THE

INDIAN ANTIQUARY,

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

IN

ARCHÄOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, FOLKLORE, LANGUAGES,
LITERATURE, NUMISMATICS, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, &c. &c.,

EDITED BY

JOHN FAITHFULL FLEET, C.I.E.,
BOMBAY CIVIL SERVICE,

AND

RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE,
CAPTAIN, BENGAL STAFF CORPS.

76204

VOL. XIV.—1885.

Swati Publications
Delhi
1984
# CONTENTS

The names of Contributors are arranged alphabetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. J. Avery</td>
<td>The Religion of the Aboriginal Tribes of India</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Ball</td>
<td>On the Identification of the Animals and Plants of India which were Known to Early Greek Authors</td>
<td>274, 300, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Beames</td>
<td>A Note on Ptolemy's Geography</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil Bendall</td>
<td>An Inscription of Sivadeva and Amshuvarman from Nepal</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. T. Best</td>
<td>The Proverbs of Ali EbnAli Talebi</td>
<td>92, 124, 206, 236, 261, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. G. Bühler</td>
<td>A Note on a Second Old Sanskrit Palm Leaf Manuscript from Japan</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Banavasi Inscription of Hariputra-Satarkami</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notice of Prof. B.G. R. Chaudhury's Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency in the Years 1928-29</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notice of Prof. Jolly's Tagore Law Lectures of 1883</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notice of Dr. Peterson's Second Report of Operations in search of Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Circle</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas. Burgess</td>
<td>On the Identification of Places in the Sanskrit Geography of India</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chandragupta and Vikramaditya</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Leiden Copper-Plate Granata - a Correction</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note on the Probable Indian Origin of the Names of the Week-Days</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. C.</td>
<td>Notes on the Jatahs</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-General A. Cunningham</td>
<td>The Probable Indian Origin of the Names of the Week-Days</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Doctos</td>
<td>Persian-English Dictionary</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keshav H. Dibbaya</td>
<td>The Malays of the Mudrakshasa and the Dominions of King Parasivansya</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir Walter Elliot</td>
<td>Note on the Family and Date of the great Rajahs - Chola of Tanjore</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. Fleet</td>
<td>The Early Gupta and Others Connected with them</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanarese Ballads</td>
<td>The Insurrection of Bhyasga of Saijodgi</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Silver Coin of Raudisinha</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chronology of the Early Rulers of Nepal</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Date of the Koca Buddhist Inscription of the Sanastra Devadatta</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Chandragupta and Vikramaditya of the Udayagiri Ananta Cave Inscription</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Thos. Foulkes</td>
<td>The Genealogy of the Cholas</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. A. Grierson</td>
<td>Vidyapati and his Contemporaries</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Song of Almah's Marriage</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Summary of the Almahand</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curiosities of Indian Literature</td>
<td>124, 206, 236, 261, 292, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. S. Growse</td>
<td>Four Querries concerning the Fathapur District in the North-West Provinces</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. A. F. Rudolf Hornle</td>
<td>The Gamhars and Rathors</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Palas of Bengal</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. H. Howorth</td>
<td>Cutting Khan and his Ancestors. XXX. 81, 115</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>XXX. 142, 169</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>XXXI. 207</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Singhalese Prince in Cairo</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTENTS.

E. HULTSZCH, Ph. D.—
A BUDDHIST SANSKRIT INSRIPTION FROM KOTA 45
AN EARTHENWARE FRAGMENT OF GUHASENA OF
VALABHI 75
THE SINGA INSRIPTION OF THE BHARSHUT
STUPA 139
THE SANCHI INSRIPTION OF MAHAPAPA 190
A COPPER-PLATED GRANT OF THE KABIRAKUTAS
OF GUZALAT, dated Śaka 757 196
LIEUT.-COLONEL G. A. JACOB, Bo.S.C., M.R.A.S.—
THE MAHABAYANA-UPASHAD OF THE BLACK
YAJUVEDA 4
PROF. F. KIELHORN ; Göttingen—
A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF VAKATILAJA OF
DHARA 159
QUOTATIONS IN THE MAHABHARATA AND THE
KARAKA-VRTTI 336
A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF SUDASITA I. OF
VALABHI 337
Notice of the Centenary Review of the Asiatic
Society of Bengal 355
REV. T. H. KNOWLES, F.B.G.S., M.R.A.S.—
SHARAP THE THIEF 26
THE PRINCE THAT WAS THREE TIMES SHIPWRECKED 239
THE KANGAB OR KANGI, THE KASMIRI PORTABLE
BRITISH 265
PROF. ERNST KÜHN—
On the Descent and Speech of the Transanganetic
People 126
W. LOGAN, Esq., M.C.S., M.R.A.S.—
The Koṇḍēśa-Rājakal 134
K. B. PATHAK, Esq., B.A.—
A NOTE ON THE EARLY KADAMBHA INSCRIPTIONS 12
AN OLD-KADAMBHA INSCRIPTION AT TERDÁL 14
A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE YADAVA KING
KRISHNA 68
THE EXPLANATION OF THE T.E. PALISHVAYA 104
K. RAGHUNATHJI, Esq.; Bombay—
Omens from the Falling of House Lizards 112

B. BEHATSEK, Esq.; Bombay—
SARMA INSCRIPTION ON AN INCENSE-BURNER 97
RUSSIAN ICONS 237
LÉWIS RICE, Esq., C.E., M.R.A.S.—
THE GANGA INSCRIPTIONS IN COOCH 76
A JAIYA-VAISHNAVYA COMPACT 233, 292
PANDIT S. M. NATESA SASTRI ; Madras—
FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA—
VI. Vīḍānusīkaṇa Bāhūrī 77
VII. Vṛṣṇīkaṇa Bāhūrī 79
VIII. The Mother-in-law became an Ass 108
IX. The Story of Appayya 109
X. The Bāhūrī Girl that married a Tiger 134
XI. The Good Husband and the Bad Wife 153
V. A. SMITH, Esq., C.S., M.R.A.S.—
The Coins of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty 179
WHITLEY STOKES, Esq., F.S.A.; London—
Another Bhaunayantra 235
HONLE K. T. TELANG, C.I.E.—
A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF PUJALIN 11 330
CAPT. R. C. TEMPLE, Bo.S.C., F.R.G.S., M.R.A.S.—
THE DHILLI DALALS AND THEIR SLANG 155
A MODERN ORNAMENTAL KUFI ALPHABET FROM
KARUL 181
PROF. G. THIBAUT, Ph.D.—
THE NUMBER OF STARS CONSTITUTING THE
SEVERAL NAHĀKRAS ACCORDING TO BRAHMAGUPTA AND VAIṢHNAVA-GARGA 43
REV. J. A. VANES—
Origin of the Śrīvalshnavas 61
PUTLIBAI D. H. WADIA—
FOLKLORE IN WESTERN INDIA—
1. The King’s Lesson 311
PROF. W. D. WHITNEY; U.S.A.—
THE STUDY OF HINDU GRAMMAR AND THE STUDY
OF SANSKRIT 33

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

S. B. Doctor’s Persian-English Dictionary 36
Origin of the Śrīvalshnavas, by J. A. Vannes 61
A Singhalese Prince in Cairo, by Henry H. Howarth 61
Chandragupta and Vikramādiya, by Jas. Burgess 61
Notes on the Jatīja, by W. C. 62
The Proverbs of Ali sbn Ali Talebi, by K. T. Best 124, 126, 256, 292, 322
Narlī in the Kaira District, by J. F. Fleet 123
The Koṇḍēśa-Rājakal, by W. Logan 134
Curiosities of Indian Literature, by G. A. Grierson 134
236, 256, 292, 322
The Coins of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty, by V. A. Smith 179
Note on the Family and Date of the Great Rājendrā-
Cholā of Tanjore, by Sir Walter Elliot 203

The Genealogy of the Chōlas, by Thomas Foulkes 206
Leiden Copper-Plate Grants—a correction, by
Jas. Burgess 206
Another Bhaunayantra, by Whitley Stokes 235
Four Queries concerning the Fattapur District
in the North-West Provinces, by F. S. Growse 290
A Note on Ptolemy’s Geography, by V. Ball 291
Jain-Vaishnava Compact, by Lewis Rice 292
Descent and Speech of the Transanganetic People
(Errnt Kühn) 190
A Note on the Probable Indian Origin of the Names
of the Week-days, by Jas. Burgess 322
The Date of the Kāṭa Buddhist Inscription of the
Śāmartha Dēvādatta, by J. F. Fleet 351
The Chandragupta and Vikramādiya of the Udāyas-
giri Amīta Cavo Inscription, by J. F. Fleet 322

SOCIETIES.

The Asiatic Society of Bengal 93
American Oriental Society 262
CONTENTS.

BOOK NOTICES.

Bhandarkar's Report on the Search for Sanskrit MSS. in the Bombay Presidency in the year 1882-83; by G. Bühler ... 62
Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LIII. Pt. I. No. 2, 1884; by J. F. Fleet ... 92
The Sanskrit Reader—Sahajkrtaprabhāvall ... 96
Clouston's Book of Sindibād ... 153
Rockhill's Life of Buddha and Early History of his order ... 189
Grierson's Grammars of the Dialects and Sub-Dialects of the Bihāri Language; by John Beames ... 206
Grower's Balandra, or Sketches of an Indian District, Social, Historical and Architectural ... 208
Wherry's Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran ... 308
Bates' Examination of the Claims of Iahmael as viewed by the Muhammadans ... 326
Putnam's Elephant Pipes in the Museum of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Davenport, Iowa, U.S.A. ... 329
Ballantyne's Sākhyā Aphorisms of Kapila ... 336
Keith-Falconer's Kaliah and Dinnah, or the Fables of Bidpai ... 334
Jolly's Tagore Law Lectures of 1883; by G. Bühler ... 333
Centenary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, by F. Kielhorn ... 332

ILLUSTRATIONS.

Diagrams showing the Process by which the Names of the Days of the Week were derived ... 3
Gaṅga Graffiti of Satyavarman (2 sides) ... 10, 11
Grant of Rājārāja of the Eastern Chalukya Dynasty: Śaka 944 (4 sides; folding plates) ... 50, 51, 52, 53
Grant of the Eastern Chalukyas. Dated Śaka 1056 (4 sides; folding plates) ... 56, 57, 58, 59
Earthenware Fragment of Guhaṁa of Valabhi ... 75
Sabean Inscription on an incense burner ... 97
The Śūkla Inscription of the Bharhut Stūpa ... 139
Western Chalukya Grant of VīraSatyavaraya (4 sides) ... 141
Modern Ormamental Kufic Alphabet from Kībul ... 183
Gujarāt Rākṣatrākūṭa Grant of Dhrava II; Śaka 757 (4 sides) ... 200, 201
Copper-plate Grant of the Koṅga Dynasty (6 sides) ... 202, 203
Russian Icons (coloured folding plate) ... 207
Portable Braziers (2 sides) ... 206
Kanarese Ballads.—The Insurrection of Ṛṣurṣa of Saṅgīt.—Air of the Chorus ... 206
A Silver Coin of Rādjasaṁbha ... 205
Valabhi Grant of Śīkṣatīya I.; dated Sahra 286 (2 sides; folding plates) ... 208, 209
Chalukya Copper-Plate Grant (2 sides; folding plates) ... 208, 209
Phāl Inscription at Banavasi ... 332
The Date of the Kōja Buddhist Inscription of the Śāṃśata Devadatta ... 333
THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY,
A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH.

VOLUME XIV.—1885.

THE PROBABLE INDIAN ORIGIN OF THE NAMES OF THE WEEK-DAYS.

BY MAJOR-GENERAL A. CUNNINGHAM, C.S.I.

As the names of the week-days play a very important part in the determination of Indian dates, it will be useful to have a list of the principal appellations by which they are known. They are all named after the seven planets, including the sun and moon. The word \( \text{v\text{\char'\^{r}}ra}, \text{\text{v\char'\^{r}}sara}, \text{or dina}, \) “day,” is usually added and prefixed after the name of the planet, as \( \text{Ravi-v\text{\char'\^{r}}ra}, \text{Ravi-\text{v\char'\^{r}}sara}, \text{Ravi-dina}, \) —“on Sunday.” But sometimes simply the name of the planet is in an inflected form, as \( \text{Ravasa}, \) “on Sunday”; \( \text{S\char'\^{r}m\char'\^{e}}, \) “on Monday”; \( \text{Bham\char'\^{e}}, \) “on Tuesday”; \( \text{Budh\char'\^{e}}, \) “on Wednesday”; \( \text{Guru}, \) “on Thursday”; \( \text{Suk\char'\^{e}}, \) “on Friday”; \( \text{Sah\char'\^{e}}, \) “on Saturday.”

The names of the planets which are most commonly used for the week-days, in Indian Inscriptions, are the following:

- **Sunday**—Aditya, Arka, Ravi, Bhānu, Bhāskara, and Phalna. [Also Adžāvra, or the “First day” or “Commencement-day”].
- **Monday**—Sōma, Chandra, Indu, Vidhu.
- **Tuesday**—Maṅgala, Bhauma, Kuja, Mahija, Mahisuta.
- **Wednesday**—Budha, Saumya, Rauhip'éya.
- **Thursday**—Brihaspati, Guru, Surāchārya, Āgīrasa, Vāchaśpati.
- **Friday**—Sukra, Uśanas, Kavi, Daityaguru, Bhrigu, Bhārgava.
- **Saturday**—Sani, Sauri, Śanais̄hara, Kṛityānta.

Although the names of the week-days are clearly derived from those of the seven planets, yet nothing is actually known as to the date when they were first adopted, or as to the people who first made use of them. The Hebrews had their weeks of seven days; but they never got beyond the primitive plan of calling them by their numbers, as the “first day,” the “seventh day,” &c. Dion Cassius says that the custom of naming the days after the seven planets was first adopted by the Egyptians, and had in no very long time been communicated by them to all other nations, especially the Romans. But this statement is open to much doubt; as we know that the Egyptian months were divided into decades, or periods of ten days, and not into weeks, or periods of seven days. Dion Cassius wrote about A.D. 200, long after the names of the week-days had been in common use amongst the Romans. Thus Titubius, B.C. 20, mentions the *Saturni sacra dies*, or ‘day sacred to Saturn’ (Eleg. I. 3-18). So also Julius Frontinus, A.D. 70 to 80, in speaking of the capture of Jerusalem, says that it took place on the same day as “Saturni die quo eis nefas quidquamseries rei aegere” (*Strategemata*, II. 1.) I remember also having read that Julius Caesar esteemed the *dies Veneris* as his lucky day; but I cannot find the authority.

From these notices it seems certain that the
Romans had adopted the names of the seven planets for the week-days, a short time before the beginning of the Christian era.

But there is equally good evidence to show that the week-days, as named after the seven planets, were in use, both in Persia and in India, at the same time as in the west, and perhaps even earlier. We have the testimony of Celsius, who lived during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, that the Persian temples had seven gates, named after the seven planets in regular order, from Saturn to the Sun, with their appropriate metals and colours as follows:—

1st Gate Saturn Lead.
2nd Venus Tin.
3rd Jupiter Brass.
4th Mercury Iron.
5th Mars Mixed metal.
6th Night (Moon) Silver.
7th The Sun Gold.

Here the metals appropriate to Venus and Jupiter have changed places. That of Venus should be copper; while that of Jupiter should be tin.

But the statement regarding the Indian week-days is still more explicit. In the Life of Apollonius by Philostratus, it is said that "the Indian Sage Iarchas gave Apollonius seven "rings, each bearing the name of one of the "Seven Stars; and that he wore them alternately, according to the particular name of the "day." As Philostratus derived his information from the Assyrian Damis, who actually accompanied Apollonius, this notice is contemporary with the date of the travels, between A.D. 20 and 50. The use of the week-days named after the seven stars was, therefore, already established in India at least as early as the beginning of the Christian era.

The order of the days, according to European writers, was derived from the division of the day into 24 hours, and the assignment of each hour to the different planets in succession, in their natural order, according to their distance from the earth,—as Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, and the Moon. This is the arrangement given in the Sûrya-Siddhânta,

XII. 31. The first hour of the 24 was assigned to the Sun, as chief of the planets; the second, to Venus; the third, to Mercury; and so on, in regular succession, until the 25th hour, or first hour of the second day, which falls on the Moon; while the 49th hour falls on Mars; the 73rd, on Mercury; the 97th, on Jupiter; the 121st, on Venus; and the 145th, on Saturn. This arrangement is shown in the annexed diagram, fig. A, in which the progression is retrograde, or contrary to the motion of the Sun, as shown by the arrows inside the circle.

But if the order of the week-days was first developed in India, the process cannot have been based on the division of the day into 24 hours; seeing that the Indians have always divided their day into 60 ghâfs (ghâfī), or periods of 24 minutes each. This division of the day is still in common use in Native States, and amongst Native Pâdâais and astronomers.

The author of the Sûrya-Siddhânta makes no mention of the week-days by name; but he speaks of the "lords of the day," that is, of the planets which give their names to the days of the week.* Unfortunately he gives no instructions as to how these "lords of the day" are to be found. In another place however he speaks of the "regents of the hours" (hîrû) as occurring in downward order from Saturn.

But the process with the 60 ghâfs of India, would be similar to that with the 24 hours of Europe. Taking the Sun as the lord of the first ghâf of the 1st day,—the 61st ghâf, or the first ghâf of the 2nd day, would fall on the Moon; the lord of the 21st ghâf, or 3rd day, would be Mars; of the 181st ghâf, or 4th day, Mercury; of the 241st ghâf, or 5th day, Jupiter; of the 301st ghâf, or 6th day, Venus; and of the 361st ghâf, or 7th day, Saturn. This arrangement is shown in the annexed diagram, fig. B, in which the seven planets are arranged exactly in the same order as in diagram A, while the number of ghâfs is counted in the direct order of the Sun's progress, as shown by the arrows inside the circle.

---

1 Quoted from Origen in Maurice's Indian Antiquities.
2 See the very curious book of Petrus Arlelias de Scudalupius, entitled Symphonia Socratica Vel Averroës de Seleculum Lapidum ad Planetas; Paris, 1590. At p. 328
3 Philo. Vit. Apolloni, III. 41.
4 Sûrya-Siddhânta, I. 51.
5 id. XII. 72.
DIAGRAM SHOWING THE PROCESS BY WHICH THE NAMES OF THE WEEK-DAYS WERE DERIVED.

