowess in deeds of valour, (was) renowned under the name of Jagattuṅga. [Having conquered] the Kāraḷas, the Mālavas, (and) the Śanças, together with the Gurjaras, (and).............. who dwelt at the hill-fort of Chitrakūṭa, then he (became) a very Nārāyaṇa on the earth in respect of fame.

(L. 5.)—Having his feet touched by the diadems of hostile kings, and being possessed of heroism that is known throughout the whole circuit of the earth,—Atiśayadhavāla (is) worshipped by the lords of Vāṅga, Āṅga, Magadha, Mālava and Vēngi.

(L. 6.)—Hail! While the increase of the sovereignty, ever greater and greater, of the

---

21 This jīva was half erased by the engraver.
22 See note 10 above.
23 Compare the form in No. CV. I. 6; Vol. X. p. 167.
24 This perhaps refers to the Gāruḍa-lādchana, high favourite of Lakshmi, who is marked with the name of Śrīpāṭaṅga, the supreme king of great kings, who has attained the pañcamaṁhāsaṅga the supreme lord; the worshipful one; he who covers all the space between the regions with the thousands of courtiers, decorated with the ornaments of zones and hipped belts and earrings and armlets and necklaces, of the numerous Mahādevas of hostile kingdoms over the whole earth which is encircled by the four oceans, and with the darkness and deafness (caused by the waving) of (his) chaurī, and with (his) heroism and pride, (his) three white umbrellas, (his) āśāha-shell of battle, (his) pāṭalihva, (his) banner of a bird (į), and (his other) standards; who is by birth a leader of armies; who is possessed of a number of sites of excellent cities; whose feet, which are like waterlilies, are rubbed by the diadems and crowns of lofty people, bowing down (before him), in the many countries of Daśāṅgakas, Sāmants, &c.; who has conquered his foes; who is a very staff of death to the host of his enemies; who breaks the foolish pride of wicked people; who is possessed of fruitful joy; who is a very lion to the multitude of his foes; who subdues gods and demons; who causes fear to his enemies; who is charming in his pertinacity (į), who is mentioned below.
25 The meaning of baśe, or perhaps bāśe, is not apparent. The nearest approach to the word in the dictionaries is bāśe, 'rivalry, pertinacity, perverseness.'
the habitation of pride; born in the lineage of the Raṭṭas; he who possesses the sign of Garuda; he who has the sounds of the (musical instrument called) tivisi; the supreme lord of the city of Lattālāra,—was continuing, like the kingdom of the great Viṣṇu, so as to endure as long as the moon and sun might last:

(L. 15.)—While the saṅvatsara named Vyaya, which was the seven hundred and eighty-seventh (of) the years that had elapsed from the time of the Śaka king, was current; (and) while the fifty-second (of) the augmenting years of the victorious reign of him who was marked with the glorious name of Amoghavarsha-Nṛpatunga was continuing with perpetual increase of sovereignty:

(L. 17.)—While, through the favour of the king Atisayadhavala, the glorious Devanāgīrīya,—who is a bee at the water-lilies which are the feet of Amoghavarshadhāva; and who is the refuge of excellent people,—was dwelling at Anṅigere, governing the Belvola Three-hundred:

(L. 19.)—At the time of an eclipse of the sun, on Sunday, the new-moon day of the month Jyaiśṭha,—having washed the feet of the two hundred Mahāajan, headed by Raviṅkaya, of the village of Śrivāra, he allotted the tax on clarified butter.

(L. 21.)—He who preserves this ordinance, shall acquire the reward of giving a thousand cows at Bārāṇḍi; he who destroys it and consumes the clarified butter, shall be (as) one who destroys a thousand tawny-coloured cows or a thousand Brāhmaṇs at Bārāṇḍi.

(L. 22.)—Written by Madhavayya, at the command of Nimbichobara-Bammayya; set up (?) by Sirigānuḍa, at the command of Nāgarjuna.

No. CXXIX.

Amoghavarsha I. was succeeded by his son Krishṇä II., also called Kannara, Kandharavallabha, Krishṇavallabha, and Akālavarsa II.33 His wife, whose name is not mentioned, was a daughter of Kokkala or Kokkala I. of the Kaḷachuri or Kulañchuri dynasty of Tripura or Tewar. His inscription are fairly numerous in the Canarese country. And he is mentioned in several of the inscriptions of the later Raṭṭas of Saundatti and Belgaum. The earliest of them mentions him as reigning in Śaka 797 (A.D. 875-6), the Mammatha saṅvatsara; but he must at that time have been only the Tewaṛa, or heir-apparent and viceregal of his father in the southern part of his dominions. In two of the Raṭṭa inscriptions he is called Kṛishṇa-Kandhara and Kṛishṇa-Kandhara. And in one of these two passages he has the title of Kandhara-puravar-dāhāvendra, or 'supreme lord of Kandhara-pura, the best of cities.' There may have been an original city of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, named Kandhara-pura; but the present mention of it is as yet an isolated one.

The present inscription,24 of which a lithograph has been given on the second side of the Plate in Vol. XI. pp. 126-7, is on the exposed part of the stone beam over the entrance to the adytaum of the shrine of the temple of the god Mūkādeva at Nandāvīgre, in theHungund Tāluk of the Kaladgi District. The temple seems to have been originally Jain, as there are Lakṣmhī and her elephants on the lintel of the door of the shrine;25 it has now been appropriated to Viṣṇua worship. It seems to be in no way remarkable for architecture or sculpture, and to be of importance only on account of the inscription in it. When I saw it in 1876, it was in a state of great decay, and seemed likely soon to collapse and fall in. The inscription covers a space of 9’ high by 7’ 6” broad. There are no sculptures above the inscription. The language is Old-Canarese.

The first part of the king's name, and the number of the centuries in the date, are now quite effaced; but there can be no doubt as to the letters that have to be supplied. It is an inscription of Akālavarsa, i.e. Kṛishṇa II.; and it is dated in Śaka 822 for 824 (A.D. 902-3), the Dundubhi saṅvatsara. The name of the god of the temple is effaced. The inscription records a grant of land, the details of which are partly effaced.

The Eastern Chalukya inscription, from which I have quoted at page 218 above, shows that understand, I have spoken of it there, and also in Vol. VII. p. 210 of this journal, as being dated Śaka 792 and at the time of Dhrūva or of Gūḍālida IV.

33 Gaja-Lakshmi is however also a Viṣṇuva cognizance.—J. B.
the wars between the Rāṣṭrapūtas and the Eastern Chalukyas continued in the time of Kuśāna II. It is therein said of Kuṇaṅga-Vijayaḍītīya, who reigned from about Śaka 752 to about Śaka 792:

Gaṅgāya-Āṅgajavairī-rakṣitā-saṃsāra-Raṭṭa-rāṣṭrapūta
jīvā Maṅgī-śīrā-harāt yudhī mahā-bahlva-āpa-vīrya-āpyamā
Kuśaṅga saṃkīlma-āṁkī-ākhila-bala-prāptā-śaṅkhābhīmā bhitā-āśāttā(vta)[n*]
avidhāya tat-pura-ma(ś)ram yō nirdadāhā praḥnuh ||

"Having been challenged by the lord of the Raṭṭas, ha, the lord,—who possessed the power of Āṅgajavairī;" who had for (his) bosom-friend the bravery that had been acquired by (his) mighty arm; (and) who was possessed of great and excellent prowess acquired by (his) notorious and perfect strength,—conquered the unequaled Gaṇgas, and took the head of Maṅgī in battle, and, having made the fire-brand Kuśaṅga frightened and distressed, burned his excellent city."

After this, however, the Rāṣṭrapūtas appear to have had the advantage, as the same inscription continues:

Sa samastā-bhuvanāśraya-Śrī-Vijayaḍītīya-saṭatā-chatvārīṁśad-varṣaṇā || Tad-anu savitāry-astaṁ-gatā tirmā-paṭalēn-ēva Raṭṭa-dāyāda-balēn-ābhivāyaptam Veṅgī-ṛaṇḍalam ||

"He, the asylum of the universe, Śrī-Vijayaḍītīya (reigned over the country of Veṅgī) for forty-four years. After that, the province of Veṅgī was overthrown by the army of the Raṭṭa claimants, as if by dense darkness on the setting of the sun."

Transcription.**

[1] [Svasty-Akāḷa]varṣhadēva śrīprithivivallabha mahārajādhirāja paramēśvara paramabhāṣṭārakara rājya-abhivṛiddhī uttar-ottaraṁ salutt-ire [n*] Śaka-nipāta-kāl-āṭta-saṁvā-

Translation.

[Hail !] While the increase of the sovereignty of [the glorious Akāḷa] varṣhadēva,—the favourite of Śrī and of the earth; the supreme king of great kings; the most worshipful one,—was continuing (so as to be ever) greater and greater:—

(L. 1.)—While the year named Dundubhi, which was the [eight-hundred and] twentieth second** of the years that had elapsed from the time of the Śaka king, was current:—

28 Śiva, as the foe and destroyer of Kāmadēva.
29 From the original stone.
30 The space after this letter, ṅ, seems to be a fault in the stone.

29 The proper reading is pālanāṁ vṛtī.
30 By the Table in Brown's Carnatic Chronology, the Dundubhi samvat was Śaka 824, and Śaka 822 was the Kandri samvatara.
confiscates land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

The writing (is) made by Divākara. (May there be) auspicious and great good fortune!

At ............., Chāvuṇḍayya gave ten mātara of culturnable land.

(L. 5.)—It is very easy to give one's own property, but the preservation of (the grant of) another is difficult; if (it is asked) whether giving or preserving (is the more meritorious), [preservation] is better than giving!

No. CXXX.

This is another inscription of Kṛṣṇa II. In Vol. IX. p. 74, I have mentioned the temple of the god Galīnāth in Survey No. 75 at Aihole, in the Humān Tālūkā of the Kalāgī District. Just outside the sculptured gateway of the courtyard of this temple, and a few steps to the south of it, there is a small stone cell, partly below the level of the ground, facing north. The present inscription, of which a lithograph has been given on the second side of the Plate in Vol. XI. pp. 126-7, is on the front face of a stone over the door of the inner cell. The writing covers a space of 9' high by 3' 9' broad. There are no sculptures over the inscription. The language is Old-Canarese.

The inscription records the building of the cell, for a saint named Monibhaṭārā, which should perhaps be Maṇibhaṭārā, in Śaka 831 for 838 (A.D. 911-2), the Prājapati saṅvatara, while Kannara, i.e. Kṛṣṇa II., was reigning.

Transcription.45

[1] Svaṭi Śaka-nṛṣa-kāl-āṭhi(ti)u-saṅvatara-śatāngal-enṭu nāra vu(m)āvatto[n]da-neyā


ggeye [1*]

[3] Nagara-samudāya-nātha(dha)rmama[m] [[1*]] Pūrvvokinga[^m] monibhi=ṛiṣṭhaṭaḥ dharmma-

[1*] Pṛitaḥ-gāra[m] 1[rm]bhāṭara gane [1*]

Translation.

While the saṅvatara named Prājapati, which was the eight hundred and thirty-first (of) the centuries of years that have elapsed from the time of the Śaka king, was current; while Kannara was ruling the earth; (this cell was built as) the religious act of the assemblage of (all the people) of the city.

(L. 3.)—This abode of an ascetic,—which has been beheld by saints previously mentioned, (and the building of) which has been prescribed by the writings of religion,—is declared (to be) surrounded by learned people. (This is) the cave of Monibhaṭārā.

No. CXXI.

Kṛṣṇa II. was succeeded by his son Jāgatiṅga II. 46 This, again, is only a title; the real name being as yet unknown.

The present inscription is from a stome-tablet at the well called Koṭakokkana-bhāvi at the hamlet of Daṇḍapur, which is two miles to

41 Pāli, Sanskrit, and Old-Canarese, Inscriptions, No. 73.
42 From the original stone.
43 The mark after this letter, k, appears to be a fault in the stone, rather than to be intended for an anusvāra.
44 Gāra usually occurs only in the compound form gāra, 'room, covered place, dwelling-house, receptacle.'
45 By the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronology, the west by north from Nargund in the Nawalgund Tālūkā of the Dhūrwad District. The sculptures at the top of the stone, which are done in outline and not in the usual finished style, are—central, a linga;—others, Nandi; a cow and calf; the sun and moon; and the word śī, for śī, in characters of the same type as those of the inscription itself. The inscription covers a space of 2' 9'/ high by 2' 9' broad. The language is Old-Canarese; and the inscription is entirely in verse.

The inscription records grants that were made to a tank called Kaṇṭhamagara, in Śaka 840 for 841 (A.D. 929-30), the Prāmāṇi saṅvatara, at the time of the maṇḍara-saṅkramaṇa or passage of the sun from Sagittarius into Capricornus,—while Prabhautvarsha III. was reigning.

This inscription gives a new date and a new title in the genealogy. We know that Amāghavara I. reigned from Śaka 736-7 up
to at any rate Śaka 799. It is, therefore, unlikely that his son, Kṛśna II., reigned much longer after Śaka 833, when he had already been in power for thirty-six years. And, whereas we have already the title of Akālāvarsha for Kṛśna II., there is no evidence, and it seems improbable, that any of the Rāṣṭrakūtas had more than one title ending in varsha. There can, therefore, be little, if any doubt, that the Prabhūtavarsa of this inscription is Jagattuṇga II., for whom we have as yet no title ending in varsha.

His great-grandfather, Gōvinda III., had the same titles of Prabhūtavarsa and Jagattuṇga. Accordingly, it seems not improbable that, if ever the inscriptions disclose the real name of Jagattuṇga II., it will be found to be Gōvinda V. 48

**Transcription.**

[1] Svasti Prabhūtavarsaṁ
[2] tyateyjun rakshitaṁ vistaraṁ and-eno ta nūra nālvattavatā || Śaka-kā-
[3] langaṁ varshaṁ prakataṁ pesaril Pramāthi varttise dinapana makarakke va-
[4] rpa saṅkramaṇa-kālado kluḍe banda Paśuhaṁ tithiyol {{||}} Pannir-mmatta-
[6] Li[maṇa]?
[7] tanu-ālīya koṭṭa kereṇa yaśaṁ paṭedam {{||}} Vipraṁ vīhām-ūr-olo[a - ]
[8] gapp-anitaro-ēl̲am̲ as̲a̲na̲n̲a̲ gur̲aṁ drammaṁ-muṇaṁ tappa (ppa) de
[9] máyioḷ-erādham kepide-rū śudra-gaṇaṇa maduvaroṇ-ondaṁ ||
[11] yada paṇamaṇu per-ggeg-āyam id-end-ōsada koṭṭa dhvī-ahūka[yar] [18×]
[12] Nereve guṇ-āhya(diya)ṁ Kāṇṭhamaṇa-greg-imituṁ ārvāṇy-āyamaṁ 22 koṭṭa-
[13] (a ) vargga (ra) 18×
[16] pātakaṇa pādā lōkkak-ātān tām pōkum-endar-aduv-em-piridē ||
[17] Moraṇḍiya modalo koṭṭe or-tiere variyaṁ āryuṇ-endu kēri sa-
[18] maśam kereṇa padineḷu mattra-iruvadu Kēsabba-ittama keyy-i-
[19] m-mattar {{||}} Baredon-īdaṁ Śri-Vijā(ja)yaṁ neraś-iń(a)ṁ nūṛ-ippapadimbarum
[20] pēl̲e̲n̲e̲ tā-[jīn̲u̲]̲n̲

**Translation.**

Hail! In the length (of time) when Prabhuṭavarsa was protecting the broad circuit of the earth with ever increasing praise-worthiness of power:

(L. 2.)—When the eight hundred and fortieth year (of) the Śaka era, that is known by the name of Pramāthi," was cprrent; at the time of the saṅkramaṇa when the sun came to (the sign) makara, (and) on the lunar day

of (the month) Panāha that coincided (with that saṅkramaṇa):

((L. 4))—At the command of Vōra (?), who said:—"Let him give a nāyya-grant,"—Loṅga (?3), who was a marvel of truth, having of his own pleasure given twelve mattara of culturable land to the tank, acquired fame.

((L. 6))—They gave as a tax, without fail, three drammas on account of every marriage of Brāhmaṇas that occurred in the village—

consequence of some fault in the stone.

48 Though the argument cannot be pressed as far as he seeks to press it, yet there is, of course, a good deal of force in the suggestion made by Mr. Rice at p. 11 above. But the information that we already possess (see the genealogy in Vol. XI. p. 100) shows that, whatever relations there were between the names and the titles of the Rāṣṭrakūta kings, they were not absolutely constant ones.

49 From an ink-impression.

50 This letter is rather a nondescript one. The nearest approach to the consonant is the s of maduvarol, l. b.

51 Part of the s is just visible on the broken edge of the stone.

52 The space left blank before this ga seems to be in
Hatt-Mattur, in the Karajji Talukâ of the Dhârâwâd District. The sculptures at the top of the stone are Nandi and the sun and moon. Towards the bottom of the stone, and dividing lines 10 to 19 of the inscription in half vertically, there is sculptured a Jain flower-vase, of the description of which several instances are given by Dr. Burgess in his Amarâvati Stâpa, with flowers or leaves hanging out over the rim of it; above it there is a plain circle, with a svastika in the centre of it. The writing covers a space of about 2'8" high by 2'3½" broad. The language is Old-Canarese throughout.

Lines 1 to 13 contain an inscription of the reign of Nityavarsha I., i.e. Indra IV. It is dated in Saka 838 (A.D. 916-7), the Dhâtu sâvatara. And it records a grant of the village of Vutavura of Kachchhvara-Kàdamma by the Mahââmanta Leñeyyarâsa, in the presence of the Two-hundred-and-twenty Mahâjas of Pañjâ-Majtvâva, the modern Hatt-Mattur, or Mattur of the cotton(linën). The object of the grant is not stated; but the sculpture at the bottom of the stone shows that the grant must have been made to some Jain establishment.

Lines 14 to 19 are another inscription, undated, of the eleventh or twelfth century A.D. It records grants of oil and rice to the god Bhûgâvâra. Being written on the same stone with the other inscription, it must record grants to the same establishment. It follows, therefore, that, by the time of the second inscription, the Jain establishment to which the grant recorded in the first inscription was made, must have been converted into a temple of Siva under the name of Bhûgâvâra.

No. CXXXII.

Jagattânga II. had two wives. By his first wife, Lakshmi, the daughter of Raavigraha, who was the son of Kokkala or Kokkalla I. of the Kâlachurî or Kâlachurî dynasty of Tripura,—he had one son, Indra IV., also called Nityavarsha I.43

The present inscription is from a stone-tablet that was found lying buried towards the west above the hoâda, or ‘tank in the village,’ at

Transcription.43

[1] Svasti
Nityavarsha-sri(sri)[prita(thi)]vivallabhama-mahârâjâdhirâja-paraṃ-...

[2] Sv prayama...[thā(tā)raka-vijaya-rajiam-uttarottar-ābhivriddhi-pravarâ]-tha-

[3] manam[ma-]*-chand-râkta-taran baran sale [*] Sa(sâ)ka-bhupâla-kâl-a*]-krantam-saṁ-

[4] vâ]tsar-a-

[5] Prabhâ/bha-vādī-nâmadâ (dhâ)yam-uttama-madyama-jaghanya-pa(phâ)jadâ/da-prabhri-
Hail! While the victorious reign of Nityavarsha, the favourite of Śri and of the earth; the supreme king of great kings; the supreme lord; the most worshipful one, was continuing with perpetual increase, as long as the moon and sun and stars should last:

(L. 3.)—In the Dhātu sahāvatara, (which was) the eighth hundred and thirty-eight of the years that had elapsed from the time of the Saka king, which have the names of Prahaavā, &c., (and) which consist of those that give the most excellent results and those that give mediocre results and those that give the worst results and others:—

(L. 6.)—Hail! The Two-hundred-and-twenty Mahājanas of (the village of) Paṭiya-Maṭtavura, being (in assembly) the glorious Lenḍeyarasa, the Mahādāmantā who had attained the pāñcamaḥaḥsabā; he who was the sun of noble people; a very Kusumāyuda in respect of pride,—while governing the Purigera Three hundred, in kindness caused (the village of) Vutavura of Kachchhavara-Kādamma to be allotted.

(L. 10.)—To him who preserves this (grant), (there shall be) the reward of (celebrating) an aṣva-māṭha-sacrifice; to him who destroys this ordinance, there shall be (the guilt of) the slaughter of a Brahma in destroying a thousand tawny-coloured cows or a thousand Brahmanas at Bāraṇāsi!

Second Inscription.

(L. 11.)—Headed by the oil-man Jayasiṅgya-seṭṭi, (and) Jummiṣeṭṭi, (and) Māliseṭṭi, (and) Nāmiseṭṭi, (and) Kāmviṣeṭṭi,—The Fifty Cultivators, being (in assembly), gave to the god Śri-Bhōgēśvara a saṅgitį of oil for the lamp (of the temple). To those who continue this, (there shall be) infinite religious merit!

(L. 18.)—The merchants of the shops allotted to the god Śri-Bhōgēśvara a saṅgitį (of oil); (and) Holissiṭi ( allotted) some rice in the husk. To those who continue this act of piety, (there shall be) imperishable religious merit; to him who destroys it, (there shall be) hell!

---

second inscription.

Śrī-Bhōgēśvara (sva)m-dēvargge
telliga
Jayasiṅgya-seṭṭi
Jummiṣeṭṭi
Kāmviṣeṭṭi
inṛ-var-namo-
dalīṣeri
ayvatt-okkalum-iruddu
soḍariṅge
kōṭṭa-
ra sonicē
eppāya
I
dāna
naḍasidargge
ananta-punya
Idān
naḍasidargge
ananta-punya
I
Idān
saśadārge
katha[ṛ]
Translation.

Hail! While the victorious reign of Nityavarsha,—the favourite of Śri and of the earth; the supreme king of great kings; the supreme lord; the most worshipful one,—was continuing with perpetual increase, (so as to endure) as long as the moon and sun and stars should last:

(L. 3.)—In the Dhātu sahāvatara, (which was) the eighth hundred and thirty-eight of the years that have elapsed from the time of the Saka king, which have the names of Prahaavā, &c., (and) which consist of those that give the most excellent results and those that give mediocre results and those that give the worst results and others:—

(L. 6.)—Hail! The Two-hundred-and-twenty Mahājanas of (the village of) Paṭiya-Maṭtavura, being (in assembly) the glorious Lenḍeyarasa, the Mahādāmantā who had attained the pāñcamaḥaḥsabā; he who was the sun of noble people; a very Kusumāyuda in respect of pride,—while governing the Purigera Three hundred,—
ON THE GRAMMARIAN BHARTRIHARI.

BY PROF. F. KIELHORN, PH. D., GÖTTINGEN.

Whatever may be the opinions of scholars regarding the dates generally which Professor Müller in his "Note on the "Renaissance of Sanskrit Literature" has assigned to the chief works of the so-called classical Sanskrit, there can be no doubt that Professor Müller is right in placing the grammarian Bhartrihari and the Kāśikā-vṛtti before the middle of the 7th century A.D. This date is fixed by that of the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing, who has left us an interesting account of the progress of the study pursued in the grammatical schools of India at the time of his visit to that country. I propose to compare I-tsing's statements regarding the works of Bhartrihari with what we know of them from existing MSS. or commentaries, and to inquire if those works furnish any data that may help to fix the time of other authors.

According to Professor Müller, I-tsing's account of Bhartrihari's works, so far as it is necessary to mention it here, is, as follows:—

'Next, there is the Bhartrihari-discourse, a commentary on the . . . Chūrpi, the work of the great scholar Bhartrihari. It contains 25,000 ślokās.'

'There is, besides, the Vāky-discourse (Vākya-padikā), which contains 700 ślokās.'

'Next, there is the Pina or Pīda or Vina. It contains 3,000 verses of Bhartrihari.'

In the first of these works Professor Müller recognizes Bhartrihari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, and in the second the Vākyapadīya; as regards the last work he inclines to believe that I-tsing is speaking of the Bhāṭṭideva, 'supposing that Bhāṭṭi could in Chinese have been represented by Pīda.'

From existing MSS. we know that Bhartrihari has written a commentary on the Mahābhāṣya, and a work in three chapters (kāṇḍa)

1 India, What can it teach us? pp. 281-366.
2 Loc. cit. pp. 341-349. In the first work mentioned by I-tsing, the elementary Siddhānta, I would recognize a kind of Loṭi- or Mārut-kīvita, similar to the one of Kshemendraśarma, which teaches the letters, their combinations, the organs with which they are pronounced, &c. I think I am right in stating that both in Brahmanical and Jainas indigenous schools, the first thing children learn is the phrase अ न्नमिन. मिक्नम् —

For the use of the auspicious word निवृत्त at the commencement of literary works I need refer only e.g. to the first of the Kātyāyanas's Vārttikas and I would draw attention to the fact that Kātyāyanas has employed the commonly called Vākyapadīya. The commentators and later grammarians generally inform us that his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya did not extend over more than three Pādas, and, so far as I know, they do not ascribe to him any works besides that commentary and the Vākyapadīya. In proof of this I may quote Hēlarāja, who, towards the end of his own commentary, thus speaks of Bhartrihari:

'द्वारायामनी देव सदासागर लिपिः कुता।
तस्य संस्कृतविश्वास्थितत्वात्यय हरये नमः॥

Whether the whole of Bhartrihari's commentary on the Mahābhāṣya is still in existence, it is impossible to say. I have never heard of any MSS. of it except the Berlin one which does not go beyond the 7th Ânhika of the first Pāda; it is incomplete at the beginning and defective in the middle, and altogether very incorrect. But even from this imperfect and faulty MS. it is clear that Bhartrihari's was a very full and elaborate commentary, that its author knew more than one gloss on the Mahābhāṣya of which we know nothing, that his MSS. exhibited readings not to be met with in any of the MSS. which have hitherto become accessible, and that Kaiyāta's commentary—least for the first seven Ânhikas—is but a very meagre extract from the work of Bhartrihari. Considering that Bhartrihari's commentary is at least four times as extensive as Kaiyāta's, and that Kaiyāta's comment on the first three Pādas contains about 6,000 ślokās, we may well believe that the Tripadi contained 25,000 ślokās, which is the figure given by I-tsing. I-tsing is right too in calling Bhartrihari's work a commentary on the Chūrpi, for Bhartrihari himself calls the author of the Mahābhāṣya the Chūrpi kāra, or author of the Chūrpi. (Berlin MS. pp. 92a, 102b, 121a.)

same auspicious term at the end of the last Vārttika in every one of the eight Adhyayas. Curious is it that the author of the Vājasaneyi-pratidīkhyā should have wound up every one of his eight Adhyayas with the similarly auspicious expression बुद्धि श्रवणं — I-tsing's statement about the so-called Khilas appears to me to contain some mistakes. Khilapābha occurs Kāl-śrīt, 1, 9, 9, and is explained there by Haradatta to comprise the 'Dhatupābha, Pratidīkhyā (i.e. Guna-pratidīkhyā and Vākyapadīkhyā.)

3 The Hari-kārdikā are no separate work, Hari-kārdika being merely another expression for a verse from the Vākyapadīya.'
The work usually called Vākyapadīya has long ceased to be studied in India. MSS. of it are rare, and generally incorrect. In all of them the work is divided into three Kāṇḍas, and the whole is therefore also named Trikāṇḍī. The first of the three chapters which is called Brāhmaṇakāṇḍa or Āgama-samuchchaya contains in most MSS. 183, the second or Vākyya-kāṇḍa 487 ślokas. The third or Pada-kāṇḍa consists of 14 sections (Samuddeśa), with a total of 1815 ślokas. The Vākyapadīya then, such as we have it, contains altogether 2000 ślokas, and this is the figure given at the end of Colebrooke's MS. (together with the additional remark 'Rupees 2!').

Such being the case, it appears to me that I-ting's statement, according to which the Vākyya-discourse contained 700 ślokas, cannot refer to the work to which our MSS. give the title Vākyapadīya; for I see no reason to believe that a writer who gives correctly the extent of Pāṇini's grammar, of the Kāśikā-ratīti, of the Mahābhāṣya, and, so far as we can judge, of Bhartrihari's commentary, should have made a mistake or been misinformed in this case. On the contrary, I hope to show that I-ting's account is as accurate here as it is in the case of the other works which he describes, and I believe that I can at the same time suggest the Sanskrit title of the last work mentioned by him, the 'Pīna or Pīla or Pīna' which Professor Müller hesitatingly understands to be the Bhāṭṭikārya.

Vardhamana describes Bhartrihari, whom he mentions in his Gaṇarata-mahodadhi, as the author of the Vākyapadīya and Prakīrṇaka, and commentator of three Pādas of the Mahābhāṣya. The expression 'Vākyapadīya and Prakīrṇaka' is here equivalent to the term Trikāṇḍī in the verse cited from Helārāja, and must be understood to denote the work which the MSS. call simply Vākyapadīya. As a South-Indian MS. uses Prakīrṇaka synonymously with Pāda-kāṇḍa, and as moreover Helārāja calls his commentary on the Pāda-kāṇḍa—Prakīrṇa-prakāsa, it is clear that Prakīrṇa or Prakīrṇaka was a name for what is now considered the third chapter of the Vākyapadīya, and it follows that as late as the 12th century the term Vākyapadīya was employed to denote the first and second chapters only of Bhartrihari's work.

After this it is hardly necessary to say that I understand I-ting's statement about the Vākyya discourse to refer to the Vākyapadīya in this restricted sense, which would contain 670 or, roughly speaking, 700 ślokas, and that I would recognize in the 'Pīna' the Prakīrṇa or Pada-kāṇḍa. I am aware that the number of ślokas which I-ting assigns to the Pīna does not agree with the actual number of ślokas of the Prakīrṇa, but am inclined to think that this very discrepancy speaks rather in favour of than against my identification. Not to mention my own views on the subject, we have Puṇya-rāja's distinct testimony, that already in his time the Pada-kāṇḍa was no longer complete, either because it had ceased to be studied, or through the carelessness of copyists, or through other causes. I-ting's statement is the more valuable as suggesting how much of Bhartrihari's work may really have been lost.

Excepting the well-known verses at the end of the Vākyya-kāṇḍa, Bhartrihari refers to other literary works, both in the Vākyapadīya and the Prakīrṇa, only in such general terms as Smrītyantara and Vākyarājantara, by which the commentators understand the grammars of Āpiśāli and Kāśikārāta. In his commentary on the Mahābhāṣya he cites of writers on grammar by name the Āpiśālaḥ and Kuṇi, the commentator of the Aṣṭādhyāyā. Besides he mentions or quotes:—the Taṭṭṭīrīyād and Vājasanyinā, the Aśvalayana and Āpastamba (Īrauṭa)-sūtras, and a Bāhuvriha (Īrauṭa)-sūtra-bhāṣya; the Nirukta, Prāṇidhih, Śikṣasūtra, in general, and a verse from the Pāṇiniya-sūkṣma in particulars; Dharmasūtrakālī; the Mīnanaka-dārśana, Śāṅkha-dārśana, Vaiśeṣika-dārśana and the Naiyāyikā. But what I would call particular attention to, is the fact that Bhartrihari also mentions and quotes three times from the Vaiśyaka and Chauraka, and that it is therefore certain that of Indian writers on medicine Chauraka at any rate must be placed before the middle of the 7th century.

I hope to prove elsewhere by the help of Bhartrihari's commentary, that later grammarians are wrong in identifying Gomardīya with Patanjali.
THE RĀŚHTRĀKUṬA KING KRISHNA RĀJAI AND ĖLĀPURA.

BY PROF. RAMCHANDRA GOPAL BHANDARKAR M.A., POONA.

While preparing a paper on the early history of the Dekhan for the Bombay Gasetter, I had to give an account of Krishnārāja, an early Rāśṭrākūṭa monarch and successor of Dantidūrga, and in this connection had to examine the Baroda copperplate inscription published in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Journal, vol. XVII, pp. 292ff. It struck me that an important passage relating to this king had been misunderstood by the translator, and I found that Dr. Bühler and Mr. Fleet, when they had occasion to write about Krishnārāja accepted this translation, and spoke of Krishnārāja as having built a fort on the hill at Ėlāpura. Dr. Bühler thought one of the stanzas was badly deciphered or was corrupt, and made out that a temple of Śiva was constructed in addition to a hill fort; but he did not identify Ėlāpura. Mr. Fleet expressed his opinion that Ėlāpura was the same as Yellāpura in North Kanara. And now, in the number of this Journal for June last, Mr. Fleet has given a revised transcript and translation of the inscription, together with a facsimile. But I am sorry to observe his translation of the passage in question is still unsatisfactory. As the point involved is important, I take the liberty of discussing the sense of the passage, and feel little doubt that a scholar like Mr. Fleet will himself acknowledge the appropriateness of the translation I have to give. The two stanzas are:

एलापुरावल्लभादधस्तिप्रेमवरे
यहित्र्य निकितविवाहवरानपरं
एतस्यस्य जयस्य विवाहम् न कृत्रिमं थी
इष्टेत्स्तवेष्टनं सत्तमं वह चच्चयति।
भूयत्वाविष्टिति व्यवस्थानिद: कहमहो
भूतेष्टविष्टिति व्यवस्थानिद: कहमहो।
करतिप यवक्तन निरमयायी हिली
तच्छन कृत्तिनमावित देव राजा।

Mr. Fleet corrects the कृत्रिमें of his facsimile to कृत्रिम in line 2. But the original is appropriate, and the emendation will not do.

Mr. Fleet translates the passage thus:—

"Having seen his wonderful encampment situated on the mountain of Ėlāpura, the astonished immortals, who travel in celestial cars, always take much thought, saying:—" This is the abode of Svayānḥvī Śiva, and no artificially made (dwelling) Śrī, (if she could be) seen, (would be) such as this.' Verily even the architect who built it felt astonishment, saying:—" (The utmost) perseverance would fail to accomplish such a work again; who has it been achieved by me!" (and), by reason of it, the king was caused to praise his name."

The evident objections against this translation are:—1st. Mr. Fleet takes एला—सतीवेष्टन as a karmadhāraṇya compound, and a substantive noun, not an adjective. But in that case its gender ought to be masculine, since सतीवेष्टन is a masc. noun; but it is not so here, because बहु, which is neuter qualifies it. बहु ought to be बहु if the compound is a karmadhāraṇya and a substantive. 2. There must be a तद् to answer to this बहु, but where this तद् is, does not clearly appear from the translation. Mr. Fleet perhaps translates बहु to refer to king Krishnā, but in that case it ought to be बहु, and then only can it be connected with the compound एला—सतीवेष्टन. 3. Svayānḥvī Śiva is taken as a compound; but Svayānḥvī as an adjective of Śiva or as a crude ought to have the ending vowel long, while it is short here; and the metre does require a short vowel. 4. There is no reason why कृत्रिमें should be regarded as a mistake for कृत्रिम. 5. When a noun and an adjective are put together, the copula only can be understood between them and not verbs of the potential or conditional mood. Mr. Fleet, however, understands 'would be' after Śrī, and 'if she could be' in connection with बहु. 6. Mr. Fleet translates बहु as "by reason of it." "Of what?" I would ask. Certainly not, "of his being struck with astonishment," which is what precedes. 7. What could have led the author of the verses to compare "an encampment" with a temple of Śiva? Such a comparison is inappropriate as there is no resemblance. 8. Why should an abode of Śiva be contrasted with an artificially made dwelling; in other words, what is the necessity of denying this attribute of a temple of Śiva?

According to my way of taking it the two stanzas form one sentence. The principal clause is बहु राजा कृत्तिनमावित and the rest are attributive adjuncts of कृत्तिन. The word कृत्तिन has

1 Ind. Ant. vol. VII, p. 61.
2 Ind. Ant. vol. XII, p. 195.
been understood in its usual and etymological sense by Mr. Fleet and the first translator; that sense is not at all appropriate here and the word must be taken to signify "a temple." Though the dictionaries do not give this sense, there is no question the word does denote a "temple." Thus in Mr. Telang's Sīlāhāra grant, we have

सं(अं)/मेती द्वारस्तंपिश्रयमिक्राष्टिद्याचिक्रित्त

"Who verily constructed in a short time twelve temples of Śiva."* (Ind. Ant., vol. IX, p. 34, il. 1-2.)

The word occurs in other inscriptions also where it must be interpreted as "a temple." In the Agni Purāṇa we have in the Chapter on the Construction of Temples;—

संमहितं ससतास्त्रक्षक जीवनात्

द्वासलमश्रयवेयं कीर्तिनाथ व शरीरेऽ

(Ed. Bib. Ind. vol. I, p. 111.)

"Therefore having got wealth by luck or by exertion, one should give it in the proper way to the best among the twice-born and cause temples to be constructed." Similarly in Bāna's Kadambartī, in the description of the victorious march of a prince, we have—

आसिइनदेशश्वध्यायं स्थायवन्मिखिनायन कुर्वकी

रत्नानि लेश्वरस्त वासनानि...पुष्पिनी विचाराय।

"He traversed the earth, dictating arrangements for the government of countries, placing his memorials, constructing temples, causing grants to be written, &c." In Someśvara's Kīrtikāmudī, we have

ममतास्य विषधमानार्य विद्यापरिपरिशीति बः

स्मर्यं भवस्यकुललोकनिमित्तुप्त

This occurs in the description of Vastupūla in the fourth canto. The sense is, "[That Vastupūla] who does good to the great who are living by means of wealth, and to those who are dead by the restoration of dilapidated works of public utility (such as tanks, wells &c.) and temples." The words in the two stanzas before us are to be thus syntactically connected:

यदू एलिपुरालवमानातूखलितिविषयम् [कीर्तिनाम] वैश्वाकर्पितुतिविनिराकारात्मकः "एतद् विश्वास सर्थियो, इत्यादि शी: कृपणि न छटा।" इति सततम्

वाक्यविस्तारं:; स्थवर [कीर्तिनाम] कर्तवति दिवसीय अथ खण्ड भूमिपत्यविलक्ती यवसायाणि: "अहो कृष्णै एतद् मया कुम्भ समाहरति।" इति अवस्थानिति विषभवम् अथ

तदुद्दानां कीर्तिनाम नेन रात्रि अराज्यति।

*This reference I owe to Mr. Telang himself.

* My attention was called to this passage by Prof.

Here वेन राजा is, like श्री and वृषिणि in the preceding sentences and वेन in the following, to be connected with कुम्भराज: वेनृ in the first sentence in which the description of this king begins. It is usual in Sanskrit literature when a description is given, to introduce each sentence by the relative pronoun and make it an attributive adjunct of the subject in the principal sentence, i.e., the thing or person described. A close translation of this is—

"[That king] by whom, verily, was caused to be constructed a temple on the hill at Elāpur, of a wonderful structure,—on seeing which the best of immortals who move in celestial cars, struck with astonishment, think much constantly, saying, 'This temple of Śiva is self-existent; in a thing made by art such beauty is not seen,'—a temple, the architect-builder of which, in consequence of the failure of his energy as regards [the construction of] another such work, was himself suddenly struck with astonishment, saying, 'Oh, how was it that I built it?'

एवं—संविषयम् is to be taken as a Bahuvarhi qualifying कीर्तिनाम understood; नम् is an indeclinable adverb meaning "verily," सर्थियो has its final vowel shortened because it qualifies the neuter noun Śivaśāhma.

In this passage therefore, Krishnārāja is represented to have caused to be constructed on the hill at Elāpur, a temple of Śiva of extraordinary beauty, and in the next stanza the idol is spoken of as having been decorated by the king with rubies, gold, and all other precious things. Here, too, Mr. Fleet translates yena by "by means of it," but it ought, as in the preceding sentence, to be rendered as "by whom," i.e., by the king. Now, when the ending puruśa of names of places undergoes a change in the vernaculars it becomes pura, and in rare cases pura. Thus we have Chittur for Chittapura, Indor for Indrapura, Sirur for Siripura, Sinipur for Sinhipura, Nandur or Nandor for Nandipura, Bishnur for Vishnapura, Mahāpur for Mahāshāpura, Tērr (often spelt Tērr) for Tripura, &c. Thus then Elāpurā should become Elūrā, and with the termination ka which is the Sanskrit original of the vernacular ending d, we have Elūrā. It is, therefore, a temple of extraordinary beauty on the hill at Elūrā that Krishnārāja, in these two stanzas is said to have caused to be constructed; very likely it was the Kaḷāsi itself, since it is spoken of with such admiration.

The date of the grant in which Danīḍuṇa is represented to have conquered the Chālukyas and become paramount sovereign is Śaka 675, and
Krisnarája is in the Rádhanaapur grant also spoken of as having wrested the supreme sovereignty from the Chálukyas. It therefore appears that Dantidurga died without completing his work, i.e., soon after Śaka 675, since his successor had to continue it. Krisnarája, therefore, reigned in the last quarter of the seventh century of the Śaka era, i.e., between 753 and 778 A.D.

MISCELLANEA.

Rájapitámaha.—The Śiláhára Title.

With reference to what Mr. R. D. Davé has written at p. 150 above, on the meaning of Rájapitámaha, or more correctly Ráya-Pitámaha,—since pitámaha, as well as being a name of the god Brahmá, means ‘grandfather,’ the title may of course be taken as meaning ‘the grandfather of kings,’ as was done by the author of the Kuśmárapalācharita, in order to suit the fancy that he had in his mind. But, so far as the inscriptions are concerned, it undoubtedly means,—as Mr. Wathen did not ‘suggest,’ but properly took it to mean, in the case of the analogous expression Manálikā-Pitámaha,—nothing but ‘a Pitámaha (or Brahmá) of a king,’ or ‘a very Pitámaha among kings.’—Compare the analogous titles, not capable of the same double interpretation, of—Ráya-Nárada, applied to the Western Chálukya king Vikramáditya VI. in I. 3 of the Góliháli inscription (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. Vol. IX. p. 299), and to the Dévagiri-Yádava king Krisna in I. 14 of the Béhaṭtī grant (id. Vol. XII. p. 42), and to Rámacandra of the same dynasty in the two Tháná grants (Jour. R. As. Soc., O. S., Vol. V., No. 9, p. 178, and No. 10, p. 183)—Ráya-Madítá, applied to the Kalachuri king Súvídēya or Sómēsvara in I. 1 of a Bálagdha inscription (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 188)—Srícaryapati-Tríśras, applied to the Ráshtrakúṭa king Govinda V. in I. 38 of the Sángili plates (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. Vol. IV. p. 100)—Rája-Savajñánhápa, applied to the Western Chálukya king Sómēsvara III. in I. 9 of the Paṭṭadakal inscription (id. Vol. XI. p. 259)—Rájardája-Tríśra, applied to the Dévagiri-Yádava king Krisna in I. 12 of the Munawalī inscription (id. Vol. XII. p. 34)—Rája-Munója, applied to the same king in I. 17 of the same inscription,—Manálikā-Kusumakárdja, applied to Permadji I. of the Sind family in I. 33 of the Narégal inscription (id. Vol. XI. p. 224)—Yádava-Nárada, applied to the Hoyálaka king Bálalá II. in I. 5-6 of a Halebid inscription (P. S. and O. C. Inscriptions, No. 223), and to the Dévagiri-Yádava king Singhána II. in I. 13-14 of the other Munawalī inscription (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. Vol. XII. p. 11), and to Súrachandra III. of the Yádavas of Násik in I. 3 of the Afjánári inscription (Ind. Ant. Vol. XII. p. 126)—Srícaryapati-Nárada, applied to the Ráshtrakáṭa king Govinda V. in I. 38 of the Sángili plates,—and Srícaryapati-Nárada, applied to the same king in I. 6 of a Kalas inscription.—The title of Ráya-Pitámaha was not confined to the Śiláháras. It is applied also to the Dévagiri-Yádava king Rámacandra in the second of the Tháná grants referred to above;—and to Srívachitra or Permadji of the Kádambas of Goa in I. 14 of the Góliháli inscription (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. Vol. IX. p. 296).—Other titles in which the name of Pitámaha occurs in the same way are—Sámaṇtra-Pitámaha, applied to Súrachandra III. in I. 3 of the Afjánári inscription referred to above;—and Manálikā-Pitámaha, applied to Achyutanáyaka, the feodary of Rámacandra, in the second of the Tháná inscriptions referred to above.

J. F. Fleet, Bo. C.S.

Simla, 26th May 1883.

VIKRAMÁDITYA ERA.

In Max Müller’s India: What can it teach us? there is a long note (pp. 281—306) on “The Renascence of Sanskrit Literature,” in which the author, among other matters, discusses, with his usual clearness of statement and fulness of reference, the origin of the Saivat and Śaka eras. The whole note is full of the most interesting and important data, but we can only find room for the following extract from the first ten pages of it:—

It has long been an open secret among all who are interested in Indian coins and inscriptions, that there is absolutely no documentary evidence whatever for the existence of such a king Vikramáditya in the first century B.C. But the puzzle has always been, how the belief in such a king, living in the first century B.C. and in all his wonderful achievements, could have arisen, and this puzzle has at last been solved, I believe by what I may be allowed to call the architectonical genius of Mr. Ferguson. ¹

I do not mean to say that all difficulties which beset that period of Indian chronology have been removed by him, but I cannot help thinking that in the main his solution will turn out to be correct. Mr. Ferguson tries to prove that what is called

the era of Vikramādiṭṭha, 56 B.C., was a date arrived at by taking the date of the great battle of Kuru,4 in which Vikramādiṭṭha, i.e. Harsha of Ujjayini, finally defeated the Mlechchhas, 544 A.D.,5 and by throwing back the beginning of the new era 6 + 100 (or 10 + 60) before that date, i.e., 56 B.C. By a similar process, i.e. by adding 10 + 100 years, another chronological era, called the Harsha era,6 was fixed at 456 B.C., though it never seems to have come into actual use.

This certainly seems very plausible. We could thus understand why much that was said originally of the Vikramādiṭṭha of the sixth century A.D. was reflected on the purely nominal Vikramādiṭṭha of the Vikramā era 56 B.C., the inventor of the era being projected 600 years before his actual reign, a period when there is really no monumental, numismatic, or historical evidence of the existence of any such king.

It has been said that there is as yet no other evidence for this battle of Kuru (Kurukṣetra?) besides Albiruni's statement. But Albiruni does not invent battles. He tells us what he was told, and he may sometimes have misunderstood what he was told. But in our case the chronological side of the argument is too strong to be set aside by mere general suspicions and surmises, though, no doubt, it would have to yield to contemporaneous evidence should it make a great battle against foreign invaders at that time and in that place impossible. Besides, the statements of Tārānātha as to Harsha's victory near Multan, though no doubt very modern, cannot be due to mere accident.

Others had guessed at such a solution before Mr. Ferguson, but what I admire in him is his pluck, and the clearness with which he puts forward his theories.

Nothing, I feel sure, has injured Sanskrit studies

---

4 This battle of Kuru is described by Albiruni in his account of the Saka era. (Reinard, Prog. Arch. et Persan, pp. 140ff.), and Bhau Daji, Journal of the Bombay Br. R. Asiatic Society, vol. XVIII (1864), p. 242; Reinard, Memoire sur Y Inde (1849), p. 73. This battle of Kuru may be the same as that of Mulaṇa mentioned by Tārānātha, 'Sṛ Harsha abolished the teaching of Mlechchhas by massacring them at Multan.' Asanga and Vasubandhu were his contemporaries (900 B.C.), his predecessor was called Gamhūrāpakaśa, his successor Śiva, Ind. Ant., vol. IV. (1875), p. 396.

5 See Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. XIV. (1880), p. 273. The same date, 460 Saka=544 A.D. is mentioned in the Satrañjaya Mahatmya as the beginning of Vikramādiṭṭha's reign; Kur. Preface, p. 15, on the authority of Wilford. Bühler, however, calls the Satrañjaya Mahatmya 'a wretched forgery of the 12th or 14th century.' It has been edited by Professor Weber. 5

6 Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. XII. (1880), p. 275; Reinard, Memoire sur Y Inde, p. 136. It is strange that Albiruni should not have guessed the real state of the case, when he was told by a native that Harsha lived 400 years before Vikramā; but that so much as the want of a certain amount of scientific manliness and straightforwardness on the part of scholars, who never venture to say Yes or No! and who always involve a crowd of reasons for and against in a cloud of words difficult to construe.

Mr. Ferguson, whether he is right or wrong, at all events puts down his foot firmly and sticks to his colours as long as he can. There is an immense advantage in this. If he is wrong, he can be knocked down, and no one is likely to defend again what he has been unable to uphold. If he is right, there can be no mistake as to where he has plantèd his standard, and others may safely push forward beyond the point which he has reached.

The contest has been going on for some time, Dr. Bhau Daji arrived at the conclusion that 'not a single inscription or copper-plate grant is dated in the Vikrama Sanvat before the eleventh century of the Christian era, and that the Vikrama Sanvat was brought into use on the revival of Jainism and the establishment of the Anhilpur dynasty in Gujarāt.' Mr. Ferguson thought at first that the Vikrama era was invented in the age of Bhoja of Dhārā (A.D. 993), or rather by the revived Chālukyas (A.D. 1093). This, however, was going too far. General Cunningham in his Archaeological Reports, vol. II, p. 296, denies indeed the possibility of any inscription being dated in the Sanvat era in 747, and reads in consequence the date of one of Tod's inscriptions, not 747—56=691, but 747+38=925. Afterwards, however, on p. 68, he speaks of an inscription dated 811, which he interprets in the Vikrama era, i.e. 754-5 A.D., and which he quotes as the earliest inscription he is aware of, dated in that mediæval era. Sir Walter Elliot published translations of some Chālukya inscriptions in 1836 (J. R. A. S. vol. IV. (1837), p. 14), in which the inscriptions must be dated 573 B.C. according to the Almanack of Kasñira Harṣa. It is therefore placed 604 years later, i.e. 608 A.D. The number of years may not be quite right, but what really took place is clearly indicated.

5 Many years ago Holtmann (über den greek. Ursprung des indischen Tierkreises, p. 19), remarked, 'to assign to Vikramādiṭṭha the first year of his era might be quite as great a mistake as we should commit in placing Pope Gregory XIII. in the year 1 of the Gregorian calendar, or even Julius Caesar in the first year of the Julian period, to which his name has been given, i.e. in the year 4713 B.C.' See Weber, Sanskrit Literature, p. 202.


8 There is no contradiction in this, as Mr. Ferguson seems to think (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. XII. (1880), pp. 271, 272); but what seems strange is that on other occasions General Cunningham should translate Sam. 5.3 sa n.c. 52. See Archaeological Survey Rep., vol. III., p. 31.
era is alluded to. Of course, nothing short of a contemporaneous document dated less than 600 of the Vikrama era would really upset Mr. Fergusson’s theory, and such a date has, as yet, not been met with.

My learned friend, Professor Bühler, who still holds to the belief that the Vikrama era, which begins 56 B.C., was really established by a king of that name who lived before the beginning of the Christian era, has for years been engaged in the study of Indian inscriptions, and has of course been most anxious to produce at least one inscription dated contemporaneously in any year before 600 of Vikrama, or 544 A.D. He could easily prove that Bhao Daji’s limit was much too late, as there is the Samāṅgadha plate, the date of which in the Vikrama era comes to 754 A.D. He also pointed out the Pāṭhan inscriptions of Sāvant 80 (746 A.D.), recording the accession of Vanarāja, though here Mr. Burgess expressed some doubts as to its genuineness. Anyhow the fact remained that a scholar who had probably seen more inscriptions than any other, could not produce a single case where the Vikrama era was used before 754 A.D., that is, 810 years after its supposed introduction.

I should have expected therefore that Professor Bühler would have hesitated, when he suddenly came on the Kāvī inscription which gives the date 430 A.D. for its grantor Jayabhāṣa, before accepting it as a Vikrama date. Under other circumstances his arguments might have carried conviction, but when this is the only case of a Vikrama date before 600, the circumstantial evidence on which he relies requires, surely, careful reconsideration. If Jayabhāṣa is the father of Dada II, and if Dada’s dates range from Šāka 350 to 417 (A.D. 459-498), no doubt the date assigned to his father—viz., 456, cannot be Šāka (A.D. 564). But does it follow therefore that it is Vikrama 864, i.e., 430 A.D.? Is it likely that the father would use one era, and the son another? Besides, the date in the inscription is injured, and even if the date were right, there would be considerable doubt whether the Ashāṇhā Śudī could have fallen on a Sunday in 430 A.D. Heartily as I should welcome any evidence that would settle this interesting point either way, I cannot think that this one date of Jayabhāṣa will settle it. What has to be proved is that an era, invented by a great king in 56 B.C., remained dormant for 600 years at least. This will require very plausible arguments, and the strongest monumental evidence.

Let us now see how, according to Dr. Bhao Daji and Mr. Fergusson, the real date of Vikrama, the inventor of the Vikrama era, can be determined. During the whole of Hionen-thang’s travels in India, Šilālītva (Harābavardhana Kumāraṇa) was on the throne of Rājakubja, as supreme ruler in the north of India. The date of these travels, according to Chinese chronology, is from 629-645. In about 640, or during his second stay at Nālanda, Hionen-thang had a vision that king Šilālītva would die in ten years. This, apart from all visions, would place the king’s death in 650 A.D. When Hionen-thang took leave of king Šilālītva, he had reigned thirty years, and was holding his sixth quinquennial assembly (called Mokṣahāṣaparishaḍ or Princen-pahāṣaparishaḍ). The beginning of his reign must therefore be fixed at 610, its end about 650. He was by caste a Vaiṣya.

The Chinese historian Ma Tuan-lin gives slightly different dates, for he speaks of an embassy sent to Madhā in 643 when king Šilālītva died, and his minister O-lo-na-shan

---


** Jour. of the Būlos Bām. R. Asiat. Soc. vol. II., p. 371 seq. [This plate is not dated in the Vikrama-Sāvant era at all: [see Ind. Ant. vol. VIII., p. 188; vol. XI., p. 110. —Ed.]

11 Professor Bühler informs me that he now possesses an inscription, dated Sāvant 794 = A.D. 737-8 (Ind. Ant., vol. XII., pp. 151ff.)

12 Ind. Ant. vol. V., p. 110. —Ed. I. A.

13 Ind. Ant. vol. V., p. 111; vol. VII., p. 61. —Ed.

14 Mr. D. B. Hutcheon calculates that Ashāṇhā Śudī 10th, in Sam. 496, fell on Wednesday, 29th May, 429 A.D. and in Sam. 347 (486 elapsed) it fell on Tuesday, 17th June, 430 A.D., and in this latter year the kāraśaṇa kṛiti fell on 26th June or 13th Ashāṇhā śuṇi. This confirms Prof. Kern L. Chatrier’s computation (Ind. Ant. vol. V., p. 112, note). —J. B.
(a-la-na-shun) ruling in his stead. So small a difference, however, in Indian chronology, is really to be considered as a confirmation rather than as a difficulty; and so is Ma Tuan-lin’s account of the wars between Silādiya and his great opponent Pulakēśin of Kālaṇa (whom he does not name), which he places in 618-627.

The father of this Silādiya was Prabhākara (or Prabhākara-varavardhana), and his elder brother, Rājyavardhana. Both had been reigning before. The elder brother had been defeated and killed by Sāsāka (moon) of Kārṇasavarma, an enemy of the Buddhists, and it was then that Silādiya was proclaimed king, though he declined the title of Mahārāja, preferring that of Kumārarāja. In six years he conquered the ‘five Indies,’ but peace was not restored during thirty years. Being a strict Buddhist, he forbade the eating of meat. His minister was Pōnī (Bhanḍī). This account of Silādiya of Kānyakubja, the supreme ruler of Northern India, and his two predecessors, coming from an eye-witness, the Chinese pilgrim Hionenthsoang, is confirmed by a well-known Sanskrit author Bāna, in his Harshakarita. This text was discovered by Dr. F. Hall, and its great importance pointed out in his preface to the Vāsavadattā. It has since been published at Calcutta. In this work, again the work of an eye-witness, the same Harshara or Harṣhavardhana Silādiya is represented as the son of Pratāpāsala and Yaśovat, his elder brother being Rājyavardhana. Prabhākara-varavardhana is said to have been a worshipper of the sun, while his father Pusphabhaditī had been a worshipper of Śiva. Prabhākara-varavardhana’s spiritual guide was called Mādhavagupta, his astrologer Tāraka, his physician Susheṇa. Both he and his brother had been educated by Bhanḍī. Their sister, Rājyāśri, was married to Graharvarman, who was killed by the king of Mālava on the same day that Prabhākara was defeated. This king of Mālava was afterwards slain by Rājyavardhana, and when Rājyavardhana succumbed to Gupta, king of Gauḍa, Harsha (Harsha Dēva or Harsha Malla) succeeded. While Bhanḍī defeated the Mālavas, and Rājyāśri was recovered, Harsha made an alliance with Bhūṣkaravarman, of Pragjyotisha, the same as Bhūṣkaravarman, the king of Kāmarāja, whom Hionenthsoang visited, his title being Kumāra (Hionenthsoang, tome III, p. 77), like that of Harsha.

The duration of the reigns of Rājyavardhana and Prabhākara is not given, but as it is stated that about 640 Silādiya had reigned thirty years, and that, about sixty years before that time, the throne was occupied by Silādiya Pratāpāsala, Mr. Ferguson proposes to fix the end of Silādiya Pratāpāsala’s reign in 580, which leaves about thirty years, 580-590 for Prabhākara-varavardhana and Rājyavardhana. Silādiya Pratāpāsala ruled fifty years, 530-580, and was preceded by Vikramādiya (at Śravasti), whose reign would accordingly have ended in 590. From what Hionenthsoang tells us of Vikrama’s treatment of the Buddhist Manoratha, the king seems for a time to have favoured the Brāhmans, while his successor Silādiya favoured Vaśubandhu and the Buddhists, though it is easy to see that, during most of these reigns, all sects enjoyed equal freedom and peace. One king is a Buddhist, the next a Brāhmans. Sometimes the same king favours both systems, or favours one at one time, the other at another. We hear of fathers turning Buddhists, and their children remaining Brāhmans.

30 Hionenthsoang, tome I, p. 112.
31 Hionenthsoang, tome I, p. 112.
and if there are any feuds between the rival sects, they are settled by intellectual rather than by physical force.

Now this proposal to assign thirty years to the reigns of Prabhākara-varadhana and Rāya-vardhana, seems to me to create unnecessary difficulties. Hiouen-thasang says no more than that sixty years before 640 the throne was occupied by Śilāditya. If we assign to Śilāditya a reign from 550 to 600, it would have been equally true to say that Śilāditya reigned sixty years before 640. There would then remain ten years for the reigns of Prabhākara-varadhana and Rāya-vardhana, both of whom died a violent death, and we should have the battle of Korur and the starting-point of the Vikrama era, as well as the appointment of Mātrigupta to the throne of Kāśmīra, well within the reign of Vikrama-ditya, his reign extending to 550 A.D. ‘Sixty years’ is probably meant for the Brāhmapati cycle.

This may be seen from the following table:—

531-579. Khoara Nushirvān and Barzōt.
544. Battle of Korur, 600 after 56 B.C., era of Vikrama.
Siddhasena Sūri, a Jain, helps in reckoning the era.
544. Mātrigupta, ruler of Kāśmīra, contemporary of Bhartrihirtha.
Kālidāsa, contemporary of Dignāga, Vasubandhu and Asanga.
Kālidāsa, mentioned with Bhāravi in inscriptions. 634 A.D.; his Setukāyasa praised by Daṇḍin (6th cent.); he quotes Bhāsa, Saumila.
Varaha-mihira, died 587; quotes Aryabhata, born 476.
Varaha-mihira quotes Rama-siddhānta by Śrīhena, 505, based on Ākṣara; Vaśishṭha, Vījaya māndī, &c.; quotes Pañjika-siddhānta by Paulus all Yumāni; quotes Vaśishtha-sid dhānta by Visnu-chandra; quotes Saumara-siddhānta; Vaśishtha-mihira, quotes Pañjika-siddhānta; also Satya Bhadanta, Bādārāyana, &c.
Amara-sūrya, translated into Chinese 561-566.
Jiahnu, father of Brahmagupta (born 598).
Dignāga, criticized by Uddyotakara, who is mentioned by Subandhu, who is mentioned by Bāna.
Manoratha, teacher of Vasubandhu, disgraced, 900 B.C. ?

550-600. Śilāditya Pratāpa-sīla (Mālava), called Bhoja by Periṣthah.
Vasubandhu restored, Pāṇḍita at Nālanda, brother of Asanga; died before 569.
Prabhākara-varadhana.
Mādhavagupta, Tāraka, Sushega, at his Court.