BY DAY OF 24 HOURS.

BY DAY OF 60 GHATIS.

The fact that in India the naming of the days of the week after the seven stars had already been followed by the wearing of rings, "each bearing the name of one of the Seven Stars," to be worn "according to the particular name of the day," seems to point to an early adoption of the system, if not to its actual invention, in India. This custom
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indeed still exists in India, where a man will
wear a red coral ring on Tuesday, the day of
Mars, and a blue sapphire ring on Saturday,
the day of Śani or Saturn, after whom the
gem itself is named Śani-priya, or Saturn's
beloved.

The dedication of the different stones and
the different metals appears to have been
regulated by the colours of the planets them-
selves, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planet</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Stone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturn</td>
<td>blue</td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>amethyst, amethist, jacinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venus</td>
<td>red, tawny</td>
<td>copper</td>
<td>sapphire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jupiter</td>
<td>grey</td>
<td>tin</td>
<td>cornelian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury</td>
<td>black</td>
<td>quicksilver</td>
<td>touchstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mars</td>
<td>green</td>
<td>cutting</td>
<td>bloodstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>crystal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sun</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>diamond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no direct evidence to show the age
of this scheme; but I believe that it must
have been in use in Media and Babylonia for
several centuries before the Christian era.
The account given by Herodotus of the seven
walls of the Median Ecbatana of seven dif-
ferent colours, whether true or false, is at least
as old as the time of Herodotus himself. So
also the description of Belshazzar's feast given
by Daniel,* when “the king, and his princes,
his wives, and his concubines, drank wine and
praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass,
and of iron, of wood, and of stone,” is as
old as the Book of Daniel, whether it be
referred to the time of Nebuchadnezzar or to
that of the Maccabees. Here the gods of gold
and of silver, of brass and of iron, can only
refer to the planets as regents of the
metals. As there is no allusion to this subject
in any of the early classical authors of Greece
or Rome, I conclude that the dedication of the
different stones and metals to the seven plan-
etas must have originated in the East, in the
quarter where they are first found.

At a later date, on the coins of the Indo-
Scythian Kushāns, we have the planets
represented under their personified forms as
heavenly kings, as well as under their elemen-
tal forms as Āgap, fire, Ādī, air, &c.

That the planets, or the regents of the
planets, were accounted kings, we learn from
Hyde, who says, “apud Ethnics planetæ
omnes regum epitetho gaudebant.” So also,
on the Indo-Scythian gold coins, we find the
inscriptions PAO PHOPO and PAO NANA.

THE MAHĀNĀRAYANA-UPANISHAD OF THE BLACK YAJUR-VĒDA.

BY LIEUTENANT-COLONEL G. A. JACOB, BOMBAY STAFF CORPS.

Being engaged in the preparation of a com-
plete concordance to the most important of the
Upanishads, I have recently examined the print-
ed text of that named above, which forms the
tenth Prapāñhaka of the TaittirIya-Āryaka.
By a most fortunate coincidence, a very rich
collection of Upanishads and Dipikās has lately
been added to the library of the Deccan College;
and it now possesses an old and accurate MS.
of Nārāyaṇa's Dipikā on this Upanishad, to-
gether with four MSS. of the text. Of these,
No. 140 of 1879-80 contains the text used by
Nārāyaṇa, and is very valuable. The other
three, No. 10 of 1882-83 and Nos. 133 and 134
of 1880-81, embody the same text, except in
Sections 18-20. The Dipikā, No. 10, and No.
133, were purchased in Gujarat; and the others
are probably from the same province. All
these have been carefully collated with the
printed text edited by Dr. Rājendralāl Mitra
in 1872, and many valuable readings have been
obtained.

The editor of the Āramyaka seems to have
had good materials at his disposal; but it is
questionable whether he made the best possible
use of them. Suffice it to say, that the com-
position of the first Anuvāka of the tenth Book
is certainly unsupported by any MS. now
extant! In publishing a text of this kind,
with a verbal commentary by the renowned
Śāyaṇa, it would seem but common-sense that
the former should, as far as possible, agree
with that used by the commentator. Dr.
Rājendralāl Mitra, however, determined to fol-
low the text of his manuscript A, in spite of the
fact that it differed materially from Śāyaṇa's;
and the result is not encouraging! For ex-
ample, the first Anuvāka proper consists of 140

* Daniel v. 3, 4, and 23.
lines,—33 of which are not in the Bhāṣya which accompanies it, whilst others appear there in a different order. The first Anuvāka of manuscript A evidently ends on page 785, and the pratisākas, or memorial words, follow on page 786; but the second is glued on to it, in a most unseemly fashion, so that the chapters may be in conformity with those of Sāyāṇa.

In some MSS., the text now under notice is styled the Nārāyana-Upanishad; and Sāyāṇa gives it also the name of Yājñikī (तत्र कर्मणां बहुस्यात्मानीभृत्रूच्छिते). In two of the College MSS. it is called the Brīhadnārāyana-Upanishad; whilst in the other three it bears the title adopted at the head of this paper.

Before proceeding to examine the one in hand, it may be well to notice briefly another Upanishad of the same name, but differing entirely as to its contents. It is otherwise known as the Paramatmātvarāhāra-Upanishad (Burnell’s Catalogue of Tanjore MSS., page 34), and commences thus:—

अं श्रीमति-श्रीविद्य्रशतसंहं दृश्यमिति विद्वान: । अव परमात्मा-सरस्वतेः परमात्मा देवाओ यहसंहस्त्रि परमात्माः । सहस्रो अविस्तरभवते परमात्मा भवने महानिवयं प्रवङ्गी परिप्रेयचित्ति भवन्यपरमत्वः सतुस्यं मेवृहिति ॥

The following is a résumé of its contents as appended to each of the eight adhyāyas:—

1. इत्यादिषे-राजनादिरामणिणि पारसतुथ्य-सत्त्वतपरिपत्रुणि नाम परमात्माय:
2. प्रवेदिणि: सत्त्वतपरिपत्रुणि नाम परमात्मायः
3. मूर्तिविश्वासलभस्यपरिपत्रुणि
4. महाभागवतीततकः हृदिपरमात्मान्यदल्लकन्यकप्राणिणि: परमात्मकस्तपरिपत्रुणि
5. संसारसहस्त्रं धनं प्रसर्वभाषाण्यस्तत्त्वात्मासाधिकस्तपरिपत्रुणि
6. परमोऽस्तरस्तपरिपत्रुणि
7. परमोऽस्तरस्तपरिपत्रुणि
8. परमस्तरस्तपरिपत्रुणि

In style and matter it is thus wholly unlike the older Upanishads, and should rather be classed with the later Vedaṇḍic treatises based on those works. There is a MS. of it in the set of 108 Upanishads added to the Deccan College Library last year, and called No. 437 of 1862-83.

Sāyāṇa tells us that the number of Anuvākas in the tenth book of the Tattvātītya-Brāhmaṇa varies from 64 to 89; but that he himself followed for the most part a text consisting of 80 (तत्र वधा पादनरागणि ब्राह्मणोऽवस्मयिना अधिकारेण मृद्धप्रमुखे व्याख्यासाम्यः). Dr. Rājendrānl Mitra’s edition comprises only 64, but seems to exhaust the whole of the Bhāṣya.

The divisions in the College MSS., however, differ from all the above, and they also vary amongst themselves. The Dīpikā divides it into 25 sections, as stated in Nārāyana’s opening words:—महानारायणवेत्त्य तत्त्वतपरिपत्रुणि।

The matter included in each Section, together with the portion that corresponds with it in the printed text, is indicated below:—

1. अंकमयादि (pp. 752-763)
2. एव हि देवी (pp. 763-769)
3. पुरवस्त्र विप्रहि (pp. 769-770)
4. नायकरुमयादि (pp. 770-771)
5. पुनालय्यमक (pp. 778-780)
6. अवकाशमयादि (pp. 786-791)
7. भूःमयादि (pp. 791-797)
8. ब्रह्मनरायण (pp. 804-813)
9. ब्रह्मदेवानां (pp. 813-820)
10. चतुर्थमन (pp. 820-821)
11. परमलार (pp. 821-822)
12. ब्रह्म (pp. 822-834)
13. पूजन (pp. 834-842)
clerical error. The Dipika explains it thus: अनमिदे अनितीयां यन्त्रां मय्यांत्र इत्यदद्य मय्यां। The other reading is very common, however, and I found it in four MSS. which I borrowed in the city of Poona; but how meaningless!

2. Page 756. यम्यां: समुद्देव वेदी वेदी वेदी instead of यम्यां: समुदेव वेदी वेदी - A, B, C, D, E. It is not noticed in E.

3. Same page, निर्माण for निर्माण - A, B, C, D, E.

4. Page 764. निर्माण for निर्माण - A, B, C, D, E.

5. Page 765. स्वरुः: विरुष्क for स्वरुः: विरुष्क - A, B, C, D.

6. Page 768. दिशा दिखा for दिशा दिखा - A, B, C, D.

7. Page 768. हिन्द for हिन्द - A, B, C, D.

8. Page 769-772. The invocations in imitation of the Gâyatrî differ considerably from those in the printed text. The latter has only 12, whilst the Dipika gives 18. Their order is as follows:

9. Page 773. धारिता देवि instead of धारिता देवि - A, B, C, D, E. - देवि धारिता देवि श्रावि श्रावि श्रावि श्रावि - E.

10. Page 773. The Anushtup line beginning with मृत्तिका: lacks four syllables. They are supplied by A, B, C, D, which read thus: मृत्तिकाः परित्तिकाः च, &c. The four Poona city MSS. already referred to agree with the printed text; so the omission is evidently of ancient date.


13. Page 777 and 779. निर्माण instead of निर्माण - A, B, C, D.

15. Page 781. एव सर्वस्व भूस्य भये मुख-नये गीता। एव पुष्करणू मेण्यून गिराप्रय।—
A, C, D, E. B omits सर्वस्व. The Dīpikā annotates thus:— एव सर्वस्वेष्ठ मुख-मुखान्यान्नत्तं।
16. Page 784. रशी मुखस्तारत्यस्त वस्ते रशीभुभूस्य मां वायुस्य, —A, B, C, D, E. Sāyaṇa’s explanation of this passage is wonderful. Here is Nārāyaṇa’s:— रशी मल्ल मुखमुम्बूर्जते। हे कण वा रावपूर्णमिकान्तव। दर्शनी-स्मरणान्तिक: स्मारा कुः: रशी नाथ्येतक्ष:।
17. Page 785. आदनसमुहूः इस्तेऌत आदनसमुहूः:—B, C, D, E.
18. Page 788. दुर्गोऽविनि इस्तेऌत दुर्गोऽविनि:—A, D, E. This is a very interesting reading, and seems far superior to that of the printed text, with which, however, B and C agree. It is thus explained by Nārāyaṇa:—
19. Page 789. आदनसमुहूः यस्मात् आदनसमुहूः, —A, C, E. B: वथ्यां भविष्य अनिष्कर्षीय विषय प्रज्ञानमर्गमात्रा निष्कर्षात् तु दोषे दुर्गोऽविनि।
20. Page 790. मनःकिर्म्यं प्रमाणो, —A, B, C, D, E. मनः: तत्र मनः: प्रमाणोऽविनि कं निश्चितं अनेकोपमा यात् योगिश्च। सुन्य: सत्याच्योऽहं:।
21. Anuvāda 6. शाब्दायं गायत्रिः गायत्रिः। अस्या शाब्दायं वाचायं:।—E. धर्मः इस्तेते।—A, B, C, D, E.
22. Anuvāda 8. उपस्य इस्तेते, —A, B, C, D, E.
23. Anuvāda 9. यद्वेबैतृत्याः:—E. यद्वेबैतृत्याः। शब्देषु स शब्देषु सम्बधे इत्यं स दलिताधिः।—E. वदुत्तेव, —A, B, C.
24. Page 802. भूमिकात निषिद्धता: इस्तेते। भूमिकात निषिद्धता। —B, C, E.
26. Page 811. मिमिश्यं इस्तेते। मिमिश्यं:—A, B, C, D, E.
27. Page 818. ब्रह्माण्यात्, —A, B, C, D, E.
28. Page 825. इवं तकान्त्यायाः इस्तेते। इवं तकान्त्यायाः:—A, B, C, D, E.
29. Page 828. शुभागायं इस्तेते। शुभागायं, —A, C, D, E.
30. Page 836. उपस्यात् उपस्यात् इस्तेते:—A, B, C, D, E.
31. Anuvāda 17. Sāyaṇa’s interpretation of कृष्णायं इस्तेते:—सवैः सवैः इस्तेते। इस्तेते:—A, B, C, D, E.
32. Page 868. दुर्गोऽविनि इस्तेते:—A, B, C, D, E.
33. Anuvāda 59. िनिषिद्ध इस्तेते, —A, B, C, D, E.
34. Anuvāda 59. वाक्यावयं इस्तेते, —A, B, C, D, E.
35. Page 896. न भून्ते स च भून्ते विभासीतीजेन मात्रादिः।—E. समाधिमित्याह कृपयाः। तत्त्वस्य पुरस्त ‘विभासा भासुमित्तत्व’। इस्तेते। इस्तेते।—E.
36. Page 897. भूमिकात इस्तेते। भूमिकात इस्तेते। इस्तेते। इस्तेते।—A, B, C, D, E.

These, then, are some of the most important readings obtained from the College manuscripts. I have said nothing of the passages which they add to the printed text. I am anxious to publish the entire text with Nārāyaṇa’s Dīpikā. The five MSS. now in my possession (for which I am indebted to the courtesy and friendly co-operation of Professor Blümíkar), would amply suffice for the text of the Upānishad; but for that of the Dīpikā at least one more manuscript would be necessary. I trust it may be forthcoming.
SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo. C.S., M.B.A.S., C.I.E.

(Continued from Vol. XIII. p. 276.)

NO. CLI.

BYANĀ STONE-INSRIPTION OF THE

ADHIRĀJA VIJAYA.—SAMVAT 1100.

Byanā,—the ‘Byana’ of maps; in Lat. 26° 55' N. and Long. 77° 21' E.,—is the chief town of the Thalis of the same name in the Bharatpur State in Rājputāna.

About two miles to the south-west, and situated at the junction of the lands of Bhānā and three other villages, there is a large and ancient hill-fort called Bījāyagāth or Bījēgadh, i.e. Vijayagāth or the hill-fort of victory. There are several old temples and other remains in the fort,—the principal one being the temple that is called Bījāyamandir or Bījēmendir, i.e. the temple or hall of victory. But the chief object of interest is a red sandstone Lātī, standing inside the walls of the fortress, towards the south-east, which has on it an ancient inscription of the Vārika king Vishāuvardhana, dated on the tenth day of the dark fortnight of the month Phalguna, in the year 428 of some unspecified era. On the occasion of my visit, my servants discovered, built into the inner side of the fort-wall near this Lātī, a small stone containing a still more ancient inscription; but, unfortunately it is a mere fragment, and all that it discloses is that it is the commencement of a Sanskrit inscription of a Mahārāja and Mahāśēṇapati, whose name is lost, of the Yau[dh]ēya gaṇa or tribe.

Inside the town of Byanā, there are two old Hindu temples, now used by the Musalmāns as Masjids,—each with a Sanskrit inscription in it. The inscription that I now publish, is on a pillar on the left hand near the entrance of the unnamed temple which is described in Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. VI. p. 51ff., and which the inscription shews to have belonged in the eleventh century A.D. to the Jains. The writing covers a space of about 1' 1½" high by 8" broad, and is well preserved, except for a few letters that have been worn away, apparently by the sharpening of knives at the sides; the only letters, however, that cannot be restored with certainty are one at the end of line 13, and one at the beginning of line 14. The characters are Nāgarī, of the period to which the inscription refers itself.

Commencing with an invocation of the Siddhas or Saints, the inscription proceeds to record that, in the kingdom of the Adhirāja Vijaya (line 5), at the city of Śrīpatāḥ (l. 6), there was the Śāri or Jain teacher Mahēśvara (l. 4), a leader of the Śeśāmbaras, and belonging to the Kāmaka garhēkha or sect (l. 3), who occupied the seat of Vishuṇūrī (l. 2), i.e. who was the successor, or a successor, of Vishuṇūrī. Lines 6 to 11 record that Mahēśvarasūri died when the year one thousand and one hundred was drawing to its close, when the waning fortnight of the month Bhādrapada was current, and when the second lunar day of the dark fortnight, coupled with the name of the moon, was passing away. Lines 12 to 17 describe how Mahēśvarasūri’s fame, like the river Gaṅgī, flowed through the three worlds. And lines 17 and 18 record that this prāṣasti was engraved by the Śādhu Sarvadēva in the year 1100, on the same day, viz. Chandravāra, or Monday, the second day of the bright fortnight of the month Bhādra.

The Adhirāja Vijaya mentioned in this inscription seems, from his title, to be only a local chieflain, whose name is preserved in the local traditions as Vijayapāla, and who is said to have rebuilt and added to the fort, and to have named it after himself.

The mention of the city of Śrīpatāḥ in this inscription, and of the little pavilion standing in Śrīpatāḥ, in the inscription at the ‘Ukha-Mandār’ which I shall notice below,

July A.D. 1841.—This is according to the southern computation, with the year beginning in Kērtika. According to the northern computation, with the year beginning in Chaitra, the corresponding English date would be Wednesday, the 27th July, A.D. 1843,—Unless we assume that this inscription was composed by a visitor from the south, this instance seems to show that the southern computation was the one in force in, at any rate, this part of Rājputāna.

1 For some reason or other, which I could not ascertain, this fort is entered in maps under the name of Badalgarh-Kot.—The proper name of it is Bījāyagāth,—not Bījēyamandirgadh, as Mr. Carliyle gives it.
2 Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. VI. p. 50 and Plate viii.—The era is probably that of the kings of Mālava; see ante Vol. XIII. p. 163.
3 For a facsimile, see Indian Inscriptions No. 7.
* The corresponding English date is Monday, the 30th
point very clearly to the ancient Sanskrit name of Bānā being Śrīpathā.

This inscription has been noticed in some detail by Mr. A. C. L. Carllley,6 who deduces from it, "with some difficulty," the following remarkable genealogy of kings: —

Sri Vishnu Sāryāsana.
(A.D. 970 ?)

| Sri Nabhāmyaka, or Mat-Kāmyaka ?
(A.D. 995 ?)

| Sri Mansūri Maheswar.
(A. D. 1030)

| Sri Vijayaḍhā-rāja nripatē.
Sri Sri Pagāyāśaṇīr.
(Samvat 1100.—A.D. 1043)

with an expression of "doubt as to whether the long string of titles last mentioned refer to one or to two individuals." I quote this genealogy as an instance of the utter futility of a certain class of writing, unfortunately invested with the authority of Government publication, which can serve no possible purpose, except to mislead.7 The name of the first of these imaginary kings, is, in the original, simply a locative case meaning "in the seat of the holy Vishnuśūri." The second name simply comes from a misunderstanding of the word śrīmat, "glorious or holy," coupled with Kāmyaka, the name of the gachchha or sect that is referred to. The third name, which Mr. Carllley translates by "the fortunate Mansūri, the great lord," is made up of a mixture of the words śrīnāya-śrī-Mahēśvara, "the glorious, or holy, Śrī Mahēśvara." And the second string of "titles" attached to the fourth name, is, in the original, simply two locative cases in apposition, which mean "at the glorious city of Śrīpathā." Mr. Carllley further deduces, from part of the passage recording the date,—viz. from the words Soma-sa[hi]ta krishṇā dviṭiya, which mean "the second day of the dark fortnight, coupled with (the name of) the moon,"—that the Aḍhirāja Vijaya was "moon-produced, or of the Lunar race, and a second Krishna."

In connection with his account of Bānā, Mr. Carllley has devoted eleven pages of print to the object of shewing that the name is derived from that of the demon Bānāsura, who was overthrown by Kṛṣṇa. At my visit to the place, I could find out nothing about the derivation of the name Bānā, except that the fuller and older form of it was Bānāyānā.8 But Mr. Carllley's derivation of it from Bānāsura may be dismissed with the remark that his arguments in support of it are based on nothing except his inability to recognize the difference between bānā, 'an arrow,' vana, 'a forest,' bāgu (for bāhū), 'an arm,' bhaun (mahēśha), 'a buffalo,' and Bais, the name of a tribe, and between asura, 'a demon,' sūra, 'a hero,' sūri, 'a learned man' or 'a Jain teacher,' and siṣya, 'the sun.'

Mr. Carllley also states that the ancient name of Bijayagadh was "Śāntipura." The name of Śāntipura may be connected with the locality; I can only say that, on the occasion of my visit, I could not obtain any information in support of it. But this much is certain,—that the name Śāntipura does not occur in the other inscription at Bānā, at the foot of a pillar in the 'Ukha-Mandar.'9 Of this inscription only the first twenty-seven or so letters of each of the twenty-three lines of which it consists are visible, the rest of the stone being inaccessible through being permanently built in below the bottom of the pillar, and the part that is accessible being a good deal damaged in places. The inscription is in the Sanskrit language, and in Nāgāri characters of the Kāśita type, probably a century, or perhaps two centuries, older than the inscription of the Aḍhirāja Vijaya.10 It is an inscription of a local ruler named Maṅgalaśaḷāja (line 12); and, being a Vaiṣṇava prāṣasti (l. 19), composed by the Karaṇika Śrīṣakti (l. 23), it shows that this temple was originally one of p. 82, and deduced from this and another inscription at Māṅgha, must be equally imaginative and misleading.

The name is now disyllabic, Bānā,—not triasyllabic, Bānāsa, Bānāsa, or Bānasah, as Mr. Carllley writes it.

6 Arch. Surv. Ind. Vol. VI. p. 53, with a lithograph, but by no means a facsimile, in Plate vi.
7 Another similar instance is the genealogical table of "sovereign Rajas" given in id. p. 240, and deduced from some inscriptions at Bijoli; the names given here are, in reality, simply those of a succession of Jain bhūṭha-rākas or saints.—And, judging from the extraordinary version of the text, and interpretation of it, given in id. p. 73, of an inscription at Māṅgha (see id. Plate vi.), the whole of the genealogy given in id.
the god Vishnu. In line 5, there are the words kriṣṭa-ripur-ahā, “having made omenated his enemies, there was (a king)”; and, in line 10, the words pravideṣa-sūrya-purāṇa, “(an army) entering the city of its foes;” it must be in these two passages that Mr. Carleyle read the name of Śantipura in this inscription, as there is nothing else at all approaching to it. In line 21, there are the words dramān-śrīmān dattē prati-divasena Śrīpathā-śamadāraka, which seem to shew very clearly that the ancient name of Byañā was Śrīpatāhā.

TEXT.

[1] Om Om Namah siddhābhyaḥ || Asin= nirvritak-ā
[2] nvay-aika-tilakaḥ śrī-Vishnusūrya-śasanē śrīma-
[3] t-Kāmyaka-gachchha-tāra-kapatha-śvētāmśamun-vi-
[5] ra-grāmanī || rājyē śrī-Vijay-ādhikājana-ṛipapa-
[7] sānaḥ saharsa-sahitaṃ sanavatsaratāṃ drautaṃ mya-
[8] mā Bhādrapadāḥ sa bhadrā-padaviṃ māsaḥ sa
[9] mārohaṇaḥ || sāya-sāya kshayam-ētu soma-sa-
[10] [hi]tā krishṇā dvitiva tithiḥ [*] paṇcha-śrī-para[m]jē
[11] [sthiti]-niṣṭhāna-bādayāḥ prāptō divaṃ yatra saḥ || [A]-
[12] [pi] cha ||(I) Kṛttir-kīrati-kīnta-dāntamukālaḥ pro[dbhū]-
[13] [ta]-lāśya-krameṇ | kvāpi Himādri-muṣ.*
[16] [m]yausti bhuvana-trayaṃ nāripāna-śāyāṃ ādivi na śrīma-
[17] [t(i)] Saṁ 1100 Bāhira va di 2 Chaṁdrē kalyāṇaka-di-
[18] [nē] prāṣastir-yaśa śādu-Saṁvadāvaṇ-ātikṛṣṇa-eti ||

No. CLIII.

CHICACOLE PLATES OF THE
MARĀḤĀ SAVAYARMAṆ.

This is the Gaṅga grant of Satyavarman, of which I have spoken in Vol. XIII. page 274. It is the last of those that were found, with the grant of Nandaprabhaṇjanavarman, No. CXXXVIII., Vol XIII. p. 487, at ‘Chicacoole’ in the ‘Gaṅjaam’ District of the Madras Presidency, and were presented by Mr. Graham to the Madras Museum. I edit it from the original plates, which I obtained through the kindness of Mr. Sewell, C.S.

The plates are three in number, each about 7° long by 2½° broad. The edges of them were raised into rims, to protect the writing, and the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation throughout; but some of the letters are choked with hard rust to such an extent that it was impossible to clear them out properly, and consequently they shew rather imperfectly in the lithograph. The ring, on which the plates are strung, is about 7½° 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 the surface of the seal itself,—in the centre, a bull, couchant to the proper right, with the moon above it, an elephant-god behind it, and a floral device below it. The characters are primarily of what Dr. Burrell has named the South-Indian Nāgarā type. But they present, at the same time, many characteristics of the Grantha alphabet, and also many forms of a still earlier period. There is, in fact, hardly any letter in this grant which does not appear under at least two forms,—compare, for instance, a in amara line 1, and ā in line 26; u in utarēṣa 26, and utpala 27; k in kāṭika 1. 2, and aika 1. 4; three forms of ga in nagara 1. 2, and tyclopedia and gusā 1. 10; cha in chakrā and chāḍāmaṇi 1. 8; ja in jaya 1.

From an inpression.

Metre, Śrīdēvaśavikrīda; and is the following two verses.

This syllable reeds as sa; but it is damaged, and may therefore be really something else. The proceeding syllable myā is certainly a mistake. The probability is that the text, before the second syllable was damaged,

18 From an inpression.
19 Metre, Śrīdēvaśavikrīda; and is the following two verses.
20 This line was at first omitted, and then inserted, rather small, above the line.
21 No. 159 in Mr. Sewell’s List of Copper-plate grants. Noted by me, ante Vol. X. p. 266, No. 5.
22 South-Indian Palaeography, Plate xiv.
GANGA GRANT OF SATYAVARMA.

[Image of ancient texts and a seal]
7, and ṛṇījīta l. 8; four forms of ta, in viditān l. 15, tilaka l. 13, janita l. 7, and vijayavataḥ l. 2; three forms of na, in naya l. 9, nagara l. 2, and śāmanita l. 7; three forms of pa, in prabhā l. 8, and prātāpā l. 7; ba in balabhurī l. 28, and byda l. 27; bha in balabhurī and dādēha l. 28; three forms of ma in amara l. 1, prāṇāḍā l. 6, and kamala l. 5; ya in vijayavataḥ l. 2, and jaya l. 7; three forms of ra in amara and rama-nīyā l. 1, and dāhāra l. 11; la in kulāchālō l. 9; three forms of ta in viṣhayā l. 14, serrva l. 1, and bhavayā l. 4; sa in āśīl l. 24, and āśīl at the commencement of the same line; as in serrva l. 1, and saurya l. 10; and ha in agrahāra l. 18, and mahārāja l. 13.

The language is Sanskrit throughout, and the style is almost the same as that of the grant of Dēvendravarman, No. OL., Vol. XIIII. p. 273f. The weight of the three plates is 91 tolas, and of the ring and seal, 53½ tolas,—total, 144½ tolas.

The order recorded in this inscription is issued, as in the three grants of Indravarman and the grant of Dēvendravarman, from the victorious camp or residence situated at the city of Kaliṅga-nagara (line 2), by the glorious Satya-varmadēva (l. 14), —who has had the stains of the Kali age removed by performing obeisance to the god Śiva under the name of Gokaraśavāmin (l. 5), established on the pure summit of the mountain Mahēndra (l. 2); —who has acquired the supremacy over the whole of Kalīgā by the edge of his sword (l. 11); —who is a most devout worshipper of the god Mahēśvara (l. 12); —and who is the son of the Mahārāja Dēvendravarman (l. 13), the glory of the family of the Gaṅgas. It is addressed to the Kuṭunbē residing at the village of Tāru-grāma (l. 14) in the Gaḷeḷa (l. 14) or Gaḷeḷai (l. 34) viṣaya; and it records that, on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun (l. 17), the said village was constituted an agrahāra, of the grūmadēva or tutelary village-god, and was given to Kamālāsa, the son of the Gaṅga Khaṇḍyama. The boundaries of the village are described in lines 22 to 27. Lines 27 to 32 contain three of the usual benedictory and imprecatory verses. Lines 34 and 35 contain, as in the grant of Dēvendravarman, the date of the fifty-first (year) of the centuries of years of the Gaṅga e yā lineage. And line 35 further records that the charter, was both written or composed, and engraved, by Viṭapa, the son of Khaṇḍyama.

TEXT.*

First plate.

[1] ᪡m || Svasti Apara-marāpur-śamabāya[h*]sarva-varta-sukā(kha)-ramani(g) ᪡a
[2] yād=vijayavata[h*] Kaliṅga-naśa(ga)ra-vāsakāh(t) Mahēndra-[Å*]chālmāna
[3] a-si(kh)khara-pratishthi(h)yasa schara-schara-gurūh sakā
[4] la-bhravasa-nirmanāh(ai)a-svaradharāśa śaśa(h)ka-śhā

Second plate ; first side.

[7] saṃkhaṭhāḥ-banita-jayāśāvda(bda)-pratāpā(ā)panata-samasta-samantā
[8] chakrā-chuḍāmaṇi-prabha-manjā(ā)nja(ā)ra-panja(ā)ra-jānta[ā] vara-charanāṅ śita-kum
[9] muda-kund-ādvā-dā(ya)kadā-[yaśā]*dhvasta-ārāti-kulāchāl naya-vinaya-dayā-Ď
[12] ḍhīra-yāṣa para-ma-mēbāvar māṭapitra(tā)-pād-śudhyātē

Second plate ; second side.

[14] vṛmampa-sūnu[ā]* śrī-Satya-varmadēvā[ā]* Gaḷeḷa-viṣhayā Tāru
[15] grāma-vāsinaḥ kuṭumvi(māḥ)ah samājāpayati Viditām-aṭa
[16] vō yath-sāyaṁ mayā vidita-sakala-paramārttha-tat[ā]*vēna abhi-

*See ante, Vol. XIIIII. p. 274.
* From the original plates. * From the original plates. * Read chēḷāmaṇer. First mā ś was engraved, and then it was corrected into maneḥ.
* Read viṣṭa-sarvu. * Read ṛṇījīta. * This mā was at first omitted,—apparently from uncertainty on the part of the engraver as to what the akṣara was, since a space was left for it,—and was then inserted in much smaller characters than the rest of the inscription, and partly above the line of writing.
A NOTE ON THE EARLY KADAMBA INSCRIPTIONS.

BY K. B. PÁTHAK, D.A., MiraJ.

Ten copper-plate grants of this Dynasty have been published by Mr. Fleet,—in Vol. VI. p. 22ff., and in Vol. VII. p. 33ff., of this Journal. They contain two points of interest, as yet unnoticed, which I propose now to discuss.

The first of these points is the occurrence of the phrase átumadāsya-yañānaḥ in Dēva-varman’s grant. The language of this inscription is so clear that it will convince anyone that the grantor, Dēva-varman, was a devout adherent of the Jaina creed. Now it is quite inconsistent with the principles of Jainism that a Jaina king should, as an ordinary thing, speak of his ancestor as a performer of horse-sacrifices.

Those who are acquainted with the less trodden paths of Jaina literature, will know that shortly after the nirīkṣā of the Tīrtha-kāra Manisuvrata, a fierce dispute arose between the Brāhmaṇas and the Jinas in the matter of sacrifices. The former insisted on the continuance of yajñas; while the latter protested against this iniquity, as it was a clear violation of the principle ahiṣṭā paraṁ dharmaḥ.

Guptabhadrāchārya, who lived before Śaka 820, dwells at some length on this subject in the Utarapurāṇa. He says—

The Gaṅga king Cāmunda-raja or Mārasimha, who finished his work in Śaka 900, the Īśvara saṁvatāra, says—

Mahākālana vañcchaneyan-ariyade vihit-Āda(tha)rvana-vēda-nirûpitamun vividha-

Read bhunadhyaḥ. 11 Read diśi. 12 Read diśi.
13 The lithograph fails to show completely the lower part of the p.
14 Read dviti. 15 Read vāsiṣṭha.
prāgni-hūnā-sakahanamum-appa yāgamaṁ nirvartiti namakakke vṛgyi Sagara-kulam-iintu nihisēśhaṁ keṭṭudu.—

"Unable to see through the tricks of Mahākāla, Sagara performed a sacrifice, which is described in the wicked Atharva-vēda, and which has for its characteristic the killing of various animals, and went to hell; his whole race was thus destroyed."

This will convince the reader that no Jaina could attribute to his father, with any thing like a feeling of pride, the performance of horse-sacrifices. And yet this is precisely what Dēvavarmā does in respect of his father, Kriṣhayovaṃ. This inconsistency on the part of Dēvavarmā can only be accounted for by supposing that Kriṣhayovaṃ had been a follower of Brāhmaṇism in his earlier years, and that he embraced Jainism only in the latter part of his life. His popularity with the people rested on the performance of horse-sacrifices. This important incident in his life could not, of course, be omitted in the grant. Besides it is quite possible that any inconsistency in respect of this point would entirely escape Dēvavarmā’s notice, as his family had been only recently converted to Jainism.

The second point is the following:—Kākusthovaṃ issued his grant "in the 50th year of his victory." This is the literal rendering of the expression, svu-vaijyāśe aśītītaṁ sūvataśaḥ. Applied literally, these words would mean that Kākustha himself won the victory. But, if we suppose that he was only 15 when he gained the victory, he would of course be 95 years old,—and still a Yuvārdja, too, according to the inscription,—at the time of issuing the grant; and his father would then be more than 112 years old, at the lowest computation. This can hardly be accepted as possible. Nor, again, as he describes himself as Yuvārdja at the time of making the grant, can we suppose that he was crowned when an infant, and that the victory was achieved for him by his generals. The expression is plainly not to be interpreted in this way at all; and we must understand it as referring to a victory won, not by Kākusthovaṃ, but by one of his ancestors.

Now in Dēvavarmā’s grant, ll. 4 and 5, we read:—

"[5] Sāmanta-vaijyāśe-ratnas-cellā (syā) Nāgajān-ākramya-dīy-anubhūtasya śarā-damala-


This is Mr. Fleet’s reading, which I adopt as the most correct one. In the interpretation of the fourth line, however, I beg to differ from him. The words in this line may be better separated thus:—Sāmanta-vaijyāśe-ratna-su-Nāgajān-ākramya dīy-anubhūtasya.

And the two lines may be better translated thus:—"Of the prosperous Kriṣhayovaṃ, who possessed the sole umbrella resembling the moon that has risen in the cloudless sky of autumn, and who enjoyed the heritage, after having conquered the good Nāgajān, who were jewels among excellent feudatory kings."

This conquest of the Nāgas or Nāgas must be the one that is alluded to in the expression svu-vaijyāśe aśītītaṁ sūvataśaḥ in Kākustha’s grant. And the result is that Kākusthovaṃ and his descendants were subsequent to Kriṣhayovaṃ and Dēvavarmā,—but also that not more than about thirty years can have intervened between Kriṣhayovaṃ’s victory and Kākusthovaṃ’s grant, and consequently that Kākusthovaṃ must have been either of the same generation with, or only very slightly subsequent to, Dēvavarmā.

In ancient times the Nāgas were a powerful race. Their sway was by no means confined to the Karnāṭaka. They were the terror of the people of Kāśmir. Thus we read in the Būja-taravājīpya I. 179:—

मुख्ये विपुलाचारे विचुचुवलालिभिरः।
नेगे संवरयथं प्रमुद्धितमविषयः।।

After their subjugation by Kriṣhayovaṃ, the Nāga kings evidently continued to rule as feudatories of the Kadambs. For, many years later we find Bhānuṣakti acknowledging the sovereignty of Harivarman. When the confederacy of the Kadambs was destroyed

* ante, Vol. VI, p. 23.
* The correction of su into sva is not expedient, as it would make Krishṇavarmā at once "a jewel among chief-sons" and "lord of the sole umbrella."
* The epithet Bhuja-ṣad-ṣad-ṣaṃsāra-ṣad-ṣad-asamāndra is also applied to the Nāgas.—ante, Vol. VII, p. 106.