610-650. Śilāditya Harshavardhana (younger son), called Kumārāja, 'a Vaiśya'.
His sister, Rājyāśri, wife of Grahavarman, who was killed by king of Mālava.
His minister Bhandī (Po-ni), Alliance with Bhāskara-varman, Kumara of Prājāpati (Kārīpā). Wars with Pulakēśin II of Mahāśātra, temp. Hiouen-thasang (618-625, Ma Tuan-lin).
Defeated by Pulakēśin II, Nāyadāra, who began to reign 609.
Chinese embassy to Māndhāra, leaves 648, arrives after Śilāditya's death.
Visited by Hiouen-thasang, 629-645; by Alopen, 639.
Dandina Daśakumāracharita, Rāvya-Dāra, old.
Subandhu, Vasavadatta quoted by Bāna.
"" quotes Uddyotakara, Dharmakīrti, pupil of Asanga.
Bāna, Harshacharita, Kādambarī, Char-gikotro, Rāmsattva (Dhāvaka?), Pāravaratibāṇatā (ed. Bombay).
Mayūra, Mayūra-sūrya.
Mānatunga Sūri, Bhaktamara-stotra.
Nārāyana.
Ādhyarāja.
Bhārtihari, died 650 (I-tsing).
Jayāditya (Kādikī), died 660 (I-tsing).
Brahmagupta, born 588.

Though some of the links in this chronological system are still doubtful, the belief in the existence of a Vikrama-ditya in the first century B.C. may now be accounted for, while his real existence in the sixth century admits of little doubt.


Having recently been engaged in an endeavour to identify the localities of the sources of the

1 From the Academy, April 21, 1883, p. 277.
different mineral productions mentioned by the earliest writers on India, my attention has been drawn to the allusions which accompany them to many so-called fabulous races of men and species of animals and plants. A tolerably intimate acquaintance with the wilder tribes of India and with some of its natural productions enables me, I venture to think, to make some new contributions towards explaining the origin of certain of these Oriental myths. The portion of my work which refers to the mineral productions will shortly be published; but, as it may be some time before I can complete my notes on the races of men, animals, and plants, I make an offering of this installment to those who are interested in the subject, hoping that what I have to say will be subjected to their criticism. My knowledge of Ktesias and his commentators is almost wholly founded on Mr. McCrindle's recently published work.¹

First, as regards the Pygmies. They were of small stature, covered with long hair, and lived by hunting. In the country occupied by them there was a lake which produced oil,² and there were also many silver mines situated in the same region.³ Other accounts represent them as fighting with cranes and robbing their nests. Now, without going into details, it will be sufficient, perhaps, to point to the facts that a hairy tribe of men of low stature who live in trees is reported to dwell in the upper valley of the Irrawady, between Momein and Manipur. In this region, too, are the famous Upper Burma petroleum wells of Ye-man-gyong, while in the Shan States and towards Bhama argentiferous galena is worked at the present day, and the silver is extracted. The robbing the cranes' nests, &c., may have arisen simply from a figurative description of the fact that these people had their dwellings in the tops of trees.

The martikhora is described as an animal of the size of the lion, red in colour, with three rows of teeth and stings on various parts of its body, but especially on the tail, which caused it to resemble the scorpion. Its name records the fact that it was a man-eater (Persian mardkhor), which is also expressly stated by Ktesias. It was hunted by the natives from the backs of elephants. Although it has been suggested by some commentators that this was the tiger, others appear to be unwilling to accept it as such, and regard the whole as purely fable. Now, among facts not generally known, though mentioned in some works on zoology, is one which I can state from my own personal knowledge is familiar to Indian Shikaris—it is that at the extremity of the tail of the tiger, as well as of other felidae, there is a little horny dermal structure like a claw or nail, which, I doubt not, the natives regard as analogous to the sting of the scorpion. Moreover, the whiskers of the tiger are by many natives regarded as capable of causing injury, and sportsmen know, where this is the case, that, if they do not take precautions, the skins of their slaughtered tigers will be destroyed by the removal or burning of the whiskers—to prevent accidents. The idea of the three rows of teeth probably had its origin in the three lobes of the carnivorous molar, which is of such a different type from the molar of the ruminant or of the horse. The martikhora was therefore, I believe, the tiger, and the account of it embodies actual facts, though they were somewhat distorted in the telling.

The griffins, or griffons, which guarded the gold, are described as "a race of four-footed birds, about as large as wolves, having legs and claws like those of the lion, and covered all over the body with black feathers, except only on the breast, where they are red." If from this account we exclude the word birds, and for feathers read hair, we have a tolerably accurate description of the hairy black-and-tan coloured Tibetan mastiffs, which would naturally be, and are, in fact, the custodians of the dwellings of Tibetans—those of gold-miners, no doubt, as well as of others. Capt. Gill's frequent references to these fierce dogs in his River of Golden Sand fully bear out this identification. They appear to have played a part, too, in the other fable of the gold-digging ants which has been so fully cleared up by Sir H. Rawlinson and Prof. Schiern.⁴

The bird (!) called dikarion, which was the size of a partridge's egg, and buried its dung, may be identified with the beetle of that size, a species of scarabaeus, or dung beetle, and which is called gabaronda in Hindustani. As is well known, it buries pellets of cattle droppings as a receptacle for its eggs or larvae.

I might add many items to this list, but I forbear further trespassing on your space, save that I would point out that the amber of Ktesias and the red insects with which it is associated may obviously be identified with shell-lac and lac dye (coecus lacca), while the Siptakhora tree on which they were found may possibly be the Khum. H. (Schleichera trijuga), the fruit of which is edible. Or it may have been the Mhovva (Bassia latifolia), the flowers of which, when dried, constitute an important article of food, and the fruit is also eaten.

V. BALL

Trinity College, Dublin, April 6, 1883.

² Economic Geology of India, p. 148.
³ Loc. cit. p. 234.
SEAMY SIDE OF THE VEDIC RELIGION.

By Andrew Lang, M.A.

It may seem almost blasphemous to say that the Védas have their seamy side; but truths even more painful, if possible, than this must be faced in the sacred interests of science. Mr. Max Müller has recently said, in India; What it can Teach Us, that "in the Védas we have a nearer approach to a beginning, and an intelligible beginning, than in the wild invocations of Hottentots and Bushmen." The Védas, according to Max Müller, are the religious hymns of a highly civilized people, of a people whose ancestors were practically civilized before the Aryan separation, before the language in which the hymns were chanted was a language at all. It is difficult to see how the religion of a society so long matured can be nearer "the beginning" than the religion of races who have not yet evolved or accepted civilized society. Again, there is nothing particularly "wild" in some of the "invocations" of Bushmen. Qing, an uncorrupted Bushman, gave the first Europeans he met, Mr. Orpen and his companions, the following account of the rudiments of his faith:—"He said, 'Cagn made all things, and we pray to him.' I said (Mr. Orpen writes) 'How do you pray to him?' Answer: (in a low imploring voice), 'O Cagn, O Cagn, are we not your children? Do you not see our hunger? Give us food! And he gives us both hands full.'" (Cope Monthly Magazine, July 1874). Take an example of the "wild invocations" of the Banks islander. Here is the prayer of a Papuan in danger at sea. He addresses Qate:—"Qate, Marawa! Look down on me; smooth the sea for us two, that I may go safely on the sea. Beat down for me the crests of the tide-rip that I may come to a quiet landing-place" (Codore, "Religious Beliefs in Melanesia," Journal of the Anthropological Institute, Feb. 1891). Compare the prayer of Odysseus to the Phaeacian river:—"O King, whosoever thou art, unto thee am I come as to one that receiveth prayer. . . . may, pity me, O King, for I avow myself thy suppliant. So spake he, and the god stayed his stream and withheld his waves and made the water smooth before him." These Greek, Bushman and Papuan prayers are all on a level, and all are not only near the beginning, but near the heart, of religious hope. It is true that Cagn is a kind of grasshopper, and Marawa a spider. But the religious sentiment is there, undisturbed by the ludicrous myths of the spider and grasshopper. We propose to show that civilized and ancient as was the society which produced the Vedic poems, yet the faith of Vedic worshippers was very near akin in the wildness of its details and of its mythology to the faith of Bushmen and Hottentots. The evidence for the Vedic religion is to be found, of course, in the hymns of the Veda and in the ritual of the Brähmanas. Dates cannot be given with any certainty, but we may assume the collection of the Veda to be not later than 1000 B.C., while the Brähmanas (directions for the ritual of sacrifice and explanations of the separate details) may, we presume, be three or four hundred years later. The Brähmanas, however, contain many myths and legends which may be as old as, and even older than, the Védas; just as the scholia on Homer contain legends which, in one form or another, may be older than the Iliad or Odyssey. Other legends are clearly the late explanatory inventions of a superstitious priesthood, working on the old lines of mythological belief. . . .

In the Rig Veda human sacrifice has left its traces, but the practice chiefly endures in symbols and substitutes. Behind the Veda, earlier than the Veda, "nearer the beginning" than the Veda, was the age of human sacrifice. Wilson writes (H. VI, 59-63; I, xxiv,) that it is inferrible from some passages that "human sacrifices were not unknown, although infrequent." One famous story is accepted as proof that human sacrifice was, if not actually practised, at least a lively recollection of the religious spirit. Among other passages, a valuable example is found in the Satapatha Brähmana (Sacred Books of the East, vol. XII, p. 59). A cake is offered as a substitute for an animal "which, it would seem, was originally a substitute for the human sacrifice." "At first the gods," says the Satapatha Brähmana, "offered up a man as a victim." When he was offered up, the sacrificial essence went out of him. It entered into the horse, and thence into a number of animal victims. Finally, it entered the earth and was dug up in rice and barley, and therefore rice and barley cakes are now substituted for human and animal sacrifices. Similar substitutes for human sacrifice, "men of straw," are now offered by the Oraons, a wild tribe of India, and by other races. A curious vestige of human sacrifice is found in a famous hymn, the Ninetieth of the Tenth Book of the Rig Veda. The hymn tells us how all things were made out of the mangled limbs of a magnified non-natural man, Purusha. Now, whether this hymn be an ancient one or not, whether it be "near the beginning" or not, the legend which it relates is found among Scandinavians, Iroquois, Egyptians, Greeks and other races. Among these people the world, or great part of it, is constructed out of the mangled frame of a non-natural man or giant. Among the Vedic bards the man or god is Purusha; among the Iroquois he is Chokanipok; among the
Scandinavians he is Ymir; Omorcan among the Chaldeans; and the savage Tinnehs have their representative of Purusha. Among the Tinnehs not a man, but a dog, is the victim. The limbs of Set and Osiris in Egypt, of Dionysus Zagreus in Greece, of Ru in Mangais, were "utilized" in the manufacture of various plants, stones, animals and metals. We have never observed these coincidences noted by learned disputants as to the meaning of the myth of Purusha. The only peculiarity of the Vedic hymn is its ritual character. In the other stories the giants were sliced into component parts of the universe in a rude casual way, in the Purusha Sûkha the gods sacrifice Purusha with due attention to ritual. "These were the earliest rites," says the Rig Veda; and very nice rites they were, and uncommonly "near the beginning." Necessarily the ritual details must be later than the elaboration of sacrifice (whether that be late or early), but the general savage conception is a feature of the myths of very backward races in various parts of the world. Hang observes, and we partly agree with him, that "the ideas which the hymn contains are certainly of a primeval antiquity. In fact the hymn is found in the Yajur Veda among the formulae connected with human sacrifices, which were formerly practised in India. Were we to pursue the topic of cosmogonic myths among the Vedic people, it would be easy to show that Vishnu, when in the shape of a boar, brought up the world from the watery, was equivalent to the North American coyotes and musk-rats, who performed the same useful feat. The myth of the origin of species in the Satapatha Brûhmanas is "very curious and disgusting." Purusha was alone in the world. He differentiated himself into husband and wife; afterwards the woman reflected that Purusha was both her father and lord. Reasoning that their union was a crime, she assumed all manner of animal forms, and became in each shape the mother of a separate species. The animal metamorphoses and amatory pursuits of Zeus, Kronos, Demeter, Nemesis and other Greek gods are analogous to this singular story. In the Satapatha Brûhmanas the earth was only the size of a span. A boar called Ernuka fished it up. Here the myth recurs among the Navajoes, while the boar, as we have said, recalls the musk-rat of the Tacullies. He too, fishes up a fragment of soil, which grew into the earth as we know it. If the Brûhmanas are "near the beginning" of thought, they are also near the notions of the Tacullies and the Navajoes. Of course the Aryan mind has not been idle. When we find the Satapatha Brûhmanas declaring that all creatures are descended from a tortoise, we seem to be among the Indians of the North Pacific coast, or the Australians, who derive men from lizards. But when the tortoise is identified with Aditya, and when the Adityas prove to be solar deities, and when Aditi, their mother, is recognized as the Dawn, the Earth, or Attica (according to the interpretations of various scholars), then we perceive the superiority of Aryan fancy.

The gods in the Vedic religion are, on the whole, to be regarded as the usual departmental deities of Polytheism. They do not confine themselves to their departments, and now one, now another god is regarded as supreme for the moment; probably by a bard in whose clan that god received peculiar honour. The gods are, in many cases, nature gods; that is, Thunder, Fire, the Heaven and so forth, are worshipped as personal beings; and a god who directs thunder, or animates fire, or controls heaven, is next evolved in fancy. But it is a peculiarity of the savage imagination to regard the great powers and phenomena of nature not only as persons, but as savage persons. Now the savage draws no fixed line between himself and the other things, animate or inanimate, in the world. He, or at least his medicine man, may become a bird, beast or fish; may transform others into the same shape; may fly in the air; may influence the weather; may "milk the sky-cow," as the Zulus say, or "trap the Thunderbird," as Kaffirs and Red Men believe. Now when the savage worships Thunder, the Heaven, the Wind, or what not, he worships them as persons, and moreover as persons gifted with the power of transmigration and with the other accomplishments we have described. He "anthropomorphizes" the powers of nature, but the anthropomorphic shape in which he casts them is all unlike our civilized conception of what is anthropomorphic. He makes gods in what he conceives to be his own image, and a very old image it is. All people do the same. The ritualistic compilers of the Brûhmanas make their gods constantly engaged in sacrifice; always busy with ritual details that drive away the evil spirits; always engaged in magical austerities. But the conservatism of religion does not allow the Vedic believer, while he regards his gods as constantly occupied in ritual, to discard the older savage notions, according to which the gods behaved just like savage sorcerers. Consequently the Veda and the Brûhmanas often show us the gods in animal form fighting with animals, afraid of enemies (the Asuras), changing their foes into stars, and in other ways behaving just like the half-anthropomorphic and half-theriomorphic deities of the Australians, Hottentots, and Bushmen.
The origin of the gods is conceived of in various ways. Sometimes, as in Greek, Maori and Manganian myths, Heaven and Earth are regarded as two persons indissolubly united, who begat the gods, and were finally thrust apart by their own offspring, by Maui, or Kronos, or Indra. The gods are not naturally or necessarily immortal, any more than they are in Scandinavian mythology. They drink immortality from the charmed ocean of milk, or, in an earlier myth, they overcome death by means of certain sacrifices, much to the chagrin of death. Coming to individual gods, we find a legend about Indra which may or may not be "near the beginning" of religious thought, but which is painfully noted of the Hottentots, which are wild. "What god, O Indra, was present in the fray when thou didst slay thy father, seizing him by the foot?" asks a Vedic poet (R. V. IV, 18.12), quoted by Dr. Muir. To explain this Vedic text (which in itself is a little damaging), a passage from the Black Yajur Vêda is quoted. "Yajña desired Dakshiná, He consorted with her. Indra was apprehensive of this. He reflected, 'Whoever is born of her, will be this.' Having considered, he—took steps which caused Dakshiná to produce a cow. Thus the Rig Vêda observes (IV, 18.1): "His mother, a cow, bare Indra, an unlicked calf." Now Heitsi-Eibib, a god of the Namas, was also borne by a cow. "There was grass growing, and a cow came and ate of that grass, and she brought forth a young bull." This bull was Heitsi-Eibib (Hahn, Teut. Gimo: the Supreme Being of the Hottentots, p. 68). The Vêda and the "wild invocations of the Hottentots" are not so absolutely discrepant, then, in their accounts of the birth of gods. Indra is also said to be referred to in the Vêda as a Ram, "of which," says Wilson, "no very satisfactory explanation is given," though the Ram-god of ancient Egypt is familiar to all, and was worshipped (Herodotus, ii. 32), with rites precisely like those of the Buzzard among the Indians of California. The Ram, like the Buzzard, was sacred all the year; but on one solemn day the Ram, like the Buzzard, was sacrificed to himself. By an interesting coincidence, Indra, the Sheep, and the Khatatriya caste were all born at one moment from the breast and arms of Prajápati, as, in the Manganian myth, Tangerà was born from the arm of Papa. Whether such ideas are the birth of civilized thought, or are retained from a state of thought like that of Hottentots and Manganians of the past, it seems almost superfluous to inquire. According to a Vedic hymn, Indra cannot well have been a god from the beginning, for he "conquered heaven by austerity," a method of obtaining celestial promotion which is open to mortals. Indra was a great soma drinker. He once swigged thirty bowls of soma, though Dr. Haug, who has tried the liquor, could only manage one teaspoonful. According to Sâyana, Indra took the shape of a quill when he went for soma, as Odin was an eagle when he flew off into the mead, and Yehl (the Thinkeet god) was in a raven's shape when he stole the water. Indra's great feat was the slaughter of a serpent, which, like the frog in the Murri and Californian myths, had swallowed all the water. Indra also recovered some cows belonging to the gods which had been stolen.

It would take several articles to unfold all the seamy side of Vedic religion. We have merely touched on Indra; the chronique scandaleuse of his divine companions must be left untold, or told in a future essay. Suffice it to remark that as Racine says of the Greek gods, burning was too good for most of the Vedic deities, if we regard them in the seamy aspect of their legend. That lofty moral prayers are addressed to such creatures is a proof of the conservatism of religion, and of that moral advance by which men's ethical conceptions are always moving beyond the religious ideas bequeathed by their past experience. If any one wishes to see at a glance how much savage thought persisted till the age of the Brahmans, let him compare the myths of the constellations (Sâtapha Brâhmaṇa,—Sacred Books of the East, vol. XII, pp. 282-288), with the similar myths in Brough Smyth's Aborigines of Victoria, or with any collection of savage stellar myths which he may have at hand. The prize for ferocious license of puerile fancy must be given to the Brâhmaṇas. Max Müller says the contrast between the myths of real savages and those of Aryans is "strong," though "very difficult to explain." We think the chief difference is that the savage in this are told, sans phrase, by people to whom they still seem natural, while Aryans have sometimes added their ritualistic idea to the savage myths they retain, and have sometimes attempted to explain them away as allegories, or as founded on linguistic misconceptions. Except on the hypothesis that the Aryans came civilized into the world, they must have descended from savage ancestors. That they retained savage practices, such as human sacrifice and much worse things, is universally admitted. Why should they not have retained savage ideas in religion and mythology, especially as of savage ideas Aryan mythology and religion are full to the brim?"
THE Ilichpur Grant of Pravarasena II of Vākāṭaka.

BY DR. G. BÜHLER, C.I.E.

The subjoined grant of the Vākāṭaka king, Pravarasena II, was made over to me for translation by Dr. J. Burgess. A transcript of it, prepared by Pandit Bhagyvanlal Indrājī, has been published in Dr. Burgess' Notes on the Baudhāya Rock Temples of Ajañṭā, (Bombay 1879) p. 54, as well as some information regarding the place where it was found.

The grant is incised on seven small plates, measuring 7½ inches by 3½, which are held together by one ring with a plain round seal sliding on the ring. The first and last plates are inscribed on one side only, the blank side being turned outwards. Plates IIIa and IVa have six lines each, plate IVb four lines, and the remainder five each. The execution of the inscription is good, though the engraver has left out a few syllables. The preservation, too, is very fair. The alphabet resembles that of the Seoni grant (Jour. As. Soc. Beng. vol. V, p. 729 seqq.) and of the Ajañṭā inscriptions.¹ The little hollow square at the top of the letters which is so characteristic of the Vākāṭaka alphabet and of those used in other parts of the Central Provinces, is frequently represented in the Ilichpur grant by a regular 'nail-head.' To judge from the style of the letters the document belongs to the beginning of the fifth century A.D.

The language is not very grammatical Sanskrit. Half a dozen bad grammatical mistakes occur in the middle of the document, and towards the end in the list of names, the use of the case terminations is scant and irregular. The spelling is sometimes faulty, e.g. in Sakāiptopakapāta (IVa, l. 3) and the Sandhi rules receive little attention. The omissions and mistakes can, however, nearly all be supplied or corrected with the help of the Seoni plates which were engraved only a few months earlier, and copied from the same model form. Down to Pl. III a, l. 4 the text of both grants is almost literally the same.

On account of the close agreement of the two documents, especially in the historical portion, it might be expected that the publication of the Ilichpur Śāsana, would not, throw much new light on the history of the Vākāṭaka kings. That would, also, undoubtedly be the case if the Seoni grant had been edited carefully and translated correctly. But Prinsep's Pandits have unfortunately done their task in a very slovenly manner, and press of work seems to have prevented the illustrious epigraphist from checking them. Consequently the transcript abounds in misreadings, which seriously distort the historical information furnished by the grant, and it is not even quite complete. The translation is not better than the transcript. This circumstance, as well as the fact that very unsatisfactory attempts have been made to harmonise the information regarding the Vākāṭakas furnished by the Ajañṭā Inscription in Cave XVI, with the statements of the two grants, induce me to give here a short summary of the historical facts known about the Vākāṭakas.

Vākāṭaka, a word which unfortunately does not admit easily of an etymological explanation, is both the name of a country and of the Rājput tribe governing it. In the latter sense it is used in the frequently recurring phrase of the two grants, 'the great king of the Vākāṭakas (Vākāṭakānām mahaṛāja), in the epithet 'the ornament or chief of the Vākāṭakas,' given to Pravarasena II, on the seal of the two grants, and in the expression 'the banner of the Vākāṭaka race' (vākāṭakavākṣaketa, Ajañṭā inscr. I. 3). It denotes a place in the compound Pavaraṭṭa-Vākāṭaka, the name of a village to the north of Brahmapūra (read pura), mentioned in the Seoni grant. The position of the kingdom of the Vākāṭakas is fixed partly by the sites where the two grants have been found and partly by geographical names mentioned in the inscriptions. The Ilichpur grant was found 'seven or eight miles south of Ilichpur,' in the northern corner of the Berar. It is quite clear that the modern village of Chāmmanāk is the representative of the ancient Chārmanāk, con-

¹ Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. vol. VI, p. 53 seqq.; and by Dr. Burgess, Cave Temple Inscriptions (Bombay, 1880, p. 69). See Archaeological Reports, vol. IV.—The Baudhāya Temples and their Inscriptions, pp. 124ff., and plates. This paper will also be found in the same volume, pp. 116-124.

² The 'square' has been cut out with a small chisel, and the copper driven down from it partially overlaps the upper part of the stem of the letter, rendering it very difficult to obtain a satisfactory facsimile.—En. I. A.
veyed by the Śāsana to 'one thousand Brāhmaṇas of various schools and families.' For according to the strict laws of the ancient Prākrits Charmānka would become Chāmmanka, to which the present name comes very near. The identification of the village of Charmānka permits us to infer that the Ilichpur district corresponds with the province (rāthra) of Bhojaśa or that the river Madhū, on which Charmānka lay, is one of the tributaries of the Pūrṇā. In the case of the second grant, which was found at Seoni, half way between Nagpur and Jabalpur, I am not in a position to identify on the maps at my disposal any of the villages named. But the document contains an allusion to the Beṇagaṇa, (Waingāna on the maps) which flowing southwards falls into the Paingāna. It is found in the word which Prinsep's Pāndita have read Ernākēryavaratāga and have failed to explain. The facsimile gives very plainly Bernākēryvarbahāgya 'in the portion called Bernākērparāra.' It is possible that the reading is correct. But as bhāga is not often used for a territorial division, I should prefer to change it to bhoga, which like bhūkṣa can denote an Inām district or a zilla, and in the Koshas is given as an equivalent of rājya. Karpary which is evidently a Taddhita formation derived from karparā, a 'skull,' 'Udumbara tree,' etc. can have various meanings. Perhaps the whole compound might be translated 'in the district on the Bernā where the Udumbara trees grow.' But however this may be, the word Bernā occurs and can refer only to the Beṇagaṇa; (compare also Krishnavernā which is sometimes used for Krishnaveṇī). Under these circumstances General Cunningham's proposal to fix the boundaries of the kingdom of the Vākāṭakas approximatively between the Mahādeva hills on the north, the Godāvari on the south, the Ajaṃṭā hills on the west, and the sources of the Mahākuda on the east may be accepted. The Ilichpur grant gives the name of the capital as Pravarapura, evidently called so in honour of one of the two Pravarasenas. General Cunningham feels certain that the modern Bhandak must have been the ancient capital of the Vākāṭakas, and seems to be inclined to derive the former name from the latter. If Bhandak is correctly spelt with an initial Bh, it cannot have any etymological connexion with Vākāṭaka. But, in case it could be shown that Bhandak is the correct form, or that Bhandak had another more ancient name, the identification might perhaps stand.

According to the two land grants, the pedigree of the Vākāṭaka kings is as follows:

1. Pravarasena I.

Gautamiputra, married to daughter of the great king Bhavanāga Bhāraśīva.

2. Rudrasena I.

3. Prithivishena.

4. Rudrasena II, married to Prabhavatigupta, daughter of the great king of kings, Devagupta.

5. Pravarasena II.

The whole dynasty belonged to the Vishnuvydhagotra. According to Baudhāyana's Gṛotapravaramānyaya the Vishnuvydhas are a subdivision of the Brāhuḍvājas, and a Brahmanical family. It does, however, not necessarily follow that the Vākāṭakas were Brāhmanas. For, according to the compilations on gotras, it was the practice of royal families to be affiliated to the Vedic gotra of their domestic chaplain.

As regards the history of the individual princes, we learn regarding Pravarasena I, that he offered a good many Śrāuta-sacrifices. The fact that Asvamedhas or horse-sacrifices were among their number, and the title samrāj, 'universal king' which he assumes, show conclusively that he was independent, and did not owe allegiance to a paramount power. His reign was probably a long one, as he survived his son. If I am right in assigning the two land grants on epigraphic evidence to the middle of the 5th century A.D., Pravarasena I must have ascended the throne about 300 A.D. For, as Pravarasena II is the fifth descendant of the first king, and twenty-five to twenty-six years are the duration of an Indian generation, the interval between the two Pravarasenas is 125 to 130 years.

Pravarasena's son Gautamiputra died, as already stated, before his father. For the

---

2 Sconi grant, pl. IIIr, 11-12.
4 Weber, Cat. Berl. MSS, p. 60.
fact that he receives no title of any kind, and that he is only incidentally mentioned in the paragraph referring to his son, shows that he did not actually rule. The name given to him is not his real proper name, but a metronymic, which designates him as the child of a wife of Pravarasena I, who belonged to the Gautama gotra. General Cunningham has published my remarks on the use of metronymics by the ancient princes of India, and has given his adhesion to my explanation which is based on the observation of the practice still prevailing among the Rājpūts. Gautamiputra, it appears, made a great marriage, and obtained the daughter of the Bhrāśīva king Bhavanāga for his wife. The epithets applied to the Bhrāśīva clan give a punning explanation of the name which is derived from their having carried Śiva's emblem as a load (bhrā) on their shoulders, and show that their seat lay to the north of the Vākātakaś on the Ganges (Bhagirathī). Possibly the Bhrāśīvas are the same as the Bhrā Rājpūts.

Regarding Rudrasena I, nothing is stated except that he was an ardent devotee of the Lord Mahābhūtara, or in other words a Śāiva who worshipped Śiva in his form as Bhairava. This reticence and the circumstance that the preceding and following reigns were long ones, make it probable that he sat on the throne for a short time only. His reign probably fell between 340–350 A. D.

About Rudrasena's son, Prithivishēna, who also was a worshipper of Śiva (atyantānādēśvara), the grants say that “his treasures, means of government and line, increased during a hundred years, and that he had sons and grandsons.” The correct explanation of this phrase seems to be that he ruled for a long time and saw his sons and grandsons grow up. The expression ‘a hundred years’ must not, of course, be taken literally. His reign probably lasted up to the end of the fourth century, or about 350–400.

Prithivishēna's son, Rudrasena II, seems to have forsaken the creed of his forefathers and to have chosen Vishṇu as his ishṭadevātā. For the grants say that “he obtained great prosperity through the favour of divine Chakrāpāṇi.” He was married to Prabhāvatiguptā, the daughter of the great king of kings Devagupta. The title given to Devagupta shows that he must have been a greater man than the Vākātakaś king. It is unfortunately hopeless to speculate at present on the question where his dominions lay. I would only warn against the assumption that every ancient king whose name ends in gupta must necessarily be a member of the so-called Gupta dynasty which ruled in the third and fourth centuries over a great part of Central and Western India. The real name of that family is not as yet known, and it can be shown that there have been princes unconnected with them, whose names ended in gupta. Rudrasena II probably reigned for a few years only, and his end may be placed about 415 A. D.

His son Pravarasena II again returned to the Śāiva creed, as he receives the epithet paramaṇādēśvara, and is said to have been a prince worthy of the Kṛitayuga ‘through the favour of Śambhu.’ Both the grants are dated in his eighteenth year, the Senā inscription in the month Pālghuna (February–March) and the Ilīchpur grant in the month Jyesṭha (May–June). On the former the Senāpatis Bāppādeva* is mentioned, and on the latter the Senāpatis Khatravarn. It seems to me improbable that Pravarasena had in the course of a few months two different commanders-in-chief. I think that the term senāpati rather denotes here the commander of the troops in the district where the village granted lay, and should be translated by ‘military governor.’ As Čharmāṅka (Channak) was situated in the province of Bhōjakata and Brahmaṇāra in Karanjaviratata, two different persons would naturally be employed.

It now remains to discuss the contents of the mutilated inscription in the Veranda of Cave XVI at Ajanta. Mr. Bhāḍ Dāji, who first gave a tolerably accurate facsimile and transcript of this document* as well as of the other Ajanta inscriptions, was of opinion (p. 66) that it named Vindhyāśakti as the first prince of the Vākātaka race, that it contained besides the names of the two Pravarasenas, and of Devasena the son of the Pravarasena II. He assumed that the name of Rudrasena I, Čhārmanḍa, and Rudrasena II

---

* See Barbot’s Index, p. 129.
* So the facsimile; the transcript gives erroneously Nāpyadeva and the translation Bappādeva.
had been lost. He further conjectured that the Vindhyāsakti mentioned in this inscription, was identical with the chief of the Kailakila Yavana, mentioned in the Purāṇas, and that Pravira (according to him Pravara) whom the Vayupurāṇa makes Vindhyāsakti's son, was the same as Pravarasena I. He finally ventured to propose the derivation of the name Kailakila from that of Gahlghaleh near Bāmian, and to assume that the Vākāṭakas had migrated thence into Southern India, bringing with them the art of excavating caves.

The remarks prefixed to Pandit Bhavānlāl Indrajil's improved transcript and translation, (Notes, pp. 64-65) are much more correct and free from the extravagant views which disfigure Mr. Bhāḍ Dājī's speculations. It is stated there that the list of kings supplied by the inscription is as follows:—

1. Vindhyāsakti,
2. Pravarasena,
3. (Rudr)rasena (?)
4. 
5. Devasena,
6. Harishena,

and that the connexion between Nos. 1 and 2 is not clear. It is further correctly pointed out that the inscription does not proceed from a Vākāṭaka king, but from Varahadeva, the minister of Harishena.

According to my restoration and interpretation of the Ajañṭa inscription11 the Vākāṭakas named therein are:—

1. Vindhyāsakti,
2. Pravarasena I,
3. Rudrasena I,
4. Prithivisheha,
5. Pravarasena II,
6. a son, (name lost),
7. Devasena,
8. Harishena.

The mutilation of the document makes it impossible to determine if Pravarasena I was Vindhyāsakti's son or a remoter descendant. But I think the former opinion, which Mr. Bhāḍ Dājī first expressed, the more likely one. The only real discrepancy between the historical contents of the plates and those of my version of the Ajañṭa inscription is that in the latter Rudrasena II has been left out. This omission may be owing to mere carelessness on the part of Varahadeva who served under Rudrasena's fourth descendant, or to the idea that Rudrasena II, whose reign was a short one, was not worth mentioning. However that may be, as the Ajañṭa inscription, according to my interpretation, gives one earlier and three later generations than the land grants, I arrange the Vayuśvali of the Vākāṭakas as follows:—

Kings. Accession.
1. Vindhyāsakti, about 275 A.D.
2. Pravarasena I, son of No. 1 (?) about 300.
3. Rudrasena I, grandson of No. 2, about 335.
4. Prithivisheha, son of No. 3, about 350.
5. Rudrasena II, son of No. 4, about 400.
6. Pravarasena II, son of No. 5, about 410.
7. (Rudr)rasena III, son of No. 6, about 440.
8. 
10. Harishena, son of No. 8, about 490.
11. Harishena, son of No. 9, about 515 A.D.

In conclusion I warn once more against the identification of Vindhyāsakti Vākāṭaka with the Kailakila Yavana Vindhyāsakti. For firstly the Ajañṭa inscription, vs. 2, states distinctly that the former was a 'distinguished Arya,' (dvija prakāśa) while the latter, according to the Purāṇas, was a foreigner (not necessarily a Greek). Secondly, not a single other name of the Kailakilal dynasty agrees with those of the Vākāṭakas. Mr. Bhāḍ Dājī never furnished the proof that any copy of the Vayu or of any other Purāṇa has the name Pravara. All those MSS. which Professor H. H. Wilson, Dr. Hall, and myself have consulted give Pravira.

Transcript.

Plate I.

(*) ओ ओ स्त्रि पत्रपुरा रतिरियोताप्रयोगमेववे स्वश्चतिरित।
(9) वानपथूल्स्तितसास्त्राक्रंचचुरोश्चप्रयाजितः

10 Vishayupurāṇa, (ed. Hall), vol. IV, pp. 202-211.
11 See Dr. Burgess' Archaeological Reports, vol. IV, p. 125.
Plate IIa.

Plate IIb.

Plate IIIa.

Plate IIIb.

14 L. 4, read "कस्मिन्द्र विशेष". L. 5, read "स्वयंभुवनम्".
18 IIb, l. 1, read "स्वयंभुवनम्". L. 3, read "स्वयंभुवनम्".
Plate VI b.

(1) गतस्तदार्या भार्त्तमवार्य सच्चार्या अंद्रस्तदार्या—

(2) "गौमस्वसाधार्यं समस्यां मनाय कया कार्यां मातुः

(3) शार्मिक्य ब्रह्मसमाजाय ब्राह्मणाय राजनाय—

Plate VII.

(4) "गौमस्वसाधार्यं समस्यां मनाय कया कार्यां मातुः

(5) ज्ञेयसामाज्याय शारिरक्स्यकु मारसामाज्याय शािरामाज्याय

(6) शािरामाज्याय छोड़यात्मकु मारसामाज्याय सेनापति

(7) सधारण संस्कारादेहि १८ ज्ञेयसामाज्याय

(8) पेक्षाप्रायस्यां लिखितापि

Seal.

वक्ताकलामस्य
कुसङ्गतप्रत्ययः
राजः प्रवंशस्य
शासनं रिच्चासानं

Translation.

Om, Om, hail; from Pravara pura.

By command of the illustrious Pravara sena, the great king of the Vākāṭakaś, the ardent devotee of Mahēśvarā, who, through the possession of Śambhu's favour, is (a ruler) worthy of the Kṛitayoga, who was born by Prabhāvatigūpta, the daughter of the great king of kings Devagupta (and who is) the son of the illustrious Rudrasena, the great king of the Vākāṭakaś, who gained great prosperity through the favour of divine Chakrapāṇi (and who was) the son of the illustrious Prithivishāṇa, the great king of the Vākāṭakaś, who behaved like Yudhiṣṭhira, whose treasure, means of government and line increased during a hundred years, and who had sons and grandsons, who was gifted with such excellent qualities as truthfulness, uprightness, mercy, heroism, bravery, political wisdom, modesty, high-mindedness, intelligence, devotedness to worthy men and

82 VII, l. 2, read śrāmāṁśē bhūtyā.
83 VII, l. 1, read śrāmāṁśē. L. 3, read śrāmāṁśē.
84 Though the two signs look somewhat like dhrīṣṭu or dṛṣṭā, I think they cannot be read otherwise than I have done. For an answer is plainly visible either of the two syllables. There are, further, among the numerous varieties of the letter o, some which are similar to those here employed. Finally it is not uncommon practice on Sanskrit inscriptions to place two Oṃkāras at the head, and to use a different form for each, see e.g., the facsimile of the Iqniqā śāsana Int. Ant. vol. V, p. 56. The beginning of the Seoni plates (J.R.A.S. Beng. vol. V, p. 729) is according to Prings's facsimile, O, Om, middam. The two small marks are so called ardhamakāra and mark, as is normal in the Gupta and other old inscriptions, the vowelless final o.
85 The peculiar construction of the text makes it necessary to give the description of the last king first. The corresponding Sanskrit passage occurs, Plate IIIa, L. 2, and those who wish to control the translation have to go backwards from that point.

86 Prings's transliteration and translation of the Seoni plates give sthāne in the place of for śrīnāḥ 'the son of.' But the facsimile has the latter reading (plate IIIb, l. 2).
87 Prings again reads and translates sthāne. His facsimile (Plate IIIb, l. 1) reads śrīnāḥ bhāguṇa, omitting the r above bhā.
88 The compound abhāsāvyadhāyādūdāsaśādūdāsasūdūpapratīcīsa consists of two adjectives, which both refer to the king: abhāsāvyadhāya, abāśādūdāsaśādūpapratīcīsa. It is possible to take abāśādūdāsaśādūpanapratīcīsa has been assumed to be a tātpurāna compound as a danda. Prings's transliteration gives wrongly sanskāra for sanskāra, while his facsimile has sanskāra.
89 It is worthy of note that the Seoni plates have exactly the same mistakes as ours. The facsimile reads māndūryadāsāsādūdāsasūddūnāpaptībhaktī, which the transcript erroneously renders by māndūryadāsāsādūdāsasūddūnāpaptībhaktī, which I have given my corrections above. Prings, which I substitute for Māra, means 'a worthy person,' and especially a Bhāma worthy to receive gifts. The
guests, ability of making righteous conquests, and purity of mind, who was an ardent devotee of Mahaëvara (and) the son of the illustrious Rudrasena, the great king of the Vâkâtâkas (who was)\(^{29}\) the son of Gautamiputra (and) the daughter’s son of Bhavânâga the great king of the Bharasiyas—who bathed after the celebration of ten horse-sacrifices, whose heads were sprinkled with the pure water of the Bhagirathi, obtained by their valour,\(^{31}\) and whose royal line was produced by Siva exceedingly pleased with their carrying in a procession his linga that had been placed as a burden on their shoulders—who (viz. Rudrasena) was exceedingly devoted to the Lord Mahábhairava (and who was)\(^{32}\) the son’s son\(^{33}\) of the illustrious Pravarasena, the great king of the Vâkâtâkas, a universal ruler, who belonged to the gotra of Vishnuvaridhha and offered an Agnishtoma sacrifice, an Áptoryâna, an Ukthya, a Shoçâsin, an Átrâtra, a Vâjapeya, a Bhishamatisava, a Sâdyaskra and four horse-sacrifices,\(^{34}\) at the request of prince Koñjärâja, the destroyer of his foes, the village called Chârmâna (situated) in the kingdom of Bhöjakâta on the bank of the river Matrâ (and containing) eight thousand (8,000) bhâmis\(^{35}\) measured by the royal measuring-rod, has been given to one thousand Brahmapas belonging to various families and schools.

Wherefore\(^{36}\) our obedient noblemen and our officers who are appointed to the office of general overseers, (our) soldiers and umbrella-bearers, should be given the (following) order preceded by (the word) viśruta\(^{37}\) (famous):

Be it known to you that, in order to increase our spiritual merit, life, strength, conquests and rule, for the sake of our welfare in this and the next worlds (in fact) in order to benefit ourselves (the above mentioned village) has been given, at our victorious office of justice,\(^{38}\) as a new donation, (the act of giving) being preceded by a libation of water.

Now we grant, (as) appropriate for this (village) the charter of a village inhabited by Brahmapas versed in the four Vedas, such as has been approved of by former kings. That is as follows: "(The village) shall be free from taxes, it shall not be entered by soldiers or parasol-bearers . . . it shall not furnish flowers and milk . . . . it shall be free from all obligation of furnishing forced labour, it is granted the rights\(^{39}\) of treasure-troye and of (keeping unclaimed) deposits . . . . it has been granted for as long a time as the moon and sun endure, and shall descend to the sons and grandsons (of the donors). Nobody shall cause hindrance to them while they enjoy it. It shall be protected by all means and be made to prosper. And him, who disregarding this edict, even slightly annoys (the donors) or causes them to be annoyed, we will fine and (otherwise) punish, if he is denounced by the Brahmapa (proprietore)."

"And in this document\(^{40}\) which procures at least spiritual merit we do not mention the care and protection bestowed (by us) on grants made by various former kings, in order to avoid boasting of meritorious actions performed (by us)."

\(^{29}\) Prinsep’s transcript of the Sceni plates omits by mistake the end of II a, 1.1 and the whole of 1.2. His translation is one series of mistakes.

\(^{30}\) Prinsep’s transcript gives wrongly sthánamsthānā. 

\(^{31}\) The correct text of the translation of the beginning of the compound atihashāravânvkâsîhâtitaśvatâdhyogahnâhmanvâganvânâkausmukhapradaññapāragârāvânâkam is attested by the various readings of the facsimile of the Sceni plates annexed to Prinsep’s transcript. Prinsep’s transcript gives wrongly vihâranvāhanvâkausmukhapradaññapāragârāvânâkam.

\(^{32}\) It is just possible that the construction in this passage is ungrammatical, and that the king means to say “All our overseas, officials, obedient noblemen, persons in authority, etc.—Ohdutha, ‘umbrella-bearer’ includes probably the whole host of menial servants attached to the court.

\(^{33}\) I am unable to refer to any passage where the title viśruta is given to Râjās. For Brahmapas the title viçkaphâna, ‘learned’ is prescribed.

\(^{34}\) Dharmañthinâ is, more accurately speaking, not only the ministry of justice, but the office where all business relating to justice, spiritual matters and charities is transacted.

\(^{35}\) The right of treasure-troye is guaranteed to learned Brahmapas by the Smriti, see e.g. Vasishtha, III, 14. Deposits, the owner of which cannot be found, go according to the Smriti like all unclaimed property to the king. From the above passage it would appear that kings usually relinquished this right in Agarharas.

\(^{36}\) It includes probably the whole host of menial servants attached to the court.

\(^{37}\) Prinsep’s transcript gives wrongly sthánamsthānā.

\(^{38}\) For analogous cases of grants being made at the request of a third person, a feudal baron, see Inser. from Nepal No. 9 (J. Ant. vol IX, p. 172).

\(^{39}\) Sthāna must here be a technical term, and denotes a particular measure of land.
"And with respect to this matter two verses, sung by Vyāsa, must be acknowledged as authoritative (by our successors):

(1). 'He who resumes land given by himself etc.'

(2). 'The giver of land rejoices etc.'

And the conditions (of) this charter must be observed both by the Brāhmaṇas and by the (future) rulers (of the country). That is as follows: the king shall allow (the village to be held) by the Brāhmaṇas as long as moon and sun endure, if they do not commit treason against his government which consists of seven essential parts, and if they are not guilty of offences of slaying Brāhmaṇas, committing theft, adultery, or acts prejudicial to the king, (or) engage in frays with other villages. (But if the king takes the land from those who act otherwise, he will not) be guilty of theft."

And the donees appointed here for the occasion (are): Gaṅga, a Śātyāyana; Devārya, a Vātsyya; Kumāraśārmārya, a Bhrāradvāj; Gunaśārmārya, a Pārāśārya; Devārya, Maheśvara (and) Mātrāya (three) Kāśyapas; Rudrārya, Somārya (and) Hāriśārmārya, (three) Kuṇḍīnyas; Kumāraśārmārya, a Bhrāradvāj; Mātrāsārmārya, Varnaśārmārya, Gunaśārmārya, Nāgaśārmārya, (four) Kuṇḍīnyas; Śantiśārmārya (and) Rudrāsārmārya, (two) Bhrāradvāj; Bhogaka-devārya, Maghaśārmārya, and Devaśārmārya, (three) Vātsyya; Mokshāsārmārya, Nāgaśārmārya, Revaśīrmārya, (and) Dharmaśīrmārya, (four) Bhrāradvāj; Śarmaśīrmārya, Nandānārya, Mūnśārmārya, Iśvaraśārmārya (and) Varnaśārmārya, (five) Bhrāradvāj; Skandaśīrmārya, a Vātsyya; Bapārāya (and) Dharmaśīrmārya, (two) Bhrāradvāj; Skandaśīrmārya, an Ātreya; Somaśārmārya, Bhrātriśārmārya, Rudraśārmārya, Mahāpārāya, Mātrāsārmārya (and) Iśvaraśārmārya, (six) Gautamās; Mahāśīrmārya of the Gauṭama family; Devaśīrmārya, Varnaśīrmārya and Rohārṣaṇa, (three) Kuṇḍīnyas; Svāmidevārya, Revaśīrmārya, and Jyesṭhāśīrmārya, of the Gauṭama family; Kuṇḍīnyas; Varnaśīrmārya (and) Śvāmidevārya, (two) Śāṇḍilyas; Kuṇḍīnyas, a Śātyāyana; and so forth.

This edict has been written while Khaṭravān was commander-in-chief (send-pati) in the eighteenth (18th) year on the thirteenth day of the bright half of the month Jyesṭhā.

Seal.

An order of king Pravaraśena, who is the ornament of the Vākṣṭaka (race), and has obtained his royal dignity by inheritance, is an order (even) for his enemies.

SANSKRIT AND OLD-CANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

By J. F. Fleet, Esq., C.S., M.R.A.S.

(Continued from p. 225).

No. CXXXIII.

Indra IV. appears to have had two sons. Such, at least, seems to be the inference to be drawn from the verse commencing in line 23 of the present inscription, in which Gōvinda V.2 is described as displaying no forbidden cruelty towards his elder brother. The name of that elder brother, however, is not given in this inscription, or in any other that has yet come to notice; and, from the expression used, the probability is that he was either weak in intellect or feeble in body, and was quietly set aside in favour of his younger brother Gōvinda V.

The present inscription is re-edited by me from the original plates, which belong to Rao
Bhādūr Wāmanrao Pitāmbar Chitpūs, of Sāwanto-wādi. It was originally published by General Sir George LeGrand Jacob, in the Jour. Ba. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. IV, pp. 100 ff.; and the plates belonged then to a Brāhmaṇ family residing near Sāngīlī. That, therefore, must be the part of the country in which the grant was originally discovered; and it is usually known as the Sāngīlī plates. The plates are three in number, each about 13" long by 9" broad; and the inscription is arranged on them in such a way that they turn over like the pages of an English book. The plates are quite smooth, with the exception of here and there a slight unintentional depression near the edge,—the edges being neither fashioned thicker, nor raised into rims; the inscription, however, is in perfect preservation throughout. The ring on which they are strung is a plain ring, about ½" thick and 4½" in diameter; it had been cut and soldered again before the grant came into my hands. It may not be the original ring; or it may have had some image or seal attached to it, which has been removed: General Jacob, however, does not mention any such. The weight of the three plates and the ring is 13 lbs. 3 oz. The language of the inscription is Sanskrit throughout.

This inscription is the first that allocates the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family to the lineage of the Yadus or Yādavis; Paṇḍiit Bhagwānlī Indrajīl considers this to be a late invention, of about the time of this grant, and to have been made to account for the change of the emblem on the Rāṣṭrakūṭa seals, from originally a lion, to Garuda, the emblem of Vishnū, from whom the family of the Yadus or Yādavis started. It has been already noted that Jagattūrga II. married Lakshmī, the daughter of Rānavigrāha, who was the son of Kakkola or Kakkola I., of the family of the Kalachuries or Kulachuries of Tripura or Tewar. And we also learn from the present inscription that his son Indra IV. married Dvījāmbī, whose father was Ammaṇa, the son of Arjuna, another son of the same Kakkola or Kakkola I. The sons of Indra IV. and Dvījāmbī were Gōvinda V., and his unnamed elder brother.

In the description of Gōvinda V., it is said that the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā did service to his palace. This, of course, is only a figurative expression, as Gōvinda's capital and palace must have been far away from those rivers. But the allusion appears to me to be of the same kind as the statement in No. CXXVII. above, that Gōvinda III. took away the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā from his enemies, and acquired insignia of royalty in the form of those two rivers. As I pointed out then, there is evidently, in the case of Gōvinda III., a distinct allusion to some victory over the Chalukyas, whether Western or Eastern, among whose insignia were the banners or signs of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā. And the Chalukyas would seem to have acquired these two insignia by some early conquest of the Gupta; for, one of the most striking characteristics of the Gupta style of architecture is the statues of the river-goddesses Gaṅgā and Yamunā, guarding the entrance-doors of their temples. It is pretty clear, therefore, that the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā must have been among the insignia of the Gupta; and that the Chalukyas derived them—whether directly, or indirectly, remains to be discovered—from the Gupta.

The present inscription gives Gōvinda V. the titles of Suvarṇavara II. and Vallabharāṇa II. And in the same passage it speaks of Indra IV. under the title of Nityavarsha I.

The inscription is dated Śaka 855 (A.D. 933-4.), the Vijaya samvatāra, on Thursday the full-moon day of the month Śrāvaṇa. And it records a grant of the village of Lāḥagāra, in the Rāmapuri Seven-hundred circle of villages, to a Brāhmaṇ named Kēśavādikā, of the Kauśika gōtra, who, or whose father, had come from the city of Puṇḍarikāha. This city must be the Paṇḍu-faṭ’u-na, of Hiwen Thsang, which M. Stanislas Julien rendered by Paṇḍravardhana, and which General Cunningham identified originally with Pūna or Pōna, on the Ganges, in

* About twenty-four miles in a north-easterly direction from Kālīpura.
* He is of opinion that the principal emblem on the seals of No. CXXXI. (Vol. XI. pp. 156 ff.), No. CXXXIII. (id. pp. 125 ff.), No. CXXXV. (id. pp. 155 ff.), and No. CXXVII. (pp. 158 ff. above), is Garuda, and not Śiva.

* For General Cunningham's genealogy of this dynasty, see Archaeological Survey of India, Vol. IX. p. 83.
* General Cunningham: Archæol. Surv. of Ind., Vol. X. p. 50. So also we have them in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa temple of Kailāsa at Ellora.

* See note 22 below.
Bengal, but has since then been identified with Mahāsthān, on the Kāratayā, seven miles to the north of Bogra in Northern Bengal.

I have another inscription of Gōvinda V., dated Śaka 851 for 852 (A.D. 930-1), the Vikrita evavatara, at the time of an eclipse of the moon on Sunday the full-moon day of the month Māgha,—from Kāla, in the Bābākōpūr Tālikā of the Dvārakā District. In this inscription, he is called Gōjiga dēva, and has also the titles of Nṛpatisūya, II., Vīra-Nārāyaṇa, and Raṣṭa-Kandarpa. And an Eastern Chalukya grant, the original plates of which belong to Sir Walter Elliot, mentions the defeat by Bhillamāla II., who reigned from about Śaka 845 to Śaka 857, of a Rāṣṭrakūṭa force sent against him by Gōvinda V. It is therein said of Bhima II. (II. 34-8):

Śrīmantaṁ Rājamañjyan-Dhā(?)va jagam-uru-
taran-Tātabikkhiṁ prashāṇḍa[? in*]
Bijjaṁ sa[a(?)]ṁ ca yuddhā baliṁam-atita-
rām-Ayyapaṁ bhīmaṁ-uraṁ
danḍaṁ Gōvinda-dārāja-praṇīhitam-adhikāṁ Čho-
a-pānī Lōvabikkhiṁ
vīkṛti[n*] Yuddhamallaṁ ghaṭita-gaja-ga-
ṭāṁ(s)-saṁghita-saikā eva

"Having, unaided, slain the glorious Rāja-
maya, (and) the mighty Dvārāga, (and) the fierce Bijja, and Ayyapa who was (always) ready and was exceedingly powerful in war, (and) the terrible and fierce army that was despatched by Gōvinda dārāja, (and) the great Lōva bikkī, the ruler of the Čhōjas, (and) the valorous Yuddhamala, (and his) drawn-up arrays of elephants, * * * * * * * * * [this king Śrī-Bhillama protected the whole earth for twelve years.]"

Transcription.12

First plate.

1. Ōm [I*] Jayaṁti Vra(bra)ṁhaṇaṁ sargga-nipati-mudit-ātmaneḥ Sarasvatī-kṛ(?) t
ānāhā madhurāṁ-sāma-gitaṁ ||
Tārā-chakṛ-āvja(bya)-

2. saḥd-āvraṁ-gaganaṁ-adharaṁ-padmint-rājanaṁ- || -t[t*]a-ilōkyo-aikādhapatiya-svita-Madana-

3. mahāraṁ-savihbhr(bh)-āttraptraṁ || -d=vaṁsah Śomād-
yah = tribhuvana-kāmal-āva-

4. saudhā=upetaṁ || Tasmāch-chariyatā kula-griham bhavānā mahīmnā mahī-

5. saṁpadāṁ svit-mahardhī-gabhgaṁānām ||

6. śapna-saivita-paripālaṁ-ladavha(dha)-kṛttir-vvāṁbo va(ba)bhuva bhuvī simhā-nibhā

7. YaY beneficiaries para-manvatalah kalā-

8. vān-pravitaṁ-v(a)(ba)hula-yāsō-mān-pūrīt-āśā || śaśadharā iva Dantindrāga-rājō

9. Yadukula-yāmam viyataṁ =saḥ=ōdīyā

10. [y] a || Tasyādyaṁ nīrapatē pitriyā udāyī śrī-vira-simhaṁ sakāna

11. śrīvī ravi-vachya ravi-vachya Chhīr-

12. Āśrū-aṁaṁ tataṁ || dvāst-ōdrī(ḍri)ka-Chalukya-vāsā-timiraṁ prithvi-bhūtāṁ

13. mastaṁaṁ yasāt-āṭaṁ sakāna

14. jagat-pravitaṁ=tejōhīrī=ākraṁtavān ||
Tasmāc-Gōvinda-rājō=bhūḍ=indu-vimva-silatālē

15. yasyāṛī,

16. plōha-dhūrō-śkaṁ praṁśāt-iva lakṣ[a*]tē || Tasyābhihavā =bhuvana-pālana-

17. vīra-va(ba)bhuva-vuddhā-sāttraṁ(tru) kula-saṁtātir=iddhatējaṁ

18. rājānūjō Nirupam-aṁ-gadadhāyō yan-mudraya=āṅyuv(bu)bhir-apī prathitaṁ sa-
mudraṁ || Tad-ann Jagatūtunāṇa jani pari,

19. hṛita-nīja-sakala-mahāl-ābhōgāḥ gata-yavuna-vanitājana-kuchā-sadṛṣaṁ yasya vairi-

nīpaṁ || Tasmāch-śrī-

---


* He would seem, therefore, to be the (Gujiya or Gojjiga who is mentioned by the poet Pampa in the Pratishṭā of his Vīramudrājāśāstraṇija or Pampa-Bhārata, see Mr. Rice, in the Jour. R. As. Soc. N.S., Vol. XIV. pp. 19 ff.; also Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 37, note 1.

12 Conf. 1. 36 of the present inscription.
13 The predecessor of Bhima II.
14 From the original plates.
tóy-vyájéd=visuddhaṁ yasa iva nihitaṁ tajja-
[15] gat-tuṅga-sindhu | Tasmād=Akalavarsro nripatir=abhid=yat-parakrama-ttra(tr)staih
sadyaḥ sa-mahávalagrhaṁ khetakaṁ=aḥi
[16] tāṭh paritaktaṁ | Sahasrájñuna-vaññasya bhúshaṁ Kakkal-ātmajā | tasya=
ābhava-mahádevī Jagattunga-

Second plate ; first side.

[17] =tatō jani | Gumbhirad=ratna-nidhér=bhúbhrit-pratipakṣa-rakshaṇa-kshamataḥ | Kakkala-suta-Rañaviraha-jaladhāra=Lilakśamih sa-
[18] mutpamā | Sā jáy=ājáyat=ājátaśatrō(trō)=tasya mahbhujāḥ Bhimasēn-Ārjun.
opatta=yaśo-bhúshaṇa-śālīnāṁ |
ūditō=jani vijayā rāja-mārtandaḥ | Sthiṣi-cha-
animisha-darsāya-yogyā
yah satyaṁ-iṁ=Emdrā rāja atī | Yasa=tasmān=Daśakaṁśha-
[21] darppa-dalane Śrī-Haivayānāṁ kulō Kokkallāḥ pratiṇādōt-sya cha guṇa-jiyē(jyō)aṭhō=
Rjūnō bhūd=tūtah | tat-pruttūr(trō)=Munand.evā12 ity=stiva=(ba).
[22] las-tasmā=[D*]vijayun(mub)=ābhavat=Padmēvā dvāvum(bu)niddhēr=Ume=eva
Himavan-
nāmōḥ kshamābhrit-prabhōḥ | Śrī-Indra-nārendrā=tasyāṁ śūnāṁ abhūd=
bhūpāreatr=Dv-
[23] jaṅvā(ba)jāṁ Āvinda-rāja-nāmā Kām-ādi(hi)ka-rūpa-saudaryaḥ | Sāmarthyā sati
ninditāṁ14 prāvhitā n=āiv=āgrajē krūntā va(ba)ndhii13 str-
[24] gaman-ādibhiḥ kucharitāṁ=āvajjiṁ n=āyaśāḥ sauch=āsaucha-parānmukham na cha
bhiyaḥ paśūchyaṁ=sūngkrītaṁ tyā
gēn=āssama-sāhhasīė=cha bhuvanē yas=āsahas-āṃkō=bhuvat | Varshani=svaṃpa-varṣaḥ
prabhūtā-prabhōḥ=pi kanaka-dhā-
[25] rābhīḥ jagad-akhiham=ēka-kānchana-mayam=akarōd-iti jainar=ntkāḥ | Yad-adhi-
dig-vijayāvāre sati prasa-
[26] bha-saṃbhrama-bhāvāna eva bhūḥ | sapadi nṛṣati pālimahādvaj-ōcchhrītā
er=ānya-kunātha-vivijjitaḥ | Sahatē [na*] hi maṇḍal-ādhepaṁ pa-
[27] ram=ēsho=bhyādayē samuddhataṁ | iti jāta-bhiyā dhiy=āgratō ravī-chandrāv=apī
brahmātē(tah) | Avanata-pari-maṇḍalū-
[28] āvaraiṁ saha-vijaya-ābhiḥ16 vēma ēbhiṁaṁ sama-himakara-tōraṇāṁ m chiraṁ niña-
tējas-tati yasā rājaṭe | Śaha-
[29] tō sama-vāhīnīm ayaṁ na parēṣaṁ sa-vaśīṣha-śālīnīṁ | yad-aniyūtī-rājamaṁ
dīraṁ nadu Gaṅgā Yamunā cha sēvatē ||
[30] Yasmihi15 n=rajanī saurājyaṁ nirjītī-āri vitanvati vimāna-sthitir=ity=āsil=na bhógēshu
kudāchanaḥ | Yasa=ḥoddamaḥ pratā-
[31] p-anala-va(ba)hala-śikhā-kajjalaṁ nīla-mēghā visphūrjjan-khadga-dhāra-phurpane-
visaranānyē=evī vidyund-vidśaḥ |
[32] durvār-Ārībhāsa-kumbhasthala-dalana-galan-mauktikānyē=evā tārās=chandra-kshāvadhi-
(bdh)Śīśā bhṛita-bhuvana-yaśo-rāsi-nisyaṇīdītiṁ12 ||

12 General Jacob's Pāñcil read putrāmpum and gave 'Angandeva' in his translation. But the letter mistakes by him can only be seen, though a cross stroke is wanting in the lower 8, and it is thus made to look a little like p.
13 This anusvāra is a mistake.
14 This visarga is a mistake.
15 The metre is faulty here; but the text is quite clear and gives a suitable meaning.
16 This anusvāra is superfluous.
17 The last three syllables and the mark of punctuation are inserted below the end of line 5, but it is unnecessary to treat them as a separate line by themselves.
Second plate; second side.


[28] rāyaṇaḥ Śri-vikraṇa-Nāryāṇaḥ | sva-kara-kalita-hēti-hala-dalita-vipaka-svaka[nā] [h*] sthala-kētra(traka)=ē Śri-nripati-Tri(tri)ṇētra(traka)h | 10 

[29] samabhavat=Śa=cha parambhaṭṭaraka-mahārājādhīrāja-paramāṣvāra-śrimati-Nityavarṣa- dēva-pāda-anudhāya(h*) | paramabhaṭṭarā. 


[31] yatā(thā)-saṁvā(ḥ)tya(dhā)a munākān rāṣtrapati-viśaya-pratāma-grāmekā- mahattara(a) yu- κtak-ōpayuktak-ādikā- rīkan=samādīṣṭya=Āstu vah saṉvīditaṁ | yathā Māṇyakāṭa-rājadhāni-śthiratar- āvāstānāna mātā- 


[34] śātēṣhū=saṁṣa paṁcha-paṇḍhāsad-adhikēṣhu=ṣaṁkātė=pi saṁvatsāraḥāṁ 855 pravartatamaṇa-Vijaya-saṁvatsaras-āṅtranga-. 