* For other notices of the Nāgas, who are treated as playing a very important part in the early history of Kāśmir, see Rujavantapāñjīpya I. 28ff., 89, 111, 135, and 202 ff.—J.E.F.
* ante, Vol. VI, p. 31.
by Kiritvarman I, the Nāga kings transferred their allegiance to the Chalukyas. Accordingly we find, as their vassals, Durgāsakti in the time of Satyāśraya, Dēvaśakti in the time of Vikramāditya I, and Pogill in the time of Vinayāditya I.¹⁰

AN OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTION AT TÉRDĀL,

BY K. B. PĀTHAK, B.A.; MIRAJ.

Térdāl is a large village belonging to the Sāgīli State in the Southern Marāṭhā country. In the Jaina basti at this place, there is a stonetablet, containing an inscription consisting of three separate parts.

The first part, which ends in line 56, records a grant made by the Mandalika Gohkidēvaras or Gōkika, in Saka 1045 (A.D. 1123-24), to the Ālak Nōminatha, established by himself, and mentions, as contemporaries of his, the Western Chalukya emperor Vīkrāmaditya VI, and his feudatory Kāratvīrya II of the Raṇa family of Saundatti and Belgaum. The word ṛṇṭa, according to Trivikrama, is a Prākrit form of the Sanskrit vāśṭra; and it must have been assumed as a family title by Kāratvīrya and his predecessors, in honour of the Rāṣṭrajāta emperor Kṛishṇa II, whose descendants they professed to be.

The Sāmanta Nimba, mentioned in line 33, is the same person who is spoken of as Nimbarāja in the Kōhāpur inscriptions and is praised by Padmanandi, the pupil of Subhacandra, as the "crest-jewel of Sāmantas," in the concluding prāakṣi of the Ēkavatapati. Most of the Jaina ascetics mentioned in this inscription are well known as authors among the Jainas, who cherish their memory and read their works to this day.

But the great importance of this part of the inscription lies in this, that it enables us to clear up the mystery that hangs over the authorship of the Rāghavaśāntara.

¹) ante, Vol. VII. p. 106.
²) Dynasties of the Kanaresa Districts, p. 10.
¹⁰) Bhrānasakti, Durgāsakti, Dēvaśakti, and Pogill, were Śēndra or Śēndraka chiefants; but the Lakehnēswar inscription—which mentions Durgāsakti—and his father, Kūndasakti, and grandfather, Vijayaśakti,—tells us that the Śēndraka belonged to the lineage of the Bhujagēndrās or Serpent-Kings.—A copper-plate grant, recently brought to my notice by Paœit Bhagwānil Indrāji, gives us also the name of the Śēndraka chiefant Vallabhāsaṇa-Ānandāraja, who was the maternal uncle of the Western Chalukya king Pulēkūn II.—J.F.F.

The student of ancient Kanarese literature knows that Abhinava-Pampa speaks of Śruttakṛtti-Traividya as the author of the poem in question. Mr. Rice rightly conjectures that Śruttakṛtti must have been a contemporary of Pampa himself. But neither Mr. Rice nor Mr. Kittel is able to tell us the date of Pampa. At the end of the Kanarese commentary on the Śamādhītakaka, however, Mōghachandra says that he wrote his work—vītā-yāsīl-nīlī śīkṣāna sutaṁyhe tīrīya-vānita pochha-pasa-karnadudāri—"in very modern Kanarese, so that the son of Pampa, an ocean of fame spread everywhere, could understand it." Mōghachandra, therefore, was a contemporary of Pampa. And Mōghachandra's son, Vīraṇandi, finished his writing of the Ācārāsāra in Saka 1076, the Śrīmukha samvatara, on Monday the first day of the bright fortnight of Jayaśṭha. From this, it is easy to conclude that Pampa lived shortly before Saka 1076. The date of our inscription, which mentions Śruttakṛtti-Traividya in line 34, is Saka 1045. The interval between this and the composition of the Ācārāsāra, is thirty-one years. Śruttakṛtti-Traividya must have written his work shortly after Saka 1045. But, as he did not put his real name to the composition, the authorship of the Rāghavaśāntara must have been a secret, even to his contemporaries. And Pampa, who, as a Jaina and a poet must have come into contact with him, has done well in preserving this interesting fact about the authorship of it.¹¹

¹¹) known as the work of Dhananjiya. At the end of the 8th chapter we read—

And the concluding verse of the 1st chapter runs thus—

From this it is plain that Śruttakṛtti-Traividya and Dhananjiya were names of one and the same writer. Nor is it necessary to mention here that the author of the Dhananjiya-kṣaṇa was a Digambara Jaina of the Kārolśaka.
The second part of the inscription, commencing in line 56 and ending in line 68, records a grant made by Śvēminis, of the Virabapaśṭu sect, to the same god Neminātha in Saka 1104 (A.D. 1182-83). This sect is mentioned in several inscriptions; and its members generally represent themselves as worshippers of the Jain goddess Padmavati. But to this rule there is an exception, in the Dambal Buddhist inscription, in which the āsira invoke Tārādevī. From a comparison of this Buddhist inscription with others that mention the Virabapaśṭu sect, we naturally arrive at the conclusion that, when the Buddhists could not hold their own against rival sects, they must have exchanged the ākāśa for the anākāśa doctrine, as the religion of Pārśva and Mahāvīra was much nearer to that of Šākyasimha than any form of Bhāmaṇīpik that acknowledged the divine authority of the Vīdas. Dr. Burgess correctly points out (ante, Vol. X, p. 273), that Tārā is a Buddhist goddess. But, when he asserts that the Baudhāyas would go over to the Luṅgagāya religion in preference to Jainism, he falls into an anachronism; for, in the time of Vikramaditya VI, such a thing as Luṅgagāyaism did not exist. He further asserts that the Jain Bapaṭṭigas are joined, in this Dambal inscription, with outcasts and Chāpāthas. But, in this, he has evidently misunderstood the expression Balaṇaṇī-γau-γolā, which can only mean the staff used by the Vīra-Balaṇaṇīgās in measuring land. There is a third assertion made by him, which will be discussed in a separate paper on Tārādevī and the interesting part she played in the history of Jainism.

The third part of the inscription, commencing in line 68, records a grant made to the same god by the Dāṇḍānyaka Bhāyiddēva, in Saka 1109 (A.D. 1187-88).

In line 64 there occurs the phrase Kōṇḍa-kūndānaya. Kōṇḍakūṇḍa, or Kūṇḍakūṇḍa, was one of the most celebrated Jain authors.

The works attributed to him are the Prābhātisātra, the Pravachanasātra, the Samayṣātra, the Bāyanasātra, and the Dvādaṣṭānuprākṛtaḥ. These are all written in Jain Prākṛta. Bālachandra, the commentator, who lived before Abhinava-Pampa, says, in his introductory remarks on the Prābhātisātra, that Kūṇḍakūṇḍa was also called Padmanandit, and was the preceptor of Śivakunāra-mahārāja. I would identify this king with the Early Kadamba king Śrī-vijaya-Siva-Mrigēṣa-mahārāja. For, in his time, the Jains had already been divided into the Nīgranthas and the Śvetapātas. And Kūṇḍakūṇḍa attacks the Śvetapāta sect when he says, in the Pravachanasātra, that women are allowed to wear clothes because they are incapable of attaining nirvāṇa:

रिवते विरा माया तत्त्व नापि विनोगरं॥

Another interesting fact that we learn from his works is, that, in the time of this author, Jainism had not spread far and wide in these parts, and that the body of the people worshipped Vishṇu; for he tells us, in the Samayṣātra:

लोकसमन्यांमिये विवेच्ये पारे य दिविते बिबटे॥

तदन्त सुधर विवेच्यो समन्यां अरपेहो कुणाति॥

"So no difference appears between the people and the Śramaṇas in respect of the siddhānta; (in the opinion) of the people, Vishṇu makes (every thing); (in the opinion) of the Śramaṇas, the soul makes (every thing)."

On these circumstances, as well as on the place assigned to him in Jain pravacanās, and on the fact that his writings are considered by Jain scholars, both in Dhārāvadi and Māisūr, to be the most ancient Jaina works now extant, I base my opinion that Kūṇḍakūṇḍaḥchārya was a contemporary of the Early Kadamba king Śīva-Mrigēṣa-mahārāja.

TEXT.


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

* By metrical license, the initial a of atisaya is lengthened, and the final two syllables are to be pronounced jē.


[\*] nadiṁ koḷadīnī tāṭkadiṁ giri-vana-tōya-durgag-kūlaśiṁd-agalgulū Budha-Mādhava-Ārk-Saṅkara-Jina-sadūmāni vimha(pa)ni-mārggadīn oppuva Tēridāla paṃneraḍa chelvanēya poganṭalāk Aja-


[\*v] chayāngalū maṇi-gaṅgagula rāśi śiṅgalū navinā maṇḍanā-bahu-vastradīnī payagaliṁ bahu-dhānanyin oppi tūrpa nachchina paradakaulūn bharitav-āgi karaṁ soṣyitu tat-purāṇaṁ || Antu saṃtanaṁ basa saṃtame manene

[\*] tīvī saṅgataṁ sakalā-hārātri-agālākaraṁ-āge sōgayisuva Tēridāla paṃneraḍa māmcyava vallabhargge vallabh-aṅda Kuṁta-ālakaḥ-çaṅkavartīṅga-ānavaya-āvatārin-eṇt-eṇndaje || Viṛ(viṛ) || Vanaja-khaṁ-

[\*] da(ha)ra-padmā-sadma-jan Ajaṁ prōdhibhūta Hārīta-nāndana Māṇḍavyānīṇaṁ āda Paṅcha-śiṅkhaṇiṁ bandā Chañkya-ānava-āniparaṁ maṁ-palair āge matta-ahiuraṁ gelu-urvviyaṁ tālda Taitaryān oṁdān anaṁya Mūrva-saṁta nilayaṁ śri-

[\*] Rāyaṅājāhalaṁ || Va || Mattamā vāhaṇadolā Jañayiṁḥaṇa vallabhan ēṁba sīṁha-paṅkramaṇaṁ-ādaṁ || Ātana tānayaṅ dhaṅ-gaṅ-ālakaḥ-patigalaṁ anēkaraṁ gelu-akhiṅ-bṛṛtvi taṅlamaṇaṁ tāle.

[\*] daṁ vikhyātāṁ Trāloko-yamaṁ-aṅha-vamaṁ || Va || Antu samasta-dhāri-vallabhge vallabhaṁ ādāvaham adhi vānprasantūjan Īgha-dōr-vyčhāntadeva Grajyārs ni(ṛ)pa baḷaṁaṅgaṁ gēlu mṛgaṁ Chōḷa’-vītanipage abhula-kalā-

[\*] nana(ia)m-an oṣedā sāṅgrāmadoś tōṛī bhīt-āniviparg-āśantakaṁ puṭtisad-anuṇayaṁ viśva-bhū-chakramaṁ sa-janav-āgala Rāyakāḥ dhalaṁ eṇa teḷeṇaṁ rāya-Permnādirāyāna || Va || Antu Kuṅtalaṁ-


[\*] te puṭī || Kailāgan bttīda virav-āṃta-ahitaram gelu-urku vīvējaḥmaṇḍala-maṅ chaṅkige sādhīṁsīttalav-adēkα-čchhatrav-āgalaṁ mīrmalā-kirtīya-āṅganeṁ āṛtu kūrtva kuṇḍuṭuṁ śī-Ṭeṅridāl-āvandhālaṁ

[\*] thaṁ negalauṁ niṟpā-tilakaṁ Lōkaṁ mahī洛克aḷolū || Vṛī || Ātana nāṁdaṁ cha(ba)ladevaṁ Raghunandanaṁ ekā-ṣvīkā-vyākhyātīyol ārtram-anīṁditaṣa ṣaṇavyadol-eṇḍranaṅkanaṁ niṭtyo-

* The metre is faulty here; two syllables have been omitted.

* This syllable, ja, was at first omitted and then inserted below the line.
THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

[January, 1885.


["**"] gutta-mukhya-samasta-naikañju-galamañ variañ Nāmi-thitthē-varana basadiya rishī[*]

["**"] gajān divya-thittha-jañgaliñ toleda śatakuñja-hāṁha-sahbhṛtya-jañgaliñ dhāra-pūrba (rv) kán mañjī Tērōdāda paśchima-bhāgada Hārunagēriya boṣṭeyinyi bañgala yippatāñ-geya-kōlō

["**"] koṭṭa mattar a(op)patt-erau Dēviya-bāviñ tikāl-ā kōlō koṭṭa tōṁa mattar=ondu antu mañ[*] tōṁa 72 tōṁa matta[\*] 1 alliya pannirvvaṛ- ggāvandugalum aruvatt-okkalum hann-dhānyaka rāśi-olage vañ biṣṭa

["**"] ru alliya setigutta-mukhya-nagarañgala tāv māra-koḍa bha(cha)guña-mājika-patī-sūtrāva-śadānān hoge visa lābh-āyada adakhe hoge hān[*] ondu tāv tegeda yoleya hērīnga[*] da(?)

["**"] ntaruvattigara tegeda hērīnga[*] nār-eley-imit-inītuvañ biṣṭaru tellīgaru māya-sāyav=enade đēvārā saṁje-sodarīgañ đhūp-ārīgēna Ġaṅgakke sollage horagoniñ banda eupeyā kodakke sollage yintavañ

["**"] biṣṭaru gana-kuñbhārari đēvārā aṣṭāvīd-ārāchchane ahaṁ-dāna naśavant-āgi dāna-āṅgele āvagegalana biṣṭaru Halāsige-hanirčchhāsirada ḍhīva[m*] jala nadēva gātīgaru đēvārige aṣṭāvīd-ārāchchane naśavant-āgi hērīnga nārū vo


["**"] m=appu śrīmad-Ayyivāle-ayunūrva[*] svāmiṇgalu Kuntala-vishayadañu grāma-nagara-khēda-karuvaṇa-ṛaṅa-ḥaṅ-ṃukhaṇa-patañgaliṃdand anēka-ṭaṇkita-prāsada-dvēvātyanātigalīṃdand=cppu

["**"] v=agrahaṇa-paṭaṇgaliṃdand=stiśayav-appu śrīmatu-Kuṇḍiñ-mūrvasirad-ol(e)ṣe hanneradakkañ modala-bāṃḍa baṇaṃju-vaṭṭaṃna nadēvaṇa-mane Tērōdādalu Sa(ā)ka-varṣañ 1104neya Plava-sāṇvatarañ Aśvayuña bahuña 3 A

["**"] divāradalu dvā-trīṇasa(ā)tu-vēlāvurumun m=ashtādāsa-pattanamun bāsashtī-yogā-pṭhāna

["**"] hā-nād-āgi nerad-a sthalañcūriǟn śrīmaṇa-mahājanīkū Goṅka-dev-arasan māṣāsiḍa Nēmi-thitessevarana chaitya-śālaman kṣuṇa baḷaṇ-gōṇḍu padevaṭṭu harsha-chittar-āgi đēvar=ashtāvīd-[\*] chchane [\*] clampārāka tārañ barāi nađeñ-ant-a


["**"] troyalu nađevaḍaṃ sūnka-parihāra=a gi koṭṭaru mattañ āśana-parihāravig-enade vōkkala-ondu paṇaṇa biṣṭaru || Yint-i keiñ-mane-tōta-mukhya-samasta aya-dāya=ddha=svattvā(rv)ā-bāḍhā(pp)=parihāravig-a

[""""""""""

["**"] gi dhāra-pūrvaḥkañ mājī biṣṭaru || Svasti śrīmatu-Koṇḍakunḍ-āchhāry-āṁ 10\textsuperscript{th} vṛgyāda ārī-Mūla-saṅgana(ga)da Dēśy-gaṇadā Postaka-gachchhada ārī-Kollāpurada Niṃbādeva-sāvantā māḍisāda ārī-Rāpa-Nārā


* and * In each case, the anuvṛtta is a mistake. 10 This anuvṛtta is, again, a mistake.
[*] சார்யாரு முக்மா ஓர்-கோண்-வுயவோ-சான்க்வேத்-வாகனால் மஹா-மாண்டல்-இயம் தேர்வால் முலச்சாக்லா குலக்-வெண்மை பிரதபென்று(தூ)ந் மாண் கேனிதா-வேண்மை பிரதபெருக்கம்-கல்மா-காலா


[11] This verse consists of five pādas.
TRANSLATION.

May the religion of Jina, the religion of the lord of the three worlds, the unfailling characteristic of which is the glorious and very mysterious sydkidakā,12 prosper! May the Tīrtha-kara Nāminātha, endowed with good wisdom, the beloved lord of the lady kaivalya, whose lotus-like feet were adorned by the excessive brilliancy of the crowns, set with shining jewels, of the venerable gods, demons and ṅgaras bowing before him, ever give long life and prosperity to the very fortunate and good people of Tērīḍāḷa!

(L. 3.)—These shines to the eye a land to the south of the Golden Mountain rising in the midst of Jambudvīpa surrounded by the shores of the ocean filled with alligators resembling large elephants able to lift up mountains. There, where Bhāratatakhaṇḍa is situated, appears full of charms the great country of Kūntaḷa; and in that land shines the great district called Kūḍī. And, in the heart of this district, the Tērīḍāḷa Twelve shines with incomparable and fragrant rice-fields, forests, lakes, tanks, groups of hill-forts and forts built in the forest and water, and ditches, with the dwellings of the learned and the temples consecrated to Viśṇu, the sun, Śiva, and Jina, and with markets. Brahmadēva is not able to praise sufficiently the beauty of the Tērīḍāḷa Twelve in the world. Shining as the large lotus-eyes of the lotus-face of that district resembling a sportive lady, the town of Tērīḍāḷa appears always peaceful in the whole world, filled with numbers of forts with ditches exceeding all comparison.

with wells, tanks, parrots, and black bees, forests, with groves of the holy dwellings of the various gods, Brahmāṇaṇa, and Vaśyasa, and with virtuous people. The inconceivably charming Tērīḍāḷa ever shines to the eye with a host of good warriors who were lions to their enemies resembling elephants and hard to conquer, with groups of scholars well-versed in sacred lore, famous and elite with the pride of all learning, with numerous persons of cultivated minds, occupying high positions, who are like the tree of Paradise to their dependents, and with those twelve head-men. That town is protected by the twelve headmen, promoting the ever-shining six branches of philosophy and the six observances13 praised in the world. That town looks very beautiful, being filled with money-changers,14 adorned with much corn, milk, new ornaments, various clothes, with heaps of jewels and a mass of gold rivaling and laughing at Kubera, saying “his wealth is nominal.”

(L. 10.)—In the same manner, Spring, like a saint, prevailing there incessantly, the Tērīḍāḷa Twelve, an ornament to the whole world, is governed by chiefs who own allegiance to the emperors of the country of Kūntaḷa, whose lineage is as follows:—

(L. 11.)—Brahman sprang from his abode, the lotus of the god Viśṇu, who supports the world and holds a lotus. Maṇḍavya, the son of Hārīta was next born. From Maṇḍavya sprang Paśčaśēkha. Many kings of the Chaḷukya line, descended from Paśčaśēkha, having already passed away, there arose Taṭā who

12 The metre is faulty here.
13 This is the third verse in the Jaina work called Ṣyabdīka, which is written partly in Sanskrit and partly in Prakrit.
14 The syabdīka is the saṅkhaśāṣṭra doctrine, which views a substance in seven different aspects. It is also called the anādīka-sāraṇa, as distinguished from the
again overthrew his enemies and ruled the earth. This family of Taila, resembling Mount Meru, was supported by the glorious Rayakôla, resembling the earth. In this family was also born Jayasimhaballabha, who was as brave as a lion. His son, who overthrew many wicked kings and assumed the sovereignty of the whole world, was known as Trailokyanalla and Ahavamalla. The King Permâdiraya, the beloved son of Ahavamalla who had thus become the lord of the whole earth resembling a lady, defeated the army of the Gûrjara king with the prowess of his great arm; delightfully showed on the battle-field the fire of all-destroying time to the Chôla king who opposed him; and, without frightening timid kings, governed the whole world with justice, so as to promote the practice of virtue in it, as though he had been Rayakôlabala himself.

(L. 15.)—Many kings having passed away in the family of the heroic king Goûka of Têridâla, who is regarded as the sheathed sword of the valiant Permâdiraya, the lord of the country of Kuntala resembling a fair one,—there was born to his parents, like the fruit yielded by the merit of former births resembling the tree of Paradise,—Lôka, the ornament of kings, the lord of the prosperous district of Têridâla, who, endowed with a heroism displayed by the erection of a pillar of triumph, distinguished himself throughout the world, by defeating formidable enemies, conquering the territory of insolent foes, and handing it over to his imperial master, thus making the Châtukya power of one umbrella, and bestowing careasses on fair fame resembling a lady. His son attained to such eminence in the world that he was considered a very Râma in firm determination, a Karûpa in reputation for fulfilment of promises, an Arjuna in blameless heroism, and a Brahmadeva in politics, to the admiration of wise men who thus ever bowed to him. The beloved son of that excellent king. If the hostile kings and aggressors did not wisely flee but encountered him, this powerful king saw them with pleasure and put them to flight on the battle-field and remained the lord of Têridâla. Who is there that does not exult the worthy Mallidâva as the lord of victory and of fair fame resembling a lady? Say, is not Bâchalamadêvi, who is the beloved queen of the brave king Mallidêva and who rivals the lady earth in her numerous qualities resembling jewels, equal to Śite and Ajjanâdevi the daughter of Mahindrâ? As the god of love was born to Lakshmi and Vasudêva, as Kumâra was born to Pârvati and Śiva, so there was born to them both, with affection, Goûka, who fearlessly shines in the world, the joy of the lord of Têridâla and a handmill to hostile chiefs.

(L. 22.)—How blessed is the excellent king Goûka of Têridâla, who has, for his mother, the meritorious Bâchalamadêvi, the beauty of the sport of Kâma,—the king Mall, shining with bravery, for his father,—the ascetic Mâghasandhi, chief of Saidhântikas, for his preceptor,—and the Tîrthankara Nâmînâtha, for his favourite god! An infectious disease, a violent death, raging Durgi, furiously attacking enemies, a springing tiger, the lightning which strikes, a terrible snake which catches, the calamity of a consuming wild fire, vanish at the mere sight of the virtue of the very valiant king Goûka at Têridâla. When, bitten by a fierce and hungry snake, he was filled with fear, he indulged the hope of being cared by spells and enchantments till he was half-dead, and then immediately reciting the names of the five saints, he was perfectly cured of the snake-bite. His pride in the Jaina faith, thus confirmed, being conspicuous, Goûka, the king of Têridâla, gained much distinction. Causing a shining Jaina temple to be erected at Têridâla, he raised a triumphant banner, and hung on the tusks of the elephants of the quarters a string of letters announcing to the world the greatness of his prowess. O! how excellent is king Goûka, the virtuous champion of Jainism! What good people are there in the world, who do not continually praise Goûka, this fearless and renowned king of Têridâla, shining in the world, who has overcome the sin of the Kali age, resembling mud, whose characteristic is the gloom spread by the sound of his

17 The Bâchakrâla, who eclipsed the glory of the Châtukya power for nearly two centuries.
18 Kârûpa says that râge-kôlaha is an ariamadhâ, admirable only as a biruda.
19 Asneppar, means "aggressors, invaders;" anneya is a corruption of anyâya, according to Kêtipâra.
20 Ajjanâdevi was the daughter of Mahindrâ. See Mâyâ's Añjânädevâcharitra.
21 These are arha, riddha, achârya, upadhâya, and sarvesuddha.
war-drum, and who strikes terror into the lotus-like hearts of hostile kings?

(L. 23.)—King Goñaka, endowed with such qualities, sent for the venerable Māghaṇḍi-Saidhāntika from Koḷḷaḷ-goḻa,\(^{22}\) to the admiration of all good people. Oh! how wonderful! To describe the glory of that ascetic.—As the earth is decorated by the milk-ocean, as the ocean by the moon, and as the sun by his fire of brilliancy, so shines to the eye in the world the line of the venerable Koṉḍakunḍa, of the Dēśiga-gaṇa and the Sarasvati-gachchha, ever adorned by the sage Māghaṇḍi, a mine of virtues and the great disciple of the chief ascetic, the venerable Kuḻachandra. Māghaṇḍi-Saidhāntika, who is, as it were, an ocean of innumerable virtues and firm as a mountain, ever shines with good intellect in the world, as the preceptor of the Saṅamā Nimbadēva. The great and good sage of Koḷḷagira, Māghaṇḍi-Saidhāntika, who dismissing all other ideas, is absorbed in interpreting the sacred learning that has emanated from the mouths of the Tīrthaṅkaras, and who ceaselessly contemplates the virtues of the saints, is renowned in the world as the chief of those who have vanquished the god of love. As though the famous Jaina faith had produced a new Tīrthaṅkara, he preached the principles of Jainaism to all people, and was saluted by the Saṅamā Nimbā; is not the distinguished and shining Māghaṇḍi, the chief of Saidhāntikas, a moon to the Jaina religion, resembling an ocean of nectar?

(L. 33.)—His chief disciple was Kaṇakakan-dipaṇḍitadēva, who shines in the world as an eagle to disputants resembling venomous serpents, as a fire to the great forest of disputants, and as a lion to powerful disputants who are like elephants. He who shares similar religious rites with that ascetic,—the lion to hostile disputants, Śrūtakirtti-Traividya, the chief of ascetics of faultless character, formidable in the six branches of philosophy, is distinguished in the whole world as a wind to the light which is the intelligence of hostile disputants. He who shares similar rites with him, the formidable thunderbolt in breaking the peaks of the mountains which are hostile disputants.—Chandrakirtti,

paṇḍita, who has resisted the weapon of love and studied the principle of mercy, who is conspicuous in the blameless Jaina religion, who is a very Indra to the mountains of insolence, pride, folly, and avarice, who causes pain to hostile disputants, and who is a Brahmaṇḍa among those who excel incomparably in logic, is highly extolled by the world. He who shares similar rites with that ascetic, who causes pain to the heads of hostile disputants.—Prabhāchandra-paṇḍitadēva is very famous throughout the world as an image of brilliant reputation; he is the chief of the Dēśiga-gaṇa, distinguished for the many shining virtuous courses he has adopted, the lord of mountains in courage, and calm as the ocean of nectar. He who shares similar rites with that lord of ascetics,—Vardhamāna, the chief of ascetics, the priest of the lofty temple of the venerable lord, Jinendra, the sole friend of the earth, is a sharp and deadly thunder-bolt to the mountain which is the power of a group of hostile disputants; he is adorned with virtues; his courage resembles a lofty mountain; and he is a Vidyādhara among Traividya.\(^{23}\) Vardhamāna is thus distinguished in the world. The excellent and prosperous lotus-like feet of the holy Māghaṇḍi-Saidhāntikadēva, the chief preceptor of Vardhamāna-Traividya, the object of so much praise and distinction.

(L. 40.)—Hail! While the victorious reign of the glorious emperor Viṅgaṭa-Trihuvana-malla, the asylum of the whole world, the favourite of the earth, the great king of kings, the supreme king, the most worshipful one; the glory of the family of Satyaśraya, the ornament of the Čāḷukyas, was continuing, with the delight of pleasing conversation and with perpetual increase, so as to endure as long as the sun, moon and stars might last, at the capital of Kaḷyāṇapura:

(L. 42.)—Subsisting on his lotus-like feet, Hail! the glorious Mahāmāṇḍalaśvara, king Kārtavīryadēva,—who has acquired the five great sounds, who is a Mahāmāṇḍalaśvara, the lord of Lattandara the best of cities, who has a tūṣyā played before him, the ornament of the Raṭṭa family, who has the figure of a

\(^{22}\) From a comparison of this passage with L. 32 and 43, it appears that Koḷḷagira was another name of Koḷḷipura.

\(^{23}\) Those well-versed in dāsaṇa, tarka, and veṅkaraṇa.
golden eagle on his banner, who has the device of an elephant, a Brahmadéva in deliberation, who strikes the temples of brave petty kings, the lord of the Désákâras, the lord of those who have won a warrior's distinction at the meeting of the three kings, who is a warrior in the right sense of the word, full of daring, the lion of Śêna; while adorned with all these titles, Kârtavîrya is reigning with the delight of pleasing conversation:—

(L. 45.)—At his command, Hail! the glorious king Goňka dêva, adorned with all titles,—who is a prosperous petty king, who has conquered hostile armies, who is sprung from the family of Jámêtâvâna, who is a Râma in bravery, elate with success in war, a lion in the battle-field, who has a waving banner of peacock-feathers, who is a god of love in beauty, who has won the best favour of the goddess Padmavati, who delights in the practice of Jainism, a warrior of Bhâva, a very Këdâra to petty kings,—adorned with all these and other titles, Goňka erected, in the centre of his capital of Têridâla, a temple called Goňka-Jinâlaya, and established devoutly under the auspices of Kârtavîrya, the head-jewel of the Râštâka family, an image of the glorious Tirthankâra Nêmînâtha, on an auspicious day and hour, and sent for the holy Mâghapandi-Saîddhântikâdêva, the priest of the temple of the glorious Rûpa-Nârâyana at Kollâpura, who is descended from Kônâkâmîchârya, and belongs to the Désiga-ga, and the Postaka-gachchha, who is the head of Jain ascetics, and who has the title of Mândalâchârya.

(L. 49.)—In Saka 1045, being the Subhâkrit asvatsatara, on Thursday the full moon of Vaiśâkha, king Goňka invited to the Goňka-Jinâlaya the twelve head-men with all their subjects and dependents, the setügutâs and other nakaras of that place, to provide for the support of the priests of the temple of Nêmînâtha, for the worship of the god with the eight materials, and for the repairing of whatever might be torn, broken, or worn out; he recited the name of the âchârya, washed the excellent and holy lotus-like feet of that chief ascetic with excellent and sacred water, poured a stream of water out of a golden vessel, and gave seventy-two mattars of land measured by a staff twenty-four gönas long, in the western part of Têridâla, to the north of the road leading to Harunagârî, and one mattar of garden land measured by the same staff to the south of the well of Dêviyâna; in all, 72 mattars of land and 1 mattar of garden land were given. The twelve headmen and sixty tenants of that place gave one measure out of twelve heaps of corn. The setügutâs and other nakaras of that place, whether they sold pots, jewels, cloths, or yarn, gave one visâ in a hon, and 12 visâs in a hon on betel-nuts sold at a profit. On a load of betel-leaves taken by themselves ...... or by those living inside the town, 100 leaves were given. The oil-men, without claiming exemption on account of rent-free lands, gave one sollage on a mill, and one sollage on a pitcher of oil brought from without, for the evening lamp and the dhâpurati of the god ...... The potters gave earthen pots to the hall of charity, to keep up the worship of the god with the eight materials and the distribution of food. The âdâgias, trading on the great road to the Halasigâ Twelve-thousand, gave 100 leaves on one load, for the worship of the god with the eight materials. Hail! The Five-hundred of the glorious Ayyâvalâ, who were adorned with innumerable good qualities acquired by five hundred strict edicts celebrated over the whole world; who were endowed with truth, pure observances, and pleasing conduct, morality, modesty and great learning; who were the protectors of the Vîra-Bâsañju religion, decorated with a pure banner having the device of a hill, whose breasts were embraced by the goddess of innumerable daring acts;

---

82 According to Kêsilîya, sîndhâra is changed into sîndarâ. The bhâkâsma of the second Tirthânkara is an elephant.—sute Vol. II. p. 132.
83 Bhânânakâra may be a mistake for Bhâvanântâkâra or bhâvanântaâkâra.
84 Mânadâchârya is in a religious sense what mahâjârâ is in a political one.
85 These are jala, gândhâra, phuqha, ñâshâ, dîdha, dûpa, nacêndha and tîmbâla.
86 Every Jain is bound to recite the name of his pañchârîya during the performance of a religious ceremony.

88 Gônas means twelve fingers or a span.
89 A hill was assumed as a device, because almost all the Tirthânkâras entered nirvâna on the summits of mountains—

**Nirmâlabhâkî.**
who were ennobled by their prowess throughout the world, who were descended from the original and auspicious lineage of Baladēva, Vāsadēva, and Khaṇḍālī; whose origin was great.....who had acquired the excellent favour of the goddess Padmāvatī, —

(L. 58.) — At Tēridāla, a merchant-town situated in the centre and the first in importance among the twelve (towns) in the glorious Kūndī Three-thousand, adorned with villages, towns, hamlets, villages surrounded by hills, groups of villages, sea-girt towns, and chief cities, with elegant mansions, palaces and temples, and with shining agrahāra-towns in the country of Kuṭalā, —

(L. 59.) — In the Śaka year 1104, being the Plava saṅkatara, on Sunday, the third day of the dark half of Āsvayuja, the people of the thirty-two sea-side towns, 21 the 18 towns, 62 seats of contemplation, and 64 religious centres, together with gavare-gātriṣa, setṭis, and setṭi-guttaś from various countries, held a convocation there, and, seeing the temple of Nūminātha erected by the glorious Maṇḍaṭika Goṅkaḍēva, went round it, bowed to it, and, being filled with joy, made for the worship of the god with the eight materials a grant so that it might continue as long as the sun, the moon, and the stars might last. The details of the grant are: — One hundred and twenty oxen, asses, buffaloes, carts, rafts, 22 and boats, were given, so that they might carry, by land or water, all things, including elephants and jewels, free from duties, within the limits of the four oceans. The tenants, also, without claiming exemption, gave one paṇa. In this way contributions were made in the shape of fields, houses, and gardens, free from all claims, with libations of water.

(L. 64.) — Hi! The Goṅka-Jinālaya of Tēridāla was connected with the basadi of the glorious Rāṣṭra-Nārāyana, erected by the Svaṁata Nimbādeva of Kollāpura, who belonged to the Sarasvatī-gachchha, the Dēṣīya-gaṇa, and the Mūla-saṅgha, and who was of the line of the glorious Kopaṇaṇḍāchārya: —

The priests of the religious centres, 23 such as Mahālīgadēva of Gōkāge, Mahālakshmiṅdēvi of Kaṅgīlēvāra, and Agaṣṭyēśvara of Kollāpura, and the gaṇas as many as seven crores, met together in an assembly and established a connection between the Goṅka-Jinālaya and Kaliṅdēva of the original place Tēridāla, and saying, "this is the place of our jāgavattige", 24 gave jāgavattige to Prabhāchandra, the priest of the Goṅka-Jinālaya, at the time of establishing that Nūminātha. On the top of the basadi there were symbols of Śūdraka, a lion, a discus, a trident, a bell, a drum, and a serpent. Saying, "he, who is hostile to the seven crores of sages, is an enemy of God," the ascetics, who were seven crores in number, gave shining jāgavattige. Tejāgi, the Dauṇḍa-yaka, shone in the world, liberal and warlike, and at once attained to eminence, as if he were a wild elephant to the lotus-like power of the armies of the hostile king of Gūrjar, a thunder-bolt in breaking the mountain Simha-rāya, and a lion to the elephant the brave Kaniṅgārīya. Tejā appeared like the lustre of fire emitted by the most formidable thunder-bolt among the confederacy of furious hostile kings, like the lustre of a resistless wild fire in the forest of proud dynasties, and like the lustre of the dreadful submarine fire in the ocean of hostile armies. In this way this great warrior easily distinguished himself through the whole world with the lustre of his own powerful arms. Tejā, the leader of forces and the admiration of the world, won great renown over the earth covered with the ocean, by his great liberality in relieving the distress of learned men, by his great power in overthrowing cruel foes, by his soft and pleasing speech, virtue, truthfulness, prosperity and wealth. His son, the glorious Bhāyīdēva, endowed with modesty, was distinguished in the world as a thunder-bolt to the mountains which were the sons of the hostile leaders of forces. Many sons are born to other leaders of forces; but their birth is a forerunner of disgrace to their father and family. When Bhāyīdēva, the son of Tejā, the leader of forces, was born, it proved, at that very moment, a source of infinite joy to his

21 Plava is the same as vīḍā-vaṇa.
22 Eṣṭi-guttaś is a corruption of ṣṭopa-ṭaṅka, a garment worn during contemplation.
23 Bhāṣṭra-vaḥittra, or vaḥittra, or Keśṭra.
24 Nijaṅgaḥittra is used in this sense in Jaina paṭṭaṅgula.
family and of great grief to his enemies. The glorious Bhâyêdêvâ, the son of Têjûgi, the leader of forces, most heroic and unrivalled as a warrior, chased to their homes, with the sword in his hand, a host of young ministers of cruel hostile kings; who can face, in battle, him who is unsurpassed in fighting and has the serenity of many a sea? The fearless Bhâyêdêvâ, the son of Têjûgi, the leader of forces, having bravely defeated those foes who opposed him in the field of battle, and having, without disgust, killed the remaining enemies who were timid and of less note, ruled peacefully over the Kândî Three-thousand, conferred upon him by the king. Having driven away the confederacy of hostile kings, having protected those who sought refuge with him, and having conferred all things on those who begged of him, the minister, the lord Bhâyêdêvâ, was able to become the husband of the lady Fame by making grants of land and houses to temples and groups of Brâhmaṇs, with great respect and compassion; could others do the like? Fame, the ornament of the valiant Bhâyêdêvâ, penetrated the ocean and danced joyfully on the hood of Śêsha, on the temples of the elephants of the quarters, and in the assembly of the gods.