[35] ta-Śrāvaṇa-paunrāṣmāyaṁ vār Gūrōḥ Pārvvā-Bhadrapadā-nakshatrē(trē) prathama- kar-ōnāc-atiṣargaṁ | 11 Pūnda12va- 


[37] Kēśava-dīkṣhitāyā Rāmapuri-saptāslā-āṅtrarggata-Lōha-grāmaḥ sa-vṛkṣa-mālī-kulaḥ sa- 

[38] dhānya-hirany-āśēyaḥ sa-dāqā-dōsha-dāśapakāḥ[h*] sa-bhūt-ōpāta-pratayayaḥ 

a-hēcha-bhaṭa-pravēṣa[h*] 

Third plate. 

[39] ēā(?)-tōṭtarīyo vra(bra) hmadāya-nyāyēn-ā-chaṃdr-ārkkaṁ namasyō dattaḥ | [**] Yasya ch =ēghāṭaḥ pārvaṇaḥ Ghoḍo- 

[40] grāmaḥ dakshīṇatāḥ Vaiṇjull-nāma grāmaḥ paśchimataḥ Viśchaviharajha(?bha)- nāma grāmaḥ uṭtaratāḥ. 


[42] rahayatō bhujāyot bhūjāyot vā na kēnachid-vyāghṭaḥ kāryaḥ [**] Mad(ṇ)ā- ānīl-āndōḷita-jala-tarmagī-ta- 

[43] ralama-śāvārya[nā] sarad-avbhr(bhra)-vīvhr(bhra)maṇ ājīvitaṁ sāmāṇyaṁ cha bhūmi-dāsa-phalam savagachchhadhībhī | 14-āgā- 


12 This suvēra is superfluous. 
20 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary, or, if used at all, should have been placed after sanākhanta in the next line. 
31 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary. 
41 Monier-Williams gives two forms, puṇja and puṇēri.—Punjāvadhana, Punjaṣvadhana, and also Panjaṣvadhana. The lower part of the ē here is more markedly turned to the left than is the case is skanda, l. 2, and other places in this inscription. But the letter is formed in just the same way as here in samahār, l. 18, and in one or two other places; and the reading intended seems to be ē, not ē. 
42 First ē was engraved, and then it was corrected by partial erasure into a. 
43 This visāra is superfluous.
Translation.

Om! Victorious are the melodious Sāma-songs of Brahmā, whose soul is pleased with the completion of creation, which cause the happiness of Sarasvatī!

(L. 1.)—From the moon,—that rājahānasabird in the pool of waterfowls of the lake which is the sky, overspread by a crowd of waterfowls which are the multitudinous stars; that radiant white umbrella of Madana, who stands in the position of being the supreme lord of the three worlds; that ocean of milk in loveliness; that mountain of silver in resplendence; that crowning of the women who are the regions,—there came—that lineage which is possessed of (the glory of being) the mansion of the abode of the waterfowl which is the three worlds.

(L. 4.)—From that lineage there sprang the race of the Yādus, which is like an ocean on the earth,—the family-house of splendour; the abode of greatness; the play-ground of endurance and great prosperity and sagacity; possessed of fame acquired by protecting (all) creatures who came to it (for refuge).

(L. 5.)—Then in the spotless sky which is the family of the Yādus there arose king Dantidurgā, as if he were the moon,—who bowed down the hosts of his enemies, (as the moon bows down other orbs); who was possessed of accomplishments, (as the moon is possessed of digits); and who gratified (all) desires by his extensive and great fame, (as the moon fills all the regions with its extensive and great splendour).

(L. 7.)—Then the king, Śrī-Kīśāna, the paternal uncle of that king, having risen and having ascended the excellent throne of splendour and bravery, as the sun ascends the summit of Meru; having dispelled the darkness of the mighty race of the Chalikyas, (as the sun dispels the darkness); (and) having placed (his) commands on the heads of kings, (as the sun places his rays on the summits of the mountains), pervaded the whole world with his extensive radiance.

(L. 9.)—From him there was (born) the king Gōvinda; whose mark, consisting of the smoke (caused) by the burning of (his) enemies, is beheld, as if it were a laudatory inscription, on the surface of the stone which is the disc of the moon.

(L. 10.)—His younger brother was the king Iḍhatēja, whose other name was Nīrapana,—whose intellect was powerful in protecting the world; who shook off the multitude of (his) enemies; (and) by whose signet even the ocean was made known to be (properly named) samudra.

(L. 11.)—After that there was born Jagatūgā, whose hostile kings, having all the circuits of their territories taken away from them, became (flaccid and weak) like the breasts of women whose youth has departed.

(L. 12.)—And from him was (born) Amogha-varsha, of unequalled strength,—by

---

23 Kāmādeva.
24 The Nuṣasthāna.
25 There are secondary meanings in this verse, referring to the ocean.
26 General Jacob's Paścit translated otta by 'command.' And though these meanings are not given in dictionaries, it must have the sense of 'command' here, as applied to Krīṣṇa, and of 'ray of light' as applied to the sun.
27 Dr. Bühler translated "on the crystal disc of the moon." (Vol. VI. p. 62, note 7). But, from the use of the word prastati, śākala is evidently intended to mean a polished slab of stone on which a prastati would be engraved, and which is occupied in respect of its brightness with the disc of the moon.
28 There is a play on the double analysis and meaning of sanudra, viz.:—1, sam + udra, 'that which has water; the ocean,' and 2, sa + mudra, 'having a stamp or seal.'
whom the restraint of pleasure that had been caused by the incomparable Chān kya and Ā bhyū shakahs and others was angrily allayed at Vīṅgavalli; (and) whose pure fame, finding no place (sufficient to contain it) inside or outside or on the upper surface of the egg of Vīrācći, was deposited in the deep ocean of the world.

(L. 15.)—From him was (born) the king, A kā l a v a r s h a ; their shields, together with their swords, were straightway abandoned by (his) enemies, terrified by his prowess.

(L. 16.)—The daughter of K o k k a l a,— the ornament of the lineage of S a h a s r ā j a n a ,—became his queen; (and) from him was born J a g a t t u n g a . From the ocean which was R a n a v i g r a h a , the son of K o k k a l a ,—who was sagacious, (as the ocean is profound); who was the receptacle of jewels (of virtuous qualities), (as the ocean is of jewels); (and) who was capable of protecting kings from their opponents, (as the ocean is capable of protecting the mountains from their opponents), there was produced (a daughter) L a k s h m i , (as the goddess Lakshmi was produced from the ocean). She became the wife of that king, who had no adversary of equal standing with himself, and who was possessed of the ornament of having acquired the fame of Bhumisena and Arjuna.

(L. 19.)—Rising from the mountain of dawn which was J a g a t t u n g a , there was born the son of L a k s h m i ,—the victorious one; a very sun of a king; whose soul was endowed with splendour; (and) who, having the thunderbolt that was his arm discharged to sever the ranks of all the kings who had fallen away from steadfastness of conduct, (as Indra discharges his thunderbolt to cut off the wings of the mountains), (and) being worthy to be gazed upon without winking the eyes, (as Indra is worthy to be gazed upon by the gods),—was truly called I nd ra j a in this world.

(L. 20.)—In the family of the Śrī-Haṁ a y a s , which destroyed the pride of Daśakaṇ th a , there was born K o k k a l l a ; and his son, pre-eminent in virtue, was A r j u n a ; his son was A m m a n a d ā v a , of exceedingly great might; (and) from him was born D v ī jā m-bā, as Padma (was born) from the ocean, (and) as U ḍ a was born from the king of mountains, named Himavat.

(L. 22.)—From the king, Śrī-I nd ra, there was (born) in her, D v i jā m bā, a king named G o υ n d a r ā j a, whose form and beauty surpassed (those of) Kāma. Though he had the power (of displaying it), no forbidden cruelty towards (his) elder brother was displayed (by him); no disgrace was incurred (by him) by cohabiting with the wives of (his) relatives, and other evil actions; demoniacal possession, which is regardless of purity or impurity, was never through fear assumed (by him) (as an excuse for evil deeds); by (his) liberality and by (his) unequalled deeds of bravery, he became characterised by daring in the world.

Raining down gifts, discharging showers of gold, and raining abundantly,—he is said by people to have caused the whole world to be made solely of gold (by his) showers of gold. At the time of his conquering the regions, which causes violent alarm, verily the earth dances (from joy), having (his) mighty pārthivajā-banners for (her) uplifted hands, and being set free from the other evil kings. With (their) minds filled with fear from the thought that he, the rising one, does not bear with any other proud king, (as they themselves do not bear with any other proud orb),—even the moon and the sun run away before him. His beautiful palace,—in which the hostile M a n đ a lāvār a s bow down before him; which is resplendent with victory; which has the moon for the regular decoration of its gateposts; (and) which is always possessed of the mass of his lustre,—is resplendent. Verily it is because he bears not with any equal army, possessed of distinguishing qualities, of (his) enemies, (as they themselves do not bear with any equal river),—that the Gaṅgā and the Yamuṇā do service to his palace. While he, the king, is continuing (his) good government, never in (any sort of) enjoyments is it (said) that there is any confinement of dishonour.

The soot of the numerous flames of the fire that is his unrestrained prowess (is) the dark-blue clouds; the darting gleams of the edge of his rattling sword (are) verily the flashes of light.

31 Brahman.—Brahmaṇa, or ' the egg of Brahmā,' is the universe.
32 Indra.
33 Or Śrīmāṅgala may be taken as a biruda or title of Gōvinda.
34 Samudroṣabha; this became one of his birudas.
35 There seems to be some play upon the second meaning of śvastu in the sense of 'a self-moving chariot of the gods.'
ning; the pearls that fall down when he
leans open the temples of the elephants of his
enemies who are difficult to be restrained (are)
the stars; (and) the drippings of his fame,
which pervades the universe (are) the moon
and the ocean of milk and (the serpent) Śeṣa.
Since he has his mind intent upon clearing
away thorns, the tubular stalks of the waterlilies,
as if through fear (of him), do not lift
themselves up in the waters (so as to be
plucked out), (but) Lakshmi, who dwells in
the buds (of them), is made a (voluntary)
offering (by them); the ketaki-plant takes
refuge in a hollow chamber of
the earth, the interior of which is darkened
by the mass of its own pollen floating about
in the wind; (and) the jack-tree (and the
reed stand (like servants) in his door in
order to save themselves. And he, wearing the
form and beauty of the transient Kandarpa,
laughing to scorn the consuming power of
the eye of Hara, became a very eternal
Kandarpa; casting ridicule upon the happiness
of Satamakha by means of his attribute of energy
which was magnified by the attributes of
lordship and counsel, he became a Chaturmukha
among Chāpakyas; being intent upon working
the welfare of the earth that was pervaded by
his renowned and pre-eminent prowess, he
became a very Śrī-Nārāyaṇa among valorous
men; (and), tearing open the fields which were
the chests of his enemies with the plough
that was the weapon with which his hands
were familiar, he became a very Śrī-Tripūtra among
kings.

(L. 39.)—And he, the most worshipful one,
the supreme king of great kings, the supreme
lord, the glorious Suvarṇavarṣhaḍava
the favourite of the earth, the glorious Valla-
hanarendravēva,—who meditated on the
feet of the most worshipful one, the supreme
king of great kings, the supreme lord,
the glorious Nītyavarṣhaḍava,—being in good
health, announces to the rūṣtrapatis, viṣayapa-
patis, grāmākṣitas, mahattaras, āyuktabhas,
upayuktabhas, and ādikārikas, according as they
are concerned:

(L. 42.)—"Be it known to you that,—(by

39 There is a play on the second meaning of kṣṇata in
the sense of 'troublesome sedulous enemy,' and on
lakṣmaṇ in the sense of 'wealth.'
37 The secondary allusion is to the posts of his doors
being made of jack-wood, and his door-keepers standing
with reeds or canes in their hands.
40 Kamiliarva, who was reduced to ashes by the flame
from the third eye in the forehead of Hara or Śiva,
because he attempted to inspire him, while engaged in
religious austerities, with love for Pārvatī.
39 The meaning of sati) tōṭarja is not apparent.
42 See note 22 above, and the introductory remarks.
grant of land belongs in common (to him who makes it and to all who continue it)."

(L. 55.)—And it has been said by Rāmabhadrā.—"This general bridge of piety of kings should at all times be preserved by you; thus does Rāmabhadrā again and again make his request to all future princes!" The giver of land dwells for sixty thousand years in heaven; (but) the confiscator (of a grant of land), and he who ascerts to (such confiscation), shall dwell for the same number of years in hell! He is born as a worm in the ordure of a dog and is cooked (in torment) together with his ancestors, who takes away land that has been given, whether by himself or by another! By giving with stint, and by confiscating that which has been given, the whole of that which has been given from birth upwards becomes fruitless: He dwells in the world of Brahmā for a thousand crores and a hundred crores of ages, who gives a grant of land! May there be the prosperity of the whole world! Ōṁ; reverence to Śiva!

No. CXXXIV.

After Gōvinda V. the succession went to the descendants of Jagattuṅga II. by his second wife Gōvindāmbā,—probably through Gōvinda V. leaving no issue. There is at any rate nothing in the inscriptions to indicate that any act of forcible usurpation took place.

The sons of Jagattuṅga II. by Gōvindāmbā were Kṛishṇa III. and Amogha-varsha II., whose wife was Kundakadēvi, the daughter of Yuvarāja,—who was probably Yuvarāja I. of the family of the Kalachuris or Kulacharís of Tripura. It is not certain whether Kṛishṇa III. and Amogha-varsha II. actually reigned; but the shortness of the interval between Śaka 855, the latest date obtained for Gōvinda V., and Śaka 867, the earliest date obtained for Kṛishṇa IV., is against their having done so,—especially as they were anterior by one generation to Gōvinda V., and as the inscription now published shows that Koṭṭiga or Koṭṭiga did reign.

Kṛishṇa III. left no issue. Amogha-varsha II. left two sons,—Koṭṭiga[*] or Koṭṭiga, also called Nityavarsha II.; and Kṛishṇa IV. or Kāmara, also called Nirupama II. and Akāḷavasara III. Koṭṭiga or Koṭṭiga left no issue, and this explains why the date of his inscription now published is considerably later than the dates obtained for Kṛishṇa IV.; viz., there being no probability of Koṭṭiga leaving any issue, first his younger brother Kṛishṇa IV. was joined with him in the government, and then the latter's son Kakkā III. Koṭṭiga seems to have died between the date of the present inscription and the date of the Kārā grant in the following year.

The present inscription is from a stone-tablet leaning against, or built into, the wall of the temple of Kālamēvara at Adaragūchi, in the Hubballī Tālukā of the Dharwāḍ District. The sculptures at the top of the stone are—three canopies or pinnacles of temples; then a compartment containing the sun and moon, three seated figures, facing full-front, and a tiṃga; and then a third compartment containing a cow and calf, some small sacrificial implement, Nandi, and two more seated figures, facing full-front. The writing covers a space of about 2' 3½" high by 1' 9" broad; it commences with three short lines to the right of the lower part of the sculptured surface. The language is Old-Canarese.

The inscription is dated at the time of an eclipse of the sun, on Sunday, the new-moon day of the month Āsvayuja of Śaka 893 (A.D. 971-2), the Prajāpati satvaraya, while Koṭṭiga, also called Nityavarsha II., was reigning, and while his feudatory Pērmāṇājī-Mārasimha, a Mahānjanelēvara of the Gaṅga family, who is mentioned in other inscriptions of the period, was governing the Gaṅgapāḍi Ninety-six-thousand, the Purigero Three-hundred, and the Belyala or Belyola Three-hundred. And it records grants that were made by a certain Pāśchāla, who was governing the Sebbi Thirty, and by Malliga-Gādāyya, to the god Malligēsvara or Śiva. Sebbi is evidently the modern Chabbi or Chebbi, in the Hubballī Tālukā, four miles to the south of Adaragūchi.

Transcription.

[†]

[‡]

[†] His name is written thus in the present inscription; but in the Kārā grant it is written Koṭṭiga.

[‡] From an ink-impression.
Translation.

Ôm! Hail! While Nītyavarshadeva, the favourite of fortune and of the earth, the supreme king of great kings, the supreme lord, the most worshipful one, a very sun among kings, a very Kandarpa among the Raṣṭas, as a very marvel of wonderful deeds, the glorious Kotitigadā, was continuing, with increase of sovereignty, up to (the shores of) the four oceans, so as to endure as long as the moon and sun and stars might last:—

(L. 7.)—While the Prajāpati saucatsara, which was the eight hundred and ninety-third (in) the centuries of years that had elapsed from the time of the Śaka king was current; (at the time of) an eclipse of the sun (on) Sunday, the new-moon day of (the month) Āśvayuja in that year:—

(L. 10.)—While the glorious Permānaṇi Mārasisghadēva was with happiness governing the Gaṅgavādi Ninety-six-thousand, the Purigera Three-hundred, and the Belvala Three-hundred:—

(L. 13.)—The property, that was given by the glorious Pañchaladēva, having washed the feet of the Eighty-four (Mahājana), while he was governing the Sebhi Thirty, (was) twelve aru-gadyāṇas of Rōṇa, (and) a fixed contribution of a kāna of salt and ghee (and) a vajnani of (sugar-cane) juice.

(L. 17.)—Malliga-Gādāvya gave into the hands of the Eighty-four (Mahājana), for the temple of the god Malligēvara, six mattresses of (land), one aruoṣa, and a dharaṇa of gold of Rōṇa.

(L. 19.)—The earth was once enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sagara; he who for the time being possesses the earth, enjoys the fruits (of this grant that has been made) ! He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, who confines land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

No. CXXXV.

In the Canarese country there are several inscriptions of Kṛiṣṇa IV. or Kannara, also called Nirupama II. and Akālavara III. The earliest date that they give for him is Śaka 867 (A.D. 945-6), the Viṣvāvasu saucatsara; and the latest is Śaka 878 (A.D. 956-7), the Nala saucatsara.

which is applied to Krishna IV.: in l. 1 of the following inscription—Bedagya and bedagya are evidently connected with beda, beda, 'wonder, surprise; novelty, curiosity; marvellousness.'

In Canarese inscriptions, the usual form of this name is Belvola.

The chief town of the Rōṇ Tālnā of the Dīsārād District.
The present inscription is from a stone-tablet on the left or west side of the god, at the temple of Virabhada at Soraṭūr, in the Gadag Tālukā of the Dharward District. I have no information as to what sculptures there may be at the top of the stone. The writing covers a space of about 3’11” high by 2’3’’ broad. The language is Old-Canarese.

The inscription records several grants that were made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, on Sunday the full-moon day of the month Mārgaśīra of Śaka 873 (A.D. 951-2), the Vishṇu-deva saṃvatsara. The original gives the name of the saṃvatsara as Vīroḍhī, which was Śaka 851; but the numerals, 873, are very distinct, and undoubtedly the saṃvatsara intended was Vīroḍhī, which was Śaka 873.

This inscription gives Sārāṭuṭra, ‘the city or village of lizards,’ as the ancient name of Soraṭūr. The name Soraṭūr itself occurs in a Hoyasāla inscription of Narasiṃha II., dated Śaka 1145, at Harhar, in which a graphic account is given of a battle between Ballāla II. and a certain Sēvuppa, who appears to have been the commander-in-chief of the army of the Dēvagiri-Yādava king Jaitugi I., and whom Ballāla II. besieged and defeated near Soraṭūr and pursued from there up to the Kṛishṇapura, where he slew him. And further on, the same inscription again mentions Soraṭūr along with the hill-forts of Eranbargav er Yelburga, Virāṭkōṭe or Hāṅgal, Guttī, Bēllīṭa, Raṭhaḷāḷi or Raṭṭēḷāḷi in the Dharward District, and Kūḍgōḍ near Ballāḷi, which were besieged by Ballāḷa II. in the same campaign.

Transcription.32


Mārgaśīra

[8] śīrā-māsada paunamyaum-Ādityarāmaṇum Rōhinī(gh)-nakshatramanum śō(sō)-
[8] ma-graḥap-andu[*] Rudrapayyan perrgadē Aṭchapayyanum gāmumda Sāmī-
[8] Kaṭeyammanuṁ Bhirmarā-śhāṭarara kalāṁ karchchi sāiyra baliya

Toṭamaṁ dārvagge koṭar-Āyavidharaṁ ekklad-ire grahaṇaṁ tat-kālām

dol ayān talar-ēsos[*] Siddh-āyam-ēlāṁ dārvagge barissake

asrargge nibadhadāṁ muvattu kariya drahamma(mma)man môgarvar-tīrṇav

[1] rī lāt hitiyām tappad-antu ārodeya Pīṭṭyaṁ kālī-erēye ga-

[8] muṇḍa Sāmī-Kaṭeyammanuṁ Aṭchapayyanum kalāṁ kache mattaṁ

maṭha(ka)kke vidya-dāna[kka]jān pannir-mmattar-keyya koṭar-Kkeyi siddh-ā-

[8] yaṁ barissake ūrā kariya drahamma(mma)man tīrṇav-I ṃvarī mē-

[1] g-alāṁ koṭ(ka)jālal-īl(ī) dē-Āyavidharaṁ kāpur(π)duvav[*] Bhāvāṇī-setti pērin[ō] tso-

[1] nu paṇamāṁ dārvagge mādijān-Idan-tappade nadeyisēdāṁ


[8] sāy(i)rbbar-pāvravargge dānāṁ-goṭṭa phalaṁ el-koṭi tapōjanakkaṁ

[8] Vāraṇnāsiyōlaṁ Prayāgeyōlaṁ Gu(ku)ruxhētrodalōaṁ

[8] sahaṣra(ara)-bhōjanaṁ-māḍidā phalaṁ-akkuṁ[*] Idan-ajādātāṁ Vāra-

[8] nāsiyōlaṁ Prayāgeyōlaṁ sāiserān[8] kavileyunā sāsi-

[8] rbbar-brāhmaṇarā-ēl-koṭi tapōjana[mar-va] man-sālida paunchamahā-


[8] yō harēti(ta) vasundharaṁ(m) shashtiṁ var(ī)- saha(sa)-sahaṣra(srā) ni vi[sh]t[ā]-


33 From an ink-impression supplied by the Mānlalādar of Lakshmīnāvar.
34 This repetition of rō is a mistake.
35 The Vīroḍhī saṃvatsara was Śaka 851. The numerals here, 873, are quite distinct; and, Śaka 873 being the Vīroḍhīkrīṭa saṃvatsara, it is obvious that the omission of the letters krīṭa is only due to carelessness on the part of the engraver. 36 This Āṃśodara is unnecessary.
37 This Āṃśodara is unnecessary.
38 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary.
39 Some correction is required here; but it is not apparent what was intended.
40 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary.
Translation.

Om! Hail! While the sovereignty of Akaśāvarṣhadēva, the favourite of fortune and of the earth, the supreme king of great kings, a very marvel of refuge, a very hero against infuriated elephants, he who is excellent ... ... ... Sri-Kannaradēva, was continuing with perpetual increase:—

(L. 3.)—While the body-guard Sri-Ruddapayya was governing (the city of) Sarasvāra:—

(L. 5.)—On Sunday, the full-moon day of the month Mārgasīra of the Virodhikriṣtanasantara which was the eight hundred and seventy-third (in) the centuries of years that had elapsed from the time of the Śaka king, under the Rōhini nakhatra, (and) at the time of an eclipse of the moon:—

(L. 6.)—Āchapayya, the Pergade of Ruddenpaya, and Sāmi-Kāltēyamma, the village-headman, having washed the feet of the venerable Bihmarāśi, gave to the god a piece of gardenland of the measure of one thousand (betel-nut) creepers.

(L. 8.)—(There was given by) the Fifty (Mahājanas), uniting together, at the time of the eclipse, a contribution of a young betel-leaf plant in the leaf.

(L. 9.)—All the fixed contribution (was that) the Goracu should supply to the god, year by year, thirty drammas of (?) charcoal, (being the amount) appointed (to be given) to the king.

(L. 10.)—When the Urodeya Piṭṭayya made supplication at that time, his ordinance should not be broken, Sāmi-Kāltēyamma, the village-headman, and Āchapayya, having washed the feet of the Fifty Mahājanas, gave also twelve mātars of cultivable land for the mātha and for education.

(L. 13.)—The fixed contribution on the cultivable land (was that) they should supply, year by year, six drammas of charcoal, ... ... ... The Fifty (Mahājanas) shall protect (these grants).

(L. 15.)—Bhavānisēṭṭi gave to the god one paṇa on each pēru.

(L. 16.)—He who possesses this (grant) without fail, shall have the reward of fashioning the horns and hoofs of a thousand tawny-coloured cows and presenting them to a thousand Brāhmaṇa, (and) the reward of giving a thousand meals to seven ecores of ascetics at Varaṇasi or Prayāge or Kurukshētra! He who destroys this shall go to the world to which a man goes, guilty of the five great sins, who destroys a thousand tawny-coloured cows or a thousand Brāhmaṇa or seven ecores of ascetics at Varaṇasi or Prayāge!

(L. 23.)—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! Those men who protect land that has been given, whether by themselves or by another, are established for sixty thousand ecores of years in the world of Rudra!

(L. 27.)—At the command of the Fifty (Mahājanas), when they made the proclamation of the sentence "Who has (the requisite) knowledge?"—Guligavere-Nāga wrote this edict, to be famous as long as the earth might last.

MISCELLANEA.

A BUDDHIST TOPE IN THE PIṬṬĀPURAM ZAMINDĀRI.

In the Indian Antiquary for February last (vol. XII, p. 34), Sir Walter Elliot published a notice of some finds of Buddhist caskets and other relics in the Fīṭṭāpuram Zamindāri of the Gōdēvarī District, Madras Presidency, with a plate of drawings. On reading there that all the relics had been sent to the Central Museum at Madras, I visited the Museum, and learned that while, as I had supposed, the stone caskets were there, none of the other smaller relics mentioned could be traced. These losses are very much to be regretted. Of course Dr. Bidie is not resp-

28 The prās is violated here.
29 Āna seems to be connected with ānu, "to stay, prop, support."
30 Dēdeva: meaning not known.
31 Aigaraṇa, aṅgarakha.
sible, and my remarks must not be taken as in any way implying that he is to blame. All this occurred before he assumed charge of the Museum.

There are two portions of crystal caskets in the Museum alleged to have come from Amaravati, and placed under a glass case with portions of a marble outer-casket from the same place. Is it possible that the crystal caskets really came from Piṭṭāpuram? They look much like those marked 1d and 4c, in Sir Walter Elliot's plate.

R. Sewell.

PROPER NAMES IN THĀNĀ DISTRICT.

SIR.—The following I am sure will interest some of your readers.

The Āgris, Kōḷis, Māḷas, and other castes at Wāsāki (Bassein) and adjoining places, who, it is said, are natives converted to Christianity, and some of whom have even the same surnames as Konkaṇastha Brāhmans, are named and married by the Pāḍrē. There is nothing peculiar in this. But many of them have names given them from the days on which they are born. The name Somā, for instance, is given to one born on a Monday. He who is born on Tuesday is frequently named Mangālyā. One born on Wednesday is called Buddhū or Budhāyā (?). Bistara, Bistara, or Bistara is given to one born on Thursday, and Sukara or Sukāryā to one born on Friday. One was named Sinwar, which word I first thought was a corruption of the word Siŋ̱or, but afterwards conjectured must be a corruption of Śānačāra or Śānivāra, Saturday. One man strengthened this conjecture by his testimony. I did not hear of a name corresponding to Sunday. But I heard there were persons bearing the name of Ādāivāra.

Some derive their names from those of animals, such as Uṇḍrē, a mouse, Kolōk or Kōla, a jackal, Kēni̊ga, a crow, and so on.

Another peculiarity with these people is, that when asked their names they give the father's name first and then their own, and will not allow others even to call them, as people do in other parts of the Thānā Collectorate—viz., the personal name first, and then the father's. They thus interrogate the person who insists on the latter being the proper mode, "Who comes first, or rather who is born first, the father or the son?" If they at all allow the latter mode, they still persist in saying Sinvar Zāvarāča or Valajī Krishnāča, thus adding the suffix ād to denote that Sinvar or Valajī, as the case may be, is the son of Zāvar or Krishna.

Another thing that I marked was, that people of this part have no objection to receive from the hands of mālis, gardeners, and even gacikās, milkmen and women, things that they deal in, such as fruit, vegetables, plantain-leaves, flowers, and milk. This circumstance is to be noted because in other parts people are seen to refuse to receive the same things from the hands of Christians. It thus appears that these people are more or less naturalised, and are looked upon more as natives than Christians. There is another class seen in this part, who are known by the name of Nāve Marāṭhā. When an explanation of this word was sought, it was said that such and such a man is so called because his grandfather was a Kīristānva (a convert Christian), but he and his father have become Hindus, and have been looked upon as such.

N. B. Godabole,

Sanskrit Teacher, Elphinstone High School.

Bombay, 16th June 1883.

NOTES.

DURRĀN—a derivation. In the J. A. S. B. vol. XLIX, p. 85, in an article on the Route of the Tat-Chotidli Field Force, I wrote as follows—

"The old name of the Durrāns was Ābdāli, till Ahmad Shāh, an Abdāli of the Sadozai family or sub-section of the Popalzai section of the Abdālis, the hero of Pānīpāt in 1747, took the title of Durr-i-Durrān, the Pearl of Pearls, and named his tribe after himself Durrāns." However, lately a dweller in those parts has assured me that this was wrong, although my statement merely followed the usually accepted derivation. He says that the original name of the Abdālis or Durrāns was Mummandzai, and that they had about 500 years ago a great saint, now known as Shāh Makhshūd Abdāl, who is buried at Shār Durrā (the Sugar Pass), about 50 miles N.W. of Kandahār. The tribe, as a body, became followers of this saint, whence their name Abdāl. This Shāh Makhshūd had a habit of wearing a pearl in each ear as earrings, and so obtained the sobriquet of Durrānī, the pearl-wearer. His followers so far adopted his custom as to wear small portions of gold wire clipped on to the lobe of the ear and this many do still, whence the tribe became called Durrāns. My informant says that Ahmad Shāh's title was not Durr-i-Durrān but Durr-i-Durrānī, the Pearl of the Durrāns. As is well-known the modern Durrāns are divided into Ziraks and Panjāps, and the Ziraks further divided into Popalzais, Alakōzais, Bārkzais and Achakzais. The Sadozai family of Popalzais ruled in Afghanistan from about 1716 to 1818 A.D., when the present ruling family came into power. They are the Mūhammadzai family of
the Bārakrais, and the point with regard to them in the present connection is, that they are so called after the original name of the whole Durrānī tribe, having retained that designation as being that portion of the tribe which never followed their great saint Shāh Makhāšt. This derivation and information is all new to me, and I give it for what it is worth.

About this Shāh Makhāšt I would remark that the same power of turning stones into sugar is ascribed to him as is so universally ascribed to the better known Shekh Fariduddin of Pāk Pātaṇ in the Panjāb. Shekh Farid’s title of Shakh Ganj, or Treasury of Sugar, is derived from this legend, and Shāh Makhāšt’s tomb in the Shakh Darrā, Sugar Pass, is said to be on the site of his miracles.

R. C. Temple.

ON THE DATES ON THE COINS OF THE HINDU KINGS OF KĀBUL, BY SIR E. C. BAYLEY.

To the Numismatic Chronicle (3rd Ser. vol. II, pp. 128–185), Sir E. Clive Bayley has contributed a paper ‘On the coins of the Hindu kings of Kābul.’ These coins had already been described by Mr. E. Thomas in 1848,1 who thought that among the signs which occur on the back of the horseman found on one type of them he could detect dates, and on some of the later coins he believed he had made out a degraded and contracted form of the word Guptā.2 Sir E. C. Bayley having examined all the coins of this type within his reach, has come to the conclusion—that on certain silver coins of the bull-and-horseman type, and which all bear the name of Syālapati, the earliest of the Brahmanical kings of Kābul, there are dates in numerals of a form between those of the mediaval Indian and the modern Arabic forms. In some cases the dates are followed by the word ‘Gupta,’ and these dates he reads as 96 (for 698), and perhaps 99 Guptā, and as 707 and 727 (Gupta). On certain other coins of the same general type, but of conventional execution, which bear the names of Syālapati and Sāmanta, indiscriminately, and in rare cases of Bhīmadēva, and Khvādavāya, other dates occur, which he reads as 862 ‘Gu,’ 812 ‘Gu,’ 813, 814, 815 and 817, and on a still later copper coin of degraded type—866.3

These he regards as posthumous, and as belonging to the latest and subordinate kings of the dynasty. Then, in the British Museum is a coin bearing the conventional lion or leopard of the type found on Varka-(Vakka- or Vanka-)dēva’s coins, but on the other side a peacock of the form found on the small silver Gupta coins. Above the lion is a Hindi legend which is either Śrī Kamara or Kamra (dēva), possibly it may stand for Kumāra; and is identifiable with Kamlū—he the name given in the Jami-ul-Hikayāt to the ‘king of India,’ there described as the opponent of Amrū Lais (878–900 A.D.). This makes it necessary to place part of his reign, the reign of Pādama, and the first reign of Varka, between 878 A.D. and Syālapati’s accession; and the first reign of Varka must have been of some duration, for Muhammadan writers describe him as going through various phases of conduct before he was dethroned. A copper coin bearing the name of Pādama or Pādama is precisely similar to that of Varka-dēva, and hence Sir Edward assigns his place before Varka and after Kamara. Further, on a copper coin of Sāmanta-dēva—imitated from those of Varka, as certain of his coins are already known to be—and which bears above the lion an Arabic legend which it is proposed to read as Al Mūtakī (or Al Muttakī) b’illah,—being the name of the Khalīf who reigned from 940 to 944 A.D. On the other side is the name of Sāmanta. From this it is inferred that Syālapati was contemporary for a time with Khalīf Al Muktādir b’illah (907–932 A.D.), and that he was probably the king who struck the medal in his honour (published by Mr. Thomas) of the bull-and-horseman type.

Founding on Dr. Bührer’s identification of Śilāditya VI. of Valabhi with the Dhruvabhata in Huen Thang’s time and other similar data,4 he concludes that the Guptā era began in 190 A.D., and derives the following results—

1. Kamara or Kamlā,4 contemp. with Amrū Lais A.D.
2. Pādama or Pākma 878 to 887
3. Varka’s first reign 887–916
4. Syālapati
5. Varka’s 2nd reign, say 10 years 916–926
6. Sāmanta-dēva cir. 926–940

Mr. Thomas would object to Sir E. C. Bayley’s readings that the latter reads all the dates with the heads of the figures towards the area of the

---

2 Mr. H. Elliot, Hist. Ind. vol. II, p. 492.
4 Mr. Thomas would identify him with Khvādavāya or Khlavāya; Jour. R. As. Soc. vol. IX, (1848), p. 189.
5 Mr. Thomas had conjecturally fixed the date of Sāmanta’s accession as 933, A.D. For Al Birūnī’s list of this dynasty see Reinsand, Prunse, Arabes et Perses, pp. 152–154, 221–227, Mémoires sur l’Inde, pp. 176, 196, 212, 246, 257; Prasōp, Essays, vol. I, p. 330; Sir H. Elliot, Hist. Ind. vol. II, pp. 430–437.—Ed.
coins, whereas Mr. Thomas would read all those, at least on the later groups, as running from the horse’s head towards its feet, and as representing in more or less corrupt forms one uniform date, viz., 617, which he considers the initial date of Sāṃkṣa’s accession in the Gupta era (318+617) or 935 A.D. Sir Edward thus reads the dates in a direction different from the legend on the other side and from the monograms on the same side of the coins. But on the earlier series there are dates written in both directions, and on Gupta coins the legends sometimes read round the edge with the heads pointing outwards, and in the area perpendicularly—one letter above another; and on the coins of Toramāna the king’s name is written round the edge with the heads of the letters pointing inwards. One date, viz., 814, he admits has been mechanically copied on later coins; but other similar cases are found in later Indian coinages.

In a postscript, Sir Edward shows that the dates of the Gupta inscriptions given by General Cunningham, Arch. Surv. Reports, vol. IX, pp. 9-18, which the author tries to reconcile with an initial epoch in 167 A.D., agree much better with the epoch of 190 A.D. for the commencement of the Gupta era.* He further suggests that 319 A.D.—the initial year of the Valabhi era, would thus be 129 Gupta and the date of Kumāragupta’s death.

ASAÍATIC SOCIETIES.

The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for October 1882 is largely occupied by the continuation of Prof. Sayce’s decipherment and translation of the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Van. (See ante, vol. XI, p. 300.) This is followed by the Sanskrit text of the Śikṣā-patī of the Śvēmā-Nārāyaṇa sect, edited with a translation, by Prof. Monier Williams. The author observes that his version is the first made by any European scholar; and though he notices the English version by Bhogilīl Prāñjibandā in Briggs’s Cities of Gujārāt, he seems not to be aware of another English version that appeared many years ago in the Dīvyābhāṣyā. It may be noted that in the Śikṣā-patī, the works approved of as authoritative for the sect are—The Vedas, the Vādānta-sūtras of Vyāsa, the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, the thousand names of Vishnu in the Mahābhārata, the Bhagavadgītā, and the precepts of Vīdura, the Vīra-deva-Madhavīya from the Vaishānava-khaṇḍa of the Śandha-purāṇa, and the Smṛti of Yājñavalkya. The Śikṣā-patī was written in 1826.

The next paper is a short one by Stanley Lane Poole, on “The successors of the Seljūks in Asia Minor,” in which he gives tables of the ten dynasties that rose from the ruins of the Seljūk kingdom, and were afterwards absorbed in the Othmānī empire (A.D. 1300-1472).

The last 35 pages are occupied with the first part of a discussion on the Yh-King—‘the oldest book of the Chinese and its authors,’—by Terrien de la Cuiperie. This part is accompanied by the Annual Report read in May 1882, occupying 151 pages, and giving a very complete outline of all that was done in Asiatic research during the preceding year.

The part for January 1883 opens with Part 2nd of Sir E. C. Bayley’s “Genealogy of Modern Numerals,” being on the “Simplification of the Ancient Indian Numerals.” (Ante, vol. XI, pp. 299 and 298). Here the author has to deal with the questions treated of in detail by Moritz Cantor in his Mathematische Beiträge (Halle, 1889), and Woepcke in his Traité sur l’Introduction de l’Arithmétique Indienne et Occident (Rome 1859), and Sur la propagation des Chiffres Indiens, in the Journal Asiatique, Ser. VI, tome I. He notices the abacus and its use in computations, with the principle it involves of the values of ‘position,’ and he contends that the value of position among the numerals and the invention of the ‘zero’ were both of Indian origin, and that the invention of the former preceded the latter by a century or two. It was about 773 A.D. that the Arabs became acquainted with the Indian numerals and notation. Āryabhata (born at Kusambhipura, 475 A.D.) describes a mode of numeration based on the value of position; he implies the same in his mode of extracting roots, and he uses the word śānya = ‘place,’ to signify the position of the numeral signs, which may indicate a knowledge of fixed places in a decimal series. Again, Varāha Mihira (died 587 A.D.) uses the word śānya (a void), in a way that seems to imply that he knew the modern system. On this Dr. Bühler says—“If a man expresses (Bṛhat Samhāsīta, viii, 20) the number 3750 by the words—the nought (emptiness), the arrows, the mountains, and the Rāma— it seems to me that he must have thought of 3750, and cannot have

had in his mind \( \frac{1}{2} \times 6 \) (or \( 3000 + 700 + 50 \)) if he had the latter before his eyes, he would have said or used words equivalent to the three thousand, the seven hundred, and the fifty. There are of course hundreds of similar instances in the *Bṛhat Saṁhitā.* But the use of the terms śānya, kha, vyāma, vyāṭ, ambara, (empty), does not necessarily imply the use of a sign for zero, but only a vacant space in the abacus table. The Valabhad grants and some others are dated in the early system of figures, and the earliest example of the modern decimal system is the date of the Dhiniki plate of 738 A.D. When once the zero was introduced this system seems at once to have superseded the older, except in the extreme south of India, among the Tamils and Malayālamas. The only inscription yet known containing old figures, after 738 A.D. is that of Govinda III. of S. 730, in which a modified form of the symbol for 2 occurs. The author then argues from what we know of Muhammad bin Muṣa al Khārāzī’s work, that the Hindus used the abacus in the form of the *tableau à colonnes,* before the invention of the zero figure. On the extent and character of the Greek system of Arithmetic he cites the treatise of Delambre and the excellent article by Sir John Leslie in the *Edinburgh Review,* vol. XVIII (1811); showing that they came very near to the decimal system, but probably did not feel the want of it. The rest of the article is devoted to rebutting the claims of the Neo-Pythagoreans to the discovery of our present system.

The second paper is a short one on “Parthian and Indo-Sassanian Coins,” by the accomplished Oriental numismatist, Mr. E. Thomas. The third is on the “Early Historical relations between Phrygia and Kappadokia,” by W. M. Ramsay, in which he adds an account of the rock-sculptures of Boghazkeui and Enyuk, and of some archaic Phrygian inscriptions.

In Part II, for April, the first article is a copy of the *Tattva-muktāvali,* of Gauja-Purnānanda-Chakravartin, a native of Bengal, by Prof. E. B. Cowell. It is an attack on the Vedānta system by a follower of the Pūrṇā-prajñā school of Madhva, described in the 5th chapter of the *Savavedarasanaśaṅgraha.* The text of the poem in 122 ślokās is accompanied by a translation. This is followed by two Sanskrit ślokās—one addressed to Prof. H. H. Wilson, and one referred to by Sir Wm. Jones—and so prof. Cowell. The next paper is by the Rev. James Sibree, on “Malagasy Place-Names.” H. L. St. Barbe, B.C.S., contributes the text of the Burman *Nawakārā,* with translation. The poem is entirely in praise of Buddha. C. Gardner contributes an account of “Chinese Laws and Customs;” and Terrien de la Couperie gives the conclusion of his paper on the *Ya-King,* the oldest book of the Chinese.

The first Number of vol. LII of the *Journal* of the Asiatic Society of Bengal has appeared late, and contains five papers. The first is a collection of folklore, songs, and snatches from Eastern Gorakhpur, collected by Hugh Fraser, C.S., and edited with notes by F. H. Fisher, C.S., and G. A. Grierson, C.S. The second paper, by Surgeon-Major Bidie, is on the Pagoda or Varāha Coins of Southern India, illustrated by 30 drawings of coins, some of them copies from Elliot’s illustrations. Dr. Bidie repeats the mistake so often made that Kalyāṇa was the capital of the Chalukyas, and on other points he relies solely on statements in Rice’s *Mysore Gazetteer and Inscriptions,* which are not supported by satisfactory proofs. It is desirable we should have fuller accounts of the coins of Southern India, and we welcome this contribution to our knowledge. The next paper is a further supplement to Thomas’s *Chronicles of the Pathāna Kings of Dehli,* by C. I. Rodgers, in which he describes and figures 35 new coins. General Cunningham gives a very short continuation on the “Relics from Ancient Persia,” found on the banks of the Oxus, illustrated by two plates. And lastly, Dr. Rājendralāla Mitra has a long “Note on a Sanskrit inscription from Lalitpur district,” of A.D. 1424. It is a Jaina document.

An Extra number for 1882, and separately paged has also been published, containing a *Chrestomathy and Vocabulary of the Maithili language of North Bihar,* by G. A. Grierson, B.C.S. This is a scholarly compilation, and with the Grammar, also published as an Extra number for 1880, gives an excellent and very complete and accurate presentation of this interesting dialect, reflecting much credit on the painstaking industry and accurate scholarship of the author. Such separate publications, however, would be much better dissociated from the Society’s *Journal,* which they are not paged to bind up with, nor are the two parts in this case paged consecutively to bind together.

---


*Ante, p. 152; and conf. vol. XI, pp. 110-112.

*Ind. Ant. vol. VI, p. 56.

*Ind. Ant. vol. XI, p. 327.*
K RISHNA IV. was succeeded by his son Kakka or Karka III., also called Kakkala, Karkara, Amôghavarsâha III., Vallabhânarâendra III., and Nîrpatuânga III.

The present inscription was published originally by Mr. W. H. Wathen in the Jour. R. As. Soc., O. S., Vol. II. pp. 379 f. and Vol. III. pp. 94 ff. I re-edit it—as far as line 50, from two of the original plates, which, with the ring and seal, belong to the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society,—and, the third plate being now not forthcoming, from line 51 to the end, from Mr. Wathen’s ink-impresion of the original plate. The plates were originally found at ‘Kurda’ or ‘Kardla’ in the Dekkan, which seems to be Kar’dâ in the ‘Taloda’ Taluka of the Khândesh District.

The two plates that are still extant are each about 1’ 1’’ long by 9’’ broad. The edges of them were fashioned thicker, so as to serve as rims to protect the writing; and the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation throughout. The writing is arranged on the plates in such a way that they open and turn over like the leaves of an English book. The ring, which had been cut before the plates came into my hands, is about ½” thick and 4½” in diameter. The seal on the ring is square, about 3’’ each way. It has, in relief on a countersunk surface,—as the principal figure, the god Śiva, sitting crosslegged and holding a snake in each hand; above him are the sun and moon; over his right shoulder is a chauri; in the upper proper left corner there is a standing figure, brandishing a sword, and in the opposite corner there is a small seated figure, rather indistinct in the lithograph; lower down, on the proper right side, there is a Svastika, with either a sword or a lamp-stand below it, and on the opposite side there is apparently a floral device, with either a sword or a lamp-stand below it; and, at the bottom, there is the legend, much clearer in the original than in the lithograph, Srimad-Amôghavarsâhadévânya. The language is Sanskrit throughout.

The inscription is dated on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, on Wednesday, the full-moon day of the month Āsvayuja of Śaka 894 (A.D. 972-3), the Aṅgiras, or more properly Aṅgirasa, sakhvate,ra,—during the reign of Kakkâ III., who was then settled permanently at the city of Mânyakhēṭa. And it records a grant of the village of Pâṅgârîkâ, in the Vavulatalla Twelve, which was a subdivision of the Uppalikâ Three hundred. I have no maps to refer to at present, and cannot suggest any identification of these and the other places mentioned in the inscription. The name of Pâṅgârîkâ reminds us somewhat of the Pēthâpâṅgârâka of an early Râṣtrakûṭa grant of Abhimanyu, recently laid by Pândit Bhagwânlâl Indrajil before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

This inscription follows No. CXXXIII. in making the Râṣtrakûṭa dynasty a branch of the Yâdava family in the Sûmavânsa or lineage of the moon. The first king mentioned is Dantidurgâ, who is described as a sun which effected the destruction of the dense darkness which was the Châlukyas. Also Amôghavarsâha I. is mentioned as overthrowing the Châlukyas; and lines 14-15 of this inscription contain the passage which states that he built the city of Mânyakhēṭa; but, as we have seen at p. 215 above, the city seems to have existed long before his time. Krisna II. is mentioned as marrying the younger sister of Šaṅkuka and the daughter of Kokkalla I., king of Chêdi, of the family of the Kalachuris or Kulachuris of Triputra. And the present inscription clears up the question of the double marriage of Jagattuṅga II., and of the succession after him. The Sâgîl plates, No. CXXXIII. above, tell us that he married Lâksâmî, the daughter of Rânavîgrha, who was the son of Kokkalla I., and had by her Indra IV., his immediate successor. The present inscription gives the same name, Lâksâmî, but states that she was the daughter of Šâṁka-

1 In the Jour. R. As. Soc., O. S., Vol. II. p. 379, the name is written ‘Kardla,’ while in Vol. III. p. 190 it is written ‘Kurda.’—Kardâ seems to be the correct form.
ragaṇa, king of Chédi; and it gives also the same name, Indra, as that of his eldest son. But it adds that, not contented with the territories acquired by his father, he set out on an expedition with the object of making the whole world subordinate to one sovereign in himself; and then, in Chédi, he married Gōvinḍambā, the daughter of his maternal uncle Śānkaraṇa, and had by her two other sons, Kṛishṇa III. and Amoghavarsha II.,—through whom the succession was continued down to Kakka or Karka III. These accounts as to the pedigree of the wives of Jagattungha II. are to be reconciled by taking Śānkaraṇa and Rāṇavirāha to be one and the same person, and to be a brother of the daughter of Kokkalla I. whom Kṛishṇa II. married. In this way, Śānkaraṇa would be the maternal uncle of Jagattungha II., as well as his father-in-law through his marriage with Lakhmi. Gōvinḍambā was evidently a sister of Lakhmi. A mōghavārṣa II., again, appears to have married a Kalachuri princess, his wife being Kundakadēvi, the daughter of Yuvārāja, who was probably, as suggested by General Cunningham, Yuvārāja I. of the Kalachuris of Tripura. The present inscription supplies no details respecting Kḥoṭiṣa or Koṭiṣa and Kṛishṇa IV. It states of Kṛkkā or Karka III. that he conquered the Gurjara, Hūṇa, Chōla, and Pāṇḍya kings; but no details are given.

Transcription.*

First plate.

bhūyād-aja-kalpataru-trā(tra)yām || Vra(bra)hm-ādy-āmara-

[2] vandya-Dhūṛjāti-jatā-ātavśamśhitēḥ | siktād-dēva-nadi-śivuddha-salilair-yaś-
chandra-kandād-abhūt | sācharyō-

[3] ṛjita-vṛttā-jatā-mahīmā pāḷhīvaj-śpattaravā vāṃśaḥ kunda-nit-ātapattra(tr)-va(ba)hala-
chchhāyā-suvṛddhi[na]* | gataḥ || Tasmā-

yathāṁritasa samahād=van[d]*yōd Yādūr=anvayaḥ

[5] rēmē=tyadbhuta-sāhasas sa bhagavān-gōpī-kaṭakṣaḥ-āliḥiḥ Śārūgī yattra(tr) niplya-
māna-vilasal-lavanya-puśaṁ-ō-

[6] ḍgamaḥ || Prativō(bō)dhiya-va(ba)ndhan-padma-śaṇḍaḥ kṛṣṇa-Chālukya-ghan-āndhakāra-
nāsaḥ | udagād-ā Daśśīuderga-bhānur-Ya-

patir=bhuvo-bhūd-iiha Kṛishṇa-rājāḥ || ashta-

[8] daś-ōś-ālaya-ṛṣiṣya-rupāṁ puṇykrītaṁ yena yaśo viśuddhaḥ || Gōvinda-rājā kṣiti-
pāṇī-ch
daś-

manōbhūr-ā triptītaḥ kō-

[10] śavat-ōpbhuktaḥ || Aiśāya-ṛuṣya-yukta.tvād=yathā[r]*th-ābhivā(dhā)nō Nirupama īti
tasya-ni-

tvād=uddhiṣṭ-aś-āta-

[12] pattra(tr)āḥ || Tasmāj-Jagattungha-ṇṛṣaḥ autō-bhūt-tūṅgatvam-āgaj=ragatāṁ
gunār-yāḥ || yasy-ānīśaṁ gandha-madbha-bhā-

[13] tā mādaṁ pravānā(ṇē) dig-ibhās-ṭyajanti || Tasya śṛmaṅ-Āmoghavasra-ṇṛpiṭiśa-
Chālukya-kalānalaḥ || śūmṛ=bhū-pati-

Śrī-Mānyakheṣ-ābhīdhim | yēn-śaṁ
dh

---

* Archeol. Surv. of India, Vol. IX. p. 104.
* Lines 1 to 50 from the original plates; and, the third plate being now not forthcoming, lines 51 to the end from Mr. Wathen's ink-impression.
* T occurs in this inscription in conjunction with r, but without being doubled, in mddāpićr, l. 40.

* Wathen read and translated, here and throughout, Jagatruvira; hence the introduction of this name into the genealogy. Similarly, in this line, instead of abhūt-tūṅgatvaḥ, he read abhūd-rudratvaḥ; though in l. 40 he twice read tūṅgah, where his only error was in giving the anusvara instead of a.
[44] cha sarah kritaṁ gura-karu-prásadam-santaḥpuram || Tasmād-Akālavaraḥ-bhūt-sārvabhaumāḥ kṣīt-śvaraḥ | yat-pratā

[46] pa-paritra(tra)stot yovmni chandrayatā raviḥ || Chēd-īśa Daśakaṇṭha-darppa
dalānā Śrī-Haihayāṁh kule || Ko-

[48] kcallas-samabhūch-cha tasya tanayā yā Śaṅkukasya-śanuṣa | tasyaṁ Kriṣṇa
-nripāṁ-tataḥ srīta-mahādevi-pada-

Second plate; first side.

[49] yām-abhūt taṁsair-yaḥ prathitā guṇair-bhuvi Jagattuṇāg-ābhūdhānaḥ sutaḥ || Chēd-
śvāra Śaṅkaragāva-duhitu-

[50] ri Lakshmyāṁ tāṭo Jagattuṇaṅgat || sūnāṁ-abhūd-Indum-nripā bhāvī rījya-
-āriyā bhartā || Janaka-grhiṁtaitiḥ para-mañḍalai-

[51] rasaṁtattu(tu)ṣṭa-mānasāḥ sva-pitaḥ || ēka-chchhattṛa(tra)m prithvi[ṃ*] ka*[r*]-
tu[ṃ*] nirgajā Jagattuṇaṅgat || Čhēdāyāṁ mātulā-Saṅkaragāna-āṭmaṇājā-yā

[52] m-abhū-hā-Jagattuṇāṅgat || śrīmān-Āmogha-varehār Gōvindāmv(m)-ābhīdhāṇāyāṁ ||

| Āruhī-Enḍra-paṁ-āpan̄sa sa nripaṁti śrī-śiva-

[53] śiṁhāsanaṁ || datvā tāma-ṣrasmāya-śāsana-gatān-γrāmān-ananta[ṃ*] satāḥ || a[r*]hār[ṃ*]tūr[ṃ*]tā-nımāṇrath-ādhikataraṁ kritvā

[54] kriṭ-ā(r*)ṭhau jāgat || yāptā yēna Śivā-śayair-nīnāya-yaḥ-ṣaṁ-ṣaṁ-ṣaṁ-ṣaṁ-paṁ-āmīr-śrūmiṁ ||

Aindrā-paṁ-ṭīkṣaṃta(sa)ḥ yām śva-

[55] ṛggaṁ-adhirōduḥ cha jyeṣṭhāḥ bhratāṁ śrīmat-Kriṣṇa-kṛṣṇā-jādevī || Yuvarājā-deva-
-dūbhiḥ hi tima Kuṇḍakadevīyām Āmogha-

[56] varsha-nripāṁ-jātaḥ Khoṭiṅga-devō nripaṁti-abhūd-bhuvaṇa-vikhyātāḥ || Taśy-anuṁ-

Nirupamād-upa-

[57] lavdha(bdha)januśvāra-āriyaḥ padam-abhūd-bhuvi Kakka-rājāḥ || yo vā(ba)la

eva sakaḷām-api rāja-nī-

[58] tim-ātma-pravā(bo)ḥa-vibhavātiśayaṅ-vivēda || Sanmi-līti vi(lī)śaṁ guṇ-iti

vidushāṁ tyā-

[59] g-i ti din-ā(r)ṭihanāṁ || krōdh-i ti dvihatāṁ sam-li ti cha satāṁ rūp-iti sa-
yōhitāṁ || sri(mi)ṭtra(tra)paṁ suṁḥ-rādi-

[60] ty-avandya-vibhavā vīṁśambahārāyaḥ patiḥ || sarvāvihāṁ-api sarva(va)va[ṃ*]dē-

nivāsasyāṁ ek-pi yaś-cūtāsi ||

[61] Yasya-āstā karavāla-vāriṁ chhāna prakshālayantī yathā || Lakshmi-rāṭma-

kalākam-śhita-malaṁ nidhain

[62] kubhāp-āśrayaiḥ [64] satyaṁ Śrī-grīham-etaṁ-amvu(mnb)jan-ītō m[ā*] dvēs奥地利-

s-dvāy-utas-tisṭhāṇyāḥ attra(tra) rash-ōti

[63] yasya cha maḥkhe dēvī Sarasvaty-_api || Satyaṁ Gōṛiṇjara-nirğṇit-āri-nikaraṇa-

Chōl-ādi-lātō Hā-

[65] p-aṁbha-raghaḥvam-kampita-matiḥ Pāṇi(gnya)-prachapāro nripaḥ || vandya-yam-

bhavāṁsam-aṇiṇya-charita[h*] spa-

[66] rddhanta mā sm-āśmāni || krittā-yasya niyāṁk-sāvam-aṇiśaṁ prithvīṁ

parihṛmyati || Tyāsō(g[n]*)nāiva pa-

Second plate; second side.

[67] rām prassiddham-agamata-Karṇaḥ kil-ānāsvaśarūm || satyāṁ-attra(tra)

Yudhishtīrīṁ-pi nripaṁti prakhyāta-kī[r*]ttī

* First stā was engraved, and then it was corrected into tāi by partly cancelling the s.

* First mā was engraved, and then it was corrected into ma.

* This syllable might perhaps be confused with śva. But in śva—e.g. vikramā, 1, 39—the side stroke is much more marked than in the present case, where ka seems to be intended, and in other cases where we undoubtedly have ka—e.g. kanda, 1, 3; subhāpa, 1, 31; and kāta, 1, 45. Wathen read Kandeka; but the first letter is not the simple ka.

* Wathen read Khodeja. The ft is not exactly the same as in No. CXXXIII. 1, 8. But that it is ft is shown by the ṭa of bhaṅḍera, 1, 43 and 44 below, as contrasted with the dei of atiśaya-viveka, 1, 27, and devsakha, 1, 28, as well as by the unmistakable reading of Khoṭiṅga in Canarese letters in No. CXXXIV. 1, 5.

* The mark to the left of this na is a slip of the engraver's tool.
Third plate.

[*] savr(hra)machārīṇēḥ | tri(tri)-pravaraṇa śrīmat(mach-.) Śa(chha)ukaraiva
puṇṭraṇya śrīmat(mat-) Sa(sa)ugamaiva-antaya śrīmat(mach-) Chchha(-chchha)nna-

[*] paivy-bhatṭāya | Upplika-stāratray-antarggata-Va vvulatalla-dvādaśa-madhye |
Paṅgarikā-nāma-grāmaḥ sa-

[*] vṛiksha-nālā-ksulā sa-ūhānya-hirany-ādēyaḥ sa-dānja-dōsha-dāsā-parādhāḥ pūrvva-
prasadidha-chactus-līma-parya-

[*] ntaḥ śulā-ādi-samast-ōptatti-sahitaḥ ś-chandr-ārkkam-mayā namasyo dattāḥ || Taṣya
pūrvvataḥ Rōhitalla- 

[*] grāmaḥ | daksaphataḥ Śilaharē(?chō)-grāmaḥ | paśchimataḥ Kiṣhih(?bhi)-
grāmaḥ | uttarataḥ Antaravall-grāmaḥ ||[*]

[*] Ėvaḥ cāttar-āgātha-viṣuddham-anuḥ Paṅgarikā-grāmaṁ śrīmat(mach-) Chchha-
(-chchha)nnapāitya-bhatṭā(ṭṭa)ya(aya) kriṣa(ṣa)taḥ karhayatō bhuniptō 

[*] bhōjyatō vā na kēnačid=vyāghatō kāryaḥ | yaś-cha karōti sa pańcha-
bhīr=api maḥāpātkāra-śrupāpataka- 

[*] ś-cha sańyuktas-syād-Uktam cha || Sāmānyoḥ-yaḥ-dhamma-sōṭur-nāpāṇāḥ | 
kālō kālō pālanlyo-bhavabhbhīh | 

10 The whole may of course be correctly treated as a compound; but the insertion of a visarga here is permissible, and serves to conveniently divide a very long word. 
11 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary. 
12 From the constant occurrence of these terms in other inscriptions, there can be little doubt, if any, that mahaṭṭrumukta is to be corrected into mahaṭṭar- 
13 This visarga is a mistake.
[47] sarvān-êtān-bhávínah pá[r*]thívendrām(n) bhúyó bhúyó yáchaté Rámahbhadraḥ ||
Yáñ-ihà dattáni
táni kò na-
[51] mā sañhuñ punar-ô[k]dádita || Va(ba)hubhir-vvasudáha bhuktá pâ[r*]thívaih
Sagar-ôôdibhih || yasya yasya
[53] yadá bhúmis-tasya tasyā tadá phalaṁ || Víndhyà-ôôaválasvátyôṣu śúshka-ôôótara
vásináh || kriñhá-ôháyó
[55] hi jàyanté bhúmi-ôôán-ôôáparáriçáh || Shashthiñ varsha-sahasrápi svarggá tishtáthi
bhúmi-ôháh || ñccháñétá chá-anuma-
[57] ná cha táñy-êva narakó vaśét || Sávarññam-êkám gám-êkám bhúmér-apya=
êkám-ôôáñugálañ || haran-ôarakan-ôôôñóti ya-
[59] vad-ôôábhúta-sañm* plavañ || Mad-ôôáñã(ôôá)-ôhá para-mahápati-ôôáñã(ôôá)-ôhá và
pápad-apéta-ôôaanáa bhúvi bhávi-bhúpáñh ||
[61] yá pályantí màna dhammam-ôôán samastáñh ténahm-ôôáñvírachítôñjálic-
ésha māñdháñ || Śrímad-Amává(mbhá)-
[63] rya-ôôántreñá Yógamárya-suténa cha || Káyastha-kumuda-bháñ(ôôá)ñginá likhitáñh
Punñárya-sáñmá ||

Translation.
Ôm! May the immortal kálpá-trees,18 decorated with the clinging embraces of the shining creepers which are Śrí and Sarasvatí and Umá, be for your prosperity!

(L. 1.)—That lineage,16 the greatness of which was produced by wonderful and mighty deeds, (and) which has the páládévañá for its topmost cluster of sprays,17—which sprang from the bulbous root which was the moon, stationed in the forest of the masses of braided hair of Dhuráñjá18 who is worthy to be praised by Brahmá and the other immortals, (and) be-sprinkled with the pure streams of the river of the gods,19—attained luxurious growth from the plentiful shade of (its) umbrellas (of sovereignty) which were as white as jasmine-flowers.

(L. 3.)—As the moon (sprary) from the ocean, (and) as a stream of lustre and a trickling of nectar (springs) from the moon,—(so) from that (lineage) there sprang the race of Yádáu, which is worthy to be praised, in which the holy Sárñgá,10 of wonderful daring, disported himself,—having the budding flowers which were his captivating beauty sucked by the bees which were the side-glances of the shepherdesses.

18 Vishnu, Brahmá, and Śíva.
19 i.e., the Súnaváná. The second meaning of the verse is a play on the other meaning of óvánsa as a bamboo-plant.
20 As applied to the lineage, upállasa has probably to be taken in the sense of 'a high banner'. The meaning of páládévañá or páládévañá has not yet been cleared up; see Vol. IX. p. 129, note 32. The present passage, and (L. 6.)—Then from the mountain of dawn which was the race of Yadu there arose a brilliant sun, the mighty Dántiçúrañá,—who caused to blossom the waterlilies which were (his) friends, and who effected the destruction of the dense darkness of the Chálukyas.

(L. 7.)—And, since he had no son, his paternal uncle, Kíñhárañá,—by whom there was amassed a pure fame, the beauty of which was worthy to be gazed upon in the halls of eighteen lords,21—became the ruler of the earth.

(L. 8.)—And from him there was (born) the king Góvinçárañá, who acquired fame in many battles, (and) by whom, possessed of (great) treasures, love, which is the reward of religion and wealth, was enjoyed to full satisfaction.

(L. 10.)—His younger brother was the king Níruçañá, whose appellation was one that was of suitable meaning because of the pre-eminence of his merits; whose army rested itself on the edges of the shores of all the oceans; (and) who, through having the whole world bowed down (before him), elevated one sole umbrella (of universal sovereignty).

(L. 12.)—From him there was (born) a son,

No. CXXXVIII. L. 9, and No. CXXXIII. L. 27, are the only instances known to me in which the páládévañá is allotted to the Báshtákátas.

18 Śíva.
19 The heavenly Ganges.
20 Vishnu, as Krishna.
21 This seems to refer to the number of Krishná's feudatory chieftains.
king Jagattuṅga, who by (his) virtues became prominent in the world; when he journeyed forth, the elephants of the quarters of the world always ceased (their) flow of rut, being terrified by (his) odoriferous rutting elephants.

(L. 13.)—His son was the lord of the earth, the glorious king Amoghavarsha,—the fire of destruction to the Chālukyas, (and) the accompanist of the widowhood of the wives of mighty enemies,—by whom was made this city named Śrī-Mānyakēta, which surpasses the city of Indra, (and) this lake, (and) a palace of great workmanship, (and) a harem.

(L. 15.)—From him there was (born) the lord of the earth, the universal sovereign, Akālavarsa; being distressed by his splendour, the sun shone in the sky with only the lustre of the moon.

(L. 16.)—In the family of the Śrī-Haikayasa there was born Kokkalla, the lord of Chēdi, the destroyer of the pride of Dāraka, and she, who was the younger sister of Saṅkukas, was his daughter; in her, who attained the rank of chief queen, there was born from king Krīṣnas a son named Jagattuṅga, who was renowned in the world for all kinds of virtues.

(L. 18.)—From that same Jagattuṅga there was (born) in Lakṣmī, who was the daughter of Saṅkaragāla lord of Chēdi, a son named Indrarāja, the predestined supporter of regal splendour.

(L. 19.)—His mind being not contented with the territories of (his) enemies that had been taken by (his) father, Jagattuṅga went forth to make the realm of his father subject to one sole umbrella (of universal sovereignty).

(L. 20.)—In Chēdi there was (born) from Jagattuṅga, in Gōvindāmba who was the daughter of (his) maternal uncle Saṅkaragāla, the glorious Amoghavarsha. He, the king, having mounted a glorious and heroic throne which was like the seat of Indra, and having presented innumerable villages conveyed by copper-plate charters of namasya-grants, (and) having made the (whole) world prosperous by (his) riches which exceeded the (utmost) desires of applicants,—the (whole) earth was filled by him with temples of Śiva, which (in purity and brilliance) were like the masses of his own fame.

(L. 23.)—And,—his elder brother, the glorious Krīṣhṇarājadēva, having ascended the skies, as if from a desire to conquer the realm of Indra,—there was (born) from king Amoghavarsha, in Kundakadevi who was the daughter of Yuvarāja, king Khoṭīga-dēva, renowned in the world.

(L. 25.)—Acquiring birth from his younger brother Nīrupama, there was (born) Kākarakāja, the abode of the goddess of bravery on the earth,—who, through the excess of (his) intellect and superhuman power, learnt, even while yet a child, the whole of the science of sovereignty. Single though he is, he, the lord of the earth, possessed of irreproachable power, always dwells in the minds of all people,—under the name of the moon, (in the minds) of the quarters of the world; under the name of the virtuous one, (in the minds) of learned people; under the name of the liberal one, (in the minds) of poor people and suppliants; under the name of the angry one, (in the minds) of enemies; under the name of the patient one, (in the minds) of good people; under the name of the beautiful one, (in the minds) of lovely women; (and) under the name of the friend, (in the minds) of friends. Lakshmi abides in the water of his sword, as if engaged for a long time in washing away her impurity, the stain of which has been acquired by (her) blameworthy abodes of evil kings; and the goddess Sarasvatī also (abides) in his mouth, saying, in jealousy, "Verily this waterlily is the home of Śrī, and she is my rival; therefore I will take my stand here." Verily his coercive reputation always roams over the earth, saying, "This king, of irreproachable deeds,—who has conquered the multitude of (his) enemies in (the country of) Gārjarā, who has disported himself with the Chālos and others; whose mind has not been disquieted in battles with the lord of the Hūpas; (and) who has been fierce to the Pāṇḍyas,—is worthy to be praised by you; do not enter into i.e. the Akālavarsa of the preceding verse.

See note 3 above. Kava is probably connected with kāra, 'an artist, artisteer.' Līlā, "plays the part of the moon; behaves like the moon." Rāvaṇa.
rivalry with him." Karuṣa, indeed, attained supreme (and) imperishable fame by liberality, and king Yudhishthira, the good one, of renowned fame, by truth, and Manohbhava by beauty, (and) the famous Partha by skill in (the use of) the bow; (but) he, the king, verily surpases all of them in the world by all (kinds of) meritorious qualities. And, by being invested with names which are of excellent signification,—since he causes the happiness of mankind by the ceaseless dripping of (his) showers of gold, he has become the glorious Amogha-varsha; since he cleaves asunder the troops of (his) enemies with the sharp arrows discharged by his skillfulness, (he has become) a modern Śrī-Partha; since he is impetuous in destroying the darkness which is all (his) mighty foes, (he has become) a glorious sun towards (his) enemies; since he is intent upon slaughtering the mighty ones, who are overcome by his prowess, (he has become) a very Śrī-Nārāyaṇa among heroes; since he surpasses the achievements of all early kings, (he has become) the glorious Nirapatung; (and) since (his) sole umbrella (of sovereignty) is irradiated by supreme lordship over the whole world, (he has become) a very Śrī-Tripētra among kings.

(L. 42.)—And he, the most worshipful one, the supreme king of great kings, the supreme lord, the most devoted worships of Mahēvāra, the glorious Amogha-varsha, the favourite of the earth, the glorious Vallabhanarendra, who meditated on the feet of the most worshipful one, the supreme king of great kings, the supreme lord, the glorious Akālavarsahadeva,—being in good health, issues his commands to all the vāṣṭra-patis, viśaya-patis, grāma-kutas, mahattaras, āyuṭakas, upayuktakas, and adhikārikas, according as they are concerned:—

(L. 46.)—"Be it known to you that,—the glorious king Kaṅkālaradeva being permanently settled at (the city of) Śrī-Mañya-kheṭa, eight hundred and ninety-four, (or) in figures 894 years, (having expired) in the centuries of years that have elapsed from the time of the Śaka king, on Wednesday the day of the full-moon of (the month) Āśvayuja in the Asvinī suhvatsara, on the great occasion of an eclipse of the moon,—in order to increase the religious merit and the fame of (my) parents and of myself,—the village named Pāṅgarikā, in the Vavvulatalla Twelve which is included in the Uppalikā Three-hundred, has been given by me," as a namasya-grant, to continue as long as the moon and stars may endure,—together with the rows and clumps of trees; together with that which is receivable (in kind) in grain and gold; together with (the right to) fines and (the proceeds of punishments inflicted for) faults and the ten (classes of) offences; extending up to its ancietly determined four boundaries; (and) together with all the income of duties, &c., to the holy Bhaṭṭa Chhannapaiya,—the son's son of the holy Śaṅka-raiyiya, and the son of the holy Saṅgamaiya,—an inhabitant of the glorious (city of) Gejaravali (?), who has come here on business, who is a religious student of the Bhārādvaja gōtra and the Bahvricha (ādikē), (and) who has three invocations (at the consecration of his sacred fire).

(L. 54.)—"The boundaries of that (village) are,—on the east, the village of Rohitalla; on the south, the village of Śilahara; on the west, the village of Kinihi; (and) on the north, the village of Antaravalī.

(L. 56.)—"No obstruction is to be made by any one to the holy Bhaṭṭa Chhannapaiya cultivating this village of Pāṅgarikā, thus defined as to its four boundaries, (or) causing (it) to be cultivated, (or) enjoying (it), or causing (it) to be enjoyed. And he who does (cause obstruction), shall be invested with (the guilt of) the five great sins and the minor sins."

(L. 58.)—And it has been said:—"This general bridge of piety of kings should at all times be preserved by you;" thus does Rāmachandra again and again make his request to all future kings! Those gifts (of land), productive of religion and wealth and fame, which have been made here by kings in former times, are like that which is vomatic forth from the

20 The second meaning of this passage refers to the destruction of the power of the Daitya, Bali by Nārâyana or Vishnu, through the three strides (vāṅkramas) taken by the latter, which covered heaven and earth and, but for the submission of Bali, would have covered the infernal regions also.

21 See note 13 above.

22 The construction here is uncouth, as his name is given in the locative case in l. 47 above. It would have been better if vasya had been omitted altogether.

23 Or perhaps Kesihi.
remains of an offering to an idol; what good man would take them back again? The earth has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sāgara; he who for the time being possesses the earth, enjoys the reward (of the grant of land that has been made!) Verily, those 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! The giver of land dwells for sixty thousand years in heaven; (but) the confiscator (of a grant of land), and he who assents (to such confiscation), shall dwell for the same number of years in hell! He who confiscates a single (coin of) gold, (or) a single cow, or a single finger of land, receives hell (as his punishment) until the destruction of (all) things! Those future kings in the earth, whether born in my lineage or in the families of other kings, who, with minds free from sin, preserve in its integrity this my act of religion,—to them I make (my) salutation, joining (my) hands together on (my) forehead! (L. 66)—Written by him who is named Pumāra, who belongs to the division of the waterlilies which are the Kāyasthas,—the son’s son of the holy Ambārya, (and) the son of Yōgamārya.

No. CXXXVII.

This is another inscription of Kakka III., or, as he is here called, Kakkala. The original is on a stone-tablet at the temple of Bana-Sashkari at Guṇḍūr, five miles to the east of Sīggānūr in the Baṅkāpur Tālukā of the Dhārvād District. The sculptures at the top of the tablet are a śiva and Nandi, with the sun and moon above them; and there are a cow and calf below the first two lines and above the rest of the inscription. The writing covers a space of about 2" 2" high by 1' 6½" broad.

The language is Old-Canarese.

The inscription is dated in Sakha 896 for 895 (A.D. 973-4), the Śrīmukha saṅvatara, on a Sunday in the month of Āṣhaṅga, at the time of the sun’s commencing his progress to the south. And it records a grant of land to the god Mahādeva or Śiva of the village of Kadekēri or Kaḋekēri.

The inscription is the last Rāšṭrakūṭa inscription that I propose editing for the present. Kakka III. was the last king of his dynasty; and in the year in which the present inscription is dated, he succumbed to Taila II. of the Western Chālukya family. The only offspring of Kakka III. of whom we have any certain mention is his daughter, Kākabbe or Jākāladevi, who became the wife of Taila II.

The overthrow of Kakka III. by Taila II. is recorded in the Khārēpapta plates,²⁸ and also in the Mirañj plates.²⁹ And the verse that fixes Sakha 895, the Śrīmukha saṅvatara for this event, is given in an inscription at Gadaq in the Dhārvād District,³⁰ and in another, based on the same model, at Kālige in the Nizām’s Dominions.³¹ It runs, as far as it can be restored from the MS. Collection—

Modalōl-kitt-ikki Rāṭ̄aś-ppalarum-adhaṇaḥ
Munjiyaṁ koṇdu dōr-gga-bāb-bāriyāḥ
Pāṁchālaṁ tāleyumān
koṇḍu Chāḷukya-rajā-ā

L. 66.)—Written by him who is named Pumārya, who belongs to the division of the waterlilies which are the Kāyasthas,—the son’s son of the holy Ambārya, (and) the son of Yōgamārya.

No. CXXXVII.

This is another inscription of Kakka III., or, as he is here called, Kakkala. The original is on a stone-tablet at the temple of Bana-Sashkari at Guṇḍūr, five miles to the east of Sīggānūr in the Baṅkāpur Tālukā of the Dhārvād District. The sculptures at the top of the tablet are a śiva and Nandi, with the sun and moon above them; and there are a cow and calf below the first two lines and above the rest of the inscription. The writing covers a space of about 2" 2" high by 1' 6½" broad.

The language is Old-Canarese.

The inscription is dated in Sakha 896 for 895 (A.D. 973-4), the Śrīmukha saṅvatara, on a Sunday in the month of Āṣhaṅga, at the time of the sun’s commencing his progress to the south. And it records a grant of land to the god Mahādeva or Śiva of the village of Kadekēri or Kaḋekēri.

²⁶ The metre is faulty from yu to chā.
published,—which is dated in Śaka 896, or 895 for 896 (A.D. 974-5), the Bhāva sanat-sara, while Pernānādi-Būtayya and Māraśingha were governing the Puligere Three-hundred, the Belvola Three-hundred, the Kīsukād Seventy, and the Bēge Seventy, and the preamble of which refers itself to the reign of Akālavarsha-Kannaradēva, who is mentioned by all the customary titles of supreme sovereignty,—thus seeming to indicate that Kṛishṇa IV.

Transcription.

[1] Svad[ā*]m para-datt[ā*]m va yō(yō) hara(rē)nī(ta) vasundharā(m)m

[2] shaśthi(hth)-rrva(va)raha-sahasrā(srā)m viṣṇhāyām jāyātē

[3] ōm Svasti Pri(pri)thu(thi)vivallabhā mahāraja-adhirā-

[4] ja paramēśva śrīmat paramahātārakaṃ śrīmat

[5] ca Kakkaladēva[?m*] pri(pri)thu(thi)virājaṃ-[go*]jye[*] Śrīma-


[7] Pernmānādi(?d?)śrīmat Pāmāśingha-dēvan-erad-arū-nāru-

[8] man-āle[*] Śrīmat Sō(kō)ma(?)sraṅka-bhīmaṃ Paṃja(?)-

[9] ladēvaṃ tombhatt-āruṃ-āle[[*] Durad-ēde-gaṃḍha(?)na[?n];

[10] mām naughty-ante-gaṃḍaṃ gaṃḍa-voreka(ga)llum(?) Mu(?me)ngū-

Vējaṃ

[11] Kade(?de)kēriya-āle Śrīmat Bo(?)lagaditale-

[12] yun Rājyayunum nālghāmudgh-geyye Mana-

[13] yyan=īṛgghaṃudgh-geyye [*] Sa(sa)kha(kha)-varṣham-e-

[14] nūya tombhatt-āryayya Śrīmukha-saṁ-

[15] vatsa[?r]-Āśhāḍ(ḍha)-dakshihāyana(ṇa)-saṁkrāntiyum-Ādi-

[16] tyāvar-āndunum Bo(?)[sya]yayunum Rājyayunum Vē-

[17] jayyanum=idu Kade(?de)kēriya Mahādēvarge bi-

[18] tta kēriya key-mattal 7 gaḷde mattal 1[[*]

[19] Bahubhir-vaṇandhā bhu[k]k(?)rājabbha-Sagar-ādibhiḥ | yasya

[20] yasya yadā bhūmi- | *s=ta* tasya tadā pāhaṃ[[*]

Translation.

He is born as a worm in ordure for the duration of sixty thousand years, who takes away land that has been given, whether by himself or by another!

(L. 3.)—Ōm! Hail! While the glorious Kakkaladēva,—the favourite of the earth; the supreme king of great kings; the supreme lord; the most worshipful one,—was ruling the earth:—

(L. 5.)—(And) while the glorious Pernānādi-Mārasīṅghadēva,—the glory of the family of the Gaṅgas; a very Antaka

41 From an ink-impression.

42 This ta was at first omitted and then inserted below the line.

43 This mark of punctuation is superfluous; especially standing, as it does, in the middle of a word.

44 First ta was engraved, and then the top of it was altered into a, so as to give sta.

45 Yama, the god of death.

to the family of the Nolambas,—was governing the (Purigere Three-hundred and the Belvola Three-hundred, which) two (combined make the) Six-hundred:—

(L. 8.)—(And) while the glorious Paṃja-ladēva (?),—who was terrible to Somaraśaka (?),—was governing the Ninety-six:—

(L. 9.)—(And) while Mungāl-Vēja,—who was a very hero in the field of battle; who was true to his word; 47 who was a very touchstone of heroes,—was governing (the village of) Kadekēri:—

46 The Pallavas.

47 Nuṣid-ante-gaṃḍha; lit., 'he who videoes the fulfillment as he speaks.' Mr. K. B. Pāṭhak translates this (p. 98 above) by 'a hero in the right sense of the word.'

But I cannot agree with him, having regard to the very similar expression nuṣidā māṭṭesuṃnaṃ, 'he who does not speak (again) when he has (once) spoken,' i.e. 'he who does not break his word,' in Vol. VI. p. 139.
and ninety-six,\(^{48}\)—Bolayya (?) and Rājayya and Vojayya, being (in assembly), there were allotted (by him\(^{44}\)) seven mattsales of black-soil land, (and) one matal of rice-land, to (the god) Mahādeva of Kadekiri.

(L. 19.)—The earth has been enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Sāgara; he who for the time being possesses the earth, enjoys the reward (of this grant)!"

ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ANDHRAS AND THE WESTERN KSHATRAPAS.

BY DR. G. BÜHLER, C.I.E.

One of the most important discoveries published in Panḍit Bhagvānlīlā's paper, On the Antiquarian Remains at Sopāra and Padaṇa, is that of the name of the father of the Andhra king Siriyaṇa Gotamiputra II. Panḍit Bhagvānlīlā reads on the reverse of the Sopāra coin—Chaturapana Gotamiputakumāru Yaṇśāta
cani, i.e., "Yaṇa-Sātakani, the princely scion of Chaturapana, born of the Gautami queen." He further adds a new Nānaghat inscription which is dated in the thirteenth year of the king Chaturapana Sātakani Vāsiṭhiputa, i.e., the son of the Vāsiṭhi queen, and identifies this ruler with the Chaturapana of the coin. Though the reading of the name on the coin is somewhat doubtful, I agree with my learned friend on this point, as well as with respect to his identifications. I even believe that his discovery explains the true meaning of another ancient inscription, Kapherī No. 11 (West), (which unfortunately is badly mutilated,) and allows us to determine what the near relationship (adāratādā sauhandka) between Rūdra
damana and the lord of the Dekhan Sātakarni was, of which the Junagadh inscription speaks. Kapherī No. 11 runs, according to Panḍit Bhagvānlīlā's facsimile (Burgess, Report, vol. V., Pl. li.), as follows:

1. ........ [Vā] sāṭahputraśaḥ Sātagra[i][ya dēya[b][h] Kār
damakavanśapr[a]bhā] vāya[a] mahākashatrapa-Ru putrā[y[a]]

2. ........ [r[i]śvasyaya] amāsvayya Sātakarni pānīyāhājanam ādeyā[ma][h]

"Of the queen of . . . . . . . Vāsīṭhiputra"

\(^{48}\) By the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronology, however, Saka 896 was the Bhāva samvatsara, and the Śrīmukha samvatsara was Saka 895. \(^{44}\) i.e., Manayya.

I leave this name in its Prakrit form, because the Sanskrit equivalent is not clear to me. Bhagvānlīlā's Sātagarṇa (who is) descended from the race of Kārdamakā kings (and) the daughter of the great Kshatrapa Rūdra . . . . . . of the confidential minister Sateraka, a water cistern, the meritorious gift."

The letters, placed between brackets, have been restored conjecturally, with the exception of the r of Sātagarṇiya which is distinctly visible. It ought to be noted that the ya of the same word is very faint, and that the ta might also be read sa. Nevertheless, I think, the restorations are perfectly certain, and it is almost equally certain that the name of the Mahākṣatrapa was Rudra, as the size of the lacuna shows that one syllable only has been lost. The connexion of the two fragments seems to be, as I have already stated (Burgess, Arch. Report, vol. V., p. 78), that the confidential minister executed the charitable work on behalf of the queen (compare Banavāsi Paññ. inscr. Archaeol. Survey, No. X, p. 100). If the restorations are correct, it is perfectly clear that Vāsīṭhiputra Sātagarṇa was an Andhra king, and that his queen was the daughter of a Kshatrapa. Combining this information with Panḍit Bhagvānlīlā's discovery, that Chaturapana Vāsīṭhiputra Sātagarṇi was Siriyaṇa's father, and the statement of the Junagadh inscription that Sātagarṇi, the lord of the Dekhan, was a relative of Mahākṣatrapa Rūdra
damana, as well as the fact that Siriyaṇa on the Sopāra coin imitated the coinage of the Kshatrapas, I believe that the following inferences may be drawn from these premises:—

transliteration Chaturaparna does not seem to me acceptable. It is very probable that the word ChauṟuRVINDHA or ChauṟuRVINDHA, which Hemachandra in his Devikosa mentions as a synonym of Sāthara, denotes the same person.
Vasiṣṭhiputra Sātakaraṇī of Kapherī No. 11 is the same person as Chaturpana Vasiṣṭhiputra Sātakaraṇī, and his queen, the daughter of the Mahākṣatrāpa Rudra, is the mother of Siriyāṇa, usually called Gotamī, i.e., Gautami according to the Vaiḍika gotra of her father’s Purohita. We have, therefore, in this inscription an explanation of the adharaṇya evabhanda,—the near connexion by marriage between the Kṣatrāpas and the Andhras, which is mentioned in the Junagadh inscription and an argument for identifying the Sātakaraṇī of the Junagadh inscription either with Chaturpana Vasiṣṭhiputra Sātakaraṇī, or with Gotamiputra Siriyāṇa Sātakaraṇī.

A further confirmation of these inferences is furnished by the fact that the letters of Kapheri No. 11 are the exact counterpart of those of Rājadāman’s Junagadh inscription, and both documents belong to the same time.

As regards the explanation of the remaining problems, the question who Mahākṣatrāpa Rudra was, and what may be meant by the term Kārddamakarājavahana, I am not as yet prepared to offer any definite opinion. I think it not improbable that Rudra may be a short form for Rājadāman, just like Vikrama for Vikramāditya, and that Kārddamakarāja may have been a title of the Western Kṣatrāpas. If that were the case, Chaturpana would have been Rājadāman’s son-in-law, and Siriyāṇa would have been grandson, and the near relationship would certainly be a sufficient ground for either being spared after defeat. But, as more than one line of Kṣatrāpas certainly existed, it is also possible that Siriyāṇa’s mother was the daughter of some other near relative of Rājadāman, who ruled at a place called Kārddama.

Paṇḍit Bhagvānīlāl’s further remarks on the chronology of the Andhras require very considerable modifications. According to the inscriptions and coins the group of kings beginning with Sātakaraṇī Gotamiputra I. stands now, as follows:

1. Gotamiputra Sātakaraṇī I. reigned at least 24 years.
2. Pulumāyi, Vasiṣṭhiputra. 24
3. Mādhariputra Sakasena or Sirisena. 8 years.
4. Vasiṣṭhiputra Chaturpana Sātakaraṇī 13
5. Siriyāṇa Gotamiputra Sātakaraṇī II. 16

The position of Mādhariputra Sakasena or Sirisena, whom the Paṇḍit forgets in his latest discussion, is perfectly certain, as it has been shown by the Paṇḍit himself, that this king has re-struck coins of Pulumāyi, while coins of his were re-struck by Gotamiputra Siriyāṇa Sātakaraṇī II. But it is by no means certain that another, as yet unknown, king did not intervene between Nos. 2 and 3, or between Nos. 3 and 4. The dates, given above, are those which actually occur on the inscriptions, and in most cases the reigns probably were somewhat longer.

As regards the synchronisms between the Andhras and the Western Kṣatrāpas, there are now, one which is certain, and two which are very probable. First, Gotamiputra Sātakaraṇī certainly conquered Nāhapāna and his son-in-law Usavatāra after the 46th year of the era of their inscriptions, and before the fourteenth year of his own reign. This is evident from the date Saṅ. 46, contained in the minister Ayama’s Junnar Inscription No. 32 (Arch. Reports, vol. IV, p. 103), and from the fact that Sātakaraṇī Gotamiputra addresses his orders to his amātya, in charge of Govardhana-Nāsik, in the rainy season of the 14th year of his reign (Nāsik 11, Reports, vol. IV, p. 105). As Usavatāra’s Nāsik and Kārle inscriptions show that Nāhapāna held Nāsik and the country south of Nāsik, it is clear that if Sātakaraṇī, in the 14th year of his reign, had a governor of his own at Nāsik, the overthrow of the Kharatāras must have happened before that year. The second synchronism, which is probable, is that Pulumāyi and Chashtaṇa were contemporaries. This is probable because Pulumāyi is the immediate successor of Sātakaraṇī and Chashtaṇa the next Kṣatrāpa of Ujjain after Nāhapāna. It may also be indicated by Ptolemy’s mentioning just these two kings as rulers of Pāthana and of Ujjain. Ptolemy’s statement possesses, however, not that paramount importance which Mr. Bhāţ Dāji, Paṇḍit Bhagvānīlāl, and others attribute to it. For there is nothing to show that Ptolemy meant to say more than that Tiāstane is either as the name or the title of a son of Kesaragupta.
and Siripolemaicos were the two best known rulers of Ujjain and Paithān, or that, if he meant to say that they were the reigning kings of those towns according to the most recent information received from India, his statement was based on reports collected not by others, but by himself. The notes, "Ozene, the royal residence of 'Tisstanes'" and "'Baitthana,' the royal residence of 'Siripolemaicos" are perfectly correct, even if these individuals lived several hundred years before Ptolemy's time.9 They may, however, merely convey the meaning that these two princes were the most remarkable and famous of whom the author knew. On the other hand, even if we suppose that Ptolemy meant to say that Tisstanes and Siripolemaicos ruled over the two towns according to the latest information received, what is there to prove that his latest intelligence was not very antiquated? The writer of an extensive work like his must have copied a good deal from others, and we know from his own statements that his book is not based altogether on original research. His sources may have been a hundred years old, and even older, and there is not the slightest evidence that these two particular notes belong to Ptolemy himself. Under these circumstances the synchronism, "Pułumāyi and Chahtaḥaṇa were con-
temporary rulers,"—which I am prepared to admit,—cannot be made the basis of a chronological theory. The basis for settling the chronology of the Andhras is given by the third synchronism, which shows that Rudradāman and Chaturpana Sātakani or Siriyāna Sātakani were contemporaries. It is in great part due to Paṇḍit Bhagvānālī's discoveries that we can recognise Rudradāman as the contemporary of one of the two Andhras mentioned, and thus connect the Andhras with the era of Chahtaḥaṇa's descendants. The latter must have been destroyed shortly after their 310th year by Chandragupta, some time before the 82nd year of the Gupta era. As I have stated in my remarks on the Nāṅghāṭ inscriptions (Burgess, Reports, vol. V, pp. 73–74), the equation A. K. 310+z = A. G. 82—a follows from the latest date on the Kāshtrapa coins and the earliest date of the Guptas in Mālav. If the Gupta saṅvat begins, as seems now certain, about 190 A. D. the beginning of the era of the Western Kāshṭrapās falls in the middle of the first century before Christ.10 Whether it is identical with the Vikrama era, is a question which I will not discuss here, though the assumption appears to me a reasonable one. But the era of the Western Kāshtrapās has certainly no connection with the Śaka Saṅvat.

AN INSCRIBED ROYAL SEAL FROM WALĀ.

BY PROF. G. BÜHLER, Ph.D., C.I.E., VIENNA.

Some time ago a clay seal, measuring 2.9 inches by 2.6 inches, on the face, and about 2.4 inches high, bearing on the face a rude impression of the sun and the moon, and below it an inscription in four lines, was found at or in the neighbourhood of the ruins of Valabhi. Colonel J. Watson, into whose possession it came, sent to me several paper-rubbings and a sealing-wax impression, together with the reading of the inscription by his Paṇḍit, Āchārya Valabhiṇ. As I think that the document may eventually become important for the history of Western India, I publish my own and Valabhiṇ's interpretations of it.

9 See also my discussion of this point in Burgess, Reports, vol. V, p. 72. In order to illustrate these remarks I will give another dīwāndate. Would it not be natural and correct, if a geographer of the present day appended to the name Gharas, the remark, "the capital of Mahārdā," and would it not be a fatal mistake to infer from this remark more than that the author lived later than Mahārdā Ghansenvi? I must further add, that this objection to Mr. Bhāū Dājīl's reasoning was suggested to me by Sir E. C. Bayley.

10 See now Sir E. C. Bayley's article on "Certain Dates occurring on the coins of the kings of Cabin," Num. Chron., 3rd series, vol. II, pp. 128–165. Sir E. C. Bayley too, expresses the same opinion regarding the method to be used in settling the beginning of the Kāshtrapā era.
the last two letters have been entirely destroyed, and in the fourth the last letter is half gone.

_Transcription._

आ जयसुर्यश्रीमहाराजाधिराजः ।
बृहस्पतीश्रीमहाराजाधिराजः ।
सुनान् महाराजमहाः ।
पतिपुष्येयसय

_Translation._

"The (emblem of) the royal fortune of the great king, the great lord... Pushyaṇa, the son of the great king Ahiśvarman, whose (Pushyaṇa's) royal line has been unbroken since (the times of) Jayaśkaṇḍha."

The name Pushyaṇa is remarkable, but may be explained as Pushya śiro yasya, 'he whose lord is the nakṣatra Pushya.' Various restorations of the mutilated epithet mahāpāti can be proposed. But I think that the most probable is mahā́ṣcenpāti, 'the great general.'

As hitherto the names Ahiśvarman and Pushyaṇa have not been found among the rulers of Western India, and the occurrence of an impression of a royal seal in the ruins of an old town may be explained in very different ways, I refrain from adding any historical speculations. For the sake of comparison I give the reading proposed by Āchārya Valabhi

अतः ।
दधामहाश्रीमहाराजः ।
वृहस्पतीश्रीमहाराजाधिराजः ।
सुनान् महाराजमहाः ।
पतिपुष्येयसय

Colonel Watson adds that according to the opinion of the Pañḍit the name of the king's father is Hiśūma.

__THE COLUMN INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI.__

_by M. Émile Senart._

(Continued from p. 74.)

_Sixth Edict._

Prinsep, _ut sup._ pp. 596 ff.; Kern, _ut sup._ pp. 92 ff.

(1) Devānaṁpiyov piyadasi lārha hevan ahā [ _ ] duvājaesa
(2) vasaabhisaṭena me dhaźimalipi likhāpītā lokasa
(3) hitasukhyaye [ _ ] se taṁ apāhā [ _ ] tuṁaṁ dhaźumavoḍha pāpovā [ _ ]
(4) hevan lokasa hitasukheti paṭivekhami atha iyaṁ
(5) nātisu hevan patiyāṣaṁmesa hevan apaṁkaṭeṣa
(6) kīmaṁ kāni sukhaiṁ avahāṁti tathā cha vidahāṁ [ _ ] hemeva
(7) savāniyakoṣa paṭivekhami [ _ ] savapāśaṁda pī me pūjitā [ _ ]
(8) vividhāya pūjāya [ _ ] e chu iyaṁ atanā pachūpajamane
(9) se me mokhyamate [ _ ] saḍviṣatva saabhisetena me

("5") iyaṁ dhaźimalipī likhāpītā [ _ ]

_Translation._

Thus says king Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods. In the thirteenth year of my consecration I have (for the first time) caused edicts to be engraved for the welfare and happiness of the people. I flatter myself that it will occasionally catch something from them, and in some way or other, cause some progress in religion, that so it may be profitable for the welfare and happiness of the people; and I make the arrangements that I believe are fitted to secure the welfare as well of my remote subjects as of those who are near me and of my own relations. It is thus that I superintend all bodies of officers. All sects receive from me honours of different sorts. But it is the personal adhesion (to their doctrines and practices) that I regard as the principal point. I have caused this edict to be engraved in the twenty-seventh year of my consecration.

20 A. atha... cyaḥpā... patiyā... A. "dhārya saṁkṣe ṅe,...
21 R. "pāṭhā... A. "dhārya..."
22 R. "kāthana... M. "kāthana..."
23 R. "kīṁaṁ... M. "kīṁaṁ..."
24 R. "kāthana... M. "kāthana..."
25 A. "sakham..."
26 R. "avahā... A. "avahā..."
27 R. "tathā... A. "tathā..."
28 A. "tāmaṁ... B. "tāmaṁ..."
29 A. "vaidāpomī... B. "vaidāpomī..."
30 A. "hevaṁmeva... M. "meva..."
31 A. "sāni... koyesa... A. "viya..."
32 A. "iva... A. "iva..."
33 R. "pīta... A. "pīta ti..."
Seventh Edict.
Prinsep, p. 597 ff.
(15) Devānapīya piyadasi lājā hevaṁ āhā [.] ye atiṣaṅitaṁ
(16) aññataṁ lājāne husa hevaṁ ichhisu kathaṁ janē
(17) dhāṁmavāḍhiyā vaḍhēya no chu jāne anulūpāya dhāṁmavāḍhiyā
(18) vaḍhithā [ ] etai devānapīya piyadasi lājā hevaṁ āhā [ ] esa me
(19) huthā atiṣaṅitaṁ cha aññataṁ hevaṁ ichhisu lājāne kathaṁ janē
(20) anulūpāya dhāṁmavāḍhiyā vaḍhēyaṭi no cha jāne anulūpāya
(21) dhāṁmavāḍhiyā vaḍhithā [ ] se kina us jāne anupaṭipajayē
tādā (22) kina su jāne anulūpāya dhāṁmavāḍhiyā vaḍhēyaṭī kina sū kānī
tādā (23) abhyuṁmāṁyaḥyām dhāṁmavāḍhiyātī [ ] etai devānapīya piyadasi lājā hevaṁ
(24) āhā [ ] esa me huthā dhāṁmāsāvanāṁ svāpaṭyāmīm dhāṁmānusathīnī
tādā (25) anuṣisāṁi etai jāne suti anupaṭipajastāti abhyuṁmāṁsāṭī [ ].

Translation,
Thus says the king Piyaḍasi, the beloved of the gods:—The kings that have governed in the past have (indeed) formed this vow: how to bring it about that men may make progress in religion? But men have not made such progress in religion as was conformable (to their desire). Then thus says king Piyaḍasi, the beloved of the gods:—I have made this reflexion: since the kings who have governed in the past have formed this vow,—how to bring it about that men may make such progress in religion as was conformable (to their desire) and since men have not made in religion such progress as was conformable (to their desire) by what means to lead men to follow the good path? By what means to attain that men may make progress in religion such as is conformable (to my desire)? By what means should I be able to cause them to advance in religion? Then thus saith king Piyaḍasi, the beloved of the gods:—I have taken the resolution to publish religious exhortations, to promulgate religious instructions: men hearing this (word) will enter on the good path, they will advance (in good).

Eighth Edict.
The 'circular edict,'—Prinsep, pp. 602 ff.; Lassen (p. 270, n. 1; p. 275, n. 3); and Burnouf (pp. 749f)—have not discussed or translated it entire, but only short fragments of it.
(1*) Dhāṁmavāḍhiyā cha bādhaṁ vaḍhētāt etaye me aṁthāye dhāṁmāsāvanāṁ svāpaṭitāni dhāṁmānusathīnī vividhāni anāpītāni [ ] yathatiyāpā pi bahune janapiṁ āyatā ete palāyovadisaṁti pari paṁvitaṁsaṁti pī [ ] lajukā pī bahuksesu pānastasaṁse su āyaṁ te pī me anāpīta hevaṁ cha hevaṁ cha paḷiyovadāthā
(2*) janaṁ dhāṁmayuṭaṁ [ ] devānapīya Piyaḍasi hevaṁ āhā [ ] ete ane me anuvēkhamāṁe dhāṁmānusathīnī katāni dhāṁmamahāmātā katā dhāṁma...kaṭe [ ] de-
(3*) vānapīya piyadasi lājā hevaṁ āhā [ ] magesa pī me nioghaṁ lopāpitāni chhaṁo-
(4*) pagāṁ hosaṁti pasuṁ misānaṁ aṁbāvaḍiṅā lopāpitā aṁdaḥaṁśikā pī me udapānāni
(5*) khanāpaṭitāni nisai—dhāyā ca kālapitā āpānāni me bahukāni tata tata kālapitāni paṭibhogyā pāsumuniśaṁ [ ] sa—esa paṭibhogo nāma [ ] vividhāya hā sukhāya-
(6*) nāyā pulimehi pī lajukhi mamayā cha sukhāyete loke imaṁ cha dhāṁmānupāpaṭi an-
(7*) upaṭipajantū tā etadathā me
(8*) esa kaṭe [ ] devānapīya Piyaḍasi hevaṁ āhā [ ] dhāṁmamahāmātā pī me ta bhāvahduḥsasu aṁguhahkescu viyāpaṭa se pasajitānaṁ cheva gihithānaṁ cha sava ... desu pī cha viyāpaṭa se [ ] saṁghāṭhaṁ pī me kato ime viyāpaṭa hoṁaṁti ti [ ] heṃeva bābhānesu aṁjivikesu pī me kato
(9*) ime viyāpaṭa hoṁaṁti [ ] nighaṁḥhesu pī me kato ime viyāpaṭa hoṁaṁti [ ] nanaṁ paṁsaṁdesu pī me kato ime viyāpaṭa hoṁaṁti tī[ ] paṭivisionaṁ paṭivisīṭhāṁ tesu tesu to me mahāmātā dhāṁmamahāmātā cha me etesu cheva viyāpaṭa savesu cheva aṁmesu paṁsaṁdesu [ ] devānapīya Piyaḍasi lājā hevaṁ āhā [ ]
(10*) ete ca aṁme cheva bahukā mukhā dānava-
sagaṭi viyāpaṭa se mama cheva devīnāṁ cha [ ] savasī cha me olodhanaṁ se bhāvui-
dhena ā ā. lena tāṁi tāṁi tuṭhāyaṭanāṁ pati ... [ ] hida cheva diśasu cha dālakānaṁ

1 The m has here the signs both of the vowel e and of the vowel u.
pi cha me kaṭe aṁnaṁaḥ cha devikumālānaṁ ime dānavisagesa viyāpaṭaḥ hōhaṁti ti

(9') dhaṁmaḍapadānahaṁye dhaṁmaṇopaṭipatiye [ ] esa hi dhaṁmaḍapadān me dhaṁmaṇopaṭipati cha yā iyaṁ dayā dāne sache sochave madave sādhana cha lokasa evaṁ vadhaisati ti [ ] devānaṁpiye ... lāja hevaṁ āḥ [ ] yāni hi kāni chī māmipyā sādhavānī kaṭāṁ; taṁ lokā anuṣṭpāpāne taṁ cha anuvidhiyaṁ ti tena vadhīta cha

(8') vadhaisāṁi cha mātāpitās sususāyā gulosus sususāyā vayomahalakānaṁ anuṣṭpāpātiyā bābhanaśamanesu kapanavalākesu āvaḍāśaḥakaṁ sahaṭṭipatiyā [ ] devānaṁpiye ... dasi lāja hevaṁ āḥ [ ] munisānaṁ cha yā iyaṁ dhaṅmaṇavādhi vadhīta duvehi yeva akālehi dhaṁmaṇiyamena cha njihātiyā cha [ ].

(7) tata cha luhn sadhaṁmaṇiyame njihātiyā va bhuye [ ] dhaṁmaṇiyame cha kho esa ye me iyaṁ kaṭe āṁnā cha āṁnā jātāni avaḍhyāni aṁnāni pi cha bahu ... dhaṁmaṇiyamāni yāni me kaṭāṁ [ ] njihātiyā va cha bhuye munisānaṁ dhaṅmaṇavādhi vadhīta avihīṁsāye bhuṭānaṁ

(10) anāla[m]bāye pāṇaṁaḥ [ ] se etāye athāye iyaṁ kaṭe putāpapotike chaṁḍamasuñyike hotu ti tathā cha anuṣṭpājaṁta ti [ ] hevaṁ hi anuṣṭpājaṁtaṁ hidatapalate ālāvha hoti [ ] satavisatirsabhipātena me iyaṁ dhaṁmaṇali likhaṁpiti ti [ ] etāṁ devānaṁpiye āḥ [ ] iyaṁ

(11) dhaṁmaṇalibī ata athi silāṭaḥbhāhāni vā silāṭaḥaṅkāni vā tata kaṭātiyā ena esa chilaṭhitike siyā [ ].

Translation.

In order that religion may make rapid progress, for that reason I have published religious exhortations, I have given various instructions upon religion, I have appointed numerous (officers) over the people, each having his circle to himself, that they may spread the teaching, that they may develop (my thought). I have also appointed rājakas over many myriads of creatures, and they have received from me the command to direct the faithful people. Thus saith Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods:—It is with this only pre-occupation that I have raised pillars (covered with inscriptions) of religion, that I have created supervisors of religion, that I have published religious exhortations (?).

Thus saith the king Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods:—Upon the roads I have planted nyagrodhas that they may give shade to men and beasts, I have planted gardens of mangos; from half krōta to half krōta I have caused wells to be dug, I have caused bathing-ponds (?) to be made, and, in a multitude of places, caused caravanserais to be built for the comfort of men and of animals. But, for myself the true comfort is this:—Previous kings have, and I myself have contributed to the welfare of men by various ameliorations; but to make them enter on the ways of religion, with this object I rule my actions. Thus saith Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods:—I have created also supervisors of religion in order that they may be occupied in all kinds of works of charity, that they may be occupied also with all sects, sects of monks or of people living in the world. I have had also in view the interests of the clergy, with which these officers will occupy themselves, also the interests of Brāhmaṇas, of religious mendicants, with which they will occupy themselves, about the Nirgranthas ascetics and the different sects, with which they will equally occupy themselves. The Mahāmātras will occupy themselves separately with the one and the other, each with one corporation; and my supervisors of religion will be employed in a general way, as much with these sects as with all others. Thus says the king Piyadasi, the beloved of the gods:—These officers and others besides are my intermediaries; they are appointed to the distribution of my alms and those of the queens. In my whole palace they (give their attention) in different ways each to the apartments that are entrusted to them. I intend also that, as here, so in the provinces, they be employed to distribute the alms of my children, and specially of the royal princes, in order to encourage acts of religion, the practice of religion, namely: compassion, almsgiving, veracity, purity of life, gentleness and kindness. Thus saith the king Piyadasi, beloved of the gods:—Indeed, the acts of goodness of every kind that I perform, after these do people govern themselves: they are ruled by my example. In this way have men grown and will grow in obedience to parents, to masters, in condescension to people of advanced age, in respect towards Brāhmaṇas, Śramaṇas, the poor, the miserable, even to slaves and servants. Thus saith the king Piyadasi,
beloved of the gods:—But this progress of religion among men is attained in two ways: by positive rule and by the sentiments which every one may inspire in them. But of this double action, that of positive rule is only of mediocre value; the inner inspiration alone gives it all its influence. The positive rules consist in what I enjoin, when, for example, I interdict the killing of such and such kinds of animals, and in other religious prescriptions which I have enjoined in great numbers. But it is only by the change of personal sentiments that the progress of religion grows more and more, in the (general) respect for life, in the care not to slay any being. It is with this view that I have placed this inscription in order, that it may endure for my sons and grandsons, that it may endure as long as the sun and moon, so that they may follow my directions; for in following this path they will obtain blessing here below and in the other world. I have caused this edict to be engraved in the twentieth year of my consecration. Thus saith the (king) beloved of the gods:—Wherever this edict exists on pillars of stone or walls of rock, it must be made to last long.

The Queen's edict at Allahabad.

Prinsep u. s. p. 966 ff.

(*) Devānāpiyasa vachanenā satana mahāmatā
(?) vataviyā [ ] cheta dutiyāye deviye dá (?)

Translation.

This direction is addressed in the name of (the king) beloved of the gods, to the Mahāmatras of all districts: Every gift made by the second queen,—the gift of a mango orchard or of a garden, equally every object of value found in them (should be to the honour) of the queen, whose religious zeal and charitable spirit should be acknowledged by saying: "all this comes from the second queen . . . ."

Edict of Kausāmbi.

This fragment is so named by General Cunningham because it is addressed to the Mahāmatras of Kausāmbi. This is the only information also that I can derive from it. I can make nothing of the rest of the transcript, too incomplete and imperfect to serve as a basis for any useful conjecture. I only reproduce it from the Corpus to complete the series.

(*) Devānāpiyasi anapayati Kausāmbiya mahāmatā.
(?)—ramari (?) . sanghasi nila hiyo
(?) i . . . . . . . šatibhitī . bhaṅgī nita . . . .
(?) ba . . . . . . . pinah dhapapita atā setha amvasayi.

CHINGHIZ KHĀN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

BY HENRY H. HOWORTH, F.S.A.

(Continued from p. 175.)

XXII.

While Mu-khu-li in Liau-tung and Migan before Chung-ku were prosecuting their successful campaigns, Chinghiz Khān was reposing at Hoan-chau, a town, according to Hyacinthe, founded in the year 810 by the Khitans, and situated 19 leagues N.E. of Tu-abi-ken, one of the gates of the Great Wall, and south-west of lake Dolon. It is called Kurian Balsghassun by the Mongols. 1 When the news of the capture of


2 Rashidu'd-din tells us he was formerly called Shiki, was a Tartar by origin, and had been made over to

3 Chinghiz Khān's wife, whose protégé he was.—Erdmann, p. 322.

4 Called Unggur, the chief marshal, by Bashid, and Yanggur in the Yuan-ch'a-o-pi-shi.

5 The Harkhi Khassar of Bashid.

6 Huang Ts'ien, p. 198. They are called Kal-li-u and Ku-i in the transcript of Bashid by Erdmann.
messengers with some offerings of gold and other things. Yunggur and Khasar took what was offered them but Khutakhu refused. They took the Kin treasures with them, and also Khada. Chinghiz asked Khutakhu, "Did Khada give thee some things?" He replied, "He offered them, but I did not venture to accept them." "Why not?" said Chinghiz. He replied that he had said to Khada, "Before the surrender of the city all its treasures belonged to the Altan Khan. But now it has surrendered, it all belongs to my king. How can you secretly take the property of my king, and appropriate it to private uses?" Chinghiz greatly praised him for this act, and severely reprimanded Yunggur and Arkhaj Khasar. It is singularly curious how Rashid-ad-din and the author of the Huang-yuan agree almost verbatim in this narrative, which is not mentioned by other Chinese authors. In regard to the results of the capture of Chinghiz, Minhaj-i-siraj says the Altan Khan's son and his vizier both fell into the hands of Chinghiz, and that he ordered an account to be taken from the records of the quantity of gold and silver which ought to be in the treasury, and insisted upon every bar being forthcoming. The same author reports Bahan-ad-din as stating that he actually saw the son of the Altan Khan and the vizier brought into the presence of Chinghiz. In regard to the son I can find no confirmation of the statement anywhere except in the Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi, where we certainly read that the ruler of the Kins having arrived at Bian-lian, submitted himself humbly to Chinghiz, and Chinghiz received his son Tengeri, and 100 men into his service. By the vizier is meant a famous person, who became an important factor in developing the Mongol polity. His name was Yelin-Chutsai. He was a member of the Khitan Imperial house, and descended in the eighth generation from Thu-yo, a prince of that house. His father had been vice-chancellor of the Kin empire, and he himself was born in the district of Yan in the year 1190 when his father was 60 years old. As the latter, from certain prognostications, judged that the boy would some time render important services to some foreign princes, he gave him the name of Chutsai or Tsu-Tsai, and the surname of Tsin-king, thus making a double allusion to a passage in the chronicle of Tso-khiou-ming, which mentioned a fact of the same kind. Chutsai lost his father at the age of three years, but under his mother Yan-shi, who took charge of his education, he surpassed older children in his knowledge of various kinds of books, especially those dealing with astronomy, geography, the calendar and arithmetic, studies which led him to the conclusion that the planetary motions were more accurately known in the west than in China, and he constructed a set of tables under the name Mathapa, made on the system of those of the Mussalmans. In 1213 he obtained his first public employment, which he quitted to take charge of the government of Yen-king. De Maille says he was of a gigantic stature 8 feet high (!!!) with a majestic bearing, had a venerable beard, and an imposing voice. On his being presented to Chinghiz, the latter was struck by his appearance, and said to him: "The Kin Tartars have been the enemies of the Khitans, from whom they have taken their empire, I have come to revenge your family." Chutsai replied: "My father and grandfather have been faithful subjects of the Kin, how can I condemn their conduct and venture to take vengeance upon them for what they have done to my family?" Chinghiz was pleased with this reply and determined to keep Chutsai by him, and to employ him in his service. He insisted that before each enterprise he undertook, Chutsai should predict for him according to the rules of his science whether the event would prove favourable or the reverse, and also confided to him the duty of divining by means of burnt shoulder-blades of sheep.

A few days after his reception of Yelin Chutsai, Chinghiz Khan went in person to Yen-king. All the troops there were under arms to receive him, Mingan, otherwise called Chapar, being at their head. Addressing the grandees he told them he owed the capture of the city to Chapar. After a short stay he set out again for Tartary and went to pass the summer heats of 1215 at Leang-king, a town in the district of Hoan-chau,
already named. He took with him the princesses, whom Monien-tsin-chong had deserted. Leang-king is identified by Douglas with the modern Koo-urh-too Pa’urh-bo-sun in Mongolia, i.e., with Kurtun Balghassun already named. 

At this time the towns of Hokien Tsing-chau and Tsang-chau revolted against the Mongols. Douglas names only Tsang, which he identifies with the modern Taing-hien in Chih-li and Shan, which he similarly identifies with Shun-hien in the same province. Chinghiz sent Wang-tai with an army to recover them, and sent 3,000 Mongol and Chinese troops after him under the command of Putu. They captured Hokien, where they increased their army by 1,000 men. Putu wished to exterminate the citizens, as they were very turbulent, but Wang-tai having interceded for them and answered for their good behaviour, he not only pardoned them but also the leaders of the revolt. Rashidu’d-din tells us that in consequence of the capture of Yen-king three Kin officers, whom he names Jang-gu, Jang-gu-ning, and Jun-gar-Ashu-leng, who had shut themselves up in the town of Chi-nang which was situated in a marsh, submitted. The text of the Huang-yuan is corrupt at this point. In reporting apparently the event, it says, on the contrary, that Jan-fu, Juan-khobun, Jun-gelisi and Yan-shhau occupied Chin-an, and did not surrender. Meanwhile Chinghiz determined to prosecute his advantage against the Kin empire and detach a tuman, i.e., 10,000 men, towards the south under Samuka, who is called Samkhi-batur by Hyacinthe, Sanko-patu by De Mailla, Sankepa by Gaubil, San-khe-badu in the Huang-yuan, and Samuka Behadur by Rashidu’d-din. He had orders to turn the famous and difficult Tung-kuan pass by making a detour through part of Si-hia, and advanced by King-chau or Si-ngan-fu upon Tung-kuan, situated near the southern bank of the Yellow River, and commanding a defile from Shen-si to Ho-nan. Unable to capture it he determined to make a detour through the mountains of Sung, situated N.E. of Ju-chau, in Ho-nan, and took the road leading to Ju-chau or Yü-chau.
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and Gaubil say that, in order to traverse the ravines and defiles in this difficult country, he made bridges with pikes, and interlaced branches of trees fastened by strong chains. Douglas makes out that this contrivance was employed for crossing the Yellow River, and that the interstices between the boughs, &c., were filled with earth and stones. Samuka at length reached Hing-hoa-ning, 20 li distant from the Nanking. The Kin emperor hastily summoned the troops of Shan-tung, and the Mongols were beaten and forced to retire towards Shen-chau, called Shen-khau-in by Hyacinthe. It is a town situated in the western part of Ho-nan, 15 leagues E.N.E. of Tung-kuan, on the south bank of the Yellow River. As it was winter, and the Yellow River was frozen over Samuka traversed it on the ice, returned once more northwards, and the Kin troops, too anxious for the safety of Tung-kuan, and San-fu, neglected pursuing him. The Huang-yuan says that after passing Tung-kuan Samuka in this campaign ravaged the districts of Sun and Ju, and then went straight to Pien-liang to the camp of Sin-khau-in, and plundered Khe-nan. Re-tiring thence he went to Shan-chau crossed the river, and withdrew northwards. Rashid adds that on passing the great city of Pe-sin two Kin generals named Aependur and Fisher Sani, submitted to him. According to the Yuan-shi, Chinghiz now sent Ekele, to offer terms to the Kin emperor, and to remind him that every city north of the river and in Shan-tung was now in his possession, that resistance was useless, and if he would abdicate the throne he would make him king of the district south of the river, i.e., of Ho-nan, and leave him in peace. According to the Kang-mu the overtures came from the Kin side, and it was Utubu, the Kin emperor, who sent an officer to demand peace. Chinghiz was not indisposed to grant it. “It is in these matters,” he said to Sa-mu-ho-li i.e. Samuka, “as in hunting, when we have enclosed the stag, we can select what we choose. There only
remains a hare which we have not captured. Why not let it go?" Samunaka, who blushed at not having distinguished himself like the other Mongol chiefs did not like this counsel. Chinghiz proposed very hard conditions. Utubu was to surrender all the territory he held north of the Yellow River, to renounce the title of emperor, and take that of king of Ho-nan, and to acknowledge him as his suzerain. These terms were rejected.\textsuperscript{30} The negotiations having broken down we read that in the spring of 1216 the Mongols made a second effort to reach the southern capital of the Chin; we are told that Siu-ting the commander of Ping-yang-fu sent Pilan-alutai and Tashan-pekia with 15,000 men to defend the passage across the Yellow River, and also the town of Shen-chan. He himself with a picked army went to cover the southern capital, and sent several other divisions towards Tung-kuan to oppose the Mongols if they should venture to attack it, but they turned it as on the former occasion and went and encamped between Ju-chau and the mountain of Sung, whence traversing the mountain paths which were deemed impracticable they fell suddenly upon Tung-kuan and captured it almost without a blow.\textsuperscript{31} Siu-ting ordered the governors of Kiang-chau, Hsia-chau, Shi-chau Ki-chau and Mong-chau to combine their forces in case the enemy should suddenly appear. Shortly after the Mongols having crossed the river near San-men marched towards Ping-yang, but were repulsed with loss by Siu-ting, who also recaptured the fortress of Tung-kuan.\textsuperscript{32}

The Yuan-shih has a different story about this campaign. It says that when the Chin emperor refused to listen to the terms offered by Chinghiz he sent the general She-tien-ne, called Shekian-ne by Hyacinthe, and She-tien-i in the Huang-yuan, to recommend hostilities, and to encourage his generals, he gave each of them a paitah or official tablet of office, marked with a tiger. She-tien-ne, we are told by this authority, went forth in the eighth month of 1215, and took Ping-chau, and at the same time the Chin minister, Kechu,\textsuperscript{33} surrendered.

The Huang-yuan and Rashidu'd-dln mention a third campaign in these parts. They tell us that Chinghiz sent T млan-an-Sherbi,\textsuperscript{34} who, the latter says, was the son of Mengelug Ijighel, and was at the head of the Mongol, Khitan and Chinese troops to fight in the south. They marched against Chaghish Balghassan, which he adds the Chinese called Jen-din or Jзвин-fu, which they plundered, and defeated Da-min. They then advanced upon Dun-pin,\textsuperscript{35} but on account of the river could not take it; so after pillaging the district greatly, they retired, and the Chin troops reoccupied it.\textsuperscript{36}

It is not surprising that the ill-fortunes of the Chin Tartars should have tempted their neighbors on the south, the masters of the Sung empire, and they now refused to pay the tribute which they had in the habit of paying.\textsuperscript{37} It would seem that Chinghiz Khan had tried to arrange an alliance with the Sung against the Chin, but without avail. This fact is noticed in the Tsian-yun-i-lai-ch'ao-ye-tsia-ten, and the notice has been abstracted by Palladius. We there read that in the seventh year of the reign of Tsia-din' (1214), and on the ninth day of the first moon, there arrived three horsemen at Yuet-fu, a small place on the north bank of the river Khai. They crossed the river, and set off towards the south. A scout asked them why they had come. They produced a wallet containing a letter and a figured chart written on a silken material, and saidː "The Dadan Vantz," Chinghiz, has sent us to proffer lands to the Sung, and to ask for an auxiliary army." On the following day, when the chief of the scouts learnt this, he sent several men with an answer to the effect that the district chief was at this time at the court, and that he dared not receive them without permission from the Emperor, and he ordered them to be sent back, a curious proof that the exclusiveness, European travellers complain about so much in China, is of very old date. On the following day the scouts met them on the mountain Miao-Gan, and immediately made them recross the river on a raft. Unable to return northward on account of the interruption of communications they lay hid in the lake Bo-lu-khn in the
district of Khun-sian, and the district governor three days later sent to take them to Si-chau. Nothing more is known about them. It was said that one was a Tartar interpreter, another a captive Kin, and the third a North-Chinaman.

When subsequently the Mongols sent a contingent into Shan-tung, having reached Tse-nan they told off 37 horsemen to escort three fresh envoys, and afterwards sent 300. They rode through Wei-chau, where having seized some boats they crossed the Yellow River and then rode west to Bo-chau whence they were sent back, and it was strictly commanded by the Sung authorities that in future no envoy should be received; those receiving them, being detected, were to suffer the penalty of death.\(^{40}\)

The Yuan-ch’ao-pi-chi mentions the sending of one of these embassies which it says was headed by Jubkhan, but says it was hindered by the Kin.\(^{41}\) It would seem that on their side the Kins authorities made advances for an alliance with the Sung against their terrible enemies from the north. The Sung emperor was disposed to listen to these overtures, but was diverted by Kao-ju-li, who pointed out that it would be far better to make common cause with the Mongols. It was probably in consequence of this attitude and also of their refusal to pay tribute, that we find the Kin troops now, i.e., in 1217, attacking their frontiers, but getting badly beaten.\(^{42}\)

The mode of attack of the Mongols and the defensive tactics of the Kin authorities may be gathered from a memoir, which the tribunal of censors made to the emperor, on the occasion of Samuka’s attack, the Mongol general being at the time encamped at Yu-chau. This runs as follows:—"The enemy’s army having passed Tung-kuan, Yao-kuan and Mien-chan has advanced into the interior of Ho-nan, and approached the western faubourgs of Nan-king. They know the capital contains a strong garrison. This is why they do not attack it. They avoid a fight, and endeavour by different detachments of cavalry to blockade the place, while their other armies attack the surrounding towns. They are gradually tightening their grip upon Nan-king. If we refrain from defending the other towns we shall presently find the capital deprived of food, for the public magazines and private stores there are not a hundredth part of what they are at Chung-tu. It is this which freezes our beasts. It would be well if your majesty were to order the troops from Shen-chau to cover Tung-kuan and to take up their position opposite the general Alibus; if you were to select in the capital some dozens of brave officers to whom to make over the best soldiers, in order to carry on a system of skirmishing (the petit guerre of the French), and if the same plan were adopted north of the river."\(^{43}\)

The emperor remitted this memoir to the senate, but Chu-hu Kaoki replied that the officials of the tribunal of censors were not versed in war, and knew nothing of defensive tactics, and it was laid aside. Kaoki had no plan of his own, save that of summoning as many troops as possible to the capital, and thus leaving the provinces bare.\(^{44}\)

Having traced the fortunes of the Mongol arms in the south, let us follow them further east in Liau-tung and its borders where their great general Mu-khu-li had control of matters. While he had been engaged in conquering Lian-si, Chang-king or Chang-tsung, called Changping by Gaubil, murdered the collector of taxes at Kin-chau at the head of the gulf of Liau-tung, and having proclaimed himself king of Lin-bai sent his submission to Chinghiz.\(^{45}\)

In the last month of 1215 Chang-king received orders to march from Liau-yang, i.e., the Peking of those days, with a division of troops, and to march against Tuhulan-salipi, called Dogolan by Hyacinthe, who commanded a Kin army in the south. Chang-king intended deserting the Mongol service. Mu-khu-li, who had heard of this, deputed the Uighur Siaossien to watch his movements. When they arrived at Ping-chau,\(^{46}\) Chang-king feigned sickness, and professed not to be able to march. Siaossien accordingly forced his way into his palace, and was just in time to prevent his flight. He then put him to death.\(^{47}\) Chang-chi, brother of Chang-king, was then at Kin-chau. On hearing of his brother’s death, he killed the governor of the town, which he occupied, took the title of the prince of Ing, and declared for
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the Kin emperor, who gave him command of his troops in the country. The Yuan-shi says he also pillaged Hin-chung-fu, while the Kang-mu adds that many towns situated between the sea, the river Liau, the Great Wall, and the barrier separating Liau-tung from Tartary, including Ping-chau, Luau-chau, Shui-chau, Li-chau, I-chau, Ye-chau, and Kuang-ning submitted to him. Mu-khu-li and his Uighur subordinate Siaoassien marched against the rebel, who, according to the Yuan-shi, sent one army against him under his son Tung-ping. Mu-khu-li pointed out to his men that the enemy having no armour would be overwhelmed by their arrows. He then gave orders to his cavalry to charge. The rebel army was completely defeated. Tung-ping was among the slain, while 12,800 officers and men were killed.