(L. 77.)—While peacefully governing the Kândî Three-thousand, received at the hands of the lord of Kuntâla, the husband of Fame, prevailing in all the ten quarters, the young Bhâyêdêvâ, the heroic leader of forces, gave for the anûghâbhâga and raûghâbhâga of Nêminâthâyâra of the Goûka-Jînâlâyâ of the glorious Têridâla, for providing food to ascetics, and for repairing whatever might be torn, broken, or worn out, 36 mâtars free from all claims and measured by the same staff, to the north of the 72 mâtars formerly granted by king Goûka, and a site as far as the line of shops, for the erection of a good building,32 in Saka 1109, being the Plavasâga anuvatâraya, on Thursday the 10th day of the bright half of Chaitra. And stones were set up in the ground to mark the boundaries of the land thus granted.

(L. 81.)—To future kings, who will be born in this world, either in my family or in that of others, and who will protect all this grant of mine, I place my joined hands on my forehead and bow! This grant of itself is a source of temporal and spiritual happiness, therefore be who transgresses it will fall into the great abyss of a dreadful hell! He who protects this grant, will attain to the rank of Upêndra, Ahindrâ, and Dêvêndra, and obtain life and prosperity, lasting as long as a kalpa! He who preserves this cheerfully, will obtain life and great prosperity. The sinful man who does not protect this, will incur the guilt of having killed sons and numerous cows, Brâhmaṇs and ascetics, on the Ganges, and at Gayâ, and Vâranâsi, and Kurukshêtra, and will incontinently fall into hell and remain there for ever! The sinful man, who says, "What grant is this? of what place is it? who made it? and why should I preserve it?" will at once descend into hell with all his family! He who appropriates land, whether given by himself or another, will be born as a worm in ordure for sixty thousand years!

SHARAF THE THIEF,
A CELEBRATED CHARACTER IN KASHMIR IN THE LAST CENTURY.
BY REV. J. HINTON KNOWLES, C.M.S., SRINAGAR.

A little before Ranjit Singh's time (born 1780 A.D.) theft and robbery were so very common and were practised with such proficiency in "the Happy Valley," that good and honest folk were put to their wits' end to know how to retain what they, by their industry and economy, had gathered together.
One of the most celebrated of the thieves and robbers in those days was Sharaf Tûr.33

So cunning, so daring, and so successful was he, that his name was seldom mentioned without trembling, whilst his character was supposed to be almost supernatural. Whether or not it was that the common people thought that he possessed the evil eye, or else some sort of mesmeric influence, they left him alone to prosecute his plans without let or hindrance. One or two of the more determined dispositions

known in the Panjâb under the name of Askhrâf Chôr.

32 Dhavâlêla (Dhavâla-âstâ), "a mansion."
33 Tûr is the Kashmiri word for thief. This man is
are quoted as having brought the thief before the courts, but as nothing could be thoroughly proved, nothing could be really done, and so those bereaved of their property had to submit, their only consolation being in the thought that this was their iqmat or lot.

Sharaf Tsür was the son of Kabir Ghanj, who was a very great and wealthy shawl merchant, and lived near the Zaina Kadal, the fourth of the seven bridges spanning that part of the river Jhelum which flows through the city of Srinagar, and forming the principal means of inter-communication between the two sides of the city. Supposing that he would inherit his father’s wealth, Sharaf made no effort to learn his father’s business, or to provide himself with any other means of livelihood. Consequently he developed into a lazy, listless and profligate fellow, apparently having as the only objects in life, eating, drinking, and spending money. One is not surprised to find, therefore, that on his father’s death he at once appropriated all his goods and money, and had soon squandered everything in magnificent feasts, expensive nūches, and bad society. What was he to do now? He could neither beg nor dig, so he determined to cultivate the craft of thieving.

A few native friends have given me the following stories still extant concerning this man, and there is every reason to be assured of their veracity.

(I.)

One day Sharaf visited a certain garden disguised in a dress of great pomp and style. Some children of very respectable parents were playing there in the shade of the beautiful trees. Sharaf noticed that several of the youngsters were wearing nice new shoes, and, going near, told them to sit down. According to custom the boys took off their shoes before doing so, but the thief bade them not to act thus on this occasion, as Sharaf Tsür might be near, and would certainly take them. The boys laughed at the idea. “Take them,” they said. “What would you have us to think? Are we fools or blind? These shoes are placed close by our side. How could they possibly be removed without our noticing it?” The disguised thief, now finding his opportunity, replied, “Wait a moment. I will show you how.” Sharaf then went away a little distance to well scan the neighbourhood, and seeing that there was nobody to mind at hand, he returned, took up all the shoes in a cloth, and again went away. A second time, however, he did not return, although the little company of boys shouted for him on all sides, and waited anxiously for his appearance. They had a suspicion that the man was Sharaf Tsür, and the matter was blazed abroad over the city, but nothing could be discovered.

(II.)

Batmālūn is the name of a big village, situated close to the city of Srinagar. Bata, in Kashmiri, means food, cooked rice, &c., and mālūn is probably derived from the word māl, which means desire for food. Hence, perhaps, the meaning of Batmālūn is faqrīr, i.e., one who kept under his body, and was always more or less in want of food. At any rate there is a famous mosque in this place, sacred to the memory of a celebrated faqrīr, from whom both the village and the mosque derive their name. The holy man’s grave is to be seen close by the mosque. Sharaf entered and assuming the guise of an imām, began to cry the bāng, or the Musalmān call to prayer. Many peasants on hearing this went and entered the mosque, and at a given signal arranged themselves for prayer. Before commencing their devotions Sharaf advised them to collect their tsādār, (i.e., sheets or woollen shawls, which they wear very much like English ladies wore ‘clouds’ when they were in vogue), and place them before him in a heap: “because” said he, “Sharaf Tsür, I know, is wandering about near this building, and is not at all particular whether he thieves in a mosque, or in the bāng, or upon the highway.” And they did so.

Now everyone who has watched a company of Musalmān praying, knows what regularity they go through their genuflexions according as the imām proceeds with the prayers. During one of the long prostrations Sharaf, the pseudo-imām, hastily got up, and quietly seizing the bundle of woollen cloths, left the service by a little side door in the building. All this time, about the space of a minute, the

* Bhādū in the plains.  
* Chādār or chadar in Hindustānī, and chādir in Persian.
congregation were waiting and wondering what the imam was doing. Perhaps they thought that he was a little faint. However, at last, one worshipper lifted his head, and on discovering that both their priest and wraps had disappeared, shouted to his fellow-dupes, "Sorrow, a hundred sorrows, O brethren! Sharaf Tsahir has met with us. We have been led in prayer by an unbelieving rogue!"

(III)

On another occasion, it is reported that a weaver was coming from a certain village, and bringing with him some linen cloth to sell in Srinagar. Sharaf chanced to be passing that way, and, saluting the man, asked him for how much he would dispose of his burden. The weaver answered, "Three rupees." After a little flattery and quibbling Sharaf again asked him once and for all to state the proper price. The man, then calling upon the name of God and His Prophet, said that the cloth cost him only eight annas less than he asked. "Was this too much profit for all his labour?" Sharaf, however, appeared not to believe him even then, but gathering some dust together and smoothing it a little into shape, ordered the man to consider it as the very tomb of Muhammad, and to swear again accordingly, putting his hands in orthodox fashion upon the little heap. The good weaver, in all confidence, did so, but Sharaf had kept some dust in his hand, and whilst the man was bending in all reverence over the supposed grave, took a good aim at his eyes, and picking up the bundle of cloth ran away. It is not necessary to add that the poor weaver was so blinded and surprised that he was unable to see or to do anything except to roll about in agony lamenting his sad lot.

(IV)

One day Sharaf sat by a tomb and pretended that he was reading the jātihā, or first chapter of the Qurān. Meanwhile a man passed by, whom Sharaf called to come near to him. The man obeyed, and asked what he desired. Sharaf replied, "May God bless you. Please bring me some bread. I will give you the money. I want the bread for distribution among the poor in the name of my deceased father." The man considering this to be a real work for God, gladly consented, and started to fetch the bread. When he had gone a little distance Sharaf again called to him saying, "Come here. Perhaps you will not return. Please to leave your wrap here with me, until you come again with the bread." As there was nothing suspicious about this arrangement, the man unfastened his cloth, and deposited it by the side of the supposed devout man. Alas! No sooner had he got out of sight, than Sharaf, taking the linen cloth, departed in another direction. It was rather a good bargain: a big, strong cloth for a few paisa!

(V)

A horse-dealer once unluckily happened to cross the path of Sharaf. He was mounted upon a sleek, swift horse. Sharaf in his heat admired the animal, and wished to have it. "How much do you want for the horse?" he asked. "One hundred rupees," was the reply. "Very well," said Sharaf. "I will try him to see if he has any vice or not. Let me get up." No sooner was Sharaf upon the horse, than he dug his heels into the beast's sides, and was soon out of sight, far, far beyond the poor duped horse-dealer's shouts and cries.

(VI)

A pandit walking on the river-side happened to be wearing a new well-made tadder (blanket). Sharaf seeing this, jumped into an empty boat, which was fastened by a string to a post fixed in the bank, and pretending that he was a boatman somewhat unwell, asked the pandit to come and help him, in return for the short cut and ride in the boat. The pandit readily consented.

It was some time before they arrived at their destination, and already darkness had set in; so the boatman, assuming an expression of great gratitude, said to the pandit: "It is already late, and your home, you
one thing more for me. Bring me some water from the well of yonder mosque, that I may quench my thirst. This pain has dried-up my very soul." The man went for the water, doubting nothing, and meanwhile Sharaf went also, so that when the poor weaver returned he was nowhere to be seen.

(VIII.)

The natives are accustomed to keep their money and little valuables either tied up in the waist-cloth, or fastened in a knot at the end of the tsádar, or else secreted within the turbans. The pír, or Mussalmán holy man, of whom we are now going to write, followed the latter plan. He had bought a piece of gold from a certain goldsmith and was on his way home, tired and weary, because of his hot and long journey.

Sharaf got to know that this pír was carrying a piece of gold in his turban, and racked his brains to find means of depriving the good man of it. He walked fast, and when he had got well ahead, he sat down by the wayside and began to weep. When the pír had reached the spot, he requested him to sit down and rest and take some refreshment which he offered him in the name of his father. The pír was very glad to do so, and was very soon enjoying the meal and the exceedingly pleasant conversation of his chance host.

Whether it was from eating some drugged bread, or because of his long and trying walk, we do not know, but it is certain that presently he began to feel drowsy, and yielding to Sharaf's advice, soon lay down and slept. Sharaf took off his turban for him, and in various other ways soothed the pír until he was fast asleep. Now was the opportunity for Sharaf. He took up the turban, and, with a look of contempt for his sleeping guest, walked off quietly to some secret place, and there lay down himself to sleep, exceedingly pleased with the day's business. The piece of gold was worth at least one hundred rupees.

(IX.)

Another of Sharaf's dupes was a poor fellow who was wont to go every day to the

operation before the discovery of chloroform.

* He sat down by the side of a grave: Mussalmán prefer to bury their dead as close to the public way as possible, in order that the devout passers-by may offer up a prayer for them.
celebrated mosque of Bahá’u’dd-dín and there to pray for treasure. Like many others he supposed that the great God through Sheik Bahá’u’dd-dín’s intercessions would grant him the desire of his heart, and so he went twice after time praying with all sincerity, "O Bahá’u’dd-dín, give me some—treasure, give me some treasure." One day Sharaf was walking past the mosque and overheard the man at his devotions. He thought that he might not only deceive him, but probably also make some profit out of him.

Accordingly early on the following morning he went to this mosque, and secreted himself in a very dark corner. He waited till the man came as usual, and when he uttered his request for treasure, Sharaf, from out of the darkness, replied, "O holy man, you have certainly been most assiduous in your devotions and have been most persistent in your request. Now understand that I am well pleased with you, and am quite ready, yea willing, to comply with your wishes." The man, thinking this to be none other than Bahá’u’dd-dín himself again pleaded, and now with bolder voice, his request. Sharaf told him to come at an appointed time with the tools and implements necessary for unearthing the treasure. He was to bring one hundred rupees also, and two tástarás for taking home the treasure, and to be very careful not to broach the matter to anyone. The man returned to his house with great joy, and could not sleep for the thought of the great treasure which would be discovered to him on the morrow. He was a very poor man, and not having one hundred rupees at hand was obliged to sell his property to get the money.

On the morrow at the dead of night, he was at the place of meeting, tools on his shoulder and money in his blanket, while another blanket was thrown over his other shoulder. Sharaf came forth to greet him. After the usual salutation he led the way into a little jungle, whither man seldom wandered, and showed the treasure-seeker the place where he would find the answer to his prayers. He ordered him to dig two yards deep. The man soon accomplished half of his task, but the sweat drops were upon his brow. Sharaf noticed them and told the man to take off his clothes and lay them on one side, and then he would be able to work easily.

The man did so, and in a short while had dug so deep, that he could not be seen at a short distance from the hole, nor could he see anything outside.

Now his clothes had been laid well aside. Sharaf had seen to this arrangement. So when the man had almost dug the two yards and was at the pitch of excitement, expecting every moment that his spade would strike something hard, either gold or silver or some other precious thing, Sharaf carefully took up the clothes, blankets, and one hundred rupees, and was soon lost in the darkness and intricacies of the jungle.

It is said that the poor treasure-seeker worked on until he had only just sufficient strength to draw himself up to the top of the pit, and that then on seeing that his money, wraps, blankets, and saint were not there he loosened his hold and fell back insensible into the pit.

(X.)

One day Sharaf met a poor peasant, who was pushing along a sheep to the market. Sharaf enquired the price of the animal. The peasant replied, "four rupees." After a little wrangling the price was finally fixed at three rupees, and Sharaf told the man to bring the sheep to his house, where he would give him the money. The man consented, glad to get rid of his burden so quickly. They had not proceeded far before Sharaf noticed an empty house, having a door in front and a door at the back. He told the man that this was his humble abode, and, taking the sheep, swung it over his shoulders, and walked inside. He then shut the front door and bade the man to wait whilst he went for the money. As will be imagined, while the peasant was most patiently and happily squatting outside the door, Sharaf had gone out by the back door and knowing every yard of the neighbourhood, and being swift of foot also, he soon managed to elude all possibility of being taken. After an hour or so another man, in order to cut his journey short, had entered the same dwelling by the back door, and was coming out by the front door, when the peasant seized him and demanded his sheep. The traveller was rather annoyed at this sudden and unwelcome interruption to his journey, and showed his displeasure in a rather practical way.
The poor peasant, when he had recovered from the beating which the traveller had given him, tried the neighbours' houses, but alas! no sheep and no purchaser of the sheep, only blows and insults, until at length he was obliged to depart, a sadder but wiser man, back to his village.

(XI.)

The following story will show that Sharaf's heart was in his profession, and that he followed it not so much for the gain which it brought to him, as for the sport which it afforded.

One day he noticed a very poorly-dressed man pick up a dead dove which was lying on the road. He pitted the man's distressed look and state, and followed him, curious to see what he would do with the dead bird. As soon as the man had reached his house, and had shut the door, Sharaf rushed up and bent down to see and listen. He saw the little hungry-looking children standing, or rather, dancing, round their father, pulling at his ragged garments, and asking whether he had brought them anything to eat. The history of the family was a very sad one. They had once been in affluent circumstances, but a change in the government had not been in their favour, and they had succumbed to their lot.

The man told the little ones, "Yes, I have got a dead dove. Take it and roast it for dinner." Sharaf Tasur heard and saw everything, and his heart was moved with compassion for the poor people. He shouted to be allowed to come in, and, on being permitted to do so, he gave the man five rupees saying, "Procure some food with this money, and throw the dead bird away. I am Sharaf Tasur. Up to this time I have stolen and robbed for my own aggrandisement, but henceforth I will rob and steal for the great God. I promise you that I will visit you again the day after to-morrow and will hand over to you, for your own use, as many rupees as I may get by that time. Fear not, but hope with gladness. Your adversity shall be turned into prosperity." The poor man thanked him, and falling upon his knees before him, said, "Your honour's pleasure: God bless you abundantly."

On the following day Sharaf visited the mosque near to this man's dwelling, and spent much time in earnest prayer. Prayer over, he sat to rest awhile. Presently the imam came in. Sharaf at once commenced conversation with him, and spent the remainder of the day and part of the succeeding night with him in the mosque. Sharaf thought that he was never going to leave. At last, about one in the morning the imam went to his home. No sooner had he departed than Sharaf, who had previously hired a swift and strong horse, started at post-haste for Sopur.*

On arriving at Sopur Sharaf made straight for the treasury, and thence stole many bags of rupees. He fastened these bags round his waist, and then again mounting his horse, returned to the place whence he had first started as quickly as he came. The bags of rupees he at once took to the poor man, whom he had promised to help, and then went and laid down again in the mosque. He slept soundly the remaining half hour of the night.