Mu-khu-li now sent Siaoassien to attack a mountain fortress and arsenal named Lieou-shê-shan-pao, and sent Mongu-pu-hoa, called Mungu-bukha by Hyacinthe, to plant himself in ambush, 10 li (Hyacinthe says 40) to the west of Yong-te-hien, with orders to watch the movements of Chang-chi. When the latter learnt that the enemy was attacking Lieou-shê-shan-pao, he at once went to the rescue. Mu-khu-li, who was then at Kuang-ning, was informed of this movement by his subordinate Mongu-pu-hoa, who also sent a body of cavalry to cut off his retreat. Mu-khu-li marched in all haste and reached Shin-shki at day-break, and there encountered the enemy's army. Chang-chi found himself between two fires. He fought bravely, but was at length defeated with a loss of 3,000 men killed, besides a great multitude who were drowned or forced to seek shelter in Kin-chau, which was duly invested by the Mongols, and which he defended for a month against all their efforts. Kao-i, one of his officers, who had a grievance against him, then surrendered him to Mu-khu-li, who beheaded him. Douglas says he himself surrendered, but that Mu-khu-li distrusted him as a double-dyed traitor, and put him to death. This happened in the eleventh month of 1216.

The Huang-yuan calls Chang-chi the Shnai Tsin-jou Jan-tsin, which means apparently, if we accept the corresponding phrase in Rashidun-din, — the general Chang-chi or Jan-tai from the town of Kin-chau or Tsin-chau. On his submission to Chinghiz he had been given charge of some districts, which are the Tsinak or Kinsk and Guan-ninsk districts in the Huang-yuan, and the Jurchi towns of Lariti, Falski and Gug-ling by Rashidun-din. The former says he rebelled and styled himself Liao-si-yen, i.e., king of Liao-si, and gave his administration the title of Dakhun, which Rashid says corresponded to Sultan. These two authorities make this outbreak the source of Chinghiz Khan's wrath and the cause of his ordering Mu-khu-li to march against him.

We now read that Mu-khu-li marched against Kuang-ning-fu, the modern Kuang-ning-hien in the department of Kin-chau, and subdued it, making the eight hundred and sixty-second city which had fallen into the hands of the Mongols. The Huang-yuan says Mu-khu-li sent Da-tsin-dao and others to capture Kuan-nin-fu, which surrendered.

In the tenth month of 1215, according to the Yuan-shi, the Kin governor, Fusin-onol conquered Liau-tung, proclaimed it the kingdom of Tien-wang, and adopted the dynastic style of Tientai. This was an invasion of the rights of Yelio-Linko, who no sooner heard of the victory of the Kin general than he repaired to Chinghiz to lay his case before him. Chinghiz received him well, and gave a place about his court to his son, Yelin Sheshs. The Yuan-shi lei-xen gives a different reason for Yelio-Linko's visit to Chinghiz. It says that many Khitans proposed to him to declare himself emperor, independent of the Mongols, and that he rejected this advice as contrary to his duty. "I have sworn," he said, "to be the subject of Chinghiz Khan. I cannot violate this promise To make myself emperor in the east is to oppose heaven, and to oppose heaven is to commit a great crime." He was much pressed to alter his mind but would not do so, and sent his son, Shetu, with 90 carts bearing rich presents for the Mongol chief, who had the
gifts exposed for seven days on pieces of felt, which, says the history of Yelin-Liukko, was to propitiate the sky. After this ceremony he accepted the presents, and honoured Sietu greatly. Liukko sent a census of the families subject to him, which numbered 600,000. Towards the end of 1215 he went in person to do homage.  

It may be that it was the dubious allegiance of his subjects which enabled his rival to set up authority in Liau-tung,—at all events we do not read of the latter being at once displaced, but the following year, we are told, he sent his son, Terge, with his allegiance to Chinghiz, but shortly after rebelled and usurped authority over Eastern Hia, (called Eastern Sia by Hycacinth).  

This is stated in the Huwang-yuan and also by Rashidu’d-din. The former says that when the Kin emperor moved to his southern capital he appointed Chao-tao and Yenu Suan-fus, i.e., commissaries of Sian-pin and other districts. He afterwards transferred the administration to Khobi-alan, who presently submitted to the Mongols, and sent his son Tienega as a hostage, but he soon mutinied and styled himself Tien-sia-van. Rashidu’d-din calls him Nujiu Taishi, and says he was privy counsellor of the Kin emperor, and had been entrusted with the administration of the empire when he went to Nan-king. He calls his son Teghe, and gives his title as Ton-ging-wang.  

Disorder was now supreme in various parts of the empire, and suspicion was everywhere rife. "At one time," we read, "a cry was raised against the Buddhist priests as traitors to their country, and this was followed by a fearful massacre which was carried out under the authority of She-gan-tan, who, however, was destined shortly to pay the penalty of his misdeeds, for on entering the Tung pass he was murdered by the hand of an assassin."  

We now read how Chinghiz Khân, to reward his great general, Mu-khu-li, for his eminent services, in the last month of the year 1217, nominated him head of all the princes of his empire and generalissimo of his armies in the newly conquered countries. He sent him written patents of office and also a golden seal, i.e., probably a golden tablet or paishak, and gave him charge of the countries south of Tai-hang-shan, and ordered that the same deference was to be paid to him as to himself, and that his cortège should be equal to his own.  

Gaibl tells us Chinghiz made a public eulogy in favour of Mu-khu-li, gave him the title of king, and desired that it might be hereditary in his family.  

The title actually conferred on Mu-khu-li was that of Ku-wang or Ki-wang, explained by Rashidu’d-din as meaning paishak of the country; it had been already given to him by the Chinese, and he therefore deemed it of good augury. This we learn from Rashidu’d-din.  

We will leave him and his further proceedings for the present, and turn once more to Chinghiz Khân and his doings. Whilst his generals were overrunning Northern China, he was apparently engaged in subduing the tribes of Manchuria, and in enjoying himself there. We have no details of this campaign, save a saga to which I shall revert presently, and only a bald notice of it in one authority, namely, the Yuan-ch'ao-pi-shi. We there read that when Chinghiz returned back from Bei-piu by the Tsuin-kuan pass, he ordered his brother, Khasar, to go along the coast through Danin, (?) and to pass through Niujinin, i.e., to subdue the Niuchis or Jurchis, the people of Manchuria, with the division of the right hand. If they should submit he was to travel along the frontier provinces, cross the rivers Ula and Nau, and return to the camp along the river Taour. If the Jurchis should not submit he was to devastate their country. Khasar with Jurchidai and Tolun reached Danin. This town surrendered, and when they came to the Niuchis or Jurchis, their ruler, named Fu-khen, submitted, and all the other towns also surrendered. Thereupon Khasar followed up the river Taour, and returned to the chief camp.  

Palladius says in a note that the Mongol campaign in Manchuria is described in the Dun-go-shi-mo, where it is said apparently, that they were on the frontiers of Korea, and  
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had communications with the governor. This work is not accessible to me.

In regard to Korea, we have a curious notice which is contained in the Manchu translation of the Yanas history, entitled That-yuan-nil-bikhe, which was published in 1644 by order of the emperor Shi-tau, and which notice has been published by Klaproth. In this we read that:—"In the thirteenth year of Tai-tsu Chinghis Khan, which is that of the yellow tiger or 1218, Luku," general of the mountain Tsun-shan of the kingdom of the Khitans, sought refuge, with 90,000 men, who remained with him, in the kingdom of Solgo," where he captured the town of Kiang-tang-ching, and established himself.

Thereupon Chinghis Khan sent his general Kha-jen-dza-la at the head of an army to oppose him. The Mongol general entered the territory of the Solgos. Huang-ta-sian, a grandee of that kingdom, went to the Mongol camp to organize a joint movement with him against the town in which Luku had shut himself up. Wang-che, king of Korea," who supplied the Mongol army with cattle, spirits and wine, sent Chao-dsun, one of his grandees, to assist in the siege. The two generals acted like brothers, and the Korean leader suggested that Korea should be tributary to the Mongols." The Mongol general replied:—"Your kingdom is very far from us, an envoy would have difficulty in going to and fro. It would be well, therefore, to employ ten men every year to take the tribute." He then sent out to obtain rice for his men, and was speedily furnished with 10,000 panniers. The next day, in the first month of Spring, Wang-chi sent two of his people, In-kung-dseon and Sui-i, as envoys to the camp of the Mongol general. He returned the compliment by sending Fiao-szu-yun; and presently Chinghis Khan sent the king letters-patent confirming him in his dignity. These were taken by Fulitai-yei. The king received them from the ambassador on his knees, and gave a ceremonial feast, and thenceforward Korea became tributary to the Mongols.

Turning from the regular histories to the collections of Mongol Sagas contained in the
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"Altan Topchi" and in the pages of Sezang Setzen, we have a curious romantic story relating to the intercourse of Chinghis Khan with the tribes of Manchuria and the Solongas, which is very interesting from its local colour and otherwise. It follows one or two shorter statements about other districts, which it will be well first to relate as they are not reported elsewhere.

The Altan Topchi tells us that Uran Chinkui, of the tribe Ingut (called Uran Taenkoi of the tribe Angkud, by Sezang Setzen), with 31 clans or families, broke away or rebelled, and began to nomadize towards the northwest. Chinghis Khan and Khasar went after him. Khasar rode on the beautiful yellow horse belonging to his brother called Samuchin. While the son of Taktangui-bagatur commanded the advance guard, Khasar fought so vigorously that his horse was covered with blood. Uran Chinkui was defeated and captured. He was taken before Chinghis Khan. Khasar, as his reward, received the woman, Balbal, while Uran Chinkui presented Chinghis Khan himself with a crystal pyramid. For this he was given the daughter of Altan. Altan's other daughter, Altan-Gorgoldoi, Chinghis Khan gave to the Solongut Khan, Nariin. It will be noticed that the account in the Altan Topchi is more detailed than in Sezang Setzen, but it does not enable us now any more than the notice by the latter enabled his editor, Schmidt, to say who the Ingut were, nor to what period of the great conqueror's reign the story is to be assigned. With Schmidt I am disposed to think it refers to the earlier part of Chinggis Khan's career, but the mention of the Khan of the Solongas raises a difficulty, since the Mongols had not apparently any dealings with Korea until later.

To continue: the Altan Topchi next tells us that Oroshi Gushi, of the tribe Buriat, having captured a hawk on lake Baikal, took it to Chinghis, for which he got the command of the Buriats. Sezang Setzen says the Oirat Buriad sent Oroju Shignshi from lake Baikal with an eagle, as a present to Chinghis Khan, and as a token of their submission. This
submission of the Buriads is considered by Schmidt to be the same event as the submission of the Kirghises mentioned in an earlier paper. He would identify Oroja Sheguushi with the Uras Inal of the Kirghises, there mentioned as sending presents of falcons, but I do not see how this can be probable. The Kirghises did not live on lake Baikal, while the Buriads, who still do so, no doubt did so then also, and it seems to me the statement clearly refers to the Mongolian Buriads, and not to the Turkish Kirghises. It probably refers to some early event in the life of Chinghis.

We now reach the Saga about Manchuria, to which I referred. The *Altan Topchi* says that Dsanchun, the ruler of the Jurchis, called Wangchuk Khaghan by Seanang Setzen, having noticed that Chinghis Khan was hawking between the rivers Olkho and the Ulia, fled. Chinghis sent an army in pursuit, but as there was no ford over the Ulia, the sons of Khasar Anchi-Andun-shara and Galsaguching-Taigi, coupling together 20,000 geldings by the rings of their reins, with a shout drove them into the water, and thus got over. They proceeded to lay siege to Dsanchun's capital, and demanded as the price of their withdrawal 10,000 sparrows, Seanang Setzen says 10,000 swallows and 1,000 cats. They then made some kiebungs, which they fastened to the birds and some wadding to the cats, and then fired it. They then let them loose. The birds flew to their nests while the cats jumped from roof to roof. The town being thus fired, surrendered. Dsanchun remarked, "What a wonder! What cats!" Chinghis Khan married his daughter Balakhai, who, it is said, died on her way home.

Chinghis Khan, we are told, now went on a campaign against the Solongod living in the east. The river Unegen had overflowed its banks, for which reason he halted when he reached it, and sent an envoy to the ruler of the Solongod to say he had come to demand tribute. The Solongod ruler Bukha-Tsagan, as a sign of his submission, brought his daughter Khulun, in a boat, and gave her as a marriage gift, a kibitka covered with panther skins, and made over to Chinghis the tribes of Bukha and Solongod. Noticing that Bukha Tsaghan Khan did not cross the river Chinghis bade him go over if what he took with him was tribute. So anxious was he to complete the marriage rite that, in spite of the objection of his grandees that it was not etiquette to do so, he nevertheless completed the marriage ceremony with Khulun on the high road. This notice is certainly puzzling.

According to every other authority, as we have seen, Dair Usson, the father of Khulun, was the Dair Usson, chief of the Merkits, and not of the Solongod, and we are bound to follow them. It will be noticed that Seanang Setzen actually calls the Solongod here Solongos-Merged. To continue the story, however, we are told that Chinghis remained among the Solongod for three years. Thereupon Arghassun Khorchin, who had been left in charge of his home, wanting to know the cause of his delay, set out on the red horse, Gurbelgu-dsegerdi, and compassed a three months' journey in thrice twenty-four hours. When he arrived he inquired after, the health of the chief. The nobles told him he was well. Chinghis then asked him after, the health of his wife, children, nobles and people. Arghassun replied:—"Thy wife and children are well, as to what appertains to thy great people I know not what it thinks. I only know it gets itself skins and food for its hungry mouth. As to the whole of thy people I can only say it wants water and snow for its thirsty mouth. I don't know what thy Mongol people think." Chinghis Khan, not understanding these enigmatical phrases, told him to explain. He therefore went on:—"It is said that the bird salbar (?) lays its eggs on the tree sula (?), and trusting to the tree sula it allowed the predatory bird sar (?) to destroy its nest and eat its eggs and fledglings. It is

---

*Seanang Setzen says between the Olkho and the Ulia. The former is no doubt the Olkhyi, which rises in the Scyoliji mountains, a branch of the Khing-gan, about lat. 47° N., see D'Ohsson, vol. I, p. 64. The Ulia is probably the Nemchi Ulia.

*Seanang Setzen says Andun-Ching-Taigi, son of Tokiangha Baghaturo Taigi.

*Seanang Setzen says 10,000 horses were so coupled.

*This is a doubtful word, it probably means tender. Schmidt reads the corresponding word in Seanang Setzen as cotton-wool.

*In the thekeh.

*Called Salikhai by Seanang Setzen.

*Altan Topchi, pp. 133 and 134; Seanang Setzen, p. 75.

*Seanang Setzen says Khulun was the daughter of Dair-Usson, of the Solongos-Merged.

*Altan Topchi, p. 134; Seanang Setzen, pp. 75 and 77.

*Seanang Setzen calls him Arghassun Khorchin, the lute player.

*Seanang Setzen says he had been sent by Chinghis's first wife Burte Jujin.
said the swan lays her eggs in the cane brake, trusting to the canes, and thus allows the evil bird khulu (?) to kill its young and eat its eggs, and destroy its nest. My Bogdo Edsen, listen to my words." Chinghiz thereupon turned to his nobles, and asked them if they understood what he meant. They said they did not, whereupon he explained as follows:—

"The tree sala represents my friends, the bird salbar myself, the predatory bird, sar, the Solongod, the eggs and chicks, are my wife and children, the nest my grand empire. Again, the cane-brake represents my people, the swan myself, the khulu the Solongod, the eggs and fledglings my wife and children, the nest my grand empire." Having said this he marched the army towards home. He presently began to say:—"I am ashamed to meet Burte, my wife, whom I met in my younger days. If I go home with another family how can I prevent a broil at home when the two houses meet? If there is a disturbance in the presence of strangers I shall be ashamed and disgraced. It will be better to send on one of my orltuks to have a preliminary interview with my family." Mu-khu-li was accordingly chosen. Having arrived he bowed to the empress, and sat down. Burte asked him about the health of Chinghiz, and also inquired about his errand, upon which Mu-khu-li said he had been sent with the following message:—

"He has not obeyed the laws that rule us, but has been wilful. He has not taken the advice of his nobles, but has been allured by the outward attractions of the panther skin yurt. The Bogdo Edsen has united himself on the pillow with Khulun." Thereupon Burte said:—

"He depends on his own will, and not on the Mongol people." It is said there are many geese on the river Irrish, but my Edsen knows how many it is necessary to shoot, so as to sustain life. There are many women and maidens in great empires, but my lord knows whom to choose. It is said there are many swans in the cane-brakes, my lord knows how long he can shoot at them without growing weary. It is said that a man who has a big finger will hit both the ground and the duck with his arrow, and a husband if he likes can marry two sisters. Does a wild unbridled horse wish himself to be saddled? Does the first wife wish her husband to take a second wife? It is bad to have too much. Is not too little also bad?

In a double suit of clothes it is said you won't be cold, and a twisted rope will not break."

Mu-khu-li returned with this message, whereupon Chinghiz returned home again.

After Chinghiz arrived, Arghassun Khorehim got drunk with arsi, and he entered the golden tent i.e. Chinghiz Khán's tent, and slept in it. Ssannang Setzen says he used his golden lute, but 'golden lute' seems to be a euphemism for the Khan's tent. For this offence Chinghiz ordered Boghorchi and Mu-khu-li to go and find him, and gave a sign with his hand that they were not to let him speak, but to kill him. They went to him, and said:—"We have been sent by the ruler and ordered by the movement of his hand to put you to death. He would take no excuse, since you have got drunk and slept in his golden lute." Arghassun replied:—"It is said you ought always to listen to the words of those sentenced to death. It is said a dying man should always express his last sentiments."

On hearing this they did not kill him. Holding at his breast wine, prepared for the commander, and under his arm wine for the tribunal, they took him to Chinghiz, who was asleep. They then repaired to the tent, and said: —"In thy bright chamber there is already light. By the grace of God thy boys and girls shall be good and domestic. The accused are already assembled. Order them to disperse by thy great command." In thy jasper palaciaglory is already effluent, order the doors to be opened; the unfortunate and the suffering are already assembled, condescend to order them to disperse by giving thy jewel-like orders." When they had spoken thus, Chinghiz rose and they entered the tent, taking Arghassun with them. Chinghiz did not speak, no more did they; whereupon bottles filled with strong drink.

"i.e. show thy clemency."

"Ssannang Setzen reports their speech thus: — "The light already shines in thy bright dwelling. He who has offended thee is without; and awaits thy command; when thy effluent person shall have awaked and risen, condescend to open the door, to hear and judge the repentant culprit and to exercise thy favour and clemency."

"A custom disapproved of among the Mongols."

"A skin.

"Ssannang Setzen says they gave him two leathera
Arghaban began:—"It is said that the seventy-tuned bird, Tskatsagai, becomes hushed when the hawk with outspread wings directs its flight towards it. I must also declare that I cannot say what is appropriate in the presence of our heavenly appointed ruler. For ten years," I have looked after the golden lute and have learnt thy wisdom and thy policy. Never was I known to behave ill. It is true I was drunk and used thy golden lute, but for twenty years I guarded thy Khotton lute. I listened to thy wisdom and humour, but I was never noticed doing anything wrong. It is true I was drunk and I took thy Khotton lute, but I had no evil intention." On this Chingiz said:—"Thou art forgiven on account of thy clever speech, my Arghaban Khorchin, mercy is shown thee because of thy eloquence." He thereupon had him released, and withdrew his sentence."

This saga, however, wanting in actual historical basis, and however incongruous in some of its statements, is assuredly not wanting in dramatic force and local colour, and is a good example of the tales current in the yurts of the Mongols in early times.

MISCELLANEA.

BUDDHA AND ST. JOSAPHAT.

Prof. Max Müller, in his interesting essay on the Migration of Fables, has pointed out (also quoting Reinaud) that तौराध, the name by which Buddha found a saint's place in the Greek Church calendar—transformed in the Latin legend into J o s a p h a t—is a corruption, through the uncertainties of Persian transcription, of Bodhisattva. I have never seen it noticed how strongly this suggestion is confirmed by a passage in the Chronology of Ancient Nations, by Albright, from which the English translation by Prof. Sachau was published in 1879. Here we have mentioned (p. 186), among the "pseudo-prophets," “Budhōṣa means: the same as to say, The Wise. . . .

"To this name the Gentiles throughout all India have dedicated great and superb pagodas. With reference to this story we have been diligent in enquiring if the ancient Gentiles of those parts had in their writings any knowledge of St. Josaphat, who was converted by Barlam, who in his legend is represented as the son of a great king of India, and who had just the same up-bringing, with all the same particulars, that we have recounted of the life of the Budō. And as the story of Josaphat must have been written by the natives . . . it would seem that in the lapse of time there grew round this many fables such as they have in the life of Budō, and these we pass by, for not in two whole chapters could we rehearse the stories as they have them.

"And as a thing seems much to the purpose which was told us about St. Josaphat by a very old man of the Salsete territory in Baqaim, I think it well to cite it. As I was travelling in that island of Salsete, I went to see that rare and admirable pagoda which we call the Canara Pagoda [i.e., the well-known Kanhari Caves] made in a mountain, and with many halls cut out of the solid rock—one of them as big as the larger of the mansions on the Ribeira at Lisbon—and more than 300 chambers rising like a staircase in the mountain, each with its cistern at the door, cut in the same solid rock, containing water and as then pardoning him."

100 Aitun Topchi, pp. 134 and 136; Seinang Setsen, pp. 77 and 81.

101 Seinang Setsen says twenty.
102 Seinang Setsen reports him as merely exclaiming: "My logounous Arghaban, my chattering Arghaban,"
as cool and excellent as you could desire, whilst at the gates of the great hall there are carved beautiful figures of the stature of giants, but of art so subtle and exquisite that better could not be wrought in silver; and many other fine things which we omit for brevity.

"And enquiring from this old man about the work, and what his opinion was as to who had made it, he told us that without doubt the work was made by order of the father of St. Josaphat, to bring him up there in seclusion, as the story tells. And as this informs us that he was the son of a great king in India, it may well be, as we have just said, that he (St. Josaphat) was the very Budao of whom they relate such marvels." [Dec. v., liv. vi., cap. ii.]

H. YULE.

London, August 28, 1883.

NOTE ON THE STORY OF MŪLRĀJ AND HIS SON.

In vol. XI, p. 41 ante, I gave a short story current all over the Panjāb illustrating the sacred character of the dohāt or poetic justice of the celebrated Dīwān Mūlrāj of Mūltān. It purported to say that the Dīwān put his favourite son to death for robbing his garden after the gardener had demanded the protection of the Dīwān’s dohāt. I have since examined on the real tale in Griffin’s Panjāb Chiefs, which ought to be told, with modifications, of the greater Dīwān Sāwan Mall, Mūlrāj’s father. The victim was Mūlrāj’s elder brother Rāmdās, who died in 1831, not his son Harisingh, who survived his father for many years as a Government pensioner on Rs. 300 a month. Sāwan Mall was murdered in 1844, and Mūlrāj, as is well known, died in captivity at Calcutta in 1850. From the true version of the tale it appears that the circumstances, which the Panjābīs have poetically into the pretty story of Mūlrāj and his son, really occurred in 1830. I give the story in Sir Lepel Griffin’s own words, with the additional note that it is much more characteristic of Sāwan Mall, who was above all,

as the times went, a kindly and impartial man, than of Mūlrāj, who was mean, grasping, suspicious and vacillating in character.

Sāwan Mall and his son Rāmdās.

One day a peasant complained to the Dīwān that some chief had destroyed his crop by turning his horses loose to graze in the field. Sāwan Mall asked the man if he could point out the offender in Darbār. The peasant pointed to Rāmdās, the Dīwān’s eldest son. He admitted the complaint to be just, and Sāwan Mall ordered him to be imprisoned. The injured man begged for his pardon, but for several days Rāmdās remained in confinement and his spirit was so broken by this punishment that he fell ill and died shortly after his release.

R. C. TEMPLE.

KĪRTANA.

At pp. 225 ff. above, Professor Bhānḍārkar has pointed out the true meaning of the two verses contained in lines 14 to 17 of the Baroda grant of the Rādhaṅkūta king Karaka II., by explaining the word kīrtana as meaning ‘a temple,’ in addition to its usual etymological sense of ‘praise.’ This meaning, which was not known to me when I translated the grant in question, clearly supplies the keynote of the passage. In addition to the authorities quoted by Professor Bhānḍārkar in support of this meaning of kīrtana, I have since found that it is used in the same sense in the five inscriptions of Dēvaladbhī, the ‘grandson’ of the Chandella king Yaśovarman, and the son of Kṛishṇapa and Āśarvā, in the temple of Bhrāmat at ‘Dudahi’ (Archaeol. Surv. of India, Vol. X. Plate xxxii.) No. 3 of them, for instance, runs—


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

Simla, 24th August 1883.

BOOK NOTICE.


This Catalogue is a rearrangement and expansion of that prepared by Mr. Beal in 1876 for the India Office Library. The books were sent from Japan, as Mr. Beal explains, in “cases” or “covers,” one hundred and three in number, and as they were sent so they were arranged in Mr.

Beal’s catalogue. Mr. Bunyin Nanjio in 1880 “thought it his duty to correct this wrong arrangement,” and we have now before us the result of his work, viz., the same books classified according to the original division by determining characters taken from the Thousand-letter classic. Mr. Bunyin Nanjio has done his work very completely, and with almost “Chinese exactness;” and

1 The Academy, Sept. 1, 1883, p. 146.

2 Lahore, 1865, pp. 277-278.
his catalogue will no doubt supersede the old one, and be generally used.

Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio thinks that Mr. Beal was ignorant of the original arrangement of these books (p. 111). What ground has he for this opinion he does not state. Mr. Beal on p. 2 of his Catalogue speaks of the "original division" of the works, and on p. 110 he writes:—"The books in this catalogue may be classed generally, and for the sake of brevity, under the heads Vinaya, Sūtra, Abhidharma and Miscellaneous." This also is the division adopted by Mr. Nanjio; we observe also that he has used the term sanjīpta (p. 9) or mahāsanjīpta for the last division, a term first employed by Mr. Beal in disagreement with Stanislas Julien (Beal's Catalogue, p. 3). The "irrational" character of the "tripartite division," to which Mr. Beal refers in the passage quoted by Mr. Nanjio, is, that it is made to include four sections of books; and it is irrational to attempt to put four pegs into three holes.

Why does Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio call this collection of books "a sacred canon"? It does not claim any character of sanctity. It is a collection of Buddhist books brought to China by haphazard. Of course, the imperial sanction under which the catalogue is issued, may give it a character of sacredness in the eyes of some; but we cannot let the use of such a phrase as "sacred canon" pass by unchallenged. The teaching of Buddha may be termed "holy," as it is so used in the original; but a series of books including travels, catalogues and dictionaries, can only be called "sacred" by a misuse of language.

Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio's account of the steps that led on to the preparation of the collection of these books in their present order in China, is interesting and exhaustive. If anything, it is too minute; but, anyhow, it will do for all time, and settle the question, which has hitherto been rather a perplexing one, as to the cause of differences which occur in the various lists respecting the number of the books and their right place in the Tripitaka. We note, too, as an important feature in this consideration, the zeal shown by private persons in arranging and printing these books. This alone is sufficient to show the hold which Buddhism still has on the minds of the people who profess a belief in its teaching.

Altogether there are 1602 distinct works separately named and described by the author of this Catalogue. In this respect it is a most useful help for an exact knowledge of Buddhist literature, and it will take its place beside the catalogues being now, or already, prepared, of similar books known in Nepal and Tibet. In fact our acquaintance with Buddhism in all its branches is becoming daily more accurate and more extensive, and we look forward with interest to the solution of questions involved in the rise and progress of this religion in the East, which will be suggested by an analysis or translation of some of the books in these various collections, and an exact comparison of points of agreement and divergence between them.

Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio, in the last clause of his "Introduction," "humbly asks all students of Buddhist literature to assist him in correcting any mistakes he may have made" in compiling his catalogue; we will therefore point out a few errors. In the Mahārāṣṭrākhyā class of books (No. 23), Mr. Nanjio has translated the symbol "ma" in every case as: "that (spoken at) an assembly"—but why so? The idea appears to be that each of these sūtras is a portion, or part, of the "gods heaped up;" and the term ma (mūndra) might just as well be rendered by "collection" or "portion," as by the long and unusual phrase adopted by the author.

No. 939.—Mr. B.N. translates into rather obscure English. Surely if he had consulted Stanislas Julien's Méthode (1365), or the Indian Antiquary, vol. IX, (1880), p. 85, he might have explained this title somewhat more accurately.

No. 999.—Mr. B.N. here risks the assertion, "the term Śāraṇāgama has no connection whatever with Śāra, the sun." But the explanation of the title given by Kumārajiva, viz., chien-siang, "the mark of a hero";—sia ng here as elsewhere corresponds with lakshana,—seems to point to the Sun's rays, under the figure of horns (śringin). The possession of horns (as in the case of Alexander the Great) is especially the mark of a hero. The explanation which Mr. Nanjio seems to adopt, viz., "going from heroism," is, to say the least, unsatisfactory.

No. 551.—Mr. B.N. restores experientially the expression leu-thān to lokadhatu. But from the work Pūnd-i-ming-i-tai (Book IX, fol. 19), it seems that the right restoration of this title is Pūndādana, or Pipādādana.

No. 1492.—Mr. B.N. has here separated the symbol nā from the preceding kṣet, and instead of translating the whole as, "Records of the Law sent from the Southern Sea by one returning to China," he has rendered it, "Records of the Inner Law," &c; but kṣet nā is "to return to China," the Inner Land.

There are other similar mistakes to be found scattered through this work. We point these out, not for the sake of fault-finding, but to show how easily the most careful writers may fall into error. With respect to the book as a whole (though the errata are quite unusually numerous), it deserves great commendation.
ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF THE PRINCIPAL HINDU ERAS, AND THE USE OF THE WORD SAṆVATSARA AND ITS ABBREVIATIONS.

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

(Continued from p. 215.)

II. THE VIKRAMA ERA.

As in the case of the Śaka era, the earliest technical expression for the era of Vikrama or Vikramādiya, supplied by an epigraphical record, is the simple word SaṆvatsara or ‘the year.’ It is furnished by—1, the Kāvi grant of the Gūjārā king Jayabhāṣa, in which the date, which is given in both words and numerical symbols, is expressed (II. 15-16 and 24-5) by Ashādha-sūḍ[ḍh]*a-dakṣam[y]d[sn]a karṇa-tāṇvav sa[ṇ]a[kr]ntē ravaṇa • • • SaṆvatsara-sata-chatusṭha[ṣṭa]gha. . . .

Ashādha śv 10 Adityavārā.

In my reading of this date, I differ in one detail from Dr. Bühler’s reading as published; but probably he would now adopt what I propose. He read the sign before Adityavārā as dī, i.e. śv dī. This, however, was at a time when the system of numerical symbols was not as fully understood as it is now. On the analogy of the two Kaira grants of Dadda II., we should expect to have after śv a numerical symbol for the day of the fortnight. In determining what the reading is, three aśkaras have to be noted, viz.:

\[\text{A} \quad \text{E} \quad \text{E}\]

The first of these is the symbol that follows śv; the second is the sign used for dī in this grant, e.g. in the following word Adityavārā; and the third is the sign used for dī in this grant, e.g. in gandha-dhvāpa-pushpā-dvāpa, I. 10. It is evident at once that what follows śv is not dī, or even dī for dī. Also, this symbol that follows śv does not occur, even approximately, anywhere else in this grant; and therefore it cannot be interpreted as any ordinary syllable. It is, however, almost identical with, and evidently is only a variety of, the la which is used—(a), by itself, in Gupta and Valabhi inscriptions, to denote 30.—and (b), in conjunction with the vowel rī, in Gupta inscriptions, to denote 10.* The objections to interpreting it in this grant as 30, to the purport that, though the grant was made on the tenth day of Ashādha, the actual writing of the charter was effected or completed on the thirtieth day of the same month, are—that the thirtieth day of the month belongs to the dark fortnight, not to the bright;—and that it does not seem possible, from any of the computations of this date, that the thirtieth day of Ashādha of Vikrama-Saṅvat 486 can have fallen on a Sunday. In order to interpret it as 10, we ought to have some form or other of the vowel rī below it. And I think, from indications in the photograph which are too faint to be reproduced with certainty, that a variety of the vowel rī is below it. This can only be determined by another examination of the original plate. But the advantage of accepting that we have here the symbol for 10 is, that,—whether the tenth day of the bright fortnight of Ashādha of Vikrama-Saṅvat 486 fell on a Sunday or not,—this interpretation is at any rate in exact accordance with the distinct specification of the tenth day in line 15 of the text.

This date has recently been strongly criticised by Professor Max Müller.* He seems, in the first instance, inclined to question the fact of the Jayabhāṣa of this grant being identical with the Jayabhāṣa who is mentioned as the father of Dadda II. in the four grants of the latter. But, with regard to this, I think that the arguments put forward by Dr. Bühler in his paper on this grant leave no reasonable doubt as to the identity of the two Jayabhāṣas. Further, his special objections are—(a), the improbability of the father, Jayabhāṣa, using one era, and the son, Dadda II., using another;—(b), the injury to the date in the original plate; and—(c), the doubt induced by the differing results of the computations of the details of the date. Irrespective of the fact that the

---

* Nos. 1 and 2, p. 296 above.
* The slight space between the horizontal line and the bottom of the vertical line seems to have been caused by the copper pushed up by the engraver’s tool.
* See, for instance, No. 81, p. 219 above.
computations of the details of this grant, made for Dr. Bühler by Professor Kéru Lakshmana Chhatrè of Poona and a Jōshi of Surat, give even a less satisfactory result for Śaka-Saṁvat 486 than for Vikrama-Saṁvat 486.' I would remark on these points—(a), The fact that the father and the son should use two separate eras, is not at all more strange than that,—assuming the Kāvī grant to be dated in the Śaka era; in which case the Jayabhāta of this grant must be a descendant, in the third or fourth generation, of Dadda II,—Jayabhāta should in this grant revert to the simple expression of Saṁvatara for the era, in disregard of the more specific technical name of Śaka-nirjapa-kāla which, on the same assumption, had been established at least eighty-six years before the date of his grant, and had been used in the two later grants of Dadda II. And, as an instance in which at any rate grandfather and grandson have undoubtedly used different eras, I would quote the inscriptions of the Western Chalukya king Pulikēti II., which are dated in Śaka 534 and 556,* while a Nausāri grant of his grandson Śilādītā of Śaṁśāra, the son of Jayasimhatamā-Dhārāṣṭra, recently laid before the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society by Paśḍīt Bhagwānlal Indrajī, is dated in "the year 421," the expression in the original, in both words and numerical symbols, being (ll. 20-1) Mākha(gha)-sūdhātrayodāyāṁ ∗ ∗ ∗ Saṁvatara-kāta-chatuṣṭayāṁ āka-viṁśay-ahaḥ 400 90 1 ||, this plainly cannot be referred to the Śaka era. And further,—as an instance in which even two brothers have used different eras,—in his paper on this Nausāri grant the Paśḍīt mentions a Bālār grant of Vinayādiya-Jāyāṣṭra, also called Maṅgalarāja and Yuddhamalla, another son of the same Jayasimhatamā, in which the Śaka era is specifically adopted again, the date being Śaka 653.—(b), The first of the three numerical symbols in this grant has certainly been a good deal injured by the breaking away of the plate. But, enough of it remains to show beyond any possibility of doubt that it is the symbol for 400. And, in addition to this, there is in line 24 the verbal expression kāta-chatusṭṭayā, which is distinctly illegible, and which explains this symbol quite sufficiently even if the whole of it had been broken away. As regards the others, it is not quite easy to say from the photograph whether the second symbol is entire and is to be read 80, as was done by Dr. Bühler, or whether it also has been injured and is to be read 90, as suggested by General Cunningham in the remarks quoted by me below. The third symbol is an unquestionable 6; and it is corroborated by the remnant śa of śaṭ in the verbal expression.—(c), Professor Bāpūdēva Śāstry, of Benares, computed that the 10th of Āśāḥa Śaḍī of Vikrama-Saṁvat 486 did fall on a Sunday, and that on that day the sun did enter the sign Karka, Karkaṣṭa, or Karkaṣṭa; and that the grant was issued on the 10th July, A.D. 429. On the other hand, Professor Kéru Lakshmana Chhatrè of Poona, and a Jōshi of Surat, computed that, in Vikrama-Saṁvat 486, the Karka-saṅkrānti fell on the 13th of Āśāḥa Śaḍī, and the 10th of Āśāḥa Śaḍī was a Tuesday. General Cunningham has favoured me with the following remarks on this date:—"The Vikrama-Saṁvat year 486 began in Gujarāt, according to the present reckoning, on the 1st of Kārttika Śaḍī, or the 29th September, A.D. 429; so that the 10th of Āśāḥa Śaḍī would have fallen in the following year, A.D. 430. As there was no intercalary month in that year, the 10th of Āśāḥa Śaḍī was the 29th day calculated from the 1st of Chaitra Śaḍī or Tuesday the 11th March, A.D. 430, which brings the date to Tuesday the 17th June, thus agreeing with the Tuesday already calculated by two Bombay grants, I took the era to be the Śaka era, and identified the Jayasimha of these grants, the grandfather of Vījawarāja, with the Jayasimha who according to the southern inscriptions was the grandfather of the grandfather of Pulikēti II. But it now seems that these grants must be referred, not to the Śaka era, but to the era that is used in the Nausāri grant,—and that the Jayasimha of these grants must be identified, not with Jayasimha I., but either with the Jayasimhatamā-Dhārāṣṭra of the Nirasgrā grant (Ind. Ant. Vol. IX. pp. 123 ff.), who was a younger brother of Pulikēti II., or with the other Jayasimhatamā-Dhārāṣṭra of the Nausāri and Bālār grants who was one of the sons of Pulikēti II. See note p. 232, note 14.
authorities for Dr. Bühler. But, as the day was a Sunday according to the inscription, it seems to me not improbable that the date may not have been read quite correctly. The only year which I can find that agrees with the week-day indicated is Vikrama-Saṅvat 497, in which year the 10th of Āśādha Śādi fell on Sunday the 15th June, A.D. 441. If the figure for 80 was injured below, as the figure for 400 certainly was, then the figure read as 80 might have been 90, and the Saṅvat year might perhaps be 497."—Whatever may be the case as regards the reading of the second numerical symbol and the computation of the details of the date, the fact remains that the first numerical symbol is undoubtedly 400, and that we have here a date which can only be referred to the fifth century of the Vikrama era. And the only substantial objection to it is, that it is destructive of the theory that the era was only invented by Harsha-Vikramaditya of Ujjainī in A.D. 544, i.e. exactly after the completion of six centuries from the epoch that was selected as the commencement of the era, and more than a century after this, the first known date in the era.

The same simple expression is used in—2, the Mālwa grant of Vikpāti of Dhrārā,12 (ll. 13-14 and 32-3) Eka-tri(triḥ)uka-sāhasrika- saṃvatārāmin Bhādrapada-sukla-chatur- dādāyān pavitrtra(patra)ka-parvavān • • • • • • Saṅ 1031 Bhādrapada śu di 14; in—3, the "Dewāl" inscription of Lalā of the Chhīnī dā family, 13 (l. 24) Saṅvatārā-sahāra 1049 Māgha va di 3 Gurudēnī; in—4, the Ujjain grant of Bhōja of Dhrārā,14 (ll. 8-9 and 30-1) Aṭṭha-saptat-adhika-sāhasrika- saṃvatārā Melgh-dēta-trīdhāyām Ravē-suṇagaya-saṅvatārā • • • • • • saṅvat 1078 Chaitra śu di 14; in—4, the "Ingoda" inscription of Vijayapāla of Ḳuṇapādra, (l. 11) Saṅvatārā-saṭēhuvadāda-saṉa navatya-adhikēśu Āśādha-su(ku)kā- pakṣa-aṅkādaśayām saṅvat 1190 Āśādha śu di 11; in—5, the "Siḥvar" grant of the Rāthōr king Jayachandra of Kanauj, 15 Dṿṭṛiṇ̣ṣaṅ-advika-deṿda-saṭa-saṅvatārā Bhādē

14 Id. Vol. VI. pp. 28 f.
The earliest instance that I have been able to trace out in which the simple expression

**Saivat**

or 'of the years' is used alone, is—13, the 'Deogarh' inscription of Bhōja of Kānauj,* 22 (II. 6-8 and 10) Saivat 919 Asvā (s/va)yu-sukla-paksha-chaturbdaiyān Vṛitiḥ (ṛi) haspatidinē Uttara-Bhādrapada-nakshatrātrī (ṛi) ****** Śaka-kalādā-saapta-katyād (dī)ni chatur-d (d)ītya-adināyān 784. After that date it is of frequent occurrence; e.g.—14, the Kañj grant of Māla-

raja of the Chālukya dynasty, 23 (II. 21-22) Saivat 1043 Mahāva or 15 Raveu;—15, the 'Deogarh' inscription of Kṛttivarmā of the Chandelā dynasty, 24 (I. 8) Saivat 1154 Chaithra (tra) [bā* ṛa] or 2 Vā (vā)dhau ?— 16, the Gayā inscription of Gōvindapāla,* 25 (I. 3) Saivat 1283 Vikāri-sahatsaraḥ;—17, the Timāŋa grant of Bhima II. of the Chālukya dynasty, 26 (I. 1) Saivat 1284 varsha lauśā Bhādgāva eva di 2 Sōme;—18, the Ābu inscription of the same king, 27 (I. 20) Saivat 1285 varsha Vaiśākha eva 15 Bahum; and—19, the second Praśasti of Nānakā, the court poet of Vīsala of the same dynasty, 28 Saivat 1282.

The next technical expression, viz.—

**Vikramaditya-otpāda-sahatsara**
or 'the years established by Vikramaditya,' is furnished by—23, the Pāta grant of Bhima II. of the Chālukya dynasty, 29 (II. 17-20) śrīmad-Vikramaditya-otpāda-sahatsara-ātēshu dedaivau sha(t-a) pa-(pa)ūhāśad-uttarāśu Bhādrapada-māsā-krishna-pakṣa anāvāyasyau Bhōh (bhau)maudrāstrānākakti-pi saivat 1290 lauśā Bhādrapada va or 15 Bhauva seyaṁ saivatsara-māsā-paksha-vāra-pūrvikāyānāh tithau. It occurs in precisely the same way in the Kañj grants of the same king, of Vikrama-Saivat 1263, 1283, 1287, 1288, and 1295; 30 and, with the slight difference of using Vikrama-Saivat in the place of Saivat and omitting the words asyaṁ &c., in—24, the last Kañj grant of the same king, 31 (II. 19-21) śrīmad-(d-) Vi-(v)ikramaditya -otpāda-sahatsara-ātēshu dedaivau sha(t-a) na-(na)vaṇ-uttarāśu Mārga-māsāya-krishna-chaturbdaiyān Rauvivārā 3 tr 3 32 āṅkak a ś pi Vikrama-saivat 1296 varsha Mārga va or 14 Raveu. And it also occurs in—25, the Kañj grant of Tribhuvanapāla of the same dynasty, 33 (II. 14-17) śrīmad-Vikramaditya-otpāda-sahatsara-ātēshu dedaivau na-

navaty-uttarāśu Chaitramadhyāvā-sukla-paksha-

shashyayātn 31 st 31 āṅkak a ś pi saivat 1299 varsha Chaithra eva or 6 Sōme 3 syān sa-


An abbreviation of the preceding expression, viz.—

22 Arch. Surv. of India, Vol. X. p. 101, and Plate XXXIII. No. 2. The date is equivalent to Thursday, the 10th September, 862.

22 Not yet published.
23 Not yet published.
24 This Visarga is a mistake.
26 Id. Vol. XI. pp. 71 ff.
27 Id. Vol. VI. pp. 194, 199, 201, 203, and 205.
28 Id. Vol. VI. pp. 206 ff.
29 In the original, this second asyagaha stands after the syllable ṛaḥ.
30 In the original, this second asyagaha stands after the syllable ṛaḥ.
THE OLD PALACE OF CHANDRAGIRI.

BY R. F. CHISHOLM, F.R.I.B.A., GOVERNMENT ARCHITECT, MADRAS.

Chandragiri, in the Madras Presidency, in the Collectorate of Chittur or North Arcot, is situated 30 miles N.N.E. from Chittur, and is the head-quarters of a taluq of the same name.

The town of this name is some distance from the building which forms the subject of this article. The old Palace and the Zenana buildings now stand amid cultivated lands; the fort on the adjoining hill and the remains of gateways and other ruins which lie about are the only other indications of former greatness. Chandragiri possesses peculiar interest to the British, for here resided the Rajah who gave us the first foothold in India by granting to the representatives of the East India Company the Sannad which permitted them to erect Fort St. George at Madras. The date of this Sannad was 1639 and the Rajah who granted it Singh Ranga Raya, the last representative of the Vijayanagar dynasty. He was himself subdued by the Muhammadan king of Golkonda in 1645, only six years after this event.

The main building (shown in the accompanying illustrations) is about 150 ft. long, presenting a well-balanced façade of three storeys surmounted by turrets in the form of gopuras, which break the sky-line pleasingly. With the exception of the angles (of comparatively solid construction) each floor consists of a pillared hall, the piers are arched across both ways, corbelled at the angles, and closed with flat domes. Each floor is projected 6 or 7 feet beyond the face of the external row of piers, the projecting portion resting on strong stone corbels.

It will be seen from the plan, that the rooms are all small. The largest which, no doubt, served as a Durbar Hall, is only 21 ft. square. This apartment rises through two storeys, the upper tier of arches forming a kind of clerestorey, conveying a lesson on light and ventilation, which might be advantageously studied by greater architects than those old builders professed themselves to be.

As usual in Eastern domestic art, the building, as it stands, is a perfect puzzle. There are two different kinds of work, executed apparently at two different periods, the earlier being stone, and the later brick. It is not necessary, however, to place these periods at a wide interval, as both kinds of work may have been executed contemporaneously. In nearly all the temples and other structures in Southern India, brick is always used in the upper parts, and generally in these places where the strains and loads are insignificant. Most of the civil buildings in the south have rough stone piers, wooden corbels, and brick arches. Wooden corbelling was resorted to when the octagonal form had to be worked out from the square in a limited vertical space; only one kind of hard wood was used,—a wood which neither rots nor expands. The exterior was invariably covered

sentatives made Pennakonda, in Anantapur district, their capital, and it continued so until 1592 A.D. when Veerakaṭṭi Rāya retired to Chandragiri.
with coir rope to form a key for the plaster. Work executed in this manner appears to be as durable as lath and plaster, if not more so. The removal of this timber corbelling seldom affects stability.

On the north or rear face of the palace in question the walls, pierced by the arches which have crossed work, are built with brick entirely. Again on the south side, the arches are not pointed but segmental, rising from a succession of corbels. It is noticeable also that while all the lower arches are stilted on bands rising from corbels, the upper piers have no preparation for the arch—the salient angles changing suddenly to hollow angles in a particularly bald and disagreeable manner. Further, the older vaults, particularly those in the lower story, appear to be worked in stone from stone corbels, while the upper vaults are of brick, and lastly, with one exception noted further on, not a particle of ornament of any kind exists above the basement! These facts would lead to the conclusion that the building was never finished at all, but such a conception is contradicted by the fact that the lower and presumably meaner apartments were finished to the intrados of the arches with clean-cut plaster mouldings, griffin brackets and coffered ceilings, while in the floor of State, where a superior finish would be expected, we find on one or two arches only a coarse imitation of the lower work, and higher still on the third storey is a coarse piece of cornice work worthy of the later Golkonda tombs. There is nothing beyond these miserable attempts at ornament above the lower storey. It is a curious fact that many of the remains of civil buildings in the south of India present similar characteristics. In the old Palace of Tirumal Nayyak at Madura, in the ladies' bath at Hampi, in the Zenana tower at Jiripu, and here in the Chandragiri Palace, well-conceived and carefully executed designs are marred by the coarsest of plaster finishing, and frequently, as in the present case, the better finished parts are found in what should be inferior positions. May it not be that the walls of the superior apartments were covered with a surface of intrinsic value, such as tiles, mosaics, tapestry, &c., since removed, and if so what good genius adorned their nakedness with the present coarse plaster work?

At Madura I accidentally knocked a piece of plaster off a tall cornice figure, and by this means discovered about an inch below the surface an older and better-proportioned figure, and in another place, beneath a particularly coarse and uneven pier, I found (also about an inch below the surface) a better finished pier; the latter was bound with coir rope to key the new plaster. This rope was sound and strong, and could not possibly, I think, be more than 50 years old. Now all historians agree that the Madura Palace was abandoned after the Court removed to Tiruchinapalli. It appears to me, therefore, not unreasonable to conclude that the old servants of the East India Company, with characteristic love of India and everything Indian, instituted these innovations, making use of local labour only, which would account for the coarse finish.

It is difficult at the present time to form any conception of the finished exterior of the building. The bold projections beyond the face of the arches, supported by massive corbels, probably carried a network of Hindu cusped openings tier upon tier, not unlike the rude imitation seen in the central compartment of the south elevation. This network would hide the larger pointed arches, and completely alter the character of the work. The central screen cannot, I think, be accepted as original work, although it is undoubtedly coetemporary with some of the coarse work executed on the later parts of the building, and in the absence of anything better it might be accepted as the kind of work which extended over the whole of the face of the building.

The present condition as regards stability is highly satisfactory. There is no structural weakness, the few pieces of exposed wood used to corbel out the octagonal pendants will rot and fall without damaging the more durable parts, and the wear and tear for some years will be confined to the crumbling of the brick and mortar projections, and possibly to the fall of a brick column or two in the outer projecting works.

The accompanying four plates of illustrations were drawn by Mr. Lewis, my assistant, at the expense of the Government of Madras, who have directed me to prepare plans for renovating the structure.
XXIII.

The campaigns of Chinghis Khan in China affected very largely the fortunes of himself and his people, and consequently the history of the world. A man of the highest vigour and genius, taken from the unsophisticated steppes of Asia and brought into immediate contact with the oldest, and at that time the most intricate, civilisation in the world, he naturally had his horizon very much enlarged, and his views of policy very much altered; and this not merely in the more obvious fields of military and political life, but in more intimate and deep-seated respects. I now propose to consider one or two of these, and first in regard to religion. China has virtually three religions—Confucianism, if that may be called a religion which is really a system of philosophy; Taoism, and Buddhism. With Confucianism Chinghis Khan could hardly be expected to have much sympathy, nor do we hear of any relations he had with the professors of the sect. It is very different with the other two religions. First, in regard to Taoism.

In the Ch'ê-kung-tu, a work written at the end of the Yuan dynasty, chapter 10, we have an article entitled K'êu-chen-jen. K'êu is the family name of the famous Taoist sage, Ch'ang Ch'un; and Chen-jen means the man of the truth, i.e. the Taoist. Ch'ang Ch'un was born in 1143, in Si-Hia, a city in the Department of Teng-chau-fu in Shan-tung. Ch'ang Ch'un, as is well known, paid Chinghis Khan a visit, and his journey is described in the Si-yu-ki which has been so admirably annotated by Palladius and Dr. Bretschneider. In the article on him above cited, we have recorded a very curious and interesting correspondence between Chinghis Khan and Ch'ang Ch'un. This correspondence has been translated into Russian, and published by Palladius as an appendix to the Si-yu-ki in the 4th volume of the Records of the Pekin Ecclesiastical Mission, 1866. Dr. Bretschneider has re-translated two of the letters, and published them with annotations in his Notes on Chinese Medieval Travellers to the West, pp. 120-122. As the subject is one of the highest interest, I have had the third letter translated, and now publish the correspondence. The first two letters, with the notes, are taken entirely from the text of my distinguished correspondent, Dr. Bretschneider. He says, by way of preliminary introduction, "Chinghis, in his simplicity professes such sound principles for governing people, and his words express such deep verities, that they would be valid even in our days, and for our countries. On the other side, Ch'ang Ch'un inspires sympathy by his modesty, candour and sincerity. He seems to have been endowed with high intelligence, knowing well his time and human nature. This was the reason that Chinghis, who was about to include northern China in his empire, laid such stress upon his advice. But there was yet another reason for which he was impatient to make the sage's acquaintance. According to Palladius, Ch'ang Ch'un belonged to the northern Taoist school, to the sect of the Kin-lien, or 'golden lotus,' the professors of which called themselves Ta'shan-chun, or the 'perfect true,' and sainted men. They were all adepts in spiritual alchemy, i.e., they looked in the spiritual world for the t'ien, or philosopher's stone, the secret of immortality, &c., which mysteries had been vainly searched after for centuries by material alchemists. One of the first questions Chinghis addressed to Ch'ang Ch'un at his first audience was: 'Have you a medicine of immortality?' There is a tradition, that the conqueror, in his veneration for the sage, went so far as to propose to him his daughter in marriage, and that the latter escaped from this imperial honour only by performing a surgical operation on his body. It is a curious fact that Chinghis Khan and Ch'ang Ch'un died in the same year and in the same month, i.e., in the 7th month of 1227. With reference to Chinghis Khan's letter to Ch'ang Ch'un, I need not mention," says Dr. Bretschneider, "that it was not written by himself; he could not write in any language. Probably the ideas of the conqueror were taken down by a Chinese in his suite;"
very likely by Ye-lü Ch'ü-ts'ai. The letters are written in a classical Chinese style."

The correspondence begins as follows with a letter from Chinghiz:—

"Heaven has abandoned China owing to its haughtiness and extravagant luxury. But I, living in the northern wilderness, have not inordinate passions. I like simplicity and purity of manners. I hate luxury, and exercise moderation. I have only one coat and one food. I eat the same and am dressed in the same tatters as my humble herdsmen. I consider the people my children, and take an interest in talented men as if they were my brothers. We always agree in our principles, and we are always united by mutual affection. At military exercises I am always in the front, and in time of battle am never behind. In the space of ten years I have succeeded in accomplishing a great work, and united the whole world in one empire. I have not myself distinguished qualities, but the government of the Kin is constant, and therefore Heaven assists me to obtain the throne (of the Kin). The Sung, to the south, the Hui ho to the north, the Hia to the east, and the barbarians to the west, altogether have acknowledged my supremacy. It seems to me that since the remote time of our Shan-yü, a vast empire has not been seen. But as my calling is high, the obligations incumbent on me are also heavy; and, I fear, that in my ruling there may be something wanting. To cross a river we make boats and rudders. Likewise we invite sage men, and choose out assistants for keeping the empire in good order. Since the time I came to the throne I have always taken to heart the ruling of my people; but I could not find worthy men to occupy the places of the three (kung) and the nine (k'ing)."

With respect to these circumstances I inquired and heard, that thou, master, hast penetrated the truth, and that thou wast the path of right. Deeply learned and much experienced, thou hast much explored the laws. Thy sanctity is become manifest. Thou hast preserved the rigorous rules of the ancient sages. Thou art endowed with the eminent talents of celebrated men. For a long time thou hast lived in the caverns of rocks and retired from the world; but to thee the people who have acquired sanctity repair, like clouds on the path of the immortals, in innumerable multitudes. I knew that after the war thou hast continued to live in Shien-tung at the same place, and I was always thinking of thee. I know the stories of the returning from the river Wei in the same cart, and of the invitations in the reed hut three times repeated. But what shall I do? We are separated by mountains and plains of great extent, and I cannot meet thee. I can only descend from my throne, and stand by thy side. I have fasted and washed."

"I have ordered my adjutant, Liu Chung-Lu, to prepare an escort and a simple cart for thee. Do not be afraid of the thousand li. I implore thee to move thy sainted steps. Do not think of the extent of the sandy desert. Commiserate the people in the present situation of affairs, or have pity upon me and communicate to me the means of preserving life. I shall serve thee myself; I hope that at least thou wilt leave me a tribe of thy wisdom (literally spit out a little). Say only one word to me, and I shall be happy. In this letter I have briefly expressed my thoughts, wisdom had reached. He was found (A.D. 267) inhabiting a reed hut, and was with difficulty persuaded to abandon his hermit's life."

Chinghiz here proposes that he should descend from the throne, and that Ch'ang Ch'un should take his place.

A Chinese phrase of politeness, meaning that the host has worthily prepared himself to receive the guest. The phrase in its literal meaning "fast and wash" would seem strange from the lips of Chinghiz. Rashidi'l-din reports that it was a rule amongst the Mongols never to wash or bathe themselves. The Musalmans in Mongolia, who sometimes infringed these rules were put to death. It seems that the Mongols of the present time follow conscientiously these practices of their ancestors.

He was a deserter from the Khian who entered the Mongol service when Chinghiz Khan entered China. Chinghiz valued him for his skill in making arrows.

Palladius.

In ancient times the Emperors used to send a cart for the sages when inviting them.—Palladius.
and hope that thou wilt understand them. I hope also, that thou, having penetrated the principles of the great T'ao, sympathisest with all that is right, and wilt not resist the wishes of the people. Given on the first day of the 5th month 1219."

To this letter the sage replied as follows:—

"K'in-Ch'ü-k'i from Si-Hia-bien" devoted to the Tao, received lately from afar the most high decree. I must observe that all the people near the seashore (i.e. of Shan-tung, Ch'ang-Ch'un's native country) are without talent. I confess that in worldly matters I am dull, and have not succeeded in investigating the Tao, although I tried hard in every possible way. I have got old and am not yet dead. My repute has spread over all kingdoms, but as to my sanctity I am not better than ordinary people; and when I look inwards I am deeply ashamed of myself. Who knows my hidden thoughts? Before this I have had several invitations from the southern capital (i.e. Kai-feng-fu), and from the Sung, and have not gone. But now at the first call of the Dragon court I am ready. Why? I have heard that the emperor has been gifted by Heaven with such value and wisdom as has never been seen in ancient times or in our own days. Majestic splendour is accomplished by justice. The Chinese people, as well as the barbarians, have acknowledged the Emperor's supremacy. At first I was undecided whether I would hide myself in the mountain or flee into the sea (to an island) but I dared not oppose the order. I decided to brave frost and snow, in order to be once presented to the Emperor. I heard at first that your Majesty's chariot was not farther than north of Han-chau and Fu-chau. But after arriving in Yen (Pekin), I was informed that it had moved far away, it was not known how many thousand li. Storm and dust never cease obscuring the heavens. I am old and infirm, and fear that I shall be unable to endure the pains of such a long journey, and that perhaps I cannot reach your Majesty; and even should I reach (I would not be good for anything). Public affairs and affairs of war are not within my capacity. The doctrine of Tao teaches to restrain the passions, but that is a very difficult task. Considering these reasons I conferred with Liu-Chung-lu and asked him that I might wait in Yen (Pekin), or in Tu-hing (now Pao-an-chau) the return of your Majesty. But he would not agree to that, and thus I myself undertook to lay my case before the Emperor. I am anxious to satisfy the desire of your Majesty, and to brave frost and snow; wherefore I solicit the decision (whether I shall start or wait). We were four, who at the same time became ordained monks. Three have attained sanctity. Only I have undeservedly the repute of a sainted man. My appearance is parched, my body is weak. I am waiting for your Majesty's Order."

"Written in the 3rd month of 1220."

The third letter is addressed thus:—

"The Emperor Ch'inghiz to the Teacher Ch'un."

"I read with pleasure your statement that, according to my commands, you have set out, and I have taken into consideration all that you have written. In holiness you excel three learned men, your brilliant qualities are renowned in many countries. For this reason I sent an official with a tempting present, who travelled by post-horses to seek you near the ocean. The result was in accordance with my desire. Heaven did not set itself against man. Two Courts have several times invited you, but you did not go to them; but when my single envoy invited you but once, you resolved to leave your abode. Because I am favoured by heaven, you are coming to me. You did not refuse to brave wind and weather in the open air, and have determined to cross the sandy deserts. When your letter was presented to me, I need not say how glad and satisfied I was. Military and state affairs engross my attention, but not by my desire I must confess, but in the sense of the spirit Daude. Because of the insubordination of certain chiefs, I have threatened them severely; and abused them roundly. My army no sooner arrives than distant countries become quiet and submit themselves. Whoever comes to me is on my side—and whoever leaves me is against me. I employ strength so that by some temporary labour I

---

11 K'in was Ch'ang Ch'un's family name, Ch'uki was another name of the sage; Si-Hia-bien was his native place.
12 Lang-ting, meaning the Mongol court.
13 Ancient Han-chau according to the Tu-la'ing-yo-t'ung-...
may receive a continuous peace, and intend to cease as soon as people's hearts are well disposed towards me. With this end in view, I parade a martial greatness and live amidst chariots and warriors. Again, I fancy I see your closed chariot moving from Pin-li-ya and that you direct your way on a stork towards India. Da-nul came to the East in order to impress the spirit of learning with the truth of tradition. Lao-tsi travelled to the West in order to enlighten the barbarians and to raise them to a state of grace. Although the deserts are wide it is not too far for me to see your table and your staff, for this reason I reply that you may know my sentiments. I hope you will be happy and well during your journey. I will not enlarge.

The result of this correspondence was that Ch'ang Ch'un paid Chinghiz Khan's visit, which we shall describe later on. These letters will suffice to show the impression which must have been created upon Chinghiz Khan's mind by the mystical faith which has survived so much persecution and ridicule in China, namely, Taoism.

We will now shortly consider his connection with Buddhism. This he was first brought more immediately into contact with in consequence of the Uighurs, who were so intimately connected with his people, having been Buddhists. Their Buddhism was of very old date, and was doubtless the same as that professed by the Red or Unreformed Buddhists of Tibet, who have been so put in the shade by the Yellow or Reformed Buddhists, followers of the Dalai Lama. These Red Buddhists were much contaminated with necromancy and apparently also with immoral practices. Abu'l-faraj has preserved a curious notice which has apparently not been quoted, in reference to Chinghiz Khan's intercourse with them, and with the more respectable Chinese Buddhists. He tells us that when the Mongols conquered the Uighurian Turks, they found among them certain necromancers called Kams. 'We have heard from many,' he says, 'who reported that they (the Kams) had heard the voices of demons speaking with them through the light-holes in the tent; but these manifestations, they declared, only took place when they allowed themselves to be polluted by other men.'

"Si quidem eorum multi hermaphroditae sunt. Adeo foede sunt, ut, quando aliquid ex magica eorum arte facere volunt quemcumque qui iis obviam fit, vi cogunt ut eos pollut." Abu'l-faraj continues, and says that "Chinghiz Khan, having heard that the Chinese possessed idols and sacrificing priests, sent envoys to summon some of these, promising to receive them honourably. When they arrived he ordered them to have a discussion with the Kams. When the priests had spoken and read out of their book called Num, the Kams were discomfited, for they were of small understanding, and thenceforward the reputation of the sacrificing priests (i.e. of the more enlightened Buddhists of China) among the Mongols increased. They were ordered to make some images and statues such as they made at home, and also to offer sacrifices and offerings as they were accustomed. Although they greatly honoured the priests, the Mongols did not despise the Kams. Both of them were tolerated; one did not abuse the other," says our author, "as is the custom among people who have sacred writings and prophets, among whom it is customary for each person to indulge in insults, to abuse his neighbour and call him an infidel." He also tells us how "in the book Num, just mentioned, besides profane sentences similar to those recorded by Saint Gregory, were laws of great excellence, ex. gr. violence and wrong-doing were forbidden, evil was not to be returned for evil but good. The smallest animal was not to be killed by man, not even bees and flies. Like Plato, they believed in the transmigration of souls, and that the spirits of good and upright men migrated after death into the bodies of kings and grandees, while those of evil-doers passed into the bodies of criminals, who duly suffered torture and were killed. The latter also passed into the bodies of animals. When some one took flesh for the priests to eat, they inquired if the animal had been killed purposely for them or had been bought in the market place; if the former, they would not eat it." This is surely a very fair and generous notice of Buddhism for an ecclesiastic of the 13th century to have recorded.

In addition to the influence exercised by the Chinese upon the religious opinions of the higher Mongols, they had a very potent in-

---

fluence also in moulding that magnificent force which swept over half the civilized world with such rapidity and success. It seems incredible how a body of mere shepherds, however brave and disciplined, should have engaged in elaborate siege operations and elaborated a scientific strategy which is the wonder of our time, and it is only explained when we remember that Chinghiz induced a large number of educated and skilled warriors from China to join his forces. Northern China, as we have seen, had only been conquered by the Kin dynasty a comparatively short time, and the partisans of the former dynasty, the Lian, were not only willing but anxious to help one who was likely to give their mortal foes such heavy blows. The Khitans, who had old traditions of culture, became his eager allies. In addition the Kin empire was itself, as we have seen, the prey of intestine feuds, and there were not wanting many experienced Kin officers who joined the vigorous Mongol chief. We read in the Yuen-shih-let-pon that when Chinghiz Khan set out on his western campaign, many Tartar princes and grandees were selected to accompany him, and he also had with him several Chinese generals. He also organized several companies of soldiers whose duty it was to assail besieged towns with stones (i.e., no doubt he got together from China a body of men skilled in using the mangonels and other primitive artillery of those days). These quasi-artillerymen, we are told, were commanded by a Mongol named Yennychay and by Suttalatabay who had lived at Yenking, but was a stranger by origin.17

The number of Chinamen and others from the far East who thus accompanied Chinghiz must have have very considerable, and some of them were apparently planted in military settlements, for when Ch'ang Ch'un, in his journey to see Chinghiz Khan in 1221, approached a town which his biographer calls T'ien-ch'en-hai-ba-la-ho-sun, and which Bretschneider places somewhere near Uliassutai, there came out to meet him a number of Chinamen, artisans and workmen who lived there. There were also two concubines of the late Kin emperor and a Chinese princess. This colony, we learn from

17 Ganbil, p. 34.
18 Bretschneider, Notes on Med. Travellers to the West,
against the Tumats, but we do not know whether it took place before or after Chinghiz Khan's withdrawal from China. Probably it was before. Who these Tumats were is not easy to decide. The Yuan-ch'ao-pi-si adjusts them the Kholi or Khori Tumat. Rashidu'd-din speaks of them as living near Buurghurjin Tugunu and among the Kirghises, and says they were a powerful tribe. One of the five sections of the Kerait or Kirais was called Tumait or Tumat, and if the Kirais of Wang Khan were, as some Russian inquirers believe, the ancestors of the Kirais, who still form an important section of the Kirghises, this would support the view that they were of Kirghiz race. On the other hand, the Kalmucks have a legend that one of the four original sections of their race (the Durken Uirad or four Uirads), was called Tummut. They do not know what has become of the Tummut, but believe that they still live somewhere in farther or Eastern Asia, and say they were separated from the other Uirads by the spirit—Shara Shulina, who frequently leads astray wandering tribes. Pallas, who quotes the tradition, suggests that the well-known tribe of the Tumeds among the Mongols of the Forty-nine Banners may possibly be the Tummut of the Kalmuk tradition.

I am disposed to consider the Tumats as originally a section of the Kalmuks, more especially as Rashidu'd-din in his article on the Hushins calls them the Mongol race of the Tumats. The word tuman or tumat is the plural of uman, meaning 10,000, but, in the cases above named, is clearly a proper name, and not a mere appellative. To revert to our story. According to the Hwang Ysa and Rashid u'd-din, the Tumats had submitted, but after a while, profiting by Chinghiz Khan's absence, they broke out into revolt under their chief called Dulaskhooi, by the former authority, and Tatulah Sukhar by the latter. The Hwang Ysa says Chinghiz sent Bolokhun Nayan and Duluto against them, and the former died there. Rashid u'd-din says that the Baim Bayan was first sent against them, but as he excused himself on the ground of illness, Chinghiz ordered Bugharul to march against them with a division. When he received the order he asked the minister if he had suggested his name to Chinghiz, or whether it was the latter's own choice, and on hearing that it was, he said I will obey his command, and spill my blood in the work. Having commended his wife and children to the care of the Khakan, he set out and speedily subdued the Tumat, but he lost his life in the struggle. The Yuan-ch'ao-pi-si gives us some interesting details of the campaign. When Bugharul, whom it calls Borouli, set out, the Tumat ruler Daidulul was already dead, and his widow Botokhutarkhun had control of matters. The Mongol general having set out ahead of his army with only three men, the Tumats surrounded him, cut off his retreat and killed him. Chinghiz, hearing of this, was very angry, and wished to march against them himself, but Boorchu or Bughurjin and Mu-ku-li persuaded him not to do so, and he accordingly sent Dorbodokhshin with an army against them; he made a feint to approach the place where Borouli had been killed, but actually advanced through the district Khulan-bukha along a narrow path which had been trodden by animals, and for fear his soldiers might be afraid to traverse such a road, he distributed 10 rods to each man with orders to beat those who would not advance. The soldiers also provided themselves with axes, saws and chisels with which to hew down the trees obstructing the path. Having at length reached the crest of a ridge, they looked down upon the Tumats "like looking down the smoke-hole of a tent." They fell on them while they were feasting, and conquered them. The victors released two Mongol chiefs, namely Khorchu and Khudukhabek, who had been imprisoned by the Tumats. The former, as we saw in a previous paper, had as a reward for some service requested permission from Chinghiz to select 30 beautiful girls as his wives, and having learnt that the maidens among the Tumats were beautiful, he determined to secure thirty of them. The Tumats objected and seized him. When Chinghiz heard of this, he sent Khudukhabek, who was well acquainted with the forest peoples, to secure his release, but he also was seized. When the Tumats were subdued, Chinghiz gave Borouli a hundred Tumat families; to Khorchu.

---

30 Erdmann, Timundschin, p. 190.
31 i.e. the yuan lintuio. Pallas says the Irrinste.
33 Erdmann, p. 209.
35 Erdmann, op. cit., p. 383.
36 i.e. gave to the family of Borouli, whom Rashid says he took under his special protection.
thirty Tumat maidens, while Botokhuitarkhun, the widow of the Tumat ruler, was made over to Khudukhabekil. We do not again read of the Tumats, and I am disposed to think they were incorporated with the Mongols and became the ancestors of the modern Tumeds of the Forty-nine Banners.

In regard to Bugharuli, who was one of Chinghiz Khan's most trusted officers, Rashid-ud-din tells us he belonged to the tribe Hushin. He at first filled the post of bukanl or head of the kitchen in his establishment, and that of baverji, i.e., chief marshal of the court. He then joined the vanguard of archers, then became its commander, then head of a tuman, and eventually second in command of the right wing under Boorchi. Erdmann says Boorchi, whom he calls Bughurjin, was under him.22

SOME NOTES ABOUT RAJA RASALU.


At vol. XI, pp. 346-349 ante, I gave a tale about Raja Rasalu, the great Skyanth hero of Panjab legendary lore. Subsequently General (Major) Abbott's paper on this hero in the J. A. S. Beng. for 1834, pp. 123-163, was brought to my notice. The paper is entitled, "On the Ballads and Legends of the Panjab: Refacemento of the Legend of Rassalo," and consists of a longish poem in English heroic lines, with notes on the legends the author had collected. General Abbott's tales were gathered apparently in what are now known as the Mahrif (Muree) Hills, and therefore his poem represents the same vernacular version of the legends as do the MSS. given me by Mr. Delmerick, and referred to in vol. XI, page 347 ante. There are, I find, several versions in the Panjab of the Rasalu legends, both in Hindustani and Panjabi, and the use of General Abbott's for the present purpose is that it can be closely compared with that previously alluded to by myself. In many respects General Abbott's version is much fuller than mine, especially as to the names of the places and actors in the tales, and his great local knowledge has enabled him to clear up many difficulties of toponymy, which would have been otherwise hard to solve, but he rarely gives specimens of his originals, and when he does give any, they are very faulty philologically, nor was he always fortunate in catching the sounds of his words.

Thus he calls our old friend Sallivahans (whose Panjabi names are Sallhiban, Sallibahin, Sallibahin or Sallibalin), Sahl Byne and Sala Byne. He does, however, to use his own words (pp. 159-161), give one legend, "precisely as he took it from the lips of a minstrel when shut in by the snow in a rickety and dark bastion of one of the rude castles of the Dhoondi (Mahrif) mountains." This tale happens to be the same as that I gave previously in this Journal, and in order to make my remarks on it as clear as possible I think it best to transcribe it here exactly as he tells it in his old-fashioned way of spelling the oriental words. Quoting him then word for word, he relates this tale as follows:

"Recitation.

"Rajah Rassalo, son of Rajah Sala Byne, was sleeping in his tent in the castle of Sialkot, when the Panj Peer appeared to him in a vision, and said:

"'Go thou and slay the Rakussa.'


3 Rakkhen; fem., Rakhani and Rakhai, are the modern forms of Rokshah and Rokshah. They were evidently a race antagonistic to the heroes of Panjab legends, and perhaps in translations had best be called 'giant' and "giantess." See Abbott's account, page 150 and ante, vol. XI, p. 349.

Adinagari, Hodinagari, 'Odhenagari: ante, vol. XI, p. 349, note 29, I have suggested Oubin opposite Atak on the Indus as its site. Abbott more than once says it is on the Lehor, but that seems impossible. At p. 148 he says there is a site called Lalnagar on the right (west) bank of the river below Jahan, where there are remains of a large town with coins exclusively Hidin. The Bib or forest in this tale being placed west of it, would seem to fit that as the site, at any rate, for these legends.
alighted at the abode of an ancient woman. She was cooking bread, but the whole of her mohulla (ward) was desolate, and sometimes she wept, and sometimes she sang. And in that city the inhabitants sent daily a buffalo, loaded with bread and a human victim to the Rakuss as his rations, otherwise he would have destroyed the city. And the Rakuss dwelt in the Baran, or wilderness, west of the city, and the Rajah addressed the woman thus:— (Chanted to music).

Ookoekh mundul mata marria do russ killah bazar,
Kye ra sub dur dism sukha kavar lisseh sunnar
Natoo rook my boodiah, hunjoo na dul karr,
Jie rub rukh si tera betha my siv deh sa char:—

"She replies:
Sut betha Raja Joo, my jahke, kye n’he keeta kahj,
Aikulla betha rehgya, osseh bairi ahj.
Neela ghorawallah shuksa, too mooahddri siv pug
Jereh zalun sooj deh aah! phira’i’i nj.

"Then on the morrow Russaloo departed in company with the old woman’s only remaining son, who was mounted on a pony, and who drove a buffalo laden with bread. And they reached the Neelao River, and Russaloo stopped to bathe. And the sound of thunder was heard in the clear vault of heavens, and fell upon Russaloo and the child. And from the forest appeared a column of cloud stalking forward to the spot and lightnings and thunders proceeding from it. And it paused at the river-brink and an arm, huge as a palm-tree, was stretched forth with its mighty hand to seize the youth. But Russaloo drew his sword and severed the hand from the arm. And the Rakuss uttered a dreadful roar and fled, and his brother and sister came to see what was the matter, and as they met their bleeding

However, Raja Sirkap’s fort is shown as being at Keel Bihara, near Atak, overlooking the Indus, ante, vol. XI, p. 349, note 36, and also at Mangalik, a fort overlooking the Jhelam at the point where it leaves the Himalayas: Abbott, pp. 130-151. So there is not much credit to be taken in the traditions.

The Nulao River is probably the Indus at Ragh Nilaho, where it is very blue. My version makes those adventures all take place at the Nilaho City. See ante, vol. XI, p. 347, note 18. Lately I have had reason to elieve that Nilaho should be Slia.

brother they saw Russaloo with his naked sword, and fear fell upon them because of a prophecy which said that the son of Sal Byne should destroy them, and one of them said to Russaloo:

Rahaa toomhara wutn hy, quon nugri shihr, grazan?

"Kis Rajah ka too beth ra, k’a toomhara nam?"
To which Russaloo answers:

Hus’rut Sialkat ma wutn, woohi nugri, shihr, grazan,

Salah Byne da my beth ra, Russaloo mera nam."

"The answer causes great dismay, nevertheless one of the brothers advances to the combat, but is slain by one of Russaloo’s fatal arrows, and another, Pehom, is wounded, and flies to Gundghur. Pagrupput also flies, but being hotly pursued utters a spell, and is instantly enclosed in solid rock.

"And Russaloo saw in a dream that the Rakussnie Boera, was concealed in the forest, and he came upon her with a drawn sword and compelled her to teach him the spell by which Pagrupput, her brother, might be drawn from the rock. And Russaloo muttered the spell and thunders-pealed and Pagrupput came forth, and Russaloo slew him with an arrow.

"And Boera said to Russaloo:—

"Behold, I am beautiful, make me thy wife."

And Russaloo consented, and, as they walked with infolding arms round the caldron of boiling oil, the Rakussnie who was very strong, tried to hurl Russaloo into the caldron but failed. And Russaloo hurled her in and cut off her head.

"And he mounted and rode to Gundghur, whither the first Rakuss had fled. And the Rakuss Terro, burrowed in a cavern of Mount Ph Than.

* * * * *

The names of the Rakshaas are all in modern Panjâb. Four males are mentioned and one female: viz., Chandia, Pagrup, Pheri, and Terro, with their sister Biria (most likely Biria, as Abbott frequently drops the final saal), Chandia I take to be Chandia, the moon or glorious, Pagrup means lord of the household (pagri, literally, turban), thus, sau pagri ña millih, master of a hundred households, is a common phrase to express a great man; Pheri means a quarreler; Terro, means crooked; biria lit., betel leaf, is a common name for beauty, the betel leaf being a conventional model of beauty. Abbott notes curiously (p. 150) that Terra is of Roman not Greek mythology, and could scarcely therefore have been transmitted to the Panjâb!

** "A nuptial ceremony of those days," says Abbott. If so, it is well worth remarking.

10 Pirhka, Saint’s Abode, is the highest point of the Goungar Hills, 4,500 ft.
could not get him forth he hung his terrible bow of steel in the cavern's mouth. And whenever the Rakshus would come forth the sight of this bow sends him back howling to his retreat. And many who are living have heard his voice and I amongst others. It is like distant thunder. But the last twenty years it has almost if not wholly ceased.

"And many other acts were performed by Russalo contained in other traditions and songs, and the steed of Russalo still stands caparisoned in a cavern at the summit of Mount Sirbom, waiting for his master."

All the verses quoted by Abbott are hard to follow, and are clearly very incorrectly recorded, and as incorrectly translated. I will here write down those already quoted, giving the words as I believe them to be in reality after much consultation with Panjâbî who ought to know what they should be.

Rasûlû.

Uchchhe mandal, Máâ merie, do rukh khîld bázôr;
Khère sahâ dûr dissan, sakhnâ korâ disse sanâr!
Na tâ ro, Máâ bukhâs, hanjû ná ñhalkâ:
Je Rabb rakhi terâ bejdâ,12 maâ sir desân chd.

Buðhiâ.

Sat bêta, Rájijî, maâñ jáche;13 kai na kité bâj:
Ikálâ bêta rah-gayâ; us dî bô-rî dîj.
Nîle-deerwâr shakshû, tâ múthâ dârî, nir pag:
Jehâ zâsîm sunâ14 do, âhî phîr dûn ajj.

12 Abbott, p. 155, gives a good description of the formation of the ordinary Panjâbî bow. It is made of three pieces of mulberry wood; one for centref or handle, and two for the horns or ends. These are joined by springs consisting of slips of buffalo horn, and the whole bound tightly together with gut, then covered over with glue and varnished. They are wonderfully elastic and strong considering the materials, and are moreover handy and light.

13 Rasûlû.

Nahâ tumhârî watan hai? kaun nagari shahr grâôh?
Kis Rájâ kà tu terâ? kyâ tumhârî nâmô?
Rasûlû.

Hâzrat Siâlâkot merd watan; wâhir nagari shahr grâôh:
Sâlãbhân dê maân bejd; Rasûlû merd nâmô.
Rasûlû.

Lofty palaces, mother mine, on both sides fort and bázôr;
The people seem all absent; the world seems empty and blank!
Weep not, ancient mother, drop no tears;
If God will preserve thy boy, I will give my head (for him).

Old Woman.

Seven sons, Sir King, I bore, none have married.
One only son remains; his turn is to-day.
O man with the dark-grey horse, thon hast a beard on thy face, a turban on thy head:
The evil fate I dreaded, alas! comes again to-day.

Râkshasas.

Where is thy home? what thy town, city or village?
What king's son art thou? what is thy name?

Rasûlû.

Holy Siâlâkot is my home; that my town, city and village:
I am Sâlãbhân's son: Rasûlû is my name.

General Abbott gives besides the above reflected on to the plains as Gandgarh's thunder. Gandgarh has not, however, spoken for many years (50 from present date), and this Abbott says can be accounted for by the cataclysm of 1839 (see Cunningham, Lâdik, 1854, pp. 39-111), which has so cleared the sides of the Indus gorge as to prevent large masses of rock again falling into it for many years. Cunningham's account of the cataclysm and its causes hardly bears out this theory.

Sirbhûn, one of the peaks of Gandgarh.

11 Bejd, little son, dim. from bejd. In Panjâb the termination ji, ñ and or are all diminutive. The following saying clearly shows this, "wohî to nakhâ milî, pothîr lâyân, - I found no bride, but have brought only a kind of bride," said by a disappointed bridegroom. My explanation of the r, J. A. S. B. vol. li, p. 165 (e), is therefore incomplete. See Hoernle, Gâudîn Grammar, p. 107, § 215, and pp. 123, 124, § 287.

12 Jache: this is a new word to me, but is a legitimate form in its obvious sense of "brought forth." If we admit it as a verb from the imported Persian word saçâd or sajâd, a lying-in woman, to be found in Panjâb as jachhîd and in Hindî as jachhà and jachhêd; in Persian saçhêd is child-birth.

13 Lit, the evil fate (sâlãbhân) of my sight. Ante; vol. xi, p. 348, the translation of sâlãbhân sâlãbhân gas, as "our fate has come," is rather free; literally it is "that which was to be seen has been seen."
several other verses, and one of them is this, “as the opening of a legend:—
Sawun, Sawun, too kahoh, pee, kurunta pee;
Taiko Sawun k’a kurreh, jin ghar n’by byl n’by bee.”
And he translates it:—
“Harvest, harvest, dost thou sing Poppeia,” peecia pee?
What thou hast nor ox nor seed, shall harvest do for thee?”
In modern form these verses run thus:—
“Sawun, Sawun,” t’ kaho, Pi’ karand pi’;
Taiko Sawun ky’ kare ? jin ghar na bail na by.
And they could be translated in two ways, firstly:—
Sing “Rain, rain,” cuckoo, calling p’!
What shall the rains do for thee? in whose house is neither ox nor seed?
Secondly:—
Sing “Rain, Rain,” my beloved, calling my beloved:
What shall the rains do for thee? in whose house is neither ox nor seed?
Fallon, New Hind. Dict. s. v. v. papíhá and piqá gives a similar verse playing on the senses of p’.
Are, papaiyá báore! to ho samjáhí na kawn?
Pi’ mero, mai’ pi’ kí, t’ pi’ kí kare so kawn?
Out on thee, silly cuckoo! who hath taught thee this?
My beloved is mine and I am my beloved’s: who is he thou art calling my beloved (p’)?
Again, our author quotes a triplet from the sayings of one Plíu, a poet of those parts, whose verses are still in the minds of the peasants and bards according to him.
“Peeloo churria Gungurh, nuur kurreh kulloh;
Age bughgeh Sind Rania, pichkheh bughgeh Harrooh.
Chuch Bunnarr Sumundur ki, jho bheejeh so hok.
Peeloo climbed Gungurh and stood gazing,
Before him rolled Queen Sind, behind him flowed Harrooh.

Chuch Bunnarr like the ocean, whatever you sow there will spring up.”
These I would write and translate thus:—
Pilā charhid Gungurh, nazar kare khalo:
Agge bagge Sindh Ránid, pichekhe bagge Haro.
Chach band18 samundur as, jo býe so ho.
Pilí climbed Gungurh and stood gazing.
Queen Sind flowed before him, behind him flowed Haro.20
The Chach appeared as the ocean, (where) what is sown springs up.21
Lastly, General Abbott, in remarking that the bards have a way of prefacing their recitations with long strings of aphorisms unconnected with their tales, makes the following quotation, the major part of which is misquoted, and very little correctly rendered. His words and translations are as follows:—
“Ulla dehwar. Ull bōti Pándoon, pheer bōoti Justurt,
“Mairi mairi kur gyē,” too ksei nuggeh hut,
Sumbhul ki, to buddia kia? kooh jis ki mooshk ihwass.
Gidr ko, to, sut nhwe, jis da nhkul, nh mahes.
Puttr ko, to, pild kia? koosro ko kur wees?
Undé ko chanoon kia? toorreh deeh bullun panjahas.
Moorook manoo admi hust mooehka (wuh) mahes.
Sussoo bahj nh sahoreh, huhli bahj nh mahes.
Bahj subooneh, khapra, trieh t’hokk nh rahes.
Uk nh’ kurreh dunuda, sup nh’ khyek mahes.
Narr nh’, kurrehlahdeh, nh hassoh kurreh bunahas.
Jummeh sì, to, sut gus, bur jo bān gus to charrr.
Pию, pootre, mojah lehgya do-no aik ah’ narr.
Kooloo koot rr lehgya, chukki lehgya khán.
Taili hāti ningliu, chourahi hurff graon.”
With the preliminary remark that he cannot answer for more than the general accuracy of the translation because the bards themselves can never explain and frequently misquote to such an extent as to render themselves unintelligible,22 he translates as follows, but he

about 90 miles through the Hasrā and Rāwal Pind Districts, and joining the Indus near Ask.
Alluding to the flat and fertile appearance of the Chach Plain from Gungurh. It is the scene of the struggle between Mahmul of Ghanī and Phirghi Bāj.
Every one who takes down verses direct from the bards finds this. Personally I have long given up stopping a bard to explain or correct a passage: to do so is simply to confuse him. The only thing to do is to let him go on in his own way, and try and piece together unintelligible passages as best one can afterwards. Strict attention to the literal sense and excluding secondary senses is the surest way to get at the real meaning.
has sometimes completely misunderstood the sense. The last four verses are nonsense from any view as they stand, and natives explain them allegorically.

"First were the Pandoos, after them the Jusrun."

Each said "the world remains mine own."

Yet none remains to either of you.

What harm is there in arsenic, or in the well whose odour is rotten? 22

Spare to beat the jackal, that hath nor hide nor flesh.

What carest thou for frost? The eunuch for matrimony?

To the blind what profiteth the lamp, tho' you should light fifty.

Man is an ignorant compound of hair and flesh. 23

The mother-in-law without her son-in-law, 24

meat without kuldī, 25

Clothes without soap, these three things are amiss.

Bring not the swallow-wort to your teeth. 26

Eat not the flesh of snakes.

Weep not despondently, nor laugh over much. 27

Born an infant of seven ells, would you grow into a man of four?

The father hath entered his son's boots, one measure serves for both. 28

The dog hath run off with the sugar press, the Khān hath seized the millstone. 29

The worm hath eaten the saddle of the village of 84 figures (in letters). 30

These lines I would quote, and render thus:—

Allā de wārī! Aawal bātī Pāṇḍū pher bātī Jāsrath.

32 Abbott more than once notes curiously that the Pāṇḍū rule preceded the Jāsrath in the Pānjab. Pāṇḍū was of the Lunar race, and Jāsrath is the modern form of Daśaratha, the father of Rāma-chandra of the Solar race. The bard probably refers vaguely to the two great races of Epic heroes. Chronologically it is possible there be any real chronology in this matter—I fancy Daśaratha must have been anterior to Pāṇḍū.

33 A curious mistranslation. Lit., make thy wife a darling that she may not ruin thee by laughing. It expresses a universal sentiment among the Pānjab lower orders, and is a very widely known verse.

34 I read this to translate, "she was born indeed sixty yards, at full youth (she was) indeed four yards; father and son both enjoyed the same wife." I take it to be one of those riddles natives are so fond of, with the answer, "chākhi, shadow." The natives say the morning and evening shadow of a tree is sixty yards, "stāc gas."

35 Lit., the words mean, "the little dog took away the small brass bowl, where has he taken the sweet-cake?" but they appear to have no sense in the context.

36 Lit., the little she-buffalo swallowed up the oil-maker, the village of 84 letters. I fancy really this last couplet is of the riddle nature, the three last words being the answer: charaš-江山, the 84 (lakhs of) lives is a common expression for transmigration of souls. The couplet is, however, from any view confused. The turning of the oil-maker into his buffalo would be a just retribution, the life of the latter being universally and justly upheld as the personification of hard and thankless toil for another's benefit.
TRANSLATION OF TWO BRIEF BUDDHIST SŪTRAS FROM THE TIBETAN.

BY W. W. ROCKHILL.

The two Sūtras, of which I offer the following translation from the Tibetan, serve to show, in a certain measure, that Buddhist literature is in reality a comparatively meagre one, if we take into consideration the immense collection devoted to it extant at the present time.

I might have taken a hundred other Sūtras in the Tibetan Bhag-hgyur that would have equally well served my purpose; but these are especially commendable, because they are short. It must have struck every one who has read any number of Buddhist works how the same stereotyped phrases, the same similes, occur on every page, and that one Sūtra differs from another only by slight changes introduced into these stock phrases, and by a selection suited to the text of the sermon. Take the Dhammapada, the Sutta Nipāta, or the Tibetan Udānavarga, and you will find the substance of nearly every Sūtra in the canon; these works have probably been used as compendiums from which the long diffuse Sūtras like the Lalita Vistara, or the Prajñā Paramitā, have been derived; but turn to whichever work one will, one finds the same sentiments, the same old precepts of the Dhammapada and other like works.

I do not claim that these works are in themselves among the oldest of Buddhist literature; on the contrary, they cannot have been composed until after the Dharma had been taught for a long while; but they certainly contain the best authenticated versions of the sayings of the Buddha Gautama.

The founder of Buddhism addressed himself to the masses of the people, to the learned and to the ignorant; and to all he taught, not an elaborate system, but a few irrefutable truths; in some cases, even, he enables a hopelessly stupid person to perceive the truth by the simple performance of some manual labour, or by the constant repetition of one word; but generally he teaches them to repeat a few lines which contain that portion of the doctrine best suited to their intelligence. Frequently the triviality of the simile struck their untutored minds, and in every case the verses were so short that it required but little application to commit them to memory.

"He who, though he can only recite a few lines (of the law), walks in the way of the law, and has forsaken passion, anger, and ignorance, he has a share in the priesthood" (Udānavarga, iv, 23; Dhammapada, 20).

It is these oft-repeated aphorisms that have served as the basis of the greater part of the Sūtras, which were set down in writing long after the death of the Buddha; and it is unquestionably a proof of the estimation in which they were held, to find them everywhere repeated, or so slightly altered that we cannot help detecting the source from which they are taken.

For these reasons, I think that wherever we see these aphorisms, we may take them as the utterances of the Buddha, with much greater probability than any other part of the works we may have before us. The two following Sūtras are therefore worth notice, for they are undoubtedly compilations. It is remarkable that, beside Sūtras like these, in which moral virtues are so highly exalted, we find passages like the following, taken from the Brahmacāla Sūtra: "Bhikshus, all those foolish beings who have not heard (the law) speaking in praise of the Taṭhāgata, only speak of trifles, such as morality (śīla), and of the removing of desires by seclusion" (Bhag-hgyur, Mdo, xxx, f. 110b).

The explanation of this discrepancy seems to lie in the fact that morality, charity, good-will, &c., were the foundation—indispensable, it is true—the preliminary steps, of him who would

---

1 From the Proceedings of the American Oriental Society, May 1883.
reach perfect enlightenment, who would become a Buddha. The omniscience of which the Buddha was possessed made the more humble virtues sink into insignificance—in the case mentioned in the Brahmājūla, at least.

Morality—that is to say, keeping the ten or the six commandments binding on a mendicant or on a lay follower—was a virtue essential to all beings, and was a source of great future felicity; but this only required to be impressed upon the ignorant crowd; and to such were these sermons or “trifles” spoken.

I have endeavoured to preserve, as much as possible, the style of the gathās forming the latter part of the Maṅgallākāra Sūtra, which appears to me to have been something like a song.

This Sūtra gains especial interest from the fact that it is one of a rather numerous class of Sūtras which were translated into Tibetan directly from Pāli, as we are informed by the colophon, which says that “it was translated in the Mahāvihāra, in the island of Ceylon, by the great pandita Anandaśīlī and the bhāvanatva lobsawa, the bhikhu of Śakya, Ni-ma-rgyal-mtshan dpal-bzang-po (Śrāvyadhēva Śrībhikṣu 7), who (both of them) understood the two languages (Pāli and Tibetan or Sanskrit).”

1. BHIKHU PRAJEJU SŪTRA.

In the language of India, Bhikhu pravejusūtra; in the language of Bod (Tibet), Dge-slong-la rabs-gyes-pa’i mdo (the sūtra called ‘very agreeable to a bhikhu’).

Praise be to him who knows all!

I once heard the following discourse, while the Blessed One was residing in the Phullapadma vihāra in the great city of Śrāvastī, accompanied by a retinue of twelve hundred and fifty bhikhus.

Then it happened that from amidst the retinue of the Blessed One, the Ariya called Upāli, whose senses were well controlled, who was attentive, whose wisdom was profound, who was particularly esteemed on account of the way in which he could recite the disciplinary rules that had been set forth by the Blessed One, rising up from his mat, throwing his cloak over one shoulder, touched the ground with his right knee with hands joined over his breast, and smilingly said to Bhagavat: “Thou who, like a lotus, art free from the mire of the world, thou who art unshaken as a mountain, whose mighty body is adorned with the ornaments of symmetry and beautified with the flowers of signs, thou whom one gazes at unwearyingly, who art the best of the best, thee do I worship!

We who are here gathered together, all of us bhikhus, we beseech the Mighty One to tell us these four things: 1, the nature of a bhikhu; 2, the different kinds (of bhikhu); 3, what constitutes (this condition); 4, the deportment (of a bhikhu).”

Then the Conqueror, the Blessed One, well pleased, turned toward Upāli and said: “Give thou only ear, Upāli, and I will satisfy you by explaining what is becoming in bhikhus.

The real bhikhu, being the chief ornament of the Law, the real bhikhu is a living diamond.

The real bhikhu, having cast off suffering, the real bhikhu is the son of the Conqueror.

The real bhikhu, having destroyed all corruption, the real bhikhu goes to the garden of freedom.

The bhikhu controlling (or who controls) his whole nature, knowing the four fundamental truths, and observing the two hundred and fifty rules (of the Praṅgama), is pure and virtuous.

There are many kinds of bhikhus; the signs and characteristics of the real bhikhu, of him to whom that name only really applies, are these:

He who seeks for virtue (dge-slong= bhikhu), and who seeks for his food by begging, who is dispassionate, who walks in the way, whose life is correct, who has cast off passions, he, on account of these qualities, is a bhikhu.

The real bhikhu is adorned, for having cast away (worldly) ornaments, he is well adorned. He has attained his great desire when he has cast off desires.

The mendicant who cares about unguents, baths, choice food, jewels, (fine) garments, collyrtes, horses, elephants, palanquins, wagons and carriages, for which he ought not to care, is not a (real) bhikhu.”

Then Upāli said to the Blessed One: “What the Sugata has said is obscure; I beseech the Sugata to illuminate with the light of his words the obscurity of his (previous) sayings.”

Then the Blessed One said:

“He who has cast far away gold and all the other ornaments of the world, and who is merciful, he is adorned with the most precious of ornaments.

Not the garments of the world, but the garment of the doctrine, the saffron-coloured gown, is the best of raiment.

It is not camphor and such like, but morality, that is the best of unguents.

* There are 258 rules in the Bhikhu Praṅgama and 273 in the Bhikshu F. in the Tibetan version. The Chinese Praṅgama has 250 rules.
It is not white, red, or such like, but faith, that is the most beautiful colour.

It is not worldliness, but application, that is the best and swiftest conveyance.

Contemplation and the practice of the Law is the best food, and has a sweeter aroma than boiled rice.

They who in the abode of the community are dispassionate, who are content with a single mat, come not back again (to this world), they are truly bhikshus.

They who, weary of the three perfections (pradhāna) and their companions, become hermits, and (take up) cool dwelling places, their bodies, speech, and minds all well controlled, knowing the proper way to comport themselves, they are truly bhikshus.

Both of these (kinds of bhikshus) arrive at the city of freedom, where they enjoy the perfect happiness of freedom.

He who scoffs at the alms-bowl and the other (possessions of a bhikshu), will be plunged in hell in molten bronze for four thousand kalpas.

To some morality (śīla) brings happiness, to others morality (i.e. the want of morality) is a source of suffering.

He who has morality has the greatest blessing.

He who acts against morality is in misery.

He who has brought himself to perfectly observe morality, the appearance of that man is beautiful.

He has nearly conquered, I consider, the many who has learnt morality; for in a single day he acquires an incalculable amount of merit, which vies with the fruit of enlightenment (bodhi).

He who convinces himself that he understands the spirit of the Law (iṣṭa, the sign of victory) of the Sugata, when he is not keeping the precepts of the Law, that man is only devoted to form (rūpa); so that bhikshu I consider like a mad bull held by a hair, or like one who drinks acids rather than sweet. That man sow in a single day innumerable seeds of wickedness, and does himself all kinds of injuries.

He who keeps not the śīla precepts, who, though not keeping the precepts, (thinks) that he comprehends rightly the Law of the Sugata, who approves of the saying that one can hold on to form (rūpa) and to a home (life), that man, not keeping the precepts, perceives not the characteristics that mark all worldly (existence) as essentially connected with sorrow; so all the utterances of that man are evil.

The live trunk of a tree can send forth shoots for a long time; so that man will talk for a long time the language of sin, and will greatly add to his wicked works. Morality is the greatest happiness! Morality is the road to freedom! Morality is the field of perfection! Morality is the foundation of enlightenment! Morality is the chief of good things! Watch over morality as over the apple of your eye, for life is at stake! He who renounces it, unwise, foolish is he!

All things that are born have but a limited existence; but morality has no such future.

Therefore, Upáli and all you other disciples, watch well over these laws.

When the Blessed One had thus spoken, Upáli and the bhikshus greatly extolled his teaching.

The sūtra called Bhikṣu praṇava is finished.

2. MAITRIHBHĀVĀNA SŪTRA.

In the language of India, Maitrihbhāvāna sūtra in the language of Bod, Byama-pa byom-pai indo (the sūtra on showing good will).

Glory to the blessed Triharta!

This discourse I once heard, while the Blessed One was stopping at Śrāvasti, at Jītāvana, in the grove of Anathapindika. It happened that the Blessed One called the Bhikshus to him; and when they were in the presence of the lord Bhagavat, he spoke to them as follows:

"To thoroughly emancipate the mind, one must show good will; to steadfastly keep it in one's thought, one must show it to many; one must be dispassionate, one must make it a fundamental law, one must strictly adhere to it; to this accustom yourselves, devote yourselves.

There are eleven blessings (attached to good will) which I will explain. They are as follows: one sleeps peacefully, one awakes peacefully, one has no bad dreams, men delight in him, supernatural beings delight in him, the gods protect him, fire or poison or the sword harm him not, his mind is always happy, his countenance is beaming, he will die with his mind at peace, through his righteous deeds he will be born in the world of Brahmā.

Bhikshus, steadfastly keep the thought of good will in your minds, practise it, show it to many, be dispassionate, make it your fundamental law, strictly adhere to it, to this accustom yourselves, devote yourselves. These then are the eleven blessings.

Cf. Dhammapada, v. 338.

* Or it may be rendered: "He who is born has a limited life, but he who observes the śīla precepts has no such future."

* Taken from the Bhāskha-puruṣa, xxivth vol. of the Mā, f. 109,109.
Bhikhus, I will tell you of yet other blessings that good will brings:
He lives with food and drink in plenty,
Which he finds near at hand,
He lives in the midst of great abundance,
The man who is not without good will.
Where'er he goes within the town,
Be it in the city or in the royal palace,
Everywhere he meets with honour,
The man who is not without good will.
To him thieves and robbers come not,
To him the king does no harm,
He is a friend to all creation,
The man who is not without good will.
Free from anger, he happily lives at home;
To mankind there shines no such pleasing vane,
But he is better than all them,
The man who is not without good will.
He who shows honour, honour he will find,
He who bows, to him shall others bow,
Glory and fame shall he find,
The man who is not without good will.
He who is respectful, respect he shall find,
Reverence comes to him who shows it,
He will have the bloom of health,
The man who is not without good will.
He shines as does a blazing fire,
His body like that of some (bright) god;
He will not lose his wealth,
The man who is not without good will.
Great will be the herds,
Great the grain in the field,
Many the sons and the daughters,
Of the man who is not without good will.
Falls he from off the mountain-top,
Or falls he from off a tree,
He drops not, but (gently) reaches the earth,
The man who is not without good will.
The man who climbs a phata (?) or tâla tree,
Cannot be shaken by the wind,
So enemies cannot bring to harm,
The man who is not without good will."
When the Blessed One had thus spoken, the Bhikhus greatly extolled his teaching.
The sūtra on showing good will is finished.
(Bkah-hgyur, Mdo, xxx. f. 575, 576.

MISCELLANEA.

NAGAPATAM BUDDHIST IMAGES.

Str.—In the VIth volume of the Indian Antiquary (1873), at pp. 224-227, Sir Walter Elliot has published a paper, entitled The Edifice known as the Chinese or Jaina Pagoda at Negapatam, in which he describes the ruined tower once in the vicinity of the Jesuit College there, and alludes to several Buddhist idols found by the Jesuit Missionaries under the roots of a Mohwâ tree, which was cut down in 1856.

On reading it I have been struck by some mistakes, which, I think, it will be interesting to correct.

As regards the author's account of the tower and of the discovery of the images, I have nothing to object, the second part being the translation of a paper communicated by M. Ph. Ed. Foucaux to the Athenæ Oriental, and by Baron Texier de Ravisi to the Academic Society of St. Quentin. But the author says, at page 226: "M. Foucaux adds that one of the idols has been retained in the college, and that the fifth had been sent to the Rev. T. Carayon in Paris, but he does not state what became of the remaining three. One of these is almost identical with that figured for our article (fig. 3), differing only in the absence of the square pedestal bearing the inscriptions, which, however, forms a separate piece from the lotus stand common to both, and in the disposition of the mantle, which is pendent from the 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."

I can supply some information about the statues. Of the five, two have been brought to the Rev. T. Carayon in Paris (and not one only) by the Baron Texier de Ravisi himself, one bronze statue and that in porcelain and clay alluded to in the article of Sir Walter Elliot. Two, those under numbers 5 and 6, were given to M. Texier de Ravisi by the Missionaries; of these he gave that numbered 5 to M. Ph. Ed. Foucaux, and it will soon be published as an illustrative plate in the new translation of the Lalita Vistara in the volume VI of the Annales du Musée Guimet; the other, the bronze standing image is still, I think, in M. de Ravisi's possession. The fifth was retained by the Fathers, as stated by Sir Walter Elliot, but it was not given to Lord Napier, for M. Texier de Ravisi says—in a note to a paper issued some years ago (I don't know the date), in answer to the critics of the paper in the Travaux of the Academic Society of St. Quentin, entitled Interprétations d'Antiques Idoles Bouddhiques—"By a letter of the 7th September 1880 the Missionaries also gave me the fifth Buddha. I sent it to a relation of mine,
M. Elie Pajot, landowner in Réunion Island, and Member of the Société des Arts et des Sciences of that Island."

As regards the statue numbered 7 in the plate accompanying his article, Sir Walter Elliot is entirely mistaken. First, this image was not found at Negapatan, but it was taken by a captain of Sipahis out of a shrine under the Colossal Buddha statue in the Shwé-Dagon-Prah at Rangoon, after the conquest of the city by the English troops, during the Burmese war in 1824, and acquired for M. de Ravisi from the heirs of the captain by M. Alling, police inspector in Karikal, as stated in the same paper of M. Textor de Ravisi. Sir Walter Elliot has certainly been led into this error by a misunderstanding of M. Textor de Ravisi’s communication before the International Oriental Congress, held in London in 1874, or perhaps he had forgotten, after some years had elapsed, that there were two different papers in the Travels of the Academic Society of St. Quentin, the one relating to the idols of Negapatan, the other to the said Burmese image.

He also says at page 227: “No. 7 appears to be a female devotee of very rude workmanship.” Here, also, Sir Walter Elliot is mistaken, though, in that case, he follows the interpretations of M. Textor de Ravisi, who thinks the statue may represent Mayá-Dévi, the mother of Gautama Buddha.¹

It would be needless to follow the author in the discussion of the reasons he gives for considering this statue as Mayá-Dévi; he finds them in the various parts of the figure, and refers principally to a tradition, preserved in the family of the captain of sipahis, that the idol was worshipped in Shwé-Dagon-Prah under the name of the Virgin and Mother of Buddha. Those conclusions we cannot accept, for the following reasons:

The said statue is now in the Musée Guimet Collection, at Lyons, having been given to M. Guimet by M. Textor de Ravisi four years ago. It stands in the gallery of the first floor, first room, in the lower range of the case 3 A. The image is thus described in the new edition of the Catalogue at p. 63:

“Çakya-Mouni debout, vêtue d’une grande robe et d’un manteau, la main droite étendue sur la poitrine, la gauche pendant vers la terre et tenant le bord du manteau. Marbre peint; hauteur 0’700mm. (avec le socle). Provenant de Rangoon, Birmanie.”

The statue has been carefully examined by M. Guimet and myself, and by our native collaborators MM. Panditileke and Lewis da Sylva, Buddhist priests of Ceylon, M. Y. Ymäiyzouni, a scholar of the Buddhist Singon sect in Japan, and quite recently by M. Louis Vossiou, the present General-Consul of France at Rangoon, and their unanimous opinion was that it represented the exact features of the Gautama Buddha of the Burmese.

As regards M. de Ravisi’s interpretation I objected in the following terms in a letter that I wrote to him on the 5th of June 1883:

“I cannot agree with the opinion that our statue represents the Mother of Buddha:

1st. Because there is no trace anywhere of worship paid to Mayá-Dévi, except perhaps, according to Dr. Edkins in Religion in China, by the Eastern Mongols, who worship the Mother of Buddha under the name of Ehe Borrhan. But such worship of a woman is quite contradictory to all Buddhist tenets, who place women in a quite inferior rank, so as to oblige them to be reborn as men before they can hope to attain to Nirvāṇa.

2nd. Because, though the features of the face are somewhat those of a woman, they are identical, notwithstanding, with those generally given to Gaudama, as illustrated by numerous other representations of the same personage, the face being intended to represent that of a young man of about eighteen.

3rd. Because the conical ornament on the top of the forehead has no means a flame, but the Uwāsha, the sacred elevation of the forehead peculiar to the Buddhas when they have attained to Bodhi.

4th. Because the equality of length in the fingers of the hands and feet is a particular characteristic of a Buddha,—one of the thirty-two external characters by which he is to be recognised as soon as born.

5th. Because there is absolutely nothing in the general form of the body to allow us to conclude that it is that of a woman, the garments differing in no way from those of other images of Buddha in Burma, Siam, and Kamboja.”

We, therefore, hold the said statue to be that of Sákya Muni, the Gaudama Buddha of the Burmese. Nevertheless, in order to settle entirely this question we prayed M. Louis Vossiou to try, in Rangoon, to ascertain from the priests of the Shwé-Dagon-Prah whether, at any time, there was in that Pagoda an image of Mayá-Dévi, and whether any worship was ever paid to her.

DE MILLOUÉ,
Directeur du Musée Guimet à Lyon.
Lyons, 1883.

¹ Mémoire sur l’idole de la Vierge de la Pagode de Shoé-Dagon-Prah à Rangoon, pp. 43, 44.
BOOK NOTICES.

THE SACRED BOOKS of the EAST, Edited by F. Max Müller; Volume XIX.—The Fo-shuo-hing-tsan-k'ing,—a Life of Buddha, by Aśvaghosa Bodhisattva; translated from Sanskrit into Chinese by Dharumarākṣa, A.D. 429; and from Chinese into English by Samuel Beal. (Oxford: 1883).

The publication of the Sacred Books proceeds apace,—nineteen volumes having been issued and four more announced as being in the press.

The volume by Prof. Beal adds another to the various Lives of Buddha we now possess in English, translated from Tibetan, Burmese, and Chinese sources. The translator, in his introduction, mentions that he had first begun upon a translation of the Pha yao kiu, an early Chinese version of the Lalita-vistara, made by a monk whose name was also Dharumarākṣa, in A.D. 308, but from the corruptness of the text and the turgidness of the style, this had to be given up when about three-fourths complete. It is, he tells us, in eight chapters, and belongs to the expanded class of Sūtras. In it "the story of Buddha's life is told from his birth to his death, but in the exaggerated and wearisome form peculiar to the works of this (expanded) school. It would seem as if the idea of merit attaching to the reproduction of every word of the sacred books had led the later writers, not only to reproduce the original, but to introduce, by an easy but tiresome method, the repetition of a simple idea under a multitude of verbal forms, and so secure additional merit." Of this work he has given us a good sample in a long note (pp. 344-371) appended to the present volume.

The introduction further contains some interesting details on the divisions of Buddhism, the formation of the Northern schools, a list of the various Lives of Buddha in Chinese, of which he enumerates fourteen, the earliest being the Fo-pen-hing-k'ing or Buddhacharita-sūtra of Aśvaghōsa (?), translated by Fa-lam in A.D. 63; and to this he adds remarks on the value of the Chinese translations.

Aśvaghōsa Bodhisattva, the author of the original Sanskrit work the Buddhacharita-kāvyā, was the twelfth Buddha patriarcha, and a contemporary of the great king Kanishka, who probably ruled in the end of the first century. He was a native of Śrāvastī, and a Brāhman by birth, but was converted to Buddhism, and travelled about as a musician and preacher, and seems to have been the popular hymn writer of the Buddhists.

The Sanskrit MSS. of the Buddhacharita, however, break off at the end of the 17th section or vārga, after the account of the conversion of Mahākāśyapa, whereas the Chinese version contains 11 vārgas more, continuing the story down to the division of the Sarvās, and Prof. Beal thinks this may arise from our Sanskrit MSS. being incomplete, rather than that the additions were made by some other writer before the Sanskrit work was carried to China.

Like all other Oriental Lives of Buddha, it dwells on his teaching with a tiresome amount of reiteration. Written five centuries after the death of the Founder, the body of the discourses put into his mouth in this work must be regarded as apocryphal, but the doctrines they contain are none the less the legitimate outcome of his teaching. "There are many passages throughout the poem of great beauty," even in its Chinese dress, the translator remarks: "There is also much that is dry and abstruse, yet we cannot doubt that in that day and among those people, the 'great poem' of Aśvaghōsa must have had considerable popularity. Hence the translations of it are numerous." As a specimen of the tone of this Buddhist writer we may quote the following passage from Varga 19 (vv. 1543-47) describing the meeting of king Suddhodana with his son, after the latter had assumed the role of a Buddha:

"Furthermore, he [Suddhodana Rāja] thought with himself how he had long ago desired (this interview) which had now happened unawares (without arrangement). Meantime, his son in silence took a seat, perfectly composed and with unchanged countenance (1543). Thus, for some time sitting opposite each other, with no expression of feeling (the king reflected thus): 'How desolate and sad does he now make my heart, as that of a man who, fainting, longs for water upon the road, espies a fountain pure and cold (1544) with haste he speeds towards it and longs to drink, when suddenly the spring dries up and disappears. Thus, now I see my son, his well-known features as of old (1545); But how estranged his heart! and how his manner high and lifted up! There are no grateful overflowings of soul, his feelings seem unwilling to express themselves; cold and vacant (there he sits) and like a thirsty man before a dried-up fountain(ṣo amā) (1546). Still distant, thus (they sat) with crowding thoughts rushing through the mind, their eyes full-met, but no responding joy; each looking at the other seemed as one who, thinking of a distant friend, gazed by accident upon his pictured form.'" (1547).

This scene pictures with studied clearness

---

1 For the contents of this work see Śāntar's Légende du Bouddha, p. 407 n.
2 Ind. Ant. vol. IV, pp. 141-144; vol. IX, pp. 149, 316; vol. XI, p. 29; Beal's Abst. of Four Lectures, pp. 35 ff.
how Buddhism deals with natural affections. It represents, in this direction, its highest achievement in the example of the Buddha himself, "the Perfect being," "the blessed One," and the picture is not an attractive one; Buddhism aims, not at purifying all human feeling, but at destroying some of the best impulses of humanity. Nor is this the only instance of the kind: the student of Buddhah literature can point to many such; yet we find Mr. Arnold in the preface to his Light of Asia stating, with most unwarranted assurance, that "the Buddhistical books agree in the one point of recording nothing—no single act or word, which mars the perfect purity and tenderness of this Indian teacher." While such very exaggerated statements are contradicted by the most trustworthy records, it still however remains that the singular beauty and attractiveness of Buddha's character warrant us in ranking him as among the greatest and noblest of men,—one who lived and laboured, however mistakenly, in order that he might, if possible, lighten the miseries of his fellow-men. Beautiful as his ethical aphorisms are, in the estimation of those who have been brought up amid the culture and civilization of the west, their potential efficacy can only be inferred from the practical operation of the system in Nepal, Tibet, China, Siam, and other lands where it has had a fair and prolonged trial; and the result is well known to be a very sad one.

This volume of Professor Beal's forms a valuable contribution to the materials hitherto at our disposal for the study of the doctrines of Northern Buddhism, and the translator—already well known by five or six valuable works as an accomplished sinologue and student of Buddhism, appears to have discharged his difficult task with conscientious care. It forms an important addition to the interesting series of translations embraced in the Sacred Books of the East, and is specially fitted to supply the desideratum so well expressed by the Editor in his preface to the collection:—"We want," he says, "to know the ancient religions such as they really were, not such as we wish they should have been. We want to know, not their wisdom only, but their folly also." By the translation of books like this, hitherto unknown in any western language, the series is doing much to supply this want.

Udānавarga: a collection of verses from the Buddhist Canon, compiled by Dharmatāra, being the Northern Buddhist version of Dharmapada. Translated from the Tibetan of the Bhak-hgyur, with notes and extracts from the commentary of Pradinśvarman. By W. W. Rockhill. (London: Trübner and Co. 1883.)

In the Asiatic Researches (vol. XX, p. 477), M. Csoma Kőrösi described at some length a section of the Bhak-hgyur as the Udānavaγra, a collection of versified thoughts on various subjects, by Ggra-eqom-pa-chos-sknyob, i.e. the Abhān Dharmatāra. This Dharmatāra is said to have been the maternal uncle of Vasumitra and perhaps the same as the pupil of Āvadānā, and hence must have belonged to the 1st century A.D., and of his different works in the Chinese collection, the Dharmapada sūtra is said to have been translated into Chinese in the year 224 A.D.

This Udānavaγra was first discovered by Schielner to be a form of the Dharmapada (Mél. Asiat. tom. VIII, p. 560). There is also a Chinese version the Cha-yoo-king or Avadānā-sūtra, translated in 308-9 A.D. by Sanghabhūti (a native of Kābul) and Fo-nien; and the Tibetan version,—made by Vidyaprabhākara, probably in the 9th century,—appears to follow it very closely,—both being divided into 33 chapters, with the same titles in most cases, and identical contents. It contains 999 sentences or verses, of which 300 are nearly the same as verses in the Pali Dhammapada, and 150 more resemble verses of that work; 20 are found in the Sutta Nipāta, and about as many more are very similar to parts of the same. Thus it will be seen that more than half the book is found in these works which are already well known to us.

The Udānavaγra belongs entirely to the ethics of Buddhism, a subject which has of late received so much attention, that the history of the developments of the system has been almost lost sight of. Is it not time that scholars were directing their studies again to the latter field, so well opened up by the illustrious Burnouf in his Introduction à l'histoire du Buddhisme Indien? Mr. Rockhill's version seems conscientiously executed, with footnotes and a comparative table of the verses in the Dhammapada, Beal's Phu-keu-phi-yu, and the Sutta Nipāta, that agree with the Udānavaγra; but the book has no index.


It was only last year that Mr. Whinfield published his translation of 253 of the Quatrains of Omar Khayyám which we noticed favourably at the time (see ante, vol. XI, p. 240); and now he has issued a greatly enlarged edition, containing 500 of these verses,—nearly the whole number in most editions,—with the original Persian text on the page opposite to the version. This edition includes all those in the first, but many of them have been recast and improved. The introduction also is enlarged from 6 to 30 pages.

A mong the great temples of Southern India perhaps no one is more interesting than that of Rāmēsvaram, on the east side of the small island which takes name from it. The large temple, in its present form, is not very old, but its proximity to the sacred bathing place or Tirtha of Dhanushkodi, on a spit of sand that runs out on the south-east of the island, and the great wealth lavished on it by the Sētupatis or Chiefs of Rāmnād (Rāmanāthapuram), have rendered it a place of great note among devout Hindus. It is still visited daily by scores of pilgrims from all parts of India, and at sacred seasons by hundreds and thousands,—and of these the vast majority come from great distances. Probably more come from Nēpāl and north of the Ganges than from the Tamil districts in the immediate vicinity, while the Dakhaṇ and Maisūr seem to contribute the majority. Few great temples are now much venerated by the people in their immediate neighbourhood.

The temple buildings are very large, and like others in the south they are surrounded by a high wall on the four sides, covering an area measuring about 865 feet from east to west by 657 feet from north to south, with unfinished gōpuras or gate towers on the east, south and north, and a single complete one about 78 feet high on the west side towards the village. On the east side is the largest unfinished gōpura, not on the wall of the present outer enclosure, but on that of an inner one surrounding what is known as the second prākāra, or enclosure, while outside the main wall on that side are two large porticoes, one opposite this gōpura and leading up towards it, and the other a little to the south, leading in towards a subordinate gōpura in line with the last, and surmounting the gateway in front of the temple of the goddess or Amman.

Inside the great enclosure is the third prākāra abutting on the east wall, and measuring about 690 feet by 435. A passage about 18 feet wide with raised corridors of about the same breadth on each side, leads from the western entrance into this outer prākāra or enclosure, which contains the great corridors surrounding the inner buildings, and is by far the most imposing feature of the temple. Like the entrance passage it has a corridor on a raised platform on each side of it, and runs round the four sides of the rectangle which it encloses.

This third corridor or prākāra alone is open to all castes. Within it, and nearer the east face than the west, is an area 386 feet from east to west by about 314 feet from north to south, also surrounded by a high wall enclosing the second prākāra, which is by no means so imposing, though somewhat older than the third; and within this again are the first prākāra, or inner enclosure round the shrines of the god Rāma-liṅga-svāmī and of his consort Parvattardhini Amman, of Viśva-nātha Svāmī and Viśālākṣī Amman, besides a number of smaller chapels and rooms. The principal shrines are said to have been built by Udaiyān Sētupati, with the aid of a Ceylon prince styled Parārāja Śekhara in Ś. 1336 (A.D. 1414), the latter having had the stones hewn at Triṅkōnamalai and numbered on the spot, ready to be put together. This is said to be supported by the architectural style of these buildings themselves, and by inscriptions on the base of the chief shrine. The north and south gōpuras are unfinished, and ascribed to one Kīraṇa Rāyar, of the Dakhaṇ, about 1420 A.D.

The western gōpura, like the others, built entirely of hewn stone, and the outer surrounding walls are said to be the work of Udaiyān Sētupati and a Kömaṭi of Nāgūr, near Nāgapattaṇam, in 1434 A.D.; and statues of the merchant and his wife surmount the eastern wall. In 1450 additions were made to the interior buildings by a wealthy Hindu from Madura, and others in Ś. 1490 by Chinnu Udaiyan Sētupati Kṛttātevar, then a feudatory of Viśvanātha Nāyakkar of Madura, whose statue and that of his son Kṛṣṇappa were set up in front of the Nandi. An inscription relating to this by the side of the door into the first prākāra, in front of these, was destroyed, with others, some twenty years ago or more, during a suit between the Pāṇḍāram of the temple and the Zāmilār of Rāmnād.1

1 This represents an area of 13 acres 5 poles.
2 The suit was conducted by one Appāru Pillai, still living, who had a number of inscriptions forged and inserted in the walls, and produced translations of them as evidence against the claims of the Sētupati. This evidence never seems to have been questioned. The suit, appealed to the Privy Council, was given in favour of the forgers, and the Sētupati deprived of his right to appoint the Dharmakartas or interfere in the management of the temple which his ancestors had built and so richly endowed. The older copperplate grants disappeared at the same time.
The southern half of the second prákāra was erected, it is said, about 1540, by Tīrumalai Sētpatā, whose statue and that of his son Raghunātha stand by the side of the south entrance into the Amman temple, and are honoured with garlands and an offering of betelnut and flowers* every Friday night when the image of the Svāmi is brought to this place on its way to the bed (Paḷiḷiyarai) in the Amman temple. Raghunātha Tīrumalai Sētpatā, just named, built the rest of the second prákāra about Ś. 1580.