The next morning the treasurer discovered that a robbery had taken place. "Some bags have been taken," he said. A report was at once sent to the Viceroy at Srinagar with a hint that it was Sharaf Tasur's work.

The Viceroy instantly summoned Sharaf to appear before him. When he was brought, he was at once ordered to speak the truth and deliver up the money.

Sharaf assumed a look of intense surprise, and did not appear in the least frightened. "When was the money stolen?" he asked. "Yesterday night," was the reply. Sharaf then quietly asked them to allow the imam, with whom he spent the greater part of yesterday and yesterday night to be sent for. "Send for the imam please, and enquire from him whether I was not with him at the time of the robbery. How could I be here and at Sopur at one and the same time?" The imam was brought and testified to the truth of Sharaf's words, and so the thief and robber was set at liberty.

(XII.)

Another time Sharaf, arrayed in the dress of a great man, went to pay his respects to a very

* Sopur is a moderate sized town, midway between Srinagar and Baramul, the town where visitors ex...
famous pir. He sat down in the presence of the holy man with an air of much dignity. The pir asked him whence he came and what he wanted. Sharaf, after a little hesitation, informed him that he was the son of a most respectable man, and knowing the pir to be a holy man and well-instructed in the faith, desired to be taught by him. The pir was exceedingly pleased, and then and there began to teach him. For three days Sharaf stayed in the pir's quarters, and then apparently overflowing with gratitude for the good professedly received, he told the good man how happy he was, and how much he desired to make a feast for his benefactor. "Send for a skilful cook," said he, "and please order him to prepare various dishes. I will spend thirty rupees on a really good dinner, and make the cook a present besides."

The cook promised to do his very best and asked for the loan of some of the pir's saucepans and rice-pots, which were at once handed over to him.

After some time had elapsed and Sharaf knew that the feast must be ready, he asked permission from the pir to go and see to the arrangements. The cook's house was a little distance off. On arriving at the place Sharaf upbraided him because of the delay, and ordered that, on account of this, he should send the feast with him to the Zeina Kadal, where he called a boatman and had the things placed in the boat. He himself then entered the boat and sent the cookies, who had brought the dinner, away.

On the promise of a good dinner the boatmen paddled right lustily, and were soon beyond all hope of discovery. After a short time the pir, whose appetite had been somewhat increased by expectation and delay, went to the cook's shop, and was terribly astonished to find that his friend and pupil had taken the dinner and utensils, and left him to pay the expenses.

This pir, however, was an obstinate character. He made quite sure in his own mind that the deceiver was Sharaf Taür, and in revenge he determined to bring the matter before the Viceroy, at that time 'Åtā Muhammad Khān,' and get the thief punished. The Viceroy listened with great interest to the pir's story, and at once issued a warrant for Sharaf's arrest. A day or two after this Sharaf was brought before the Viceroy, and charged with having stolen the saucepans, spoons, &c., of the pir, and in other ways deceived him. The pir eyed Sharaf with such a look, that the thief at length pleaded guilty and begged for pardon, promising to supply the Viceroy with enormous wealth if he would let him go free. 'Åtā Muhammad Khān, however, was inmmoveable. He would not listen to his pleadings for a moment, but gave strict orders that his right hand should be cut off, so that he might be hindered from carrying on his wicked profession in the future.

This was done; but it is said that Sharaf got an iron hand made with sharp-pointed fingers, and that he would strike anyone on the neck with this hand, who would not consent to give up his money or valuables. He killed three or four people in this way.

There are many other stories extant in Srinagar and in the villages concerning the cruelty and cunning of this man, too numerous to note here.

Some readers may wish to know something of Sharaf's latter days. A great pir, named Buzurg Shâh, sent for him one day, and advised him to desist from such works, and give his mind a little to heavenly things. He promised that, if he would do this, he would allow him to reside in his house as a companion and help. Sharaf's heart was touched by the kind offer and manner of the pir, and being thoroughly weary of doing wrong, he accepted the proposal.

He remained in Buzurg Shâh's house until his death, and proved himself in every way worthy of the confidence and esteem bestowed upon him by his benefactor.

It is not known when Sharaf Taür died, or where he was buried.

---

1819) the country remained a portion of the Durrah empire.
THE STUDY OF HINDU GRAMMAR AND THE STUDY OF SANSKRIT.

BY PROF. W. D. WHITNEY.

To the beginning study of Sanskrit it was an immense advantage that there existed a Hindu science of grammar, and one of so high a character. To realize how great the advantage, one has only to compare the case of languages destitute of it—as for instance the Zend. It is a science of ancient date, and has even exercised a shaping influence on the language in which all or nearly all the classical literature has been produced. It was an outcome of the same general spirit which is seen in the so careful textual preservation and tradition of the ancient sacred literature of India, and there is doubtless a historical connection between the one and the other, though of just what nature is as yet unclear.

The character of the Hindu grammatical science was, as is usual in such cases, determined by the character of the language which was its subject. The Sanskrit is above all things an analyzable language, one admitting of the easy and distinct separation of ending from stem, and of derivative suffix from primitive word, back to the ultimate attainable elements, the so-called roots. Accordingly, in its perfected form (for all the preparatory stages are unknown to us), the Hindu grammar offers us an established body of roots, with rules for their conversion into stems and for the inflection of the latter, and also for the accompanying phonetic changes—this last involving and resting upon a phonetic science of extraordinary merit, which has called forth the highest admiration of modern scholars. Nothing at all approaching it has been produced by any ancient people, and it has served as the foundation in no small degree of our own phonetics, even as our science of grammar and of language has borrowed much from India. The treatment of syntax is markedly inferior—though, after all, hardly more than in a measure to correspond with the inferiority of the Sanskrit sentence in point of structure, as compared with the Latin and the Greek. Into any more detailed description it is not necessary to our present purpose to enter, and the matter is one pretty well understood by the students of Indo-European language. It is generally well known also that the Hindu science, after a however long history of elaboration, became fixed for all future time in the system of a single grammarian, named Pāṇini (believed, though on grounds far from convincing, to have lived two or three centuries before the Christian era). Pāṇini's work has been commented without end, corrected in minor points, condensed, re-cast in arrangement, but never rebelled against or superseded, and it is still the authoritative standard of good Sanskrit. Its form of presentation is of the strangest: a miracle of ingenuity, but of perverse and wasted ingenuity. The only object aimed at in it is brevity, at the sacrifice of everything else—of order, of clearness, of even intelligibility except by the aid of keys and commentaries and lists of words, which then are furnished in profusion. To determine a grammatical point out of it is something like constructing a passage of text out of an inde verborum. If you are sure that you have gathered up every word that belongs in the passage, and have put them all in the right order, you have got the right reading; but only then. If you have mastered Pāṇini sufficiently to bring to bear upon the given point every rule that relates to it, and in due succession, you have settled the case; but that is no easy task. For example, it takes nine mutually limitative rules, from all parts of the text-book, to determine whether a certain aorist shall be ajāyārisam or ajaṭārisam: (the case is reported in the preface to Müller's grammar). There is lacking only a tenth rule, to tell us that the whole word is a false and never-used formation.

Since there is nothing to show how far the application of a rule reaches, there are provided treatises of laws of interpretation to be applied to them; but there is a residual rule underlying and determining the whole, that both the grammar and the laws of interpretation must be so construed as to yield good and acceptable forms, and not otherwise—and this implies (if that were needed) a condemnation of the whole mode of presentation of the system as a failure.

Theoretically, all that is prescribed and allowed by Pāṇini and his accepted commen-
tators is Sanskrit, and nothing else is entitled to the name. The young pandit, then, is expected to master the system and to govern his Sanskrit speech and writing by it. This he does, with immense pains and labour, then naturally valuing the acquisition in part according to what it has cost him. The same course was followed by those European scholars who had to make themselves the pupils of Hindu teachers, in acquiring Sanskrit for the benefit of Europe, and (as was said above) they did so to their very great advantage. Equally as a matter of course, the same must still be done by any one who studies in India, who has to deal with the native scholars, win their confidence and respect, and gain their aid. They must be met upon their own ground. But it is a question, and one of no slight practical importance, how far Western scholars in general are to be held to this method: whether Pāṇini is for us also the law of Sanskrit usage; whether we are to study the native Hindu grammar in order to learn Sanskrit.

There would be less reason for asking this question, if the native grammar were really the instrumentality by which the conserving tradition of the old language had been carried on. But that is a thing both in itself impossible and proved by the facts of the case to be untrue. No one ever mastered a list of roots with rules for their extension and inflection, and then went to work to construct texts upon that basis. Rather, the transmission of Sanskrit has been like the transmission of any highly cultivated language, only with differences of degree. The learner has his models which he imitates. He makes his speech after the example of that of his teacher, only under the constant government of grammatical rule, enforced by the requirement to justify out of the grammar any word or form as to which a question is raised. Thus the language has moved on by its own inertia, only falling, with further removal from its natural vernacular basis, more and more passively and mechanically into the hands of the grammarians. All this is like the propagation of literary English or German; only that here there is much more of a vernacular usage that shows itself able to override and modify the rules of grammar. It is yet more closely like the propagation of Latin; only that here the imitation of previous usage is frankly acknowledged as the guide, there being no iron system of grammar to assume to take its place. That such has really been the history of the later or classical Sanskrit is sufficiently shown by the facts. There is no absolute coincidence between it and the language which Pāṇini teaches. The former, indeed, includes little that the grammarians forbid; but, on the other hand, it lacks a great deal that they allow or prescribe. The difference between the two is so great that Benfer, a scholar deeply versed in the Hindu science, calls it a grammar without a corresponding language, as he calls the pre-classical dialects a language without a grammar. If such a statement can be made with any reason, it would appear that there is to be assumed, as the subject of Hindu grammatical science, a peculiar dialect of Sanskrit, which we may call the grammarians' Sanskrit, different both from the pre-classical dialects and from the classical, and standing either between them or beside them in the general history of Indian language. And it becomes a matter of importance to us to ascertain what this grammarians' Sanskrit is, how it stands related to the other varieties of Sanskrit, and whether it is entitled to be the leading object of our Sanskrit study. Such questions must be settled by a comparison of the dialect referred to with the other dialects, and of them with one another. And it will be found, upon such comparison, that the earlier and later forms of the Vedic dialect, the dialects of the Brāhmaṇas and Śūtras, and the classical Sanskrit, stand in a filial relation, each to its predecessor; are nearly or quite successive forms of the same language: while the grammarians' Sanskrit, as distinguished from them, is a thing of grammatical rule merely, having never had any real existence as a language, and being on the whole unknown in practice to even the most modern pandits.

The main thing which makes of the grammarians' Sanskrit a special and peculiar language is its list of roots. Of these there are reported to us about two thousand, with

---

* Einleitung in die Grammatik der vedischen Sprache, 1874, pp. 3, 4.
no intimation of any difference in character among them, or warning that a part of them may and that another part may not be drawn upon for forms to be actually used;—all stand upon the same plane. But more than half—actually more than half—of them never have been met with, and never will be met with, in the Sanskrit literature of any age. When this fact began to come to light, it was long fondly hoped, or believed, that the missing elements would yet turn up in some corner of the literature not hitherto ransacked, but all expectation of that has now been abandoned. One or another does appear from time to time; but what are they among so many? The last notable case was that of the root stigā, discovered in the Maitrāyani-Saṃhitā, a text of the Brāhmaṇa period, but the new roots found in such texts are apt to turn out wanting in the lists of the grammarians. Beyond all question, a certain number of cases are to be allowed for, of real roots, proved such by the occurrence of their evident cognates in other related languages, and chancing not to appear in the known literature, but they can go only a very small way indeed toward accounting for the eleven hundred unauthenticated roots. Others may have been assumed as underlying certain derivatives or bodies of derivatives—within due limits, a perfectly legitimate proceeding, but the cases thus explainable do not prove to be numerous. There remain then the great mass, whose presence in the lists no ingenuity has yet proved sufficient to account for. And in no small part, they bear their falsity and artificiality on the surface, in their phonetic form, and in the meanings ascribed to them. We can confidently say that the Sanskrit language, known to us through a long period of development, neither had nor could have any such roots. How the grammarians came to concoct their list, rejected in practice by themselves and their own pupils, is hitherto an unexplained mystery. No special student of the native grammar, to my knowledge, has attempted to cast any light upon it, and it was left for Dr. Edgren, no partisan of the grammarians, to group and set forth the facts for the first time, in the Journal of the American Oriental Society (Vol. XI. 1883 [but the article printed in 1879], pp. 1-55), adding a list of the real roots, with brief particulars as to their occurrence. It is quite clear, with reference to this fundamental and most important item, of what character the grammarians' Sanskrit is. The real Sanskrit of the latest period is, as concerns its roots, a true successor to that of the earliest period, and through the known intermediates. It has lost some of the roots of its predecessors, as each of these some belonging to its own predecessors or predecessor; it has, also like these, won a certain number not earlier found; both in such measure as was to be expected. As for the rest of the asserted roots of the grammar, to account for them is not a matter that concerns at all the Sanskrit language and its history; it only concerns the history of the Hindu science of grammar. That, too, has come to be pretty generally acknowledged. Every one who knows anything of the history of Indic-European etymology knows how much mischief the grammarians' list of roots wrought in the hands of the earlier more incautious and credulous students of Sanskrit: how many false and worthless derivations were founded upon them. That sort of work, indeed, is not yet entirely a thing of the past: still, it has come to be well understood by most scholars that no alleged Sanskrit root can be accepted as real unless it is supported by such a use in the literary records of the language as authenticates it—for there are such things in the later language as artificial occurrences, forms made for once or twice from roots taken out of the grammarians' list, by a natural license, which one is only surprised not to see oftener availed of: (there are hardly more than a dozen or two of such cases quotable). That they appear so seldom is the best evidence of the fact already pointed out above, that the grammar had, after all, only a superficial and negative influence upon the real tradition of the language.

It thus appears that a Hindu grammarian's statement as to the fundamental elements of

---

3 I have myself now in press a much fuller account of the quotable roots of the language, with all their quotable tense-stems and primary derivatives—everything accompanied by a definition of the period of its known occurrence in the history of the language.

* Not, indeed, universally; one may find among the selected verbs that are conjugated in full at the end of F. M. Müller's Sanskrit Grammar, no very small number of those that are utterly unknown to Sanskrit usage ancient or modern.
his language is without authority until tested by the actual facts of the language, as represented by the Sanskrit literature. But the principle won here is likely to prove of universal application, for we have no reason to expect to find the grammarians absolutely trustworthy in other departments of their work, when they have failed so signally in one. There can be nothing in their system that will not require to be tested by the recorded facts of the language, in order to determine its true value. How this is, we will proceed to ascertain by examining a few examples.

In the older language, but not in the oldest, (for it is wanting in the Veda), there is formed a periphrastic future tense active by compounding a nomens agentis with an auxiliary, the present tense of the verb as 'be': thus, dādā 'smi, (literally dātus sum), 'I will give,' etc. It is quite infrequent as compared with the other future, yet common enough to require to be regarded as a part of the general Sanskrit verb-system. To this active tense the grammarians give a corresponding middle, although the auxiliary in its independent use has no middle inflection. It is made with endings modified so as to stand in the usual relation of middle endings to active, and further with conversion in 1st sing. of the radical s to h—a very anomalous substitution, of which there is not, I believe, another example in the language. Now what support has this middle tense in actual use? Only this: that in the Brāhmaṇas occur four sporadic instances of attempts to make by analogy middle forms for this tense: (they are all reported in my Sanskrit Grammar, § 847; further search has brought to light no additional examples). Two of them are 1st sing., one having the form so for the auxiliary, the other he, as taught in the grammar; and in the whole later literature, epic and classical, I find record of the occurrence of only one further case, dārśayate (in Naished. V. 71.).

Here also, the classical dialect is the true continuator of the pre-classical. It is only in the grammarians' Sanskrit that every verb conjugated in the middle voice has also a middle periphrastic future.

There is another and much more important part of verbal inflection—namely, the whole aorist-system, in all its variety—as to which the statements of the grammarians are to be received with especial distrust, for the reason that in the classical language the aorist is a decadent formation. In the older dialects, down to the last Sūtra, and through the entire list of early and genuine Upanishads, the aorist has its own special office, that of designating the immediate past, and is always to be found where such designation is called for. Later, even in the epos, it is only another preterit, equivalent in use to imperfect and perfect, and hence of no value, and subsisting only in occasional use, mainly as a survival from an earlier condition of the language. Thus, for example, of the first kind of aorist, the root-aorist, forms are made in pre-classical Sanskrit from about 120 roots. Of these, 15 make forms in the later language also, mostly sporadically, (only gā, dā, dhā, pā, dhā, bhū less infrequently), and 8 more in the later language only, all in an occurrence or two, (all but one, in active preceptive forms, as to which see below). Again, of the fifth aorist-form, the teh-aorist, (rather the most frequent of all), forms are made in the older language from 140 roots and later from only 18 of these (and sporadically, except in the case of grām, rād, vād, viḍ), with a dozen more in the later language exclusively, all sporadic except mahā, (which is not a Vedic root). Once more, as regards the third or reduplicated aorist, the proportion is slightly different, because of the association of that aorist with the causative conjugation, and the frequency of the latter in use. Here, against about 110 roots quoted from the earlier language, 16 of them also in the later, there are about 30 found in the later alone, (nearly all of them only sporadically, and none with any frequency).

And the case is not otherwise with the remaining forms. The facts being such it is easily seen that general statements made by the grammarians as to the range of occurrence of each form, and as to the occurrence of one form in the active and a certain other one in the middle from a given root, must be of very doubtful authority; in fact, as regards the latter

---

8 Here, as elsewhere below, my authority for the later literature is chiefly the Petersburg Lexicon (the whole older literature I have examined for myself), and my statements are, of course, always open to modification by the results of further researches. But all the best and most genuine part of the literature has been carefully and thoroughly excerpted for the Lexicon; and for the Mahābhārata we have now the explicit statements of Holzmann, in his Grammatisches aus dem Mahābhārata, Leipzig, 1884.
point, they are the more suspicious as lacking any tolerable measure of support from the facts of the older language. But there are much greater weaknesses than these in the grammarians' treatment of the aorist.