The great unfinished eastern gopura is ascribed to Dalavai Sētpatā in Ś. 1571, who also built the Sabhāpati shrine in the north-east corner of the third prákāra. In Ś. 1624 Hiranyagarbhasyāji Raviṅkula Viḷayaya Raghunātha Sētpatā, besides other buildings, erected the Paḷiḷiyarai or bedroom of the Amman temple, and the maṇḍapa in front—which are statues of himself and his brother Kādamba Tēvar.

About Ś. 1662 the Sētpatā began the third prákāra, setting up the entrances into it from the gopuras on all four sides, and it was completed by Muttu Rāmaliṅga Sētpatā (born Ś. 1647, A.D. 1725-6) in Ś. 1691. The statues of the latter and of his two mantras—Mutturulappa Pīḷai son of Saundara Pāyṇybhār Pīḷai, and Kṛiṅgha Ayyaṅgār,—with members of his family are conspicuous in the western entrance corridor.

The temple therefore is not the work of one age, but extends over a period of 350 years, and has been erected and endowed almost exclusively by one family, the Sētpatā Chiefs of Rāmād. It is one of the last great works of the Hindus, and the latest addition to it is the finest of all.4

The pōja or ritual of this temple may deserve notice, as it will be found peculiar in some details, and differing from what is the practice in temples north of the Tuṅgabhadrā and Kṛiṅghā.

At half-past 4 or 5 a.m. the pāḍāsāva (Tam. āḥā) comes into the east porch in front of a shrine of Hanumān and blows thrice on a conch, tinkling on a jayaṅghāntā (T. jēkamālī)

or small gong hung on his right wrist with a small stick held between the fingers of the same hand. Then he proceeds to the south, west, and east gates in succession, and repeats the summons. During certain seasons he visits the temples outside, and blows also on the sea-shore. Then come the mēḻakāṟṟum or musicians,—three with drums, bhéri (T. pēri or naṅguṟṟu), mridang-bhēdu (T. tavīl), and damaruga, two pipers (nāyavāraru), a castanet (kaḻpam) player, and one with a trumpet kākala (T. ekkāḻam),—and play in front of the Hanumān shrine in the east entrance. The Sēṭhikāṟṟum, who keep the keys, and have charge of the jewels, the Bhājaḷar or priests, and the dancing-girl (Muraikāṟṟi) officiating for the day, with rudrākṣa beads in place of jewels, dressed as a Brahmanī and her hair uncombed—all having already bathed—come with the peons and servants of the Dharmakāṟṟum or superintendent, and open all the doors up to the Mahāmaṇḍapa, and light the lamps. The cooks go to the kitchen, and the storekeeper gives out rice and other provisions for the day. A hundred and eighty measures of rice is said to be the daily dole—40 to the servants, and 140 to be cooked for the worship.

Besides these officials it may be as well here to enumerate also the following:—

The Gurukkaḷ is the priest whose duty it is to make the pōja. His assistant is the Sathāchārya. The Šaṅgaiyāḷ assists at the abhiṣeṇka, bringing the naiṅeḻya and the water (tirumaiyamam) in a silver pot (gheṭa) on the elephant.

The Naṅiṉār is superintendent of all the temple servants.

The Manṭrapuṣṭha repeats the mantra when the Bhaṭṭār or Gurukkaḷ asks forgiveness at the conclusion of each pōja.

The Ṭagama assists in making Saṇṇprōkkaṇa according to the Ṭagamaṅkṣtra.

The Vēḍapārāyaṇa repeats the Vēda behind the image when it is carried out during a festival.

The Kaṭṭiyam holds the silver baton when the image is brought out at the time of dīpārāṇa and repeats the Kaṭṭiyam every evening when the Svāmi is carried to the Paḷiḷiyarai.

---

* These go to the Zamindār's servants if any are present.

* His statue appears also in two other places with his Mantrel, Tōllakkēṭ Tōllirulappappillai opposite, together with others of his friends; but about 1833 a Patākram had some of them chiselled into acrotes, affixing beard,
The Śrīpādām carry the image in the palaquin. Inside the temple the Śiviyārs (Śivakaiyārs) bear it.

The Periyaruvi bring the curds, milk, &c., from the Araviśal and also light all the dāpas and give them to the Gurukkal during the pūjās.

About half-past five, when the cooks have prepared the naivedya (food), the doors of the Mahāmanḍapa of the temple itself are opened. The pūjakās or bhaṭṭārs, sthānikās, and dharmakālia's servants then go to the Mahāmanḍapam of the Amman temple with the musicians and open the door, and the priest presents a camphor light at the bed in which the images lie, with fruit and betel-nut. A sthānikār in a reverential attitude then says to the image or svāmi:

Ubdhāghya jajat-svāmin sarva-lok-śīika-SAṅkara jajatam upakārya nitya-pūjāṁ grīhāṇa bhūḥ.²

"Awake, Lord of the Universe, Author of good to this whole world! and for the world's benefit be pleased to accept my daily worship."

They then place the image, which is of gold, in a small palanquin and carry it out at the south door, and, preceded by musicians and dancing-girls, two silver sticks, two torches, a silver umbrella and a chāmara, it is carried round the second prākara by the west, to the east entrance of the svāmi temple and placed in the Ardhamanḍapa or room between the shrine (garbhāgriha) and Mahāmanḍapa. The bhaṭṭār next goes into the shrine,³ and removes the old garlands (nirmālān) from the Śīkṣa and puts them upon the image of Chandikēvara, which is in a small chapel just behind the shrine.⁴ If this were not done, the pūjā would lose its merit or be of no benefit to the god.

The bhaṭṭār next performs a short sanatkala, thus—sitting in the Mahāmanḍapam facing the east he puts a pavana of darbhā grass on the fourth finger of the right hand, and bending two other stalks of darbhā round the same finger he makes prāṇāyāma, i.e., holds his nose with the third and fourth fingers and thumb and repeats the words:

Öh bhūḥ || Öh bhūvaḥ || Öh guṇaḥ || Öh māhā || Öh jana || Öh tapoḥ || Öjñānaśayaḥn || Öm tat savitur vaṃyaḥ || Bhūrjī ṛevaśya dāmavāḥ || Dhīrhī yoh naḥ prachādyāyaḥ.⁵

Then he puts his hand to his right ear, and joining his hands he says:

Śrī Śivāja-yā Śivaprītyarthanaḥ suprabhātā-pūjāṁ vidhivat tu ahaṁ kariṣyāḥ.⁶

"By Śiva's order and for Śiva's kind acceptance, I perform the sacred rite of the morning worship as prescribed by rules."

Then he performs Puṇyākāvāchana—pouring water into a brass vessel after fumigating it with lighted camphor, he places it on some rice laid on a raised stone (puṇyākāvācha kuraṇ) in the floor, having first tied a thread round the pot four times over the shoulder and bottom, and putting akṣaṭāḥ (rice grains coloured with turmeric) on four sides of it, tying a small piece of cloth round the neck, putting mango leaves in the mouth of it, laying a coconut on them, and a garland over it, he knots together three darbha stalks and spreads out the lower ends (darbha kāṭcha) so that it may stand over the coconut, and makes prāṇāyāma, saying:

Śivāja-yā Śivaprītyarthanaḥ suprabhātā-kāṭča śalapatrauddhyartham puṇyākāvāchana kariṣyāḥ.⁷

"By Śiva's order and for Śiva's kind acceptance I perform the Puṇyākāvāchana ceremony, for the purification of the place and the vessels during the holy morning time (service)."

He then lays down the coconut, and darbha-kāṭcha, and taking the mango leaves, dips the tips of them six times into the water and dropping it into a smaller vesselsays (1st) 'Vriḍīśv,' one to which the Siddhāchārya answers, 'astu,' the 2nd time he says, 'puṣkhit,'³ to which the Siddhāchārya again says, 'astu'; 3rd, 'tuscit,' Anu. 'astu,' 4th— 'drōgym,' A. 'astu'; 5th— dānadbhyasamārddhiḥ, A. 'astu'; and 6th—gāhumādhyalyahubham, A. 'astu.' The principal shrine.

² Those from the Amman temples are carried to the image of Chandikēvara.
³ 'Increase!' or "May there be increase!" "Increase!"
⁴ 'Amen,' or "Be it so." "Prosperity!"
⁵ 'Pleasure!'
⁶ 'Health!'
⁷ 'Plenty!' or "Abundance of grain and wealth!" "Good to kine and Brāhma!"
bhaṭṭar now pours the water back into the first pot and repeats the cocaanut he takes 5, 7 or 9 darbha stalks and touches the pot, while the Sādhārkāraya (adhyayanabhaṭṭa) repeats the Veda— the bhaṭṭar following him; this last takes 10 or 15 minutes. Again the bhaṭṭar takes off, the cocaanut and garland and lays them down, and dipping the darbha and mango leaves in the water he drops it on his head. This is called atma-prakshaṇam. The rest of the water he sprinkles over the floors of the Mahā- and Arda-maṇḍapas and the shrine, and on the vessels used in the pūjā,—to purify them.

A sthānikaṛ brings water from a well called the Kūṭṭārtha, in the first Prākāra, and fills a large vessel that stands in the shrine. The bhaṭṭar then takes a handful of sandalwood paste,⁵⁹ and rubs it on the līṅga and the pīthaṃ in which it stands. Next he pours water over it from the large vessel, repeating the mantra:


“The Śrī-chakraṇa-tīrtha (holy water) which is powerful to wipe off the sin of the Bētāla,³⁰ was created by Paramēsvara. The holy waters, Sīvā, Maṅgalavā, Amrīta-saras, Brāhmīya-saras, Hanumātanā-saraḥ, Agastya-tīrtha, Raghurāma-tīrtha, Jaṭā-tīrtha, Lakṣmahāja-saras, Chakrākhyaṇa, Śivā-tīrtha, Saṅkhā-tīrtha, Yaṁṇa-tīrtha, Gaṅgā-tīrtha, Gaṅgā-tīrtha and others, form the karōr of holy waters. The holy Siddhyāmṛta-tīrtha, the holy (water) (bīle-dalam) upon it.

About 6 o'clock a sthānikaṛ, accompanied by musicians playing, brings to the door of the shrine viśeṣā, of boiled rice, bread, curries—more than an ordinary meal to a single person.

The bhaṭṭar sprinkles the food with a few drops of water, and repeats the Gāyatri—

Ōṁ bṁḥ bhūvasa suvaḥ | Ōṁ tāt savitar varṇyān | bhargā dāvayaḥ dhīmahi | dhīyāḥ yā māḥ prachāḍayat²² ||

Pachāyaṇaḥ: seventh, by the milk-bath; eighth is said to be curds; ninth is said to be ghṛṭa; tenth, is Paṅchāmṛta; eleventh, the fruit juice ought to be poured; twelfth is said to be honey; thirteenth, the sugar-cane juice; fourteenth, that tūndar cocaanut (juice); fifteenth, fragrant water; and sixteenth comes the pure water. Thus sixteen kinds of bath, with the pouring of pure water in the midst, are enumerated.”

Abhisheka-pālaḥ || Piraṭhā chābhīṣṭaḥ tu sarva-pīpa-vīśeṣānam || Mahādhānāḥ chābhīṣṭhānaḥ tu sarva-saṁpatprayānam bhavat ||

“Abhīṣṭaḥ chābhīṣṭaḥ tu sarva-tāṅkā-nīśiṣṭānam ||

“The performance of the bath worship in the morning takes away all our sins. The performance of the bath worship at the noon gives us all prosperity. The performance of the bath worship in the evening drives away all our sickness.”

²² i.e., of a man possessed by the Bētāla.

³⁰ The famous Mānakā Saras.

Sometimes this is done with three fingers.

³¹ On! Let us meditate on the glorious splendour of that divine sun, that he may inspire us.”—H. H. Wilson.
Then he takes water thrice in his hand and pours it on the floor, the Adhyayanabhaṭṭar saying, arghyaṃ, pāḍyaṃ, dehamantyaṃ, as he lets them fall in succession. Then taking bilva leaves in his hand he sways or waves them thrice towards the liṅga, the other saying (for rice)—annāṃ naiyeḍyaṃ, (for bread)—apōpaṇa naiyeḍyaṃ and (for curry)—curaṇaṁ naiyeḍyaṃ. Again he pours water thrice on the floor saying as before—arghyaṃ, &c., and the curtain is withdrawen.

A sthānikār next gives the bhaṭṭar a lamp (dāvpa) in which gum benzoin (or incense) is lighted, and he incenses the liṅga, moving it first downwards in a wavy line, then thrice round, and up and down once. Another lamp (dīpa) is given and waved as before; then a camphor light. The bhaṭṭar during all these services faces the north, and now, at the close of the morning pūjā (Suprabhātams, Tam. Tīrṇeśandāl), he requests the Svāmī or god to accept the food, repeating the ślokā:

Aṃnām cha páṣyaṇaḥ bhakṣyaṇaḥ śtā-līṅya- saṃanviḍitañ tadhi-kṣira-ghrītaśīr yuktān grīḥāya Surā-pūjita

"O thou that art worshipped by the Dēvas, be pleased to accept the rice, pāṣaṇa (Rice boiled in milk) and puddings and cakes mixed with śtvālāka (chilly-powder) together with curd, milk, and ghi!"

and prostrates himself with joined hands in front of it.

About 7 A.M. the second service (Udayamāṇa-tāṇḍā) begins. The bhaṭṭar taking water in a vessel goes into the shrine, joins his hands, and thus asks the svāmī to accept this pūjā:

Namō Rudrāya bhuṣyāya Nilakṣṇāya Vēdhaś Kapardinē Surēḍya Vyōma-kēḍyā vai nāmaḥ
tathā phalaiś cha dhāpaita cha naiyeḍyaṁ vivedhiṁ api upacharaiḥ stēḍhāti-pājāṁ pājāṁ grīṁbikṣitaī Śāṅkara

"Salutation to Rudra, to Bhūmā (the fearful) to Nilakaṇṭha, to Vēdhas, to Kapardin, to Surēśa, to Vyōma-kēḍa. O Śāṅkara accept my worship which is performed with fruits, holy incenses, holy rice of various kinds, and the sixteen kinds of external honours."

Then he dips his fingers in the water and casts it on the liṅga, saying:

Apavitrāḥ pavitrā vā naredasthitāh gatōpi vā

yar smarēt Puṇḍarikāśeṇaḥ sa hāṁśyāḥ vyārāi-iṣṭukaṁ

"Whether pure or impure, in whatever state of body (physical or mental) a man may be, if he only contemplates the lotus-eyed (Vishnu) he becomes pure both externally and internally."

He next throws water thrice on the floor, saying arghyaṃ, &c. A sthānikār then brings naiyeḍya—rice mixed with curd (dāvyādāna), bread, fresh butter and curry, and the curtain is drawn. The bhaṭṭar sprinkles the food with water, and then waves his hand four times towards the liṅga saying—dāvyādānāḥ naiyeḍyaṃ, apōpaṇa naiyeḍyaṃ, navuṇṭaḥ naiyeḍyaṃ, and curry naiyeḍyaṃ—with the successive movements.

The curtain is again removed and the sthānikār bring dāvpa, dīpa and camphor lights, which are successively waved as before. Then the bhaṭṭar locks the door and goes out.

The same is done in all the four temples, and the food is distributed to the temple servants.

The third or Udayakālāpūjā commences about 9 o'clock. A sthānikār takes water in a silver pot from the Kūṭiśṭhaṇa, and with it he mounts an elephant which is ready in the second Pṛakāra and comes out by the east gate with musicians, chāmaras, umbrella and the dancing girl of the day in advance, and before them a second elephant. The procession turns to the south and comes round the temple, enters at the east gate, and proceeds round the third Pṛakāra to the east entrance, where the sthānikār dismounts with the water and carries it into the Ardhamanḍapa. Then the bhaṭṭar comes, and the sthānikār brings water in another vessel into which the bhaṭṭar dips his fingers and drops it on his own head, saying:

Paṃcha-sūḍhiṁ Śī āśī ṣūvrāya svāt

"The five kinds of purity: Let there be first of all purity of soul!"

This is called śīnmaśūḍhi; he also drops some of it on the floor as (sthānauṣūḍhi) saying—

Sthāna-sūḍhir dīrītyakāh

"Secondly, purity of place."

Again he sprinkles the vessels (draṣṭāyauṣūḍhi) saying:

Trītyaiḥ draṣṭāyauṣūḍhi tu

"Thirdly, purity of things (accompaniments)."
Then the īṅga, (īṅga-suddhi,) saying:

Chaturthe īṅga-suddhi-dam ||
"Fourthly, purity of the Īṅga."

And to prevent his yawning, coughing, &c., he makes mantra-suddhi, repeating:
Paśchamāna mantri-suddhās eydt ||
Prāchyaṇā paśca-suddhāyāh ||
"Fifthly, let there be the purity of the mantras. Thus five kinds of purities are enumerated."

He then sits down in the Mahāmāndapa and worships Sūrya.

Then he observes the following:

Sthāṇḍita-viḍhī || Uttamaṁ ṛṣṭryā-sālikāṁ tu
mādyayanāṁ tu tad ardhakaṁ || ādvarṣṭhām
kanyasāṁ prāktaṁ sthāṇḍilam tu viḍhīyaṁ ||
adhamaṁ tu ādhaṁ prāktaṁ tri-viḍhām pari-
kalpaṁyaṁ.||

"Rule for covering the ground. The best mode of covering is by two measures of Śāli
grain; a medium mode is by half of that quantity; a low mode is by half a measure; these (three)
form the definition of Sthāṇḍīla. The lowest mode is by a quarter measure."

This rule is otherwise given thus:

Śīka-sthāṇḍilam evaham mādyayanāṁ tu tad
ardhakanāṁ ||

And the rule for worship is:

Sthāṇḍīla sthā-ṛṣṭryāśā-vidhī || Darbhaṁ
pushpāṁ sabdayaṁ śīkaṁ tatra sa yajñāt.||

On a raised stone in the floor in front of him a sthāṇkār places 4 measures of rice, which
the bhattār Sahā spreaders it in a square
and traces on it a circular flower
with 8 petals. On it he places
darbha grass and flowers, saying:
Śīka śīka namah,—and then puts a little sandal
paste on it. He then takes an empty vessel like
a teapot without handle, and after immersing
it with lighted camphor he ties a thread over it,
passing it five times at equal distances down
the sides and over the shoulders and bottom, and
putting sandal paste and akṣatāḥ on four sides,
he places it over the figure drawn on the rice.
Next, taking akṣatāḥ in his left hand he places it on
the rice at the bottom of the vessel, saying:
Pādē Brahmandam uḍāhayām.||

Again he puts more on the body of the pot, saying:
Madhye Viṣṇum uḍāhayām; on the lip, saying:
Ūṣhṭha Budrāṁ uḍāhayām; again on two sides,

\[\text{Pātre jālāvahana-viḍhī} \quad \text{Gaṅgā cha Yamunā cha Narmadā cha Sarasvatī || Sindhu Gāyati cha Kāvēḥ cha Tāmbarampanīkā || kalaśa tu samabhārya ghrāṇe Viṣṇēvarāṁ uṣṭā || Suddhādān kalaśa yāra kričchram tu anayat
nyasāt. ||}

"The precept for defying the vessel. At the foot
saying:—Devi-pāravayār nandikāyā uḍāhayām;||
next inside the pot, the assistant saying:—
Pātre jālāvahana-viḍhī || Gaṅgā cha Yamunā cha
Narmadā cha Sarasvatī || Sindhu Gāyati cha Kāvēḥ
cha Tāmbarampanīkā || kalaśa tu samabhārya ghrāṇe
Viṣṇēvarāṁ uṣṭā || Suddhādān kalaśa yāra kričchram tu
anayat
nyasāt. ||

"The precept for defying the vessel in the vessel. Inside the vessel, Gaṅgā, Yamunā,
Narmadā, Sarasvatī, Sindhu, Gāyati, Kāvēḥ, and Tāmbarampanīkā, are to be
worshipped. At the spout of the vessel, Viṣṇēvara is to be worshipped."

Lastly he puts some into the spout, saying:
Kaṇṭhinukṣā Viṣṇēvarāṁ uḍāhayāṁ:—
"I worship Viṣṇēvara at the spout (of
the vessel.)"

A sthāṇkār now takes the silver pot full of
water and pours it into this vessel. The
bhattār puts a pavitra of darbha grass
on his finger, thus described:

Pavitra-vidhī || Darbha-devyāṇa saṅkīṣṭhaṁ
devdaśāṅgulaṁ dyātaṁ || deva-śāṅgulaṁ tu
calayaṁ grañṭhir śāṅgulaṁ bhaveti || chatur-
āṅgulaṁ tat puchchha pavitraśaya cha lakshāṇaṁ||

"The rule for making Pavitra:—Two dar-
bla grasses each of twelve finger-breathths long
must be twined together. Two finger-breathths
in length must be devoted to form the ring of the
pavitra; one finger-breathth for the knot;
four finger-breathths for the tail; this is the
description of the Pavitram."

The sthāṇkār brings a large flat brass tray
called tāmbālam, with half a measure of rice, some
betelnut, fruit (plantains), sandal paste, flowers,
sugar, darbha grass, coconut nut and mango leaves,
and sets the tray on the south of the kumbha:

Puṇyāhavāchana-pūjā-samagra-vidhī ||
Pātre tāṇḍula-tāṇḍula-phala-gaṅduḥcha
pushpakān || gudam-darbhamu-patrau cha
daksha-bhūgā vinikṣiptā ||

"The rule for the collection of the things
required for Puṇyāhavāchana:—In the vessel
rice, betel-leaf, fruit, sandal-powder, and
flowers; molasses, darbha grass, and mango
leaf must be placed to the right."

The bhattār sits facing the east, and the
Sadāhārāya and any other Brāhmaṇas knowing
of the vessel Brahma is to be worshipped. In the
middle Viṣṇu must be worshipped. On the brim Budra
is to be worshipped. And on the two sides Nandi and
Kāla are to be worshipped."

\[\text{Pātre jālāvahana-viḍhī} \quad \text{Gaṅgā cha Yamunā cha Narmadā cha Sarasvatī || Sindhu Gāyati cha Kāvēḥ cha Tāmbarampanīkā || kalaśa tu samabhārya ghrāṇe Viṣṇēvarāṁ uṣṭā || Suddhādān kalaśa yāra kričchram tu anayat
nyasāt. ||} \]
the Veda who may wish to join, sit down near him. The bhatar asks—Punjah punyahau vadhaydah!

"Charitable people! Permit me to pronounce the Punyabhuvachanam!"

They reply—Vachyaatam, "Let it be said!"

He says—Aksatadh!

They reply—Sanu aksatadh, "Let there be aksatadh.

Bhatar—Dakshinah? "Fees?"

Brhamans—Seasti dakshinah, "Let there be fees."

The bhatar then takes the mango leaves, coconut, darbha grass and a cloth, and lays them on the kumbha, the head of the coconut pointing to the east. Then the bhatar performs sankalpa, as before. A sthanikar brings him a cloth and garland, and the bhatar ties the cloth round the neck of the kumbha and puts the garland over it. Then taking down the coconut, he dips the mango leaves into the water thrice, and drops the water into another vessel with the same formula as in the first pujah. Next, touching the pot with some darbha stalks, he and the Brhamans repeat portions of the Veda for about an hour. The bhatar then offers betel-leaf, sugar and flowers, as naivedya to the kumbha, saying, Varunarajyadana namah, and from another vessel he sprinkles water thrice on the floor with the usual formula—Arghyam, &c. Now taking water and a flower in his hand, he waves it twice, as an offering, towards the kumbha, saying—Kadakhaladana naivedyan; gula naivedyan. Then he says:

Pujah—phala-samayuktah naga-vali-dalair gu![n]
karvra-churna-samayuktah tambulain pratirgahyatam

"Be pleased to accept betel-leaf with nuts, the tender leaves of Naga-vali, and camphor powder."

Then he adds Tambulain naivedyan, and taking aksatadh he joins his hands, and says:

Varunarajyadana namah yadhishdhana pratishthapayanam

"Salutation to Varunaparaja. I consecrate him in his usual place."

He next dips the mango leaves and darbha in the water and drops it on his head, then on the floor, and on the vessels (as prakshaṇa). The kumbha is now set aside* and a sthanikar brings the pañchagavyam—curses, ghṛ, milk, cow urine (gomutra) and dung (gomayam) for which five cups are arranged in the form of a cross; the milk is put in the centre, the curd on the east, the ghṛ on the south, the cow dung on the west and the urine on the north. The bhatar taking aksatadh in his left hand, lifts a little of it with his right and puts it on the curd, saying—Purasyadu diśi dadih pujyanam: "I worship the curd (placed) in the eastern direction."

Again on the ghṛ, saying—

Dakshinanyadu diśi ghṛtiastu pujyanam: "I worship the ghṛ in the southern direction."

Next on the gomayam,—Varanasyadu diśi gomayān pujyanam: "I worship the gomayam on the west."

Then on the gomutra saying—Uttarasyadu diśi gomtran pujyanam: "I worship the cow urine on the north."

And lastly on the milk, saying—Madhyamudgaktu pujyanam: "I worship the milk in the middle."

He now presents molasses as naivedyam, saying—Pañchagavya-vardhaya namah gula naivedyanam.** "Salutation to the god Pañchagavya. I offer molasses as naivedyam.

Then taking a little aksatadh and holding it out in his joined hands, he says—Yadhishdhana pratishthapayanam. "I consecrate it in its usual place."

Next he pours into the milk, first the curds, next the ghṛ, third the gomayam, and lastly the gomutra, and takes the vessel into the garbhagriha or shrine, and sets it on the north side of the liṅga.**

Again a sthanikar brings four measures of rice and places it on the raised stone or flag and the bhatar spreads it in a square and draws on it a lotus flower with ten petals, the 3rd pointing to the south and the 8th to the north, the milk must be placed. In the East the curds, in the South the ghṛ, in the North and West the two gomayas—dung and urine. In the South-East (Anura), South-West (Nirūpa), North-West (Pañchayam), and North-East (Nirūpa), rice flour (paste), amalaka (fruit mixed in water), Turmeric (dissolved in water) and pure water must be placed respectively. All these nine ingredients mixed together form the Pañchagavya compound.

The North is the proper side in all marriage and propitious ceremonies; in śraddhas and ceremonies relating to the dead the South is the proper side.
the numeration commencing from the east.

On it he places sandal paste and flowers, and putting akṣhatāh in his left hand he places a little of it on the petal No. 1, with the words—

Aṇantaṁ āḍhayāmī.

On No. 2, with—Sāksham āḍhayāmī.

On No. 3, with—Sīvam āḍhayāmī.

On No. 4, with—Uttamam āḍhayāmī.

On No. 5, with—Yēkanētram āḍhayāmī.

On No. 6, with—Yēkanētram āḍhayāmī.

On No. 7, with—Srikantham āḍīd

On No. 8, with—Srikanthim āḍīd

On No. 9, with—Agnim āḍīd

On No. 10, with—Śivavardhanīṁ āḍīd

And on the small circle in the centre, with—

Śaktivasātaṁ āḍīdāṁ vedaṁ āḍhayāmī.

Placing a large ṣaṅghaṭa (ghaṭam) on the centre of it and ten smaller ones (kalaśām) round it on the petals, all fumigated first with camphor, and with threads tied round each in the usual fashion here, he puts akṣhatāh and sandal paste on the four sides of each. A sthānīkār then brings water (from the Kūṭi-tīrtha) and pours into each pot, and ties a cloth round the neck, placing mango leaves, a cocoonut, darbha and a garland on all. The bhaṭṭar now washes his hands and feet at a well close to the Maṇḍapa and returning into the mahāmaṇḍapa, he sits down facing the east (the paṭivra being still on his hand), and here he makes prāṇāyāma in the usual way, then crossing his forearms, with closed fists he beats his temples with the knuckles and muttering Śrī Gauḍāya namah. Then he begins the saṅkalpa:—

Suklaṁbavanaṁ vṛkṣah praśīvaṁ caturbhujam ।
pravasanau-vāvaye śukhaṁ ṛṭavaṁ-saṅkarṣitaṁ ।

"For the pacification of all obstacles let us think on him who is dressed in white robes, who is Vishnu himself, who is of the colour of the moon, who has four hands, and who is of pleasing appearance."

And then, holding his two hands clasped on the right knee, the right hand above, he repeats the mantra—

Aṣṭa śrī-Dhaṅgapatan mahā-puruṣahasya Śivaśya śājināyai
dhyānaḥ pravartamāṇasya adya bhrasmyāḥ deśīye-parārdhā śvetāvarāha-kalpā viśvesvata-mannavaratāh ashtadīpikāṃ, satē tumē Gauḍāya prathama pāde—Jambū-dvipē Bhārata-varahā Bhārata-khandē Mēṣār dakshinē

pāreśe kābālo asmin varmaṁ añā pravartamāṇasya vyuḥāvārikā Prabhavādiḥ-shaṅkhyā-saṅyānā sarāṅgā madhyyā (Chitrābhānām)22—nāma-saṅvatarār (uttarāṅgāḥ śākalya-śākalya Mukara-mārā śukla-pakṣhā-saptamāṇaṁ)21—śubha-tithi-dvāra (Indravāra)—yukṣāyām (Ṛvati-)naksatram—yukṣāyāṁ ērī Śiva-nakṣatra,22 ērī Śiva-yogā, ērī Śiva-karaṇa Śubha-yoga śubha-karaṇa evaḥya—viśeshaṁ viśishṭāya, ārāmaḥ śubha—tithi-dvāra.

"In the second—southern division of the Continent of Brahman which is going (its round) by the command of the great and reverend Śiva; in the (present) time of Śvetavārāha, in the reign of Vaivasvata-manu; the twenty-eighth; in the first quarter of the Kalīyuga; in Jambudvīpa; in Bhāratavaraha, in Bhāratakhandā; in the southern direction from Meru; in the Śaka-era; in the saṁvatsara Chitrābhānu of the cycle of 60 years beginning from Prabhava; in the Hōmanta season; during the (sun's) northern course; on the auspicious day Monday the 7th tithi of the light half of the month Makara; on the auspicious day in which is the asterism Ṛvati, the Śiva nakṣatra, Śiva yogā, Śiva karaṇa, the Śubha yogā, Śubha karaṇa, and other (auspicious) times are in conjunction."

Then he says,—Śrī-Rāmaṇāthāśvarasyā prātha-kalāb abhishēkārthāt saṁpadyāyāṁ viśivad ahaṁ kariśhyām:—“For the holy morning-bath of Rāmaṇāthāśvara, I perform the necessary worship of the bath as prescribed by rules”—

and taking akṣhatāh in his right hand he puts small quantities of it, with his left;

1st, on the ghaṭam or large pot, saying—

Saptā-viśvam-(saṁ)duvarta-tīrthān adhāyām:—“I defiy the seven kinds of ocean waters in the vessel;” 2nd, into the kālaṣ on petal No. 1,

saying:—Gaṅgāṁ ādvayaṁ:”—I fill up water from Gaṅgā.” Into the 2nd kālaṣ, saying:—

Yamunāṁ ādvayaṁ; into the 3rd—Narmāṇāṁ ādvayaṁ; into the 4th—Sarasvatim ādvayaṁ; into the 5th—Śindhuvaśīṁ ādvayaṁ; into the 6th—Gītāvaretim ādvayaṁ; into the 7th—Kājērīṁ ādvayaṁ; into the 8th—Tāmrarpāraṁ ādvayaṁ; into the 9th—Śivatīrthāṁ ādvayaṁ; and into the 10th kālaṣ saying:—

Saṁvāt Janaka-tīrthān ādvayaṁ.

A sthānīkār brings betel leaf, plantains and

21 Mental row or resolution.
22 A Viṣṇuvara would say Viṣṇeśvar eśājñaya.
23 i.e. 1882-3.
sugar, and another brings a single dīpa and dhāpa, and the bhaṭṭar waves the dhāpa, saying,—
śrava-tirthāḥbhīṣḥāḥ mahā-purushāḥbhīṣḥāḥ dhāpaṃ
dāgṛpaṇyāmī;33 then the dīpa, saying;—śrava-tir-
ūdhāḥbhīṣḥāḥ mahā-purushāḥbhīṣḥāḥ dhāpaṃ
dāsaṇyāmī.34 Then he sprinkles a few drops of water over
the betel-leaf, sugar and fruit, and offers them in
succession as naivēḍyā saying;—śrava,35 kada-
khalā sahā naivēḍyām; gauṣā sahā naivēḍyām;
and puy-phaḷa-sādāyukthāṁ nāgavalikīśair-yu-
tāṁ kalāśa-chār̥a-sālūyukthāṁ tāmbūlāṁ pra-
ṭikāyām;36 śrava-tirthāḥbhīṣḥāḥ mahā-purushāḥbhīṣ-
ḥāḥ tāmbūlāṁ naivēḍyām. And then taking
akṣaṭāṁ in his hands he places it over the gha-
ṭam, saying;—Sarvāpoḍārāṁ samarṇapāyām;37
"I perform all the obeisances."

A sthānikār next brings, in separate dishes,
honey, plantains, curds, milk, ghi and sugar;38
thus enumerated;—
Paṅchāṃritā-viśdhī ||
443 Dādhī-madhurā-payā-sarpi-sarkara-madhyamādi
śrava-padaśiva-kār̥a-vināyēd brahma-maṇtraś ||
gudvāxu-yuṣa-maṇḍaḥ prasthāpādāṁ tu paṅc-
āṃritā-maya śiva-gūḍaṁ sthāpatāṁ trīṇi kālē ||

"Of the curds, honey, milk, ghi, and sugar,
begin from the middle and place them all in
the five sacred spots, pronouncing the Brahma-
maṇtra.39 Twice two, and a quarter times
of sugar must be in the mixture. This kind of
mixture, which is called Paṅchāṃrita must be
offered three times to the god."

The bhaṭṭar goes into the shrine and removes
the garland, flowers and bilva leaves, and
hands them to a second sthānikār, who takes
them to the chapel of Chaṇḍikēśvara. Then
the bhaṭṭar stands before the figure of Gaṇapati
or Vīghnēśvara, in the Ardhmaṇḍapa with
joined hands, and says;—
Skandāgraṇa gaṇāḍhāka dēya vallabhaye
saha Śiva-pujāṁ pravṛttiṁ niśvigneṣvāṁ
prastāma ||

"Thou elder brother of Skanda, the lord of
all the gaṇas! I have begun the worship of
Śiva with his beloved wife; be pleased to
favour me with freedom from all obstacles."

Then he goes to the Nandi and removes the
garland of the previous evening, and those on
all the other images in the temple, and takes

33 To the great persons—all the great rivers—I present
income.
34 I present light.
35 At the Ārādhana feast (Tam. Tirupāḷi); on the Ārā-
ḍa namahatra in Mālaṅḍara, jackfruit, mangoes, pome-
granates, tender coconuts, grapes, sugar cane and butter
are added.
36 Sarva- and the five Mantras beginning with it are
called Brahma-maṇtras.
over the liṅga: this is repeated thrice. The sthānīkār now gives him the ghastam, which he empties also over the liṅga. Next the sthānīkār brings to the bhaṭṭar a vessel of Gaṅgā water,41 which he pours in the same way. Then a dry cloth is given with which to dry it. Next he washes all round the liṅga with water from the large vessel in the shrine. Then two cloths are brought for vastra and upavastra, which are tied round the middle and thrown over the top of the liṅga. The sthānīkār next brings the silver tripuṇḍra or mark, of three horizontal bars, and the bhaṭṭar, making the usual mark with sandal paste, presses the tripuṇḍra against it so that it sticks, and puts a tilaka or round mark over the central bar. Then silver eyes are brought which are similarly stuck on; and lastly a garland is put over it.

The sthānīkārs come out of the maṇḍapa and pour water in front of the great Nandi—which is built up and plastered over, and is of great size. Water is also poured on all the other liṅgas. The bhaṭṭar takes sandal-wood paste in a cup and bilva leaves in a plate, and goes round to all the liṅgas and images, putting a tilaka on each, and laying two bilva leaves on the top.

The sthānīkārs next bring with music from the kitchen, mūdānnaṁ (T. pōṇgul), guḷānnaṁ (or rice prepared with sugar, ghi, green dhāl, cardamom, milk and cocoanut), kaṃbhabrānnaṁ (rice cooked with tamarind, sesamum oil, chillies, mustard and salt), bread made of black gram (phaseolus radiatus), bread of rice-flour with sugar and ghi, a cake made of rice-flour drawn into threads like macaroni, rice with milk; dhāl boiled with salt, curds, ghi and curries. This is brought into the Ardha-maṇḍapa near the shrine door and the bhaṭṭar sprinkles it with water, and taking a bilva leaf he places it at the foot of the liṅga, saying:

May dvaraṁ naivēyam padarthān aṅgikritam iti prāthānīyam

Then pouring water thrice he says, as before:

arghyam, &c. Next he waves a bilva leaf to-

wards the image, saying:—Mudānnaṁ naivēyam | guḷānnaṁ naivēyam | kaṃbhabrānnaṁ naivēyam | mākhyānapaṁ naivēyam | apānaṁ naivēyam | atiraśaṁ naivēyam | vichitrambhakṣyam naivēyam | pāyaśaṁ naivēyam | sūpaṁ naivēyam | āḷaṁ naivēyam | umānaṁ naivēyam | &c.42—waving his hand five times; meanwhile music is going on in the Nandi-maṇḍapa and a sthānīkār rings a bell in the temple.

The sthānīkārs now remove all the food to a room to the south-east of the Amman shrine, beside the kitchen, delivering it into the charge of a Maṇiyakārān, who locks it up. In the temple a sthānīkār takes a bell in his left hand and a dhūpa and dīpa in the other, and ringing the bell gives the dhūpa to the bhaṭṭar and withdraws the curtain. The bhaṭṭar waves the dhūpa, saying—dhūpaṁ aṅgṛāpyām, and pours water thrice on the floor (āchamanīya); then waves a dīpa with one light (ēkamukha) saying—dīpaṁ dārayām; then a sthānīkār gives him a lighted septasthāna-dīpa which he waves with both hands, saying:—aṅgṛākṛtamar dīpaṁ dārayām. He returns each in turn to a second sthānīkār. Then he pours water on the floor saying, āchamanīya, and receives the panča-śīrṣa-nāga-dīpa, which he waves saying, dīpaṁ dārayām; and so in succession he receives the ṛṣabha-dīpa, the purusha-mṛga-dīpa, the naksatra-dīpa and the kumbha-dīpa, and waves each, first in a wavy line from above downwards, then thrice round going up on the left and down on the right side and lastly bringing it straight downwards, and saying the same words.43 Here the sthānīkār stops ringing the bell, and the priest repeats the words:

DHUPAM DADYAT PRATHANATI NAIVEDYAM
DAPAYED GURUK | TAMWALIHU TUNA VASRAYATAH WANAR
DAPANU TO DARAYET || MAHADDAIPAN TATAPACHA SAD BHAVARU
DANASANAMIN | NAGA-DIPAHU | ESAGA-DIPAHU
PURUSHAMRIGA-SANJITKANAM || NAKSHATRA-SANJITKANAM
DIPAHU PANCAHRAJANIKAM | ORAHITKANAM CHA
SAMARPAHOTAPAYA CHAMRACHAYOT || GANDHAPUSHPAH


42 At a festival I observed that the bhaṭṭar who waved the lamps held down his hand after each, that one of the sthānīkārs might pour a little water on the fingers of it, then he took a flower out of his left hand and threw it at or upon the dīpa he was about to receive. A second bhaṭṭar always repeats the formula at his left hand.
dhūpayuktaṁ digbandhanāḥ chāpakūṭhānaṁ | paṇ- 
chamudrā-śamūyuktāṁ dhēnumudrāḥ pradā-
rayet || paṇcābrahīma khadāngiḥ cha paṇchā-
dārūtrikāṁ nagēt || Nīrāṣana tu tathāle śghantuḥ
śaṅda-nirācīrītaṁ || nīrāṇyanaṁ taṁ dattē ma-
dīyē chāchananīyakaṁ | bhaṃmāni darāṣyē paś-
chāti bhāṃmāhīyē tilakākaraṇām ||

"First the incense is to be offered; then 
the priest presents the sacred meal; then 
after presenting betel-leaf the light must 
be presented; then the mahādīpa; bhūta rudra 
dīpa; the nāga dīpa; the āsana dīpa; the 
parvahāmīrīga dīpa; the nakṣatradīpa which 
is arranged in three rows of five, three, and 
one respectively; all these dīpas each with 
its worship must be wavē before the god; 
then the diśbanda and Apakahūthya ceremony 
with sandal powder and incense must be 
performed; the Pauṭhacundrā and Dhēnumudra 
must be presented; the waving of the Aratrī 
with the five Brahmaś and the six angas 
must be performed; then the waving of camphor 
ceremony must take place when the sound 
of the bell must be stopped; after the Nīrāṣana 
the dācamaṇiyanaka must be offered; then the 
sparkling mark of kuṇkuma must be placed 
between the eye-brows."

Then the bhaṭṭār pours water on the floor, 
saying, dācamaṇi, and with ashes, kept by 
the door-jamb, he puts a tilaka on the liṅga. 
A sthānikār next gives him a looking-glass 
which he shows to it; a small umbrella which 
he holds over it for a little; a chāṇara that he 
whisks twice or thrice, and a fan of peacock 
feathers which he waves for three or four 
minutes. Then he takes flowers and bilva 
leaves, and presenting them to the liṅga, with 
joined hands he repeats:—

Pūjāparadha-ādiyarthāḥ khaṇamaseśī mayā-
archanāḥ | Nāman kriḍākutarādīyā tanyū ṭa-
vatāṁ mudam ||

"For the atonement of any mistakes that I 
may have committed in my worship, I have 
now performed the worship. May it give you 
pleasure (satisfaction)!"

He next commences the archanā; facing the 
north, and holding a tray in his hands with 
bilva leaves, the bhaṭṭār stands in the shrine, 
while the Adhyayaṃmahābhāṭṭār, standing in the 
Arḍha-maṇḍapa says:—

Śīvāya namāḥ | Śaṅkārāya namāḥ | Mahā-
devāya namāḥ | Śaṅbhavē namāḥ | Paśupatāya  

namāḥ | Iśvarāya namāḥ | Chandaśakurāya 
namāḥ | Khaṇḍapaṇakāvē namāḥ | &c., to 108 or 
1008 names.

A sthānikār has now brought back the food 
from the ariy or pantry, and the bhaṭṭār 
sprinkles it with water and waves his hand 
from it towards the liṅga, saying:—

Kadāli- phala naivēdyāṁ || Pūjī-phala-
samyuktaṁ nāga-valī-śaṅkair āyataṁ ṭorā-
chūra-samuktaṁ tāmbhālaṇa pratigrīkhyaṁ ||
Tāmbhālaṇa naivēdyāṁ.

Next, he gives holy ashes (vībūṭi), bilva 
leaves and water, to those who are worshipping 
in the Mahāmaṇḍapa. A sthānikār then takes 
some boiled rice in a basin and covers it with a 
cloth, another brings a bell in his left hand and 
a dāśka and dīpa in his right, and they go with 
music to all the liṅgas in the enclosure, the 
bhaṭṭār following. To each liṅga the sthānikār 
lifts the corner of the cloth, the bhaṭṭār waves 
his hand, offering naivēdyā, and presents the 
dāśka and dīpa. The same is then done at 
the shrines of Vināyaka, Sbhrāmāna, &c.

Next the bhaṭṭār pours water and lays down 
bilva leaves and rice on each end of the 
threshold of the east door of the Mahāmaṇḍapa. A 
copper image like a triṣṭita (Śivali—A Bālīdevata) 
fixed in a hemispherical base is now carried in 
a small palaṇquin by two men out at the east door 
of the Mahāmaṇḍapa, down the north steps, and 
round the shrine by the south, the bhaṭṭār 
following and putting water, bilva leaves, and 
food on all the balīpithams—of which there are 
nine to the south and three on the west of the 
shrine outside, and three in front of the Mahā-
maṇḍapa. Coming round by the north the pala-
quin is carried out to the Nandi-maṇḍapa, round 
the north side of it, out into the second Prākara 
and to the Yagaśāla in the north-east. There 
the sthānikār puts fire into one of the homa-
kuṇḍas and the bhaṭṭār goes in and taking as 
much food thrice as his fingers will lift, he 
puts it into the fire, saying, Deva-balī, Bhātī-balī 
and śīravatī-balī. The palaṇquin is now brought 
back to the great gīt balīpitham behind the 
dheojastambha, on which the bhaṭṭār pours 
water, and lays bilva leaves and a ball of food 
from the tray carried by the attendant sthānikār, 
this he sprinkles with water and offers 
saying:—Bāhya-deva-balī-prāṇa naivēdyāṁ. 
This food is then given to the attendant whose 
duty it is to blow the sāṅkha. The bhaṭṭār then
pours the remaining water on the balipita and throws the rest of the bilva leaves upon it, and the palaquin proceeds by the south side of the Nandl to the Mahamanjapada, ascending to the east door by the south steps. The bhatitar now locks the door of the Artha-majapada, and the third or Udayaklapaja is closed, the time being now about noon.

The fourth service or Uchhiklapaj begins soon after the close of the last, and is exactly like the first after the svami or image has been removed from the Amman temple, that it need not be gone over again. It lasts about an hour and a half, after which the doors are locked and all go to their houses for meals.

Again about half-past five the drummers and some of the musicians sit in the entrance porch and play with might and main in the shrillest of keys. At sunset the snakh is blown in the porch and the lamps are lit, servants being appointed for that purpose. The sthanikara then open the doors and light the temple," and the bhatitar, having bathed and having put on a clean cloth and ashes, comes and makes the Sadyarakshapaja, which is a repetition of the third or Udayakalida described above. This is attended by many pilgrims, and lasts till 9 or 10 o'clock p.m.

The sixth and last paja—Arthaajama, is also a repetition of the first, including the abhishaka. After this, the bhatitar puts the golden image into a small palaquin and waves a camphor light before it; then the sthanikara, preceded by musicians and the attendant dancing girl, (dasi) carry it out by the north steps from the east door, the bhatitar presenting dhipa and dipa and offers betel-nut and leaf (kadaiji) in front of the Nandl, they bring it round the north side of the Nandl, in the front of the treasury, (karuvalam) where again dhipa and dipa are presented, and again on the north-east opposite the store-room. It then proceeds east and south along the second Prakara to the south entrance into the Amman shrine. By the sides of the door out of the Prakara are statues of Tirumalai Sethupati (on the east) and his son Raghunatha Tirumalai Sethupati," where it stops, and the statues are honoured with garlands before it enters. At the south entrance of the Amman temple, the bhatitar takes out the image and places it in the bed beside Amman. There a camphor light is waved; the sthanikara brings milk, and the bhatitar offers it as naivethya.

He now comes out, and the dancing girl at the door repeats a Tevraa sijal or verse in honour of Siva:—

Mandiramam Saduragiri kalkalaka
Maharama Ponmalaiyum vijayamaka
Vindaiyanda Seshanuru kayidulaka
Visahyukita Meyjnam palakadaka
Tandiramadlayanum vadantottattha
Chaturmarayar arukirundu sadagukattha
Sundaram tirumepinindar panikal
Tupai Malai nayakeydr adirajjal

"Mandura and Saduragiri mountains are turned as it were into two pillars for the suspension of the swing; Mahameru and Ponmalai are converted into beams; the powerful Seshana has made himself into two cords; the true wisdom itself which shines supreme is turned into a plank; Vishna and Brahma hold the cord and sway the swing to and fro; the learned Vedic Brahma stands near and performs the necessary rites; the beautiful goddess Malainayaki (San. Parvatavardhini) sits by your side. Let us rock the swing."

And a Paandaram (Odivar) also repeats another tevra.

Manama nakkai vaitkai tannayoru mahanayal
Kanadil saviya kararakken uyir Seravan
Yenamilappugallanu seyapu ramachurra
Nanamum nanopulagi niranatoru nanmayai.

"That the daughter of Vidhaha (Slta) seeing the deer mistook it, without knowing that it was a Rakshasa come in disguise to entrap her, has after all taken a beautiful turn by establishing for ever the name of Ramasvaram."

The sthanikar meanwhile swings the cot to and fro and fans the images, and people attending for worship are supplied with sacred ashes.

Other sthanikars now lock and seal the doors of all the shrines; all go out, and the sthanikar counts the jewels on the images, closes and seals the door, locking the prakara doors and departs about midnight.

In S. 1570 Raghunatha gave Mulattakam, Namitalai and Attur, with separate copper-plate deeds for the first, and the other two. None of these copper-plates are now to be found in the temple.
CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

KUKKUTAPADA-GIRI AND KUKKUTA SANGHARAMA.

Sir,—On the fourth page of vol. XV of the Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India is this passage—” Mr. Beal has accused me of confounding the ‘Vihâr of the Cock’s foot,’ which was just outside the city of Pataliputra, or Pâtâna, with the ‘Hill of the Cock’s foot’, which, according to Hwen Thasang, was 16 miles to the east of Gayâ. But it is Mr. Beal himself who has made a mistake, as I particularly mention in my report (vol. I. p. 16), that ‘there was a monastery also of the same name (Kukkuta-pâda Vihâra), but this was close to Pataliputra, or Pâtâna.’ The name of Kurkhir has to be only a shortened form of Kurak Vihâr, which must certainly have referred to a monastery. In fact, no Buddhist establishment could have existed without a monastery, and I presume that the monastery of Kurkhir was known as the Kukkuta-pâda-giri Vihâra, or ‘Vihâr of the Cock’s foot hill,’ while the monastery at Pataliputra was simply the Kukkuta-pâda Vihâra, or Vihâr of the Cock’s foot.

In reference to this extract I ask your permission to make the following remarks:—In the first place, I fail to understand what General Cunningham means when he says, I “accuse him” of so and so. In the note in my book (Buddhist Pilgrims, p. 132), to which reference is made, I was speaking of the confusion which exists in reference to this “hill of the Cock’s-foot.” First of all Fah-hian places it three li south of Buddha Gayâ; then Stas. Julien in his Index (Voy. des Pol. Boud. tome II, p. 482) refers to the “Koukkoutârâma,” and says it is the same as the convent alluded to by Hiuen Tsang (tome I, p. 139), which was near Pâtâna, and yet, he adds, the correct form is “Koukkoutapâda Sanghârâma,” and refers us to tome III, p. 6, where the allusion is to a hill of ” the Cock’s-foot,” at least fifty miles from the convent near Pâtâna. Then I add that Burnouf in his Introduction de l’Hist. Ind. Bud. (p. 366.), has stated that the celebrated hermitage of ” the Cock” was situated on the mountain called Kukkutapâda, near Gayâ; after this I go on thus:—” To add to the confusion—the Archaeological Surveyor’s Report (1861, p. 15), identifies Kurkhir, about 16 miles to the east of Gayâ, with the Kukkutârâma, and then adds that ‘this situation agrees exactly with Fah-hian’s account, excepting that there is no three-peaked hill in the neighbourhood.’ “I am at a loss” (the note continues) “to know what account he refers. On the whole, I prefer to consider the hermitage and the hill as distinct localities; the former near Pâtâna, the latter some 15 miles to the E. or S.E. of Gayâ.”

It will be seen from the above that I make no accusation, but I say that General Cunningham’s account increases the confusion which exists in regard to the situation of the convent known as the Kukkutârâma, for he states that “the situation of Kurkhir agrees exactly with Fah-hian’s account,” but Fah-hian places the “Cock’s hill” three li to the south of Gayâ, and this does not agree with the position of Kurkhir, which is 16 miles or so to the east of that place, neither does Fah-hian say anything about a three-peaked hill, and yet General Cunningham remarks that “the situation of Kurkhir agrees exactly with Fah-hian’s account, excepting that there is no three-peaked hill in the neighbourhood.”

I think it will be seen that the difficulty before me at the time I wrote the note was (as indeed I state) to know to what account General Cunningham refers. But doubtless I overlooked the allusion made “to the monastery of the same name close to Pataliputsa” (although the names were not presumably the same, as the Surveyor-General remarks in the extract given above from the, XVth vol. of his Reports), and to that extent I would wish to modify my criticism.

But the matter has become more involved, and the confusion worse confounded, by what has been written since 1861. I hope General Cunningham will pardon me for making some further remarks on what he has written (undoubtedly by oversight, yet misleading to those less informed than himself) on this subject. In the Ancient Geography of India, p. 460, he says:—” According to Fah-hian’s account the hill of the Cock’s-foot was three li, or half a mile, to the south of the holy tree of Buddha-Gayâ. For 3 li we should not doubt read 3 yojanas or 21 miles, which agrees very closely with Hwen Thasang’s distance of 17 miles.”

I had myself proposed to substitute yojanas for lis in Fah-hian’s account (Fa-hian, p. 132.), and I was therefore gratified to find that General Cunningham thought, in 1871, that there was “no doubt” this was the right solution (although only a partial one,—for we must also substitute east for south in the pilgrim’s narrative) of the difficulty. But now all this is changed, for in the 15th vol. of his Reports, printed in 1882 (to which reference was first made in this letter) I find to my astonishment the following remark (p. 4, n. 2):—” Fah-hian himself has made a mistake in placing the Cock’s-foot hill only 3 li, or half a mile, to the south of Pataliputsa. Mr. Beal would correct this to 3 yojanas, or 21 miles. But as the actual
distance is over 50 miles, I would suggest 300 li, or 50 miles, as the true reading."

But, where are we? Fa-hian says nothing about Pāṭaliputra; and I had thought General Cunningham was satisfied, without doubt, that three yājnas must be substituted for 3 li, in the Chinese text. This note certainly adds to the previous confusion.

Then, again, with reference to the "three-peaked hill," in 1861 the Surveyor-General remarks that "there is no three-peaked hill in the neighbourhood of Kurkihār, but there are three bare and rugged hills which rise boldly out of the plain about half a mile to the north of the village." (Reports, vol. I, p. 16.) These he identifies with the Cock's-foot mountain of Huen Thsiang. In the Ancient Geography, p. 490, this is repeated. But in vol. XV, p. 5, we read — "Huen Thsiang describes the hill as lofty and scarped, with three bold peaks that spring into the air. These peaks I have already identified with the three peaks of the Murali mountain, which stands three miles to the north-north-east of the town of Kurkihār." Are these "three peaks of the Murali mountain three miles to the N.N.E. of the town," the same as the "three bare and rugged hills about half a mile to the north of the village"? Here the confusion is as great as ever. And I am unable to find the reference to the Murali mountain. There is, indeed, allusion in the first vol. of the Reports to a distinct peak of the Barabār group of hills which is called Murali (p. 42), but the Barābār district is 16 miles north of Gayā. Possibly the right reference has escaped me; but yet it is confusing, for the three peaks of a mountain either half a mile to the north of the village, or three miles to the N.N.E., would seem to correspond with the description of the Cock's-foot mountain given by Huen Thsiang, and yet we are told, "There is no three-peaked hill in the neighbourhood of Kurkihār." (Ancient Geography of India, p. 490).

But once more: General Cunningham on p. 4 of his Reports, vol. XV, says, that Fa-hian's account is as follows:—"The great Chia-yeh (Kāśyapa) is at present in this mountain." It is plain, therefore, that when Fa-hian wrote he was supposed to be in the Kuṅkūṭa-pāda-giri. He was there, as Huen Thsiang's account plainly says, awaiting the coming of Maitreyā Buddha, to whom he was to deliver the golden robe presented to Sākya Buddha by his aunt Prajāpati. Accordingly Fa-hian tells us a little lower down that in a fastness within the mount, the "entire body," that is, the human body of Kāśyapa, is enshrined. But General Cunningham, quoting from a wrong translation of the Chinese text would resolve all this into "a full length image of Chia-yeh placed in a niche." Of course anyone has a right to translate a Chinese text. But I should have thought that some small acquaintance with Buddhist legend was desirable in the case of a person undertaking to translate a Buddhist book. But in any case I shall be borne out by all acquainted with the subject (and by none, I believe, more than by General Cunningham, after consideration) that the legend of Kāśyapa requires the translation I have given of his "entire, or, uncorrupted body," being still preserved in the Cock's-foot mount, awaiting the advent of Maitreyā.

This is manifest from Huen Thsiang's account, which General Cunningham refers to on p. 5 of the same volume. Here we are distinctly told that Kāśyapa ascended the north side of the mount, and passed to the S.W. side. There, being halted by the opposing rock, he opened a way for himself, and passed through the mount to the north-east summit; there he sat down with the robe of gold tissue in his hand; then by his spiritual power he caused the three peaks to unite as a sierra over him, he being underneath the middle one. There he will await the coming of Maitreyā, who will receive from him the saṇyāsa robe, then Kāśyapa will ascend into the air, exhibit miracles, and his body will be consumed by self-produced fire, and thus men will be led to believe in Maitreyā.

This is the account of Huen Thsiang. Unfortunately Stas. Julien has missed the key to the interpretation, and translated it as though Maitreyā had come. But the Chinese is plain enough, and the mere fact that Kāśyapa was still supposed to be in the mountain when Fa-hian wrote his account, taken together with the fact that Maitreyā, the lord of the world, has not yet come, would be sufficient to show that this is the true version if there were any doubt about it; but there is none, for as I said before the Chinese is plain enough.

I have made the foregoing remarks not with any desire to find fault, much less to accuse, any one, but I have thought it right to explain myself, and to point out what I conceive to be errors of translation, and other inadvertencies, which gain authority by appearing without remark in the pages of such valuable works as the Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India.

Work, Northumberland.

S. Beal.

THE TIGER AND THE CAT.

Tigers at first were ignorant until the king of the tigers once came to the cat and begged him for lessons. The cat consented, and taught the tiger to watch, to crouch, to spring, and the other accomplishments familiar to the race. At last, when he thought he had learnt everything the cat had to impart, the tiger made a spring at his teacher, intending to tear and eat him. Instantly the cat ran nimbly up a tree, whether the tiger could not follow. "Come down," cried the tiger. "Come down at once." "No, no," replied the cat, "how fortunate for me that I did not teach you more, or you might have been able to pursue me even here!"

BOOK NOTICES.

The aim of M. Guimet in establishing this magnificent foundation was "to facilitate the researches of scholars, and still more to extend—by popularising—the taste for Oriental studies and the religions of the East."

Notwithstanding the far greater interest that Britain has in India and the East, there is no such establishment so handsomely endowed, either in England or India, for the pursuit of Oriental studies. The only institution of the kind is the Indian Institute at Oxford, still in its infancy, and which is so largely, if not exclusively, due to the personal exertions of Prof. Monier Williams, but which, if properly supported, promises well.

The Musée Guimet at Lyon is a very elegant and commodious building, covering an area of fully 3,000 square yards and of three stories, and since its establishment and the publication of the first Catalogue in 1880 (in 112 pages 8vo) the collections have grown so rapidly that the new edition is divided into three volumes—the first alone containing over 330 pages 12mo, and embracing, besides a short introductory sketch of the principal Oriental religions, only the collections from India, China and Japan. The second part will be devoted to the religions of Ancient Egypt, Greece, Italy and Gaul, with a list of donors to the museum; and the third will describe the collection of the ceramic works of China and Japan.

The library, we learn, "contains more than 12,000 volumes in all languages, printed and in manuscript, relative to the religions, history, philosophy and literature of different peoples, voyages and travels, ancient and modern, palm-leaf MSS. from India, Japan, &c." The walls are decorated with Chinese, and Japanese paintings, and with a special series made by M. Félix Rigamonti in India, China, and Japan. There are also specimens of Chinese, Sinhalese and other coins, objects of jade, &c. &c. In the collection are numerous images, of bronze, brass, stone, &c., from all parts. The whole forms a most important collection of mythological and artistic objects. Among them, we observe (p. 43), a stone head (probably of a Bôhisattva) from the Îlurâ Caves.

What Vandal was allowed to break this off and carry it away to France?

Nor is this all; besides the Reports of the Provincial Oriental Congress of Lyons (1878) in two volumes, the Musée issues its Annales in quarto volumes, of which four have already appeared, and other three are promised immediately. The first volume, of 386 pages, issued in 1880, contains fifteen separate papers, of which two are translations of articles by Dr. Eitel and the Rev. Mr. Alwis. The second volume (1881) is of 578 pages, and contains:—(1). A translation of Prof. Max Müller’s paper on “Sanskrit Texts discovered in Japan,” from the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (N.S., vol. XII, pp. 183-188). (2). O-mi-to-choing or the smaller edition of the Sukhāvatīvyūha as translated into Chinese by Kumārajiva (A.D. 406), rendered into French by MM. Ymaizumi and Yamada,—to which is added a facsimile of the Sanskrit text, but whether the editor does not say from what MS., or whether it has been corrected in any way. (3). The Métre or Présody of Bharata being the Sanskrit text of the latter half of the 5th and the whole of the 6th adhyāyas of the Nāṭya-dātra, with a French version by M. Paul Regnault. (4). A. Csoma Körösi’s “Analysis of the Kanjur” from the XXth volume of the Asiatic Researches (1884), translated into French with some notes and additions by M. Léon Pecc: some seven separate indexes and vocabularies are added to this translation, but unfortunately—from their referring to book and section, rather than to page, and from the absence of head-lines indicating the sections in the text—these indexes do not facilitate references so much as they ought to have done. At the end are six pages of errata in small type, again without reference to the pages, and with the preliminary notice that only the more glaring mistakes in the Sanskrit names are corrected, the Tibetan titles and the French text (in which are many mistakes) being left to the reader’s care.

The third volume (1881) contains a translation of Émil. de Schlagintweit’s Buddhism in Tibet, by M. de Milloüé, the Director of the Musée. The errata to this volume consist chiefly in the strange mistake of “après J.C.” for “avant J.C.,” but on p. 32 we observe the omission of about a line of the original (p. 48 top). It may be questioned whether the funds of the Musée would not have been better spent in translating Köppen’s valuable work. And the same may be said of the version of Dr. Edkins’s Religion in China, which occupies the greater part of the fourth volume. The other three papers in it relate to Egyptology and classical mythology.

Besides these larger volumes the Musée issues its Revue de l’histoire des Religions, edited by M. Maurice Vernes, assisted by other scholars. Of this magazine a number of about 144 pages appear every second month. With such potent accessories the museum could scarcely fail to be a success.

Dr. Anderson’s Catalogue of the Indian Museum at Calcutta, Part I, is also only a section of the complete catalogue, but so far as it goes it makes painfully manifest how imperfect are even our best collections in India compared with what has been attained by the efforts of single individuals like M. Guimet and Dr. Jago in Europe. The Indian Museum, founded in 1866, received the archaeological collections of the Bengal Asiatic Society as the nucleus of this department, and this has been enriched since by sculptures from Bharatpur, Gandhāra, and Baddha-Gayā,—very important treasures indeed; but how many of the Jamālāgarī figures have been carried off by private individuals, and sold or presented to foreign museums, or are in private hands, and so lost to the public—whether in India or England? Our Government has need to be stir itself if it would secure either for Indian or English museums a fairly complete historical representation of the art and mythology of India and the East. The private donors to the Indian Museum are strikingly few, we could wish Dr. Anderson would give in Part II, a complete list of them, with references to the pages where the donations are described. With the exception of Dr. Rajendralāla Mitra, C.I.E., we have observed the name of no native among them; yet how easily could many a native afford help to form a national collection of which India might be proud! Natives complain of Government allowing foreign libraries to purchase copies of manuscripts which are by no means unique, yet they do not loyally come forward to aid in forming either national or provincial collections of unique sculptures, coins, copperplates and manuscripts, but either hoard them to be destroyed or lost, or sell them clandestinely to caterers for museums in Austria, Germany, &c.

Dr. Anderson’s Catalogue and Handbook is too much of the latter to be a clear and handy Catalogue. The Index, though good, does not help this, and the Table of Contents, where it might have been remedied, is far too brief to do so. But much judicious care has been spent upon it, and the compilation is a most creditable one. When completed it will show the wants of the Museum, and may we not hope that all who can will help to make it as complete as it really ought to be—embracing a full representation of the art, history and mythology of the Hindu races, as well as of their ethnology in all its bearings!
## INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Page</strong></th>
<th><strong>Page</strong></th>
<th><strong>Page</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AbdAll tribe</td>
<td>Alaktakapura or Raktapura, c.</td>
<td>Annigere, Annigere, town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdul Muttabib</td>
<td>Albaïda, town in Arabia</td>
<td>216, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Abdul Wahhab, date of</td>
<td>Albrun's Chronicle of Ancient</td>
<td>Antiquarian remains at Supra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhayandri, Jain author</td>
<td>Nations</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhikarma</td>
<td>Alhun</td>
<td>anubhadhabvalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhirs</td>
<td>116, 231, 288</td>
<td>apakutha ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhidha</td>
<td>Al Khalasa, Arab idol</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhyahakhas</td>
<td>Allah</td>
<td>Aparakuntis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham, 'Religion of'</td>
<td>Allahahad Aoko inscription</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achamanyaka</td>
<td>Al Muqaddir billah, Al Mutaki billah</td>
<td>Apsaha, grammarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dredangadhara</td>
<td>Alopen, Syrian missionary of</td>
<td>'Arafat mosque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaragufi inscription of</td>
<td>the 7th century</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kofiga (Rash.)</td>
<td>Altan Khan, Kin emperor of</td>
<td>Arasaavas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaka, king (Chapa)</td>
<td>130, 131</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addana, country</td>
<td>Amara Singh</td>
<td>Ardaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Aden epitaph</td>
<td>Amitya-Buddha</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhiraja</td>
<td>Amisatigi, author of the Dharma</td>
<td>Arnold's Light of Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhyayanabhatar, priest</td>
<td>Amma I. and II, (East.</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318-19</td>
<td>Chal.)</td>
<td>arrows—casting of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adipura</td>
<td>Ammanga, k. (Kalachuri of</td>
<td>1-3, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adp, noble</td>
<td>Tripura)</td>
<td>Arsakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aera, Alexandri, &amp;c</td>
<td>Amoghavarsha, k. (Rash.)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mu'tadidi | | Aragada-
| Adgama, assisting priest | 150 | gujana |
| Agraadras, the Eighteen | | arvazas |
| Aguta, Manchu leader | | 74 |
| Ahavamalla (W. Chal.) | | arvazas |
| Ahavamalla-Bhuteya dividend | | 256 |
| Ahavamaladav, k. | | Aryabhat, astronomer |
| Ahirwama, k. | | 90, 261 |
| Aiholje inscrip. of Krishna II | | Aryaada, |
| (Rash.) | | 314 |
| | Amrtevara, god | | 7 |
| | | Arsaka, |
| | | 233-4 |
| | | Asiatic Societies: Bengal, 88f, 262 |
| | | Bombay | 178 |
| | | Ceylon | 53 |
| | | Madras | 50f |
| | | Paris | 113 |
| | | Royal | 261f |
| Akalavarsha, Krishna I. (Rash.) | | Asirgarh seal |
| | 17, 220n | 274 & err. |
| | Krishna II. (Rash.) | Asoka inscriptions. Tlf, 87, 114, 275f |
| | 217 | astragalus bone |
| | 222, 233, 268 | 81 |
| | son of Dhruda II | Aavaghbaha |
| | (Rash.) | 110 |
| | 188, 190 | Aavaghbaha's Buddharcharita |
| | Krishna IV. (Rash.) | 313 |
| | 258, | avamadha |
| | 269 | 92, 246 |
| | IV. or V | Atiayadhavala.—Aamoghavara- |
| | 271 | sha I, k. (Rash.) |
| | ak or abk, asclepias gigantea 307n | 219-20 |
| | akshata | Dimaradhavala ceremony | 318 |
| | 317, 320-2 | dhammendeda ceremony |
| | Akshobhya Buddha | 319 |
| | 115 | Avalokitesvara, god | 115 |

* Abbreviations, as in former volumes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avalokitesvara-Khaśarpana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avantis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avatamasakasūtra—Huśa-yen-ching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avvaladavī, queen (Yadvā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awān, 'Aden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awāna, Muhammadan tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayugalōchana, Śiva, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayyapa, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba'āl, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baddegra—Pārmanādi-Bittaya (Ganga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāge, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagumra plates of Dhruva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakhalīwāl M.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balavaram, k. (Chalukya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>バルダセー</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bālīpatḥam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballāla II, k. (Hoysala)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballāla, k. (Śilākkāra of Kūla-pur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballageere, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballākdragnāya sect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balṣā in Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bān—quercus arcaana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāna's Harshacharita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banka, Bankayarasa (Chella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankāpura, city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bānūvīru, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bānīrf—flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bāppadēva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbar hills and dist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bār—forest land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bārapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bārāvai, Dvaravati, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroda plates of Kakka II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bāh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basādi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassein plates of Sūnachandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bājūs, Bakhshis, magicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beal’s Po-ho-king-tsan-king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begdse, Mongol spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellinda, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellittage fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belvala, Belvola Three-hundred 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēṭāla, demon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bētra—little son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhadrānākhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadrāpali, dis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhanjī—Po-ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārāśivas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāratakāśtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārata-ndīya Śāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārāvī, poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāroch, find of coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārūthāri, grammarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārūthimendra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhārūkachchha, Bhāroch, c. 27, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāṣākavarnā, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhāṣākara, (Valabhi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhāṭḍākā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhāṭḍākāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavanāga, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavavārmā, k. of Kambijā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhēri—drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhikṣuḥpadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhikṣupraprēju Śātra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhilāma L.K II, k. (Yadvā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūma, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūma I. &amp; II, k. (E. Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūmadēva, k. (Chalukya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūmadēva, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūgēśvara, Śiva, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūjādēva, k. of Dārā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūjākaṣa, province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūjākaṣa, province, c. 27, 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūmikā, t. and prov. 152-3, 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūttā, Bhūttayadēva, Bhūttiga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Būjja, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birāc—a Rākṣasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black stone of the Ka'ba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bōgeor Kami—medicine men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boh—a Shāman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmagupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmsāstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brahma-mantras, the five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha, Life of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; a sermon of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and St. Josaphat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha-Gayā, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha Gayā or Vajråsana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism in Tibet, Schlegelweiss's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism and Chinghiz Khān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist ethics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| " images from Nāga- 
  paṭṭānam | 311 |
| layman's duty | 23, 26 |
| priests | 88 |
| schools | 306f |
| Sūtras, Two | 206f |
| tope, at Piṭṭāpura | 258 |
| Buddhist Tripiṭaka, Catalogue of | 299 |
| Būdhāsaft, Buddha | 288 |
| Bugharul | 302 |
| Buriat tribe | 285-6 |
| Calendar, Madras | 52n |
| Calpentyn, Kalpiṭiya | 53 |
| Cambojan inscriptions | 118-14 |
| cat, tiger and the | 329 |
| Catalogue of Musée Guimet | 329 |
| " of Indian Museum | 330 |
| centre—saśar, street | 26 |
| Chach plain | 306n |
| Chāki, k. (Ganga) | 18 |
| chakravākṣa | 74 |
| Chalukya-Bihma, k. (E. Chal.) | 94 |
| Chalukyas, Early | 112-13 |
| " Eastern 91ff, 122, 156-7 |
| 218, 248-9, 252-3, 268 |
| " Western | 111 |
| Chalukyas | 112-13, 132, 156-7, 248, 252-3, 268, 270 |
| Chamunḍa, k. (Chalukya) | 198 |
| Chāmundarāja, Jain author of the Chāmundarājagāpurāṇa | 21 |
| Cham or Kam, Turk | 9, 40 |
| Chandella kings | 229 |
| Chaspākṣāvāra, g. | 317, 323 |
| Chaspākṣāvāra, g. | 317n, 323 |
| Chāṇḍrātiya, k. | 10 |
| Chāṇḍrātiyapurana | 121, 124 |
| Chandragiri palace | 295f |
| Chandraprabhaśavā | 124, 128 |
| Chang-chie | 282-3 |
| Ch'ang Chun, Taoist priest | 297f |
| Chang-tsong, K'un emperor | 130 |
| Chāpā, k. | 194 |
| Chāpā kings of Vardhamāna | 190ff |
| Charaka, writer on medicine | 237 |
| Chārāmā, v. | 230-40, 246 |
| Chāṣṭāna, k. (Kahatrapa) | 32, 115 |
| Chaṭṭha I. and II | 98 |
| Chaturapana-Śātakarni, k. (Andhra) | 115, 272ff |
| Chaturasādā | 164-5 |
| Chaulukya, k. | 203 |
| Chaulukyas of Anhilwādi | 196ff |
| Chēdi, c. | 268 |
| Chelladhavāja (Chella) | 217 |
| Chellakastana (Chella) | 217 |
| Chella Māhāmāyādēvaśasra | 217 |
| Chīa-yeḥ (Kāśyapa) | 398 |
| China | 129 |
| Chiūchūli, v. | 122, 124 |
| Chinese laws and customs | 263 |
| Ching-fa-men-ching | 108 |
| Chinghiz Khān and his ancestors 35-46, 75-86, 129ff, 278ff, 297f |
INDEX.

Chinghiz Khan and religion... 297
Chinna Udayaśī Ṣēṭupati of Rāmānid... 315
Chitragūḍa hill fort... 216, 219
Chi-taung... 107
Chōla... 187, 249, 268
Christian dates converted into Muhammadan... 47-50
Chronology of ancient nations by Albirīn... 116f
Chūdaisamā... 192
Chulukya, k... 197
Chung-hei, Kin emperor... 130, 166
Chāṇḍogya of Bhartrihari... 226
Chūnākura... 256
Chūnākura... 256
Chūlā—gudurī-kaldūt... 26
Chūt—kallaf, kallaf... 25
Cook, hermitage of the... 327
Cook's foot Vihāra... 26
coincs found at Bharoch... 178
coincs (Hindu) of Kābul... 260
coincs of Pathān kings... 252
coincs, Parthian and Indo-Sa- nian... 6, 262
coincs of S. India... 282
Corea... 157

Dādakā (Chaukukya)... 188
Dādakā (Bharoch)... 232
Dāgumbarṭi, v... 95
Dāhanukā, r... 27
Dālai Lama... 300
Dālavā Sēṭupati of Rāmānā... 316
Dāmān, r... 27
Dāmaruga—a drum... 316
Dāndapār inscr. of Jāgattunga
II. (Rāsh.)... 222ff
Dāndi... 234
Dāndina-Gōva... 98
Dānṭidūrga, k. (Rāsh.) 186, 232, 267
Dāntivasā, (? Rāsh.)... 165
dārba grass... 317, 320
Dāśabhūmi-Sātra... 106
Dāṣapura, c... 27
dāṣapāravahāras... 22
Dāṣāradha... 307n
dates on Hindu coins of Kābul... 260
dāsarian, vessel... 103n
Dāvaramalla I. and II... 98
Delli Lāṭ... 71
Dēṇyogāṇa sect... 102
dēvaṭṭal... 325
Dēvagupta, k... 241, 245
Dēvalabhi, k. (Chandella)... 259
Dēvanāgarī, early use of... 151
Dēvavandī, Jain author... 19-21

Dēvaśāma, k. (Vākṣṭaka)... 242
Dhalaga, k... 249
Dhamma... 308
dhāmbrīt—a small drum... 175n
Dharmāśērā, Śiva, g... 191, 194
Dharmikā, Dhānākā, v... 154-56
Dharmaratā, by Dr. Oppert... 51
Dharmasēna II., k. (Valabhi)... 149
Dharmasāra, Śiva... 190ff
Dharmasēna II., k. (Valabhi)... 149
Dharmasāra, Śiva... 190ff
Dharmakārīt—temple superintendent... 316
Dharmapāṭakāh of Aṃitāgati... 20
Dharmaprabhāsa-Buddha... 115
Dharmāpana, Buddha... 288
Dharmasindhub... 178
Dhenu... 325
Dharmaratā, author of the
Uddana-varga... 314
Dhīlīyārā or Vīllīyārā, diss... 205
Dhīmitkā or Jākađēvā,
(Jēthā)... 151, 262
Dhruva I. k. (Rāsh.) 157, 163, 187
Dhruvā, k... 188
Dhruvabhaṭṭa, k. (Chāpā)... 194
Dhun, Muham. tribe... 150, 303n
dhāpa—censer... 319, 323-8
digbhangha ceremony... 325
dikāron of Ktesias... 234-5
dīnāra—denarius... 89-90
Dinīka... 27
Dīna-lamp... 319, 323-6
dīpdrādha... 316
dīs—evil genius... 131
Dūḍa, town... 98
dramma—drachme 90, 128, 223, 258
Dravāsa-dhuddi... 319
Driḍhaprabhāra, k. (Yādava) 121, 124,
drums... 126
Dudhī inscr. of Dēvalabhi
(Chandella)... 289
Dūḍa—tortoise... 74
Durlabhākṣa, k. (Chaukukya)... 198
Durr-i-Durrān, 'Durrān'... 259
dūtaka, o... 165, 186
Dutty of a Buddhist layman... 23
Dvādiyappa, k. (Yādava)... 121
Dvāravati, c... 121, 124, 127
Dvijāmpā, q. (Rāsh.)... 253
Earnestness in Chinese Buddhism... 112-13
Eastern Chalukyas, 91ff, 218, 221,
240, 232
eclipses, lunar, 207ff, 249, 268, 289,
291ff
sol., 154-5, 189, 207ff, 220,
256, 291ff
Edkins's Religion in China... 330
Ehe-Borrhan—Māya-dēvi... 312
Eighteen Agraḥāras... 47
Agraḥāras... 22
Ekasandhiḥāṭāraka... 19
Elāpura hill... 165-7, 163, 298ff
Elavargu, v... 91, 95
Elliot, Sir W... 311-12
Ela (or Helu) language... 54-50, 69
Elur Caves, see Elūpura.
Elur Caves, stone head from
in Musée Guimet... 329
emblems engraved on plates... 151
Erambarage, t... 99, 257
Erathāna district... 201, 205
eras, Hindu, nomenclature of 207ff,
291ff
Etāgiri, c... 110
Fa-hian... 108
felt or woollōk images, Ongon... 41-2
fire worship... 41
Firūz Shāh's Lāṭ... 71
fish emblem on copper-plates 151-3
Folk songs... 90
folklore in the Panjāb—
18 Little ankle-bone... 103f
19 Lambkin... 175
20 The tiger, the Brāhmaṇ, and the jackal...
176
21 The vixen and the tiger... 177
folklore of Gorakhpur... 262
Foo-shing-foon-king, translated
by Rev. S. Beal... 313
Fu-chan, t... 133
Führer's Manuṣtradhama-
setham... 178
Fu-sing... 173-4
Gabhira-darśana, Buddha school... 88
Gadaha or Gadhis coins... 7, 9, 10
gadva... 256
gairātās... 74
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<td>INDEX.</td>
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<tr>
<td>Gakhar, tribe</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gantarāyita, k (Śilā of Kōl-hāpur)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangārāth Mt</td>
<td>7, 305n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangā, r.</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangā &amp; Yamarūā insignia</td>
<td>157, 248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangā kings</td>
<td>11-13, 11fff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mahāmāndalāvaras&quot;</td>
<td>218, 221, 270-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangamandala</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangavādī province</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardabhillas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garudālaśchana</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garga, astronomer</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gāthā dialect</td>
<td>277, 89, 90, 139ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautamiputra (Andhra)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautamiputra, k (Vākāṭaka)</td>
<td>240, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauda, o.</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauda, o.</td>
<td>100-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudamiputra (Andhra)</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudamiputra, k (Vākāṭaka)</td>
<td>240, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gṛitaṅga, o.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gṛitaṅga, verse</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gejjarāvātī (?) o.</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gēnchāras</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gīkhi-sayana—Baudhāyya layman’s rule of life</td>
<td>23-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girnar—Uñjantagiri</td>
<td>20n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobi steppe</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godahara, Gondaphares, k.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōgirāja, k (Chāhlukya)</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogerly, Rev. Mr.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōghnātās</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōjiga, Gōvinda V. (Rāsh.).</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gomaduva, v.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōnārdāyya—Pānāśājali</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundaphares, Godaphares, k.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gongirāja, k (Chāhlukya)</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōpāmaṯs plate of a Valabhi king</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorakhpur folklore</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goravas</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōre Gangāya Rejādevāra</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gōṭa, Aṭṟēya</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Bhāraḍavāja</td>
<td>247, 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gautama</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KāŚyapa</td>
<td>94, 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaundinya</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaunika</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lākṣāṇya</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māṇavya</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muntalla (?-Mudgala)</td>
<td>154-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārāśarya</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāndīlya</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śatsyānā</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāṣaya</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vatsyānā</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gōṭra, Vaiṣṇavāyuddha</td>
<td>240, 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gōṭras acquired by affiliation</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gēde</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōvindāhana</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōvinda L. k (Rāsh.)</td>
<td>16, 162, 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;II., k (Rāsh.),</td>
<td>157, 252, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III., k (Rāsh.)</td>
<td>11ff, 163, 137, 218-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;V., k.</td>
<td>249, 253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;younger brother of Dhrūva III. (Rāsh.)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gōvindaśāmā, q.</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory, St.</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griññas</td>
<td>324-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guchi, adopted brother of Chinghis Khān</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gudda</td>
<td>96ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guḍdānār, y.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guḍdī</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guḍrī, kalūṭ, ciout</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guhāśeṇā, k (Valabhi)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guimet (Musée), Catalogue of</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guṇagakā-Māṇavāyuddha</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chal.)</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gundagar</td>
<td>7, 305n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunḍār inscr of Kakka III. (Rāsh.)</td>
<td>270ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptā coins</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptā dates</td>
<td>260-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptās</td>
<td>157, 241, 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptās, k. of Gauda</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptagupta, saint</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gūrjaras</td>
<td>15-18, 181, 219, 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guṛukkl—occupating priest</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttī fort</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habba’al</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hādineṣṭ-Agraḥāra</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hājāḷa plates of Dharmavāra (Chāpa)</td>
<td>190ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haihayas</td>
<td>253, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajj</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halākīn—measure of time</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamas, q.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hanmaraḥ-hatti</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hārami</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haribana of Manbodh</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haridhāpa, k. (Vākāṭaka)</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haritiputra</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harivikrama (Chāhlukya)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haro, r.</td>
<td>306n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsha of Ujjain</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harshavardhana of Kanauj</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harshavardhana I. and II. k. of Kambōja</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatt-Mattōr inscr of Indra IV. (Rāsh.)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebbāl inscr of Krishna IV. or V. (Rāsh.)</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hergiṇe, o.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hēlarāja</td>
<td>226-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helu, see Elu.</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hergiṇe, o.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hermitage of the Cock</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hijāz</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīnayāna school</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīranyagarbha-yājī Ravikula</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vījaya Rājanātha Sētupati</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīrani</td>
<td>108, 109, 327-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīrani, Tibetan medicine men</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoi-hoi sect</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hojaļunguda, t.</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holy tree of Buddha-Gayā</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōmakuṇyas</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hōnūr inscr of Bāllāla and Gandarāyita (Śilā of Kōl-hāpur)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōrus, Shamin’s staff</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōrus, horse, consecrated</td>
<td>80-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoyaśas</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hūba, oracle and image of</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human sacrifice</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hōnaa</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōniyas—image used in Sinha- lese sorcery</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua-yen-ching</td>
<td>106, 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hya in Mesopotamia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hīrā, r.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iddhatōjās—Dhrūva I. (Rāsh.)</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iggīr vishaya</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignis fatuus</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>īdān of al Hajj</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikshuvardhana country</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilīchpur grant of Pravaraśena II. (Vākāṭaka)</td>
<td>239ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Iml-i-Tajud</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imeglichin, or Immegiljinn, lamb goda</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Institute at Oxford</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Skythian coins</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indra, k. (East. Chal.)</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;II., k. (Rāsh.)&quot;</td>
<td>17, 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;III., k.</td>
<td>165, 165, 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;IV., k.</td>
<td>224, 233, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indrābhūtī quoted</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indravarṇa, k., of Kambōja</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingut tribe</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription on a clay seal from Wallā</td>
<td>274f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Page 335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptions, Sanak, from Kamboja ........................................ 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptions from Lalitpur .................................................. 262</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptions on copper: — ..................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Chāpa ................................................................. 190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Chaolukya .............................................................. 196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Eastern Chalukya .......................................................... 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Jēthvā ................................................................. 151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Rāṣṭrākūṭa II. 115, 156, 179 ..............................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 247, 266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Yākṣṭaka ................................................................. 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Valabhi ................................................................. 148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Yādava of Chandra-dityapura .............................................. 119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscriptions on stone: — ...................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Chandella ................................................................. 269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Khaṭraka ................................................................. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; miscellaneous 95, 99, 100, 101 ........................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Rāṣṭrākūṭa 215, 220, 222 ..............................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 244, 249, 255, 256, 270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Śilāhāra of Kollāpur ...................................................... 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Yādava of Chandrādityapura .............................................. 126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Yādava of Dēvagiri ........................................................ 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuṛī, v ................................................................. 91, 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Īśaṇavarman, k. of Kamboja 113-14 .......................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istikhāra or Khiva ........................................................ 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itoga, Mongol g .............................................................. 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-śing ................................................................. 226-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jdeke—brought forth ......................................................... 305n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jafar Khoja ................................................................. 130-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagatunga I.,—Gōvinda III., k. ...........................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rāṣṭh.) ................................................................. 219, 225, 268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II., k. (Rāṣṭh.) 222, 224, 263, 256, 269, 270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jālākādēva, k. (Jēthvā) ................................................... 151ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainēndram ................................................................. 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jainēndram—Vyḍārava, author-ship of the ................................ 19ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaitiugi I., k. (Yādava of Dēva-giri) ....................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jālamangala, v ............................................................ 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamālgāri figures ........................................................... 330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambādvipa ................................................................. 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambuvākipikī, v ........................................................... 158, 164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jānījā tribe ............................................................... 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jādan inscr. of Rudraśena ..................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Khaṭraka) ................................................................. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Java ................................................................. 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayābhaṣ of Bharoch ......................................................... 232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayādadām, k. (Khaṭraka) .................................................. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāghāntā—a gong .......................................................... 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāsinha, k. (Chāḷukya) ................................................... 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāsinhī I. and II. (East. Chal.) ....................................... 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāskandha, k ............................................................ 275</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayāvarman I.—IV, k. of Kamboja .........................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 113-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome ................................................................. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jēthvā ................................................................. 151ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish reckoning ......................................................... 117-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhāñja, k ................................................................. 125-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jingir Bukhi ............................................................... 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jitāvanā monastery ......................................................... 310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jōdha, tr ................................................................. 150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josaphat and Buddha .......................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka’ba ................................................................. 1-3, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kābul, Hindu coins ....................................................... 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kachchhāyana’s date ...................................................... 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadab plates of Gōvinda III. ...............................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rāṣṭh.) ................................................................. 11ff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadakal, Kadadola, v ......................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadambas ................................................................. 111-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadamba-Tēvā of Rāmnād ..................................................... 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadēkērī, v ............................................................... 271</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailakila Yavanas ........................................................... 6, 242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kàtdām—castanet ............................................................ 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāyāta ................................................................. 226</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kkōla—a trumpet ........................................................... 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kākka, Kākka I, k. (Rāṣṭh.) 16, 182 ..................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; II., k. 163, 165, 188 ..............................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| " " III., k. 180, 188, 263ff ...........................................
<p>| 268, 270ff |
| Kakkala,—Kakkā III. (Rāṣṭh.) ............................................ |
| 269, 271 |
| Kālacuris of Tripura 230, 234, 255, 263-4 ................................ |
| Kālā, g ................................................................. 320n |
| Kala emporium in Ceylon ................................................... 53 |
| Kalas inscr. of Gōvinda V. ................................................. |
| (Rāṣṭh.) ................................................................. 249 |
| Kālveda, superstition in Ceylon ......................................... 53 |
| Kālīdāsā ................................................................. 234 |
| Kālininga ................................................................. 65 |
| Kalivallabha,—Drīhvā I. (Rāṣṭh.) ....................................... |
| 219 |
| Kali-Vishnuvardhana, k. (East. Chal.) ................................ |
| kallaf, kullah—club ...................................................... 26 |
| Kalpitaya, Kalapatu, or Calpentyn in Ceylon .......................... 53 |
| Kalyāna, c ............................................................... 110, 282 |
| Kam, Turk g .............................................................. 40 |
| kam—Mongol necromancer 40, 300 ...................................... |
| Kamara or Kamra, k ..................................................... 260 |
| Kāmarāpā ................................................................. 239 |
| kamba, land measure ....................................................... 99 |
| Kambōja or Camboja ....................................................... |
| 233n |
| kami—medicine men ......................................................... 40 |
| kami, l. m .............................................................. 162 |
| kāyla ................................................................. 256 |
| Kānsi ................................................................. 115 |
| Kāṣeki, c ................................................................. 187 |
| Kāneri caves .............................................................. 288 |
| Kanishka, k .............................................................. 313 |
| Kānjar—Analysis of ....................................................... |
| 330 |
| Kannara,—Krishna II. (Rāṣṭh.) ........................................... |
| 222 |
| &quot; IV ................................................................. 258 |
| &quot; IV or V ............................................................... 271 |
| &quot; Permānādi—Bōtavya (Gaṅga) ............................................ |
| 270 |
| Kannēvar—Krishṇa I. (Rāṣṭh.) ............................................ |
| 17 |
| Kantaikā stālt ............................................................ 195 |
| Kapardi, g ............................................................... 319 |
| Kappadokia ............................................................... 262 |
| Karabēn, r ............................................................... 27 |
| Kardā plates of Kakka III. ................................................ |
| (Rāṣṭh.) ................................................................. 263ff |
| Karka, see Kakka .......................................................... |
| Karnāla, co ............................................................ 187 |
| Kāsakriteṇa, gramuṭriaman ............................................... 237 |
| Kāśīkā-vitthi ............................................................. 226-7 |
| Kāśapa ................................................................. 115 |
| Kaṭakaṭāra ............................................................... 95 |
| kuttīyaum—baton holder ................................................... 316 |
| Kauk Tangri, g ............................................................. 40 |
| Kauśikī, g ............................................................... 93 |
| Kāvi inscriptions .......................................................... 232 |
| &quot; plates of Jayabhāṣa (Gurjara) ........................................ |
| 291-3 |
| Kavi—Paramāśthi ........................................................ 20 |
| Kawi language ............................................................. 55 |
| Kāyaṭhas ................................................................. 270 |
| Kērula, co ............................................................... 219, 219 |
| Kerulon Mta ............................................................. 131-2 |
| kēvāla ................................................................. 22 |
| Khānbaligh ............................................................... 129 |
| Khāṅdā or Shandā ........................................................ 8 |
| Kharaṇara I, k. (Valabha) .................................................. |
| 149 |
| Khārāvēla-rāja ........................................................... 87 |
| Khazhar, Chinghiz Khān’s bro. 36-9 ...................................... |
| 284-6 |
| Khing-gan Mta ........................................................ 129 |
| Khitans ................................................................. 129, 171 |
| Khitan culture ........................................................... 301 |
| Khoilun—mother of Chinghiz Khān ...................................... 36 |
| khobu-sa .............................................................. 77 |
| Khorinj Boddissado ........................................................ 84 |
| Khoeru Nushirwan ........................................................ 234 |
| Khōṭṭiga, Kōtṭiga, k. (Rāṣṭh.) 255-6, 268 |
| Khubilai Khān ........................................................... 78, 84 |
| Kubtu-khabu ............................................................. 134 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Khurjah or Khurjat, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Khuzā’, a tribe in Hijāz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Khuzanna, supposed ancestor of the Kināna tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Khvadavayaka, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Khwarazm, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Kin dynasty in China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Kin Tartars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Kināna tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Kīranā Rāyara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228ff</td>
<td>kīrtana—temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Kirttīrājā, k. (Chaulukya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kirttyāchārya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Kisakād. d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135-6</td>
<td>Kių-yung pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kokkala, Kokkalla L., k. (Kala of Tripura)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Kokkili, k. (East. Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Kokochi or Kukkj, Shalman 35 38-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Koonj Boddissado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Kolējunru, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Kolabhiyāna—Viyākādyia, k. (East. Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Kondarjāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Koṅgudōla chronicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Kon-yuen-chau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Kōramya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-5</td>
<td>Korea—Chinghiz Khān in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Korūr battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Kö-ti-tirtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Köṭṭiga, see Köṭṭiga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Krakuchchhanda Buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229ff</td>
<td>Krishna L., k. (Rāsh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>&quot; II., k. &quot; 216, 220, 223, 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255-8</td>
<td>&quot; III., k. &quot; 255, 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>&quot; IV., k. &quot; 257, 270, 271, 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Krishnā, k. (Early Rāsh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Krishnappā Nāvakkar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Krishnavernā, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-1</td>
<td>kumbha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>kuṅkuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Koaharādta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27ff</td>
<td>Kahatrapas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>kahatryias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Kubja-Vishnuvardhana, k. (East. Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>kōče—street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Kuchu Khatun, princess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50ff</td>
<td>Kuhn on the Sinhalese language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kukkutagiri and Kukkutva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kukkutāpaḍa Vihāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kukkutāpaḍa giri Vihāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kukkutāpaḍa rāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Kumāra, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kumārajiva, author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Kumārapāla, k. of Gujarāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Kundakadēvi, q. (Rāsh.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kuni, grammarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-96</td>
<td>Kuntaula, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>Kunungil, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Kuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Kuruc̄hētra, (f) Kuru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Kusambhpura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kusahans or Kanshans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>lakahaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Lakhami, q. (Rāsh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53n</td>
<td>Lālā on the coast of India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-65</td>
<td>Lālitāp inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lamb gods, Imegilchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-65</td>
<td>Laṅgudipāra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Lassen on the Sinhalese language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Lasithiyavvā, q. (Yadava)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Lāṭa or Lāṭika, co. 54, 55, 56, 65, 167.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Lāṭēsvāra—Kakka II. (Rāsh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Lattalār, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Laurjī-Arakāj Īāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Liang-wu- ti, Chinese emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279-80</td>
<td>Liang-king, t. in Hoan-kau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129-138</td>
<td>Liang-yang-chau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Lōhagāra, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Lōkāditya (Chella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Lōkamahādēvi (East. Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Lōkāpura, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Lōvabhikī, k. (Chōva)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Maḥā or Areopolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Mādhavendra, commentator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Mādhavagupta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Madhu, a Brāhman disputant against Nāgārjuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Madhuriputra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Madhyavasana, Mathūrā, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Madhyamika, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Madina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Madras, tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Madras High Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Magadhā, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Mahābālēśvar plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-41</td>
<td>Mahābhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Mahādēva, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Mahākālpālā, k. o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Mahākāśatrapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-155</td>
<td>Mahāmādyā, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-155</td>
<td>Mahāpradhānānāyaka, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Mahāpurṣaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120-182n</td>
<td>Mahattama, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Mahāvārtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mahāvastu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290n</td>
<td>Mahāsanipāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mahāvira's date of Nirādha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mahāvira tirtha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Mahāyāna school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Mahāyāna's mission to Ceylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Mahāyānarāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mahāyānarīvara, k. of Kamboja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maiśār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306n</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maiśār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maiśār, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maithil language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maitrakas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maitrēya Buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-10</td>
<td>Maitrībhāvanā Śrītra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, place names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mahaprabhārī, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mālava, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mālava, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mālaya tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maldivan language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Maldivan—Mahāradung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mallikārjuna, k. of Koṅkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mana tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316n</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mānasaras, lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mānatunga-Sūrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Manbodh's Haribans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284-4</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Manchuria, Chinghiz Khān in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mandakas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mandala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mandala, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mandalika-Kusumabodānāja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mandalika-Pūldimāha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mandara, Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mangi, k. (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Manikyāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Manipurā, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Manīja, k. of Orissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>Mahāyāna, Mangu Khān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Nāsik inscription of Ushavadāta 27, 139
Nativag, g. 41, 43
Nā̄diya-emāda of Bharata 330
Nāvīgūnud, t. 98
navīrān—head temple servant 316
Nāvyālādāvī, q. (Yādava) 122
neleqīvā 110f
Necus or Nece in Arabia 114
Nie-pa-ching—Nīrūvadā vāstra.106,
Nīgranta, ascetic 377
Nīrītī, a Dikpāla 321n
Nirupama,—Dhrūva L (Rāsh.) 219,
Nīruva, 105, 106
Nīshāpur 7
Nīshādhī, nīshādhīgī 99f
Nītādhī, nītādhī 99f
Nīssānakamala, k. of Kalinga. 65
Nītīprakāśikī, by Dr. Oppert 51
Nītyavaraha,—Indra IV (Rāsh.)
Nōgī, Mongol god 43, 78-9
Nōjambas 271
Nripatīndravarmā, k. of Kam-
bōja 113
Nripatūnaga—Amogha varahāra I.
(Rāsh.) 219-20
Nū̄ma, V. (Rāsh.) 249
Nāka III (Rāsh.). 269
numerals, genealogy of modern 261
Nūrma-Taila III, k. (W. Chal.) 98
Nuyārōddha trees 277
obo, sacred hut 83
Ochigā 36, 38
Ochirbani, g., Mongol 84
Oitu-ōchikhu 37
Okodī, Tungus demon 42
Omar Khaiyam’s Quatrains 304
Onog, Onkon, Tungus gods. 42, 43
Ongotui, Mongol demon 83
Oungate, White Tartars 132
Oppert on the Śūkraṇāti 50-51
on Vijayanagara dynasty 51-2
oracle of Hubal 1-6
Odachi, g., Mongol 84
INDEX.

Pauras .................................. 6
Pavitra .................................. 317, 320, 322
Pennakonda, Penugonda...52,395n
Pergaje, o. ............................... 258
Periyamurai—temple servants 317
per—good spirit .......................... 131
Permaañdi,—Bātaya(Ganga) .... 270-1

—Mārasimha (Ganga) 256, 270-1
Pethapangaraka, v. ..................... 263
Phrygia .................................. 263
Pien-leang or Kai-fung-fu, c. 129
Pithūn, a Rākhasa ....................... 304
Pina, Pīda, or Vīna of Bhartrihari . 297
Pinḍadāna ............................... 290
Pīnditavāla, t. ........................... 27
Pīntar .......................... 7
Pipāsā kingdom .......................... 198
pūtham—receptacle of the śūla 318
Pūṭāpaṇam tope .......................... 258
Piyādāsi inscriptions 71f, 113, 225f
Pomalai Mt. ............................... 328
Pōpalūni tribe ............................ 259
Po-Tengri, g. .............................. 35, 40
pots, earthen ............................. 90
Prabhākaravardhana, k. 223-4
Prabhāstārtha ............................ 27
Prabhāvatigupta, q.(Vākātaka) 241, 245
Pāṇḍūnas ................................. 307n
Pāṇḍyas .......................... 187, 268
Pāṇḍvavaik, v. ............................. 263, 269
Pāṇini .................................. 205n
Pāṇini, by Guptilaka ........................ 53
Pāṇipat .................................. 259
Pāñja pīr ................................. 303n
Pāntphura, c. ............................. 110
Papāhī—black and white-crested cuckoo 306n
Pārādā, r. ................................. 27
Pārāhanaka, v. ............................. 189
Pārvakramabahu I. of Ceylon 127
Pāramēśhūta .............................. 127
Pārarsa-Sēkha of Ceylon 315
Paridhāvi Śāneṣatara ........................ 21
Parvānas ................................. 8
Parvānasas ............................... 74
Parthian and Indo-Sasanian ..... 76
coins .......................... 362
Parvatavardhini-Amman.g 315, 325
Pālāvata ................................. 123
Pātāla-karāṇī ............................. 120-1, 122n
Pātāliputra, c. ............................ 327, 328
Pātaśali—Gōṇhardiya 227
Pātāna, c. ................................. 327
Paulus al Yunānī .......................... 234
Pājrapāda, Jain author 19ff, 160
Pulakāśi, k. (Chāpa) ..................... 194
Pulakāśi II ................................. 233-4
Pāli, v. ................................. 47
Pulamāyī, k. (Andhura) ............... 115
Punarvasu nañekhatra ..................... 74
Punyavardhananagara, c. 248, 251
Pūṇādarakhaṃālaṅgaṇa 18
Punyadhāneha ceremony 317, 320
................................................................ 321, 323
Punyaratnā, author ....................... 227
Puppātas .................................. 74
Purigeṇ co .................................. 225, 226, 227
Pārnamātriśrīnāṭputra ................. 115
Pārśmānanda-Chakravartin's ..........................
Tattva-Muktāvali           262
Pārṇaprajā school .......................... 262
Purusha .................................. 237
Pushkarai ................................. 28, 32
Pushkaraksha, k. of Kambōja 113
Pushpabhūtī, k. of Kauṇaţ 233
Pushyāṇa, k. .............................. 275
pygmies ................................. 234-5

Quatrains of Omar Khaiyyām,  
by E. Whinfield 314

Rāḍhā, Lālā ............................... 65
Rādhā, Lāt ................................. 71
Rādasambova—Ratnasambhava 44
Rāgkalpadvādyaga of Śrūta- 
krttim ................................. 316
Rāgkalpa Sētupati .......................... 316
Raghunātha Śīrmasīlai Sētupati 326
Rāhappu, Rāhappya 180, 187
Raichū inscription .......................... 51
Rājagāha, Rājagriha 23
rdjadadānti .............................. 110f
rdjadhirāja .............................. 15
rdjadhyaksha, o. 120, 122n
Rājamāyya, k. .............................. 249
Rājapattirmā, k. of Kambōja 113
Rāja-Pīṭāmaha ............................ 150, 230
rdjaputra ................................. 165
Rājārdri-Tiridrīda .......................... 290
Rāja Rāsalī 303-8
Rāja-Sarveśībāda 290
Rājendravarmā, k. of Kambōja 113-14
Rākahasa, names of 303, 304n
Raktapura, or Alakapura, c. 20
Rāma (Chaulukyā) ........................ 197
Rāmalingavānti, g. 315, 322
Rāmānāthaḍpuram, Rāmnād 315
Rāma of Vijayanagara 51
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Seals, emblems on, 11, 91, 156, 179, 193

" legends on, 91, 245, 263, 274

" from Walā .... 274-5

Seamy Side of the Vedic religion ...... 236

Sebbi, v .... 255-6

Sebgin or Sukin, c.... 137

Seljuk s .... 40

Seljuk s in Asia Minor .... 261

Senn Shaka coin .... 9

Sind, o.... 241

Sēnart on Piyaḍāsī's inscriptions .... 71f, 275f

Sēnpati of Rāmādr .... 315

Sēnachandra I, k. (Yādava) .... 121

" II, k .... 122

" III, k .... 127

Sēnapura, c .... 121

Seven Pagodas, by Col. Brannill .... 51

Sērūna .... 257

Shāh Mukhmed .... 259-60

Shāk Gaṇj ?? 290

Shāmans .... 35, 38, 39, 75-9

Shāmanism .... 39-46, 78-85

Shandar, or Khandas .... 8

Shandhras .... 8

Shandhi coins .... 10

Shan-yi Chiefs .... 298

Skw-Dagon Prab, Rangun .... 312

Siau-si-tien hill, where the Buddhist books are inscribed .... 107-9

Sīhara .... 111

Siddham .... 32

Siddhāsat, c .... 164

Sigala, a Buddhist layman .... 23, 26

Sigdāvandā sermon .... 23-6

Sigdāvāne, miscellaneous inscr. .... 102

Shala, Simhala, Ceylon .... 56

Sikh .... 115

Sīkāl-patru of Vāṃśī Nārāyaṇa .... 261

Silāditya I, k. (Valabhi) .... 149

Silāditya-Haṣar .... 233-4

Silāditya-Pratāpaśila .... 234

Silāgrana, v .... 18

Silhāras of Kālāpur .... 102, 110

Silāra title, Rājapūtāmaka .... 150

Silpādrā .... 19

Sīmalas .... 74

Sinhagharā Saṃtha Buddha .... 116

Sinhalese Vocabulary, Āryan element in .... 53ff

Sinhalese superstitions .... 53

Sinhapura in Kalinga .... 52

Sithi, v .... 122

Simon Magus .... 35

Sindī, v .... 122

Sindīnāra, v .... 121, 124

Singhaṇa II, k. (Yādava), 100, 178

Sing-pi .... 173

Siptakhora tree .... 235

Śirīḍām—temple servant .... 317

Śiśuddha inscr. of Agābhūtarasāhā (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 215

Śittadhā—chilly-powder .... 319

Śiśita .... 325

Śīva-Vijayaśvaram .... 113

Śīyāṭī, Śīyāṭī—temple servant .... 317

Śiyu-āśi monastery .... 108

Skanda, g .... 323

Solongod, Māṇeṛu tr .... 286

Sōmadēva .... 19, 21

Sorāṭuṛ, t .... 257

Sorāṭuṛ inscr. of Krishṇa IV (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 256ff

Śōpārṣa .... 27, 30

Śōvra .... 7

spiritualism among the Mongols .... 45

spiritualism .... 75

Śravatāḷa ceremonies .... 321

Śravatāḷa of Maghanamādi .... 21f

Śravasti, t .... 310, 313

Śrī-Haṣar, k .... 187

Śrījāma, k. (Yādava) .... 121

Śrī-Tribhūvanadākīṣa .... 91

Śrīvalabha, Gōvinda III (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 163

Śrīvura, v .... 220

Śruṭāκāvya .... 22

Śrutākṛtṛi, Jain author .... 19, 21

sthōnasuddhi .... 319

sthānakārī—temple officers .... 316

sthānasuddhi .... 10

Subandhu .... 234

Subhāṭaṅga, Akāḷavarāha, son of Dhrūva II (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 188-90

Krishṇa I (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 187, 215

" Dhrūva II (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 109, 330

Sub-pana—saffron .... 26

Sudā .... 194

Sugata .... 309

Suggalādāvī .... 99

Suggalēvara, Śīva, g .... 99

Suhit tr .... 10

Sukhvattyaḥā—Tring-tun-wen .... 129

Sulun, Mongol g .... 80

sun-worship .... 40, 41

Sung dynasty .... 129

Supāra and Padaḷa, antiquarian remains at .... 114

suprabhdām—morning pūja .... 319

Śūryavānas .... 8

Śūraṭhagāna .... 100, 102

Śūrī plates of Trilōchanapāla (Chaulukya) .... 196ff

Śūrya, g .... 319

Śūryavarma, k. of Kanabāja .... 114

Sushēṇa, playasien .... 233

śūtrapiṭaka .... 23n

Suvanamukha, t. or Mt. .... 27

Suvāravārāha—Gōvinda V (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 254

" Kakka II (Rāṣḥḥ) .... 164-5

Svātīmangala, v .... 18

Śvāmī Mahāśeṇa, g .... 93

śvāmī .... 32, 158, 180

Śyālapati, k .... 260

Śyrian inscription in China .... 109

Tebāla, Arab idol .... 4

Tāila II, k. (West. Chāl.) .... 199, 200, 209

Tāibō, Arab idol .... 98

T'ai-tung-fu or Si-king 129, 133, 139

Tulāp, k. (Est. Chāl.) .... 34

Tālāgūr, o .... 165

Tālīkēṭa battle, 1564 .... 51-2, 295n

tambālām—tray .... 320

Tangri or Tegri, Mongol g .... 40, 42

Ta-ning-fu or Pe-king .... 129, 172

Tāntrika School .... 88

Taoist Ch'ang Ch'un .... 297ff

Tāpl, r .... 27

Tārānsāḥa .... 231

Tāpōlā, v .... 18

Tārnī—Dharāṇi .... 84

Tātabākki, k .... 249

Tātīvānātkīval of Gauḍā

Fūrānānda Chakravartin .... 262

Tāvedrītha of Umāvāțī .... 20

Tāvedf .... 87

Tegri—Tangri

temple of Rāmēsvaram .... 315

Tengeri Tokkho .... 77

Tengri .... 131

Tep-tengri .... 35, 36, 38-9

Tēsuka, k. (Yādava) .... 122

Tēvedānga .... 326

Thānā dialect, proper names .... 259

thānakālō .... 100

thān, Chinese for heaven .... 40

Tera, Kh., Chalhūna .... 115

Tibet history .... 88

Tibetan vowels .... 57n

tiger and the cat .... 329

tilaka .... 318, 325
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<th>Entry</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Timur Lang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Tirumala Sêtpatí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Tirumala of Vijayanagar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Tishya, naksatra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>tiki, fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>5th, 32, 100-1, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>6th, 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>7th, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>8th, 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>9th, new moon, 155, 189, 220, 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>10th, Sri-paichami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307n</td>
<td>Tooth-brush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Tope of Piëtâpuram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106f</td>
<td>Toragal inscr. of Barma Mokamandâlevaara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Toragale, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>'raivêdya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Tremak, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trilôchânapâla, k. (Chaulukya) 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Trilôkâsada of Nâmichandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Trînkônamalai, t. in Ceylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Tripitika, Catalogue of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Tripavara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Tripunâtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Trirâma, Mt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Trirâta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Trivikrama, Jain author...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Trîygâvâra, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Taing-wan-tsing—Buddhist priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Tsui-yun-kuan pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tukin—Turks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Tumata, tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Trângâvâda, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Tung-kuan pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Turimipâli, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tushâras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Tzia-din, Sung emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>uchhikâlapâjâ—fourth service in a temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Uddânâvargâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Uddânâvargâ, by W. W. Rockhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Udaïyân Sêtpatí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Udayâdityavarmâ, k. of Kamboja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189n</td>
<td>udrânga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>udayâkâlapâjâ, third temple service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>udayamdrîdâlapâjâ, second temple service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76, 81</td>
<td>udayun—Shamaness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Ukaí, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Upâli, Ariaqya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Upâli, Ariya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Upâli, Ariaqya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Upâli, Ariaqya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Uppâli, lâdchêchhâna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Uppâli, lâdchêchhâna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Uppâli, lâdchêchhâna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Utarapâryâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Uttamahâdâras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Uttarapâryâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Utabu, Kin emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Vâdagambhâ, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Vâdagadra, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Vâdilâgka, k. (Yâdava)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53, 66</td>
<td>Vaddô, Veddás of Ceylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Vaddâ, language of Ceylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Vagbhâlêchhâna, v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Vaitarâma-Sîkâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Vaiûpûya-darsana school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Vairâmeghâ,—Dantidurgâ, (Râsh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Vajjani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Vajrâmârâ (Yâdava)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Vajraprâjâ-Sâtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Vajrâsana or Buddha-Gayâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Vajraâta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Vâkâlâ hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Vâkâtaka, co. and tr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229f</td>
<td>Vâkâtaka kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Vâkula stâpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-7</td>
<td>Vâkupadâtyâ of Bharthirhari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146, 164</td>
<td>Valabhi, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146f</td>
<td>Valabhi kinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Valaha, vâlaha, bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Vâlahâ, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181, 188</td>
<td>Vâlabha, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Vâlabha,—Dantidurgâ (Râsh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dhruva I. (Râsh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Gövinda II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Vâllabhanârendra, —Gövinda V. (Râsh.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Kakka III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Vâllabhârâkâja, k. (Chaulukya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vâllabhêndra,—Gövinda III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Van, cuneiform inscriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Vanavâsa, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Vanga, co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Vâru, Aditya 155, 280, 286, 288, 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bhiraspati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Budha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Guru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Sôma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Vârâ, Sukra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Vâdpâya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Varâha coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254, 261</td>
<td>Vardhâlêchchhâna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Vârâhamihira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Vârdhamâna, Jina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Vârdhamâna, date of the Nirveda of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191, 195</td>
<td>Vârdhamâna, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Vârika, Vakka or Vanka, k. in Kâbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Vârâsâs, r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Varuârâkâja, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Vasâpâka, o.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Vasâbandhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vasûdevâ, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Vasumitra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Vatsâpura, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Vatsarâja, k. (Chaulukya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57n</td>
<td>Vaturo—water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Vârvulatalata, t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Vâdopâryâna—repeater of the Vâda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Vêdhas, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226-8</td>
<td>Vêdic religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Velamkñju, d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Veluvana grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Vêngi, c. and co...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Venkâta of Vijayanagâra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Vêbhoti, holy ashe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Viddamayya, and Viddamiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Vidêha, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320   323</td>
<td>Vighnâvâra, g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Vijayâditya I. II. III. IV. and V., kk. (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vijayâditya—I. and II. kk. (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Vijayâditya—Nârâendramûrgâra, k. (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vijayakrîti, saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Vijayanagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Vijayagamhadâdra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vîjûpîtâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vikramâditya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Vikramâditya—I. and II. kk. (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Vikramâditya—Gunagânâka, k. (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Vikramâditya—Nârâendramûrgâra, k. (East Chal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Vikramâditya—Sântâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290f</td>
<td>Vikramâditya—Harsha, k. of Ujâyîni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Vikramâditya—Sivakânta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Vikramâditya—Dvapâda-sahûna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29f</td>
<td>Vikrama era,—nomenclature of the Vikrama era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrama-Kāla</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikramārka, k. (Chāpa)</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrama-Saiva</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrama-Saivēt</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrama-Saṅhatsāra</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrama-Sinhā, k. (Chaulukya)</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikrātāta-Nārāyana</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīliśvara or Dhillīśvara, d.</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimalāditya, k. (Chālukya)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīmalakārtti sūtra, — Wei-mo-ching</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīnaya</td>
<td>23n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindhyaśakti (Kālikā-la-Yavana)</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; (Vākāstaka)</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṅgavallī, v.</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṅkala, v.</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣāyī</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra, date of the Nireṇyā of</td>
<td>21f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra-Nārāyana</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīra-Nārīyāna, — Gōvinda V.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rāja.)</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīravāsi</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṅṭakotē, — Hāngal, t.</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣāladeva, k. (Chaulukya)</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣālākṣi, g.</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu, g.</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇu (Gupta) coin</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇuvardhana I, II, III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. and V., kc. (East. Chal.)</td>
<td>93-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvanātha Nāyakkar</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvanāthavāṃti, g.</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśhala of Vijayanagara</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛttavālsā, Kānarese poet.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vutavūra, v.</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vyāmakēśa, g.</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahhābys</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walā clay seal of Pushyēpa</td>
<td>274-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang-jih-jew</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waśi (Basscin)</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wei-hien-wen-tī, Chin emperor</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Chalukyas</td>
<td>111, 252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Chalukyas</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whinfield's Quatrains of Omar Khayyam</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white mares</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole duty of a Buddhist layman</td>
<td>23-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yādāna-Nārāyana</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yādavas of Chandrādityapura</td>
<td>119ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; of Dévagiri</td>
<td>106, 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yadukula</td>
<td>248, 252, 267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ydgaśāld</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yajña Śatakṣari</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamunā, r.</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ydpanīya sect</td>
<td>20n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāsōvarma, k. (Chalukya)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yāsōvarma, k. of Kambōja</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yavanas</td>
<td>6, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelavaru plates of Amma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. (East. Chal.)</td>
<td>91ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelui-Chutsai, his history</td>
<td>278-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelui-luiko, Khitan Chief</td>
<td>137-8, 166, 283-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yezidism</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yā-kīng</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yōga, Śādhi</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yōjanas and līś, substitution of one for the other</td>
<td>327, 328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuddhamalla L., k. (East. Chal.)</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; II., k.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yule, Col. H., quoted</td>
<td>38-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yung-Cheng, Chinese emperor</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuvarāja, k. (Kala of Tripura)</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zamzam well</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemarchus</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziu'l-Khalasa, temple</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ERRATA IN VOL. XII.

p. 43b, l. 3 fr. bot. for Jmmegiljin read Immegiljin
p. 47b, l. 12, for olpin read olpin
    l. 13, dele. the last two of the marks, indicating illegible letters, after
    the word sira
    l. 15, for Tho read the
p. 47b, l. 35, for Dharmâpran read Dharmâpura
p. 50, Table V, 1st col. for 1634 read 1664
p. 53a, l. 21, for Gargya read Garga
56a, n. 1. 3 for Āçoka read Āśoka
57b, 2nd fr. bot. for c and naturally ch, read ch and naturally ch
60b, l. 37, for p. 58b, read 56b
61a, l. 4 for ghriti read ghrītī
d. 14 from bottom read Beiträgen sur
61b, l. 20 after Vedā, only a comma.
63b, l. 13 for marica read maricha
69a, l. 19 for a read ch
p. 148b, l. 7, for bring brings
    note l. 3 from bottom, for वैद्यान्त read वैद्याचार
p. 149a, l. 5 from bottom, for रस्मि read रस्मि.
    l. 3 from bottom, read नदियां
    l. 1 from bottom, for न read न.
p. 149b, l. 1 from bottom, read obliterated; read सनसंतरण
d. 39, for Gūjarât, read Gujarāt
p. 200a, Tr. l. 19, and 2036, notes, last line, for
kāmāndalu read kamāndalu
p. 228, l. 1, for KRISHNÂRAJAJ read KRISH-
NÂRAJA I
p. 231a, l. 6, for + read x in two places
    l. 8, for + read x
    l. 18, for Vikramâ read Vikrama
p. 231a, note, last line, for Vikrama read Vikrama
p. 232, note 14, l. 4, for karkasaṃ read Karka-
sain
p. 233b, l. 1, for 864, read 486
p. 233, note 22, l. 8, for Manati read Maguti
    l. 9, dele below he gives A.D. 635;
    l. 10, for give read gives
    note 26, l. 3, for Sāhasāṃka read Sāhas-
sanka
p. 234a, l. 42, for Paulus all Yunâni read Paulus
    al Yunâni
    l. 45, for Va-āha read Varâha
p. 234b, l. 19 delete comma after -varman
p. 150a, l. 19 from bottom for Pindi read Pindi,
p. 150a, l. 33, for Vrittarâkṣas read the Vritta-
âkṣas
p. 179a, line 18, for in read on
p. 185, [?] for [?] read [?] [?]
    [?] for पारांकेत्र नाम : read पारांकेत्र नाम
    [?] for नुकलेपातिक:मुनि read नुकलेपातिक: मुनि
    [?] for विरदाह read विरदाह
    [?] for विषय read विषय
    [?] for भेदेया - read भेदेया-
    [?] for नवीन - read मूलीन-
    [?] for साड़ें read साड़ें:
    p. 185 footnote, insert l. 7, read साड़ें, l. 17, read साड़ेंकृतौ.
    Plate III.
    p. 186, [?] for सथा[ ] read सथा[ ]
    [?] for ब्रह्माण्ड read ब्रह्माण्ड.
p. 186a, l. 24 of translation, for Brähman read
Brahman.
p. 187b, l. 15 from bottom, for (forced her) read
(and forced her).
p. 188b, l. 9, for Kṛtavirya read Kṛtavirya
    l. 16 from bottom, for Dhruvarāja read
Dhruvarāja.
    l. 36, for rāja, read rāja
p. 189a, l. 10 from bottom, for Doḍāhi read
Dhoḍāhi.
p. 190a, l. 7, for Govindarāja read Gō-
vindarāja
p. 200a, l. 28, for Kalyāna read Kalyāṇa
p. 246, note 34, l. 2, for see Inser. read see e.g.
    Inser.
    [?] for Agraḥāras read Agrahlāras
    p. 247a, note, l. 4, for ḫārthikam read ḫārthikam
    p. 247b, note, l. 2, for dītyāldīpya read dītyāldīpya
    p. 274b, l. 7 from bottom, for and on the seal
    read and on the Asirgarh seal.
p. 274b, l. 5 from bottom, for vol. III, p. 372,
    read vol. V, p. 482.
p. 275b, l. 12, for भिमासराण [हिन्दु] read भिमासराण [हिन्दु]
p. 275b, l. 13, for दुर्गीः read दुर्गीः
p. 315b, note, for Dharmakartas read Dharmakartas
p. 317a, l. 24 from bot., for Svāmi read Svāmi
p. 317a, note, l. 4, for pujā read pājā in two places.
p. 317b, l. 29 from bot., for puyjāvadh Chapman
    read puyjāvadh Chapman
p. 319b, l. 8, for dṛgyām read dṛgyām
p. 320b, l. 1, for nandikāla read nandikāla
p. 321a, note, l. 3 from bot., for Paçhagayé read
Pañchagayé
1. 36, for dikāstotra read di-kāstotra
p. 240b, l. 25, for the compilations read the Srautasūtras and the compilations
p. 241a, l. 22, for Bhagirathī read (Bhagirathī)
1. 29, for learn regarding read hear of
p. 241a, l. 22, for Bhagirathī read (Bhagirathī)
1. 26, for Mahābhīrava, read Mahā-
bhairava
p. 242b, l. 33, for Arya, read Ārya
p. 245, l. 14, for Ś read Ś
p. 246a, l. 8, for who bathed read who (viz. the Bhāratīyas) bathed
p. 246, note 31, l. 5, for ansa read anea.

p. 323a, l. 31, from bot., for kṣhṭē read kṣhṭē
p. 325a, l. 31, for purushāṁśīga read puru-
śāṁśīga; and for nakshatra read
nakshatra
p. 325a, l. 17, for digbanda read digbandha
p. 325a, l. 24, for Nirdūjana read Nirdūjana
p. 326b, l. 15, for sadangukūṭa read sadangukūṭa
p. 326b, l. 18, for Sadurāgiri read Sadurāgiri
p. 326b, l. 23, for Pārvatāvardhīni read Pārvata-
vardhīni
p. 326b, l. 33, for Sēryavan read Sēryavan