Let us first turn our attention to the aorist optative, the so-called precative (or benedictory). This formation is by the native grammarians not recognised as belonging to the aorist at all—not even so far as to be put next the aorist in their general scheme of conjugation; they suffer the future-systems to intervene between the two. This is in them fairly excusable as concerns the precative active, since it is the optative of the root-aorist, and so has an aspect as if it might come independently from the root directly. Nor, indeed, can we much blame them for overlooking the relation of their precative middle to the sibilant or sigmatic aorist, considering that they ignore tense-systems and modes; but that their European imitators, down to the very latest, should commit the same oversight is a different matter. The contrast, now, between the grammarians' dialect and the real Sanskrit is most marked as regards the middle forms. According to the grammar, the precative middle is to be made from every root, and even for its secondary conjugations, the causative, etc. It has two alternative modes of formation, which we see to correspond to two of the forms of the sibilant aorist: the s-aorist, namely, and the ṭ-aorist. Of course, a complete inflection is allowed it. To justify all this, now, I am able to point to only a single occurrence of a middle precative in the whole later literature, including the epics: that is rīrvishītha in the Bṛhadāranyaka-Purāṇa (III. 9, 24), a text notable for its artificial imitation of ancient forms (the same word occurs also in the Rāg-Veda). It is made, as will be noticed, from a reduplicated aorist stem, and so is unauthorized by grammatical rule. A single example in a whole literature, and that a false one! In the pre-classical literature also, middle precative forms are made hardly more than sporadically, or from less than 40 roots in all, (so far as I have found): those belonging to the s and ṭ-aorists are, indeed, among the most numerous (14 each), but those of the root-aorist do not fall short of them (also 14 roots), and there are examples from three of the other four aorists. Except a single 3rd pl., (in śrata, instead of śrāna), only the three singular persons and the 1st pl. are quoted, and forms occur without, as well as with, the adscititious s between mode-sign and personal ending which is the special characteristic of a precative as distinguished from a simply optative form. Here, again, we have a formation sporadic in the early language and really extinct in the later, but erected by the grammarians into a regular part of every verb-system.

With the precative active the case is somewhat different. This also, indeed, is rare even to sporadicalness, being, so far as I know, made from only about 60 roots in the whole language—and of these, only half can show forms containing the true precative s. But it is not quite limited to the pre-classical dialects: it is made also later from 15 roots, 9 of which are additional to those which make a precative in the older language. Being in origin an optative of the root-aorist, it comes, as we may suppose, to seem to be a formation from the root directly, and so to be extended beyond the limits of the aorist. From a clear majority (about three fifths) of all the roots that make it, it has no other aorist forms by its side. And this begins even in the earliest period, (with half-a-dozen roots in the Veda, and toward a score besides in the Bṛhadāranyaka and Śūra); although there the precative more usually makes a part of a general aorist-formation: for instance, and especially, from the root bhū, whose precative forms are oftener met with than those of all other roots together, and which is the only root from which more than two real precative persons are quotable. How rare it is even in the epics is shown by the fact that Holtzmann is able to quote only six forms, (and one of these doubtful, and another a false formation), from the whole Mahābhārata, one of them occurring twice; while the first book of the Rāmāyaṇa (about 4500 lines) has the single bhūyat. Since it is not quite extinct in the classical period, the Hindu grammarians could not, perhaps, well help teaching its formation, and, considering the general absence of perspective

* In his work already cited, at p. 32.
from their work, we should hardly expect them to explain that it was the rare survival of an anciently little-used formation; but we have here another striking example of the great discordance between the real Sanskrit and the grammarians’ dialect, and of the insufficiency of the information respecting the former obtainable from the rules for the latter.

Again, the reduplicated or third form of aorist, though it has become attached to the causative secondary conjugation, (by a process in the Veda not yet complete), as the regular aorist of that conjugation, is not made from the derivative causative stem, but comes from the root itself, not less directly than do the other aorist-formations—except in the few cases where the causative stem contains a p added to ā: thus, atishāhipat from stem sthāpayya, root sthā. Perhaps misled by this exception, however, the grammarians teach the formation of the reduplicated aorist from the causative stem, through the intermediate process of converting the stem back to the root, by striking off its conjugation-sign and reducing its strengthened vowel to the simpler root-form. That is to say, we are to make, for example, abābhavat from the stem bhāvyay, by cutting off ōya and reducing the remainder bhā or bho to bhā, instead of making it from bhā directly!

That is a curious etymological process; quite a side-piece to deriving vāryas and vārisṭha from uṛ, and the like, as the Hindu grammarians and their European copysts would likewise have us do. There is one point where the matter is brought to a crucial test: namely, in roots that end in u or ū; where, if the vowel on which the reduplication is formed is an ō-vowel, the reduplication-vowel should be of the same character; but, in any other case, an ō-vowel. Thus, in the example already taken, bhāvyay ought to make abābhavat, just as it makes bhāvāyishati; in the case of a real derivation from the causative stem, and such forms as abābhavat are, in fact, in a great number of cases either prescribed or allowed by the grammarians; but I am not aware of their ever being met with in use, earlier or later, with the single exception of api-plasam, occurring in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa (VI. ii. 1, 8).

Again, the grammarians give a peculiar and problematic rule for an alternative formation of certain passive tenses (aorist and futures) from the special 3rd sing. aor. pass.; they allow it in the case of all roots ending in vowels, and of grah, dṛṣṭa, han. Thus, for example, from the root ādam are allowed adāyishi, adāyishyate, adāyitī, beside adāsi, adāyate, adātā. What all this means is quite obscure, since there is no usage, either early or late, to cast light upon it. The Rig-Veda has once (I. 147, 5) dhāyis, from root dhā; but this—being active—is rather a hindrance than a help. The Jām.-Brāhmaṇa has once (I. 321) ākhyāyishyante; but this appears to be a form analogous with havyāyate, &c., and so proves nothing. The Bhāg.-Purāṇa has once (VIII. 13, 36) tāyip, which the Petersburg Lexicon refers to root ian; but if there is such a thing as the secondary root tāy, as claimed by the grammarians, it perhaps belongs rather there. And there remain, so far as I can discover, only asthāyishi (Dasak. [Wilson], p. 117, l. 6) and andyisiṣa (Ind. SprÜche, 6187, from the Kusavāyāṇa); and these are with great probability to be regarded as artificial forms, made because the grammar declares them correct. It seems not unlikely that some misapprehension or blunder lies at the foundation of these rules of the grammar; at any rate, the formation is only grammarians’ Sanskrit, and not even pashdī, and it should never be obtruded upon the attention of beginners in the language.

Again, the secondary ending dhvam of 2nd pl. mid. sometimes has to take the form dhvam. In accordance with the general euphonic usages of the language, this should be whenever in the present condition of Sanskrit there has been lost before the ending a lingual sibilant; thus: we have anesdhvam from anes + dhvam, and apasdhvam from apasv + dhvam; we should further have in the prescriptive bhavishtdhvam from bhavisva + dhvam, if the form ever occurred, as, unfortunately, it does not. And, so far as I know, there is not to be found, either in the earlier language or the later (and as to the former I can speak with authority, a single instance of dhvam in any other situation—the test-cases, however, being far from numerous. But the Hindu grammarians, if they are reported rightly by their European pupils (which in this instance is hard to believe), give rules as to the change of the ending upon this basis only for the s-aorist. For the s-aorist and its
optative (the prepositive), they make the choice between \textit{dhwam} and \textit{dheoam} to depend upon whether the \textit{i} is or is not “preceded by a semi-vowel or \textit{k}”; that is, \textit{apavish + dheoam} gives \textit{apavishdheoam}, but \textit{ajanish + dheoam} gives \textit{ajanishdheoam}, and so likewise we should have \textit{janishdheoam}. It would be curious to know what ground the grammarians imagined themselves to have for laying down such a rule as this, wherein there is a total absence of discoverable connection between cause and effect; and it happens that all the quoted examples—\textit{ajanishdheoam}, \textit{artidheoam}, \textit{aishihdheoam}, \textit{repihdeoam}—are opposed to their rule, but accord-ant with reason. What is yet worse, however, is that the grammar extends the same conversion of \textit{dh} to \textit{dh}, under the same restrictions, to the primary ending \textit{dheo} of the perfect likewise, with which it has nothing whatever to do—teaching us that, for instance, \textit{cakrih} and \textit{tushit} + \textit{dheo} make necessarily \textit{cakridheo} and \textit{tushidheo}, and that \textit{dadhri} + \textit{dheo} makes either \textit{dadhridheo} or \textit{dadhridheo}, while \textit{tumid} + \textit{dheo} makes only \textit{tumidheo}! This appears to me the most striking case of downright unintelligent blundering on the part of the native grammarians that has come to notice. If there is any way of relieving them of the reproach of it, their partisans ought to cast about at once to find it.

A single further matter of prime importance may be here referred to, in illustration of the character of the Hindu grammarians as clas-sifiers and presenters of the facts of their language. By reason of the extreme freedom and wonderful regularity of word-composition in Sanskrit, the grammarians were led to make a classification of compounds in a manner that brought true enlightenment to European scholars; and the classification has been largely adopt-ed as a part of modern philological science, along even with its bizarre terminology. Nothing could be more accurate and happier than the distinction of dependent, descriptive, possessive and copulative compounds; only their titles—‘his man’ (\textit{tatspurfsu}), ‘act-sustaining’ (? \textit{kar-}

\textit{madhdraya}), ‘much-rice’ (\textit{bahweh}, and ‘couple!’ (\textit{dweedv}), respectively—can hardly claim to be worth preserving. But it is the characteristic of Hindu science generally not to be able to stop when it has done enough, and so the grammarians have given us, on the same plane of division with these four capital classes, two more, which they call \textit{devi} (‘two-cow’) and \textit{avayyabhav} (‘indeclinable-becoming’); and these have no \textit{raison d’être}, but are collections of special cases belonging to some of the other classes, and so heterogeneous that their limits are hardly capable of definition. The \textit{devi-class} are secondary adjective com-pound, but sometimes, like other adjectives, used as nouns; and an \textit{avayyabhav} is always the adverbially-used accusative nenter of an adjective compound. It would be a real service on the part of some scholar, versed in the Hindu science, to draw out a full account of the so-called \textit{devi-class} and its boundaries, and to show if possible how the grammarians were misled into establishing it. But it will probably be long before these two false classes cease to haunt the concluding chapters of Sanskrit grammars, or writers on language to talk of the six kinds of compounds in Sanskrit.

Points in abundance, of major or minor consequence, it would be easy to bring up in addition, for criticism or for question. Thus, to take a trifle or two: according to the general analogies of the language, we ought to speak of the root \textit{grlh}, instead of \textit{grah}. Probably the Hindu science adopts the latter form because of some mechanical advantage on the side of brevity resulting from it, in the rules prescribing forms and derivatives. The instances are not few in which that can be shown to have been the preponderating consideration, leading to the sacrifice of things more important. One may conjecture that similar causes led to the setting up of a root \textit{dive} instead of \textit{dive}, ‘play, gamble’; that it may have been found easier to prescribe the prolongation of the \textit{i} than its irregular gunation, in \textit{desea}, etc. This has unfortunately misled the authors of the Petersburg Lexicons into their strange and indefensible identification of the asserted root \textit{dive}, ‘play,’ with the so-called root \textit{dive}, ‘shine.’ The combination of meanings is forced and unnatural; and then especially

\textit{Spiegel, for example (Altertumische Grammatik, p. 229), thinks it necessary to specify that deve-compounds do, to be sure, occur also in the Old Persian dialects, but that they in no respect form a special class; and a very recent Sanskrit grammar in Italian (Pulle, Turin, 1888) gives as the four primary classes of compounds the devend, tapturu, bahweh and avayyabhav—as if one were to say that the kingdoms in Nature are four: animal, vegetable, mineral, and cactuses.}
the phonetic form of the two roots is absolutely distinct, the one showing only short ī and ā (as in divam, dyuhīs), the other always and only long ī and ā (as in dyātī, -divān, and -dyā, dyātas). The one root is really diva, and the other dīvā: (it may be added that the Petersburg Lexicon, on similar evidence, inconsistently but correctly writes the roots sīvā and sīva, instead of sīvī and sīva).

It would be easy to continue the work of illustration much further; but this must be enough to show how and how far we have to use and to trust the teachings of the Hindu grammarians. Or, if one prefer to employ the Benfeyan phrase, we see something of what this language is which has a grammar but not an existence, and in what relation it stands to the real Sanskrit language, begun in the Veda, and continued without a break down to our own times, all the rules of the grammar having been able only slightly to stiffen and unnaturalize it. Surely, what we desire to have to do with is the Sanskrit, and not the imaginary dialect that fits the definitions of Pāṇini. There is no escaping the conclusion that, if we would understand Sanskrit, we may not take the grammarians as authorities, but only as witnesses. Not a single rule given or a fact stated by them is to be accepted on their word, without being tested by the facts of the language as laid down in the less subjective and more trustworthy record of the literature. Of course, most of what the native grammar teaches is true and right; but, until after critical examination, no one can tell which part. Of course, also, there is more or less of genuine supplementary material in the grammarians' treaties—material especially lexical, but doubtless in some measure also grammatical—which needs to be worked in so as to complete our view of the language; but what this genuine material is, as distinguished from the artificial and false, is only to be determined by a thorough and cautious comparison of the entire system of the grammar with the whole recorded language. Such a comparison has not yet been made, and is hardly even being made: in part, to be sure, because the time for it has been long in coming; but mainly because those who should be making it are busy at something else. The skilled students of the native grammar, as it seems to me, have been looking at their task from the wrong point of view, and labouring in the wrong direction. They have been trying to put the non-existent grammarians' dialect in the place of the genuine Sanskrit. They have thought it their duty to learn out of Pāṇini and his successors, and to set forth for the benefit of the world, what the Sanskrit really is, instead of studying and setting forth and explaining (and, where necessary, accounting for and excusing) Pāṇini's system itself. They have failed to realize that, instead of a divine revelation, they have in their hands a human work—a very able one, indeed, but also imperfect, like other human works, full of the prescription in place of description that characterizes all Hindu productions, and most perversely constructed; and that in studying it they are only studying a certain branch of Hindu science: one that is, indeed, of the highest interest, and has an important bearing on the history of the language, especially since the dicta of the grammarians have had a marked influence in shaping the latest form of Sanskrit—not always to its advantage. Hence the insignificant amount of real progress that the study of Hindu grammar has made in the hands of European scholars. Its career was well inaugurated, now nearly forty-five years ago (1839-40), by Böhtlingk's edition of Pāṇini's text, with extracts from the native commentaries, followed by an extremely stingy commentary by the editor; but it has not been succeeded by anything of importance, until now that a critical edition of the Mahābhāṣya, by Kielhorn, is passing through the press, and is likely soon to be completed: a highly meritorious work, worthy of European learning, and likely, if followed up in the right spirit, to begin a new era in its special branch of study. Considering the extreme difficulty of the system, and the amount of labour that is required before the student can win any available mastery of it, it is incumbent upon the representatives of the study to produce an edition of Pāṇini accompanied with a version, a digest of the leading comments on each rule, and an index that shall

* For the photographic reproduction, in 1874, of a single manuscript of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya or 'Great Comment' (on Pāṇini), with the glosses upon it, was but a costly piece of child's play; and the English government, as if to make the enterprise a complete fiasco, sent all the copies thus prepared to India, to be buried there in native keeping, instead of placing them in European libraries, within reach of Western scholars.
make it possible to find what the native authorities teach upon each given point: that is to say, to open the grammatical science to knowledge virtually at first hand without the lamentable waste of time thus far unavoidable—a waste, because both needless and not sufficiently rewarded by its results.

A curious kind of superstition appears to prevail among certain Sanskrit scholars. They cannot feel that they have the right to accept a fact of the language unless they find it set down in Pāṇini’s rules. It may well be asked, on the contrary, of what consequence it is, except for its bearing on the grammatical science itself, whether a given fact is or is not so set down. A fact in the pre-classical language is confessedly quite independent of Pāṇini; he may take account of it and he may not; and no one knows as yet what the ground is of the selection he makes for inclusion in his system. As for a fact in the classical language, it is altogether likely to fall within the reach of one of the great grammarian’s rules—at least, as these have been extended and restricted and amended by his numerous successors: and this is a thing much to the credit of the grammar; but what bearing it has upon the language it would be hard to say. If, however, we should seem to meet with a fact ignored by the grammar, or contravening its rules, we should have to look to see whether supporting facts in the language did not show its genuineness in spite of the grammar. On the other hand, there are facts in the language, especially in its latest records, which have a false show of existence, being the artificial product of the grammar’s prescription or permission; and there was nothing but the healthy conservatism of the true tradition of the language to keep them from becoming vastly more numerous. And then, finally, there are the infinite number of facts which, so far as the grammar is concerned, should he or might be in the language, only that they do not happen ever to occur there; for here lies the principal discordance between the grammar and the language. The statement of the grammar that such a thing is so and so is of quite uncertain value, until tested by the facts of the language: and in this testing, it is the grammar that is on trial, that is to be condemned for artificiality or commended for faithfulness; not the language, which is quite beyond our jurisdiction. It cannot be too strongly urged that the Sanskrit, even that of the most modern authors, even that of the pandits of the present day, is the successor, by natural processes of tradition, of the older dialects; and that the grammar is a more or less successful attempt at its description, the measure of the success being left for us to determine, by comparison of the one with the other.

To maintain this is not to disparage the Hindu grammatical science; it is only to put it in its true place. The grammar remains nearly if not altogether the most admirable product of the scientific spirit in India, ranking with the best products of that spirit that the world has seen. We will scant no praise to it, if we only are not called on to bow down to it as authoritative. So we regard the Greek science of astronomy as one of the greatest and most creditable achievements of the human intellect since men first began to observe and deduce; but we do not plant ourselves upon its point of view in setting forth the movements of the heavenly bodies—though the men of the Middle Ages did so, to their advantage, and the system of epicycles maintained itself in existence, by dint of pure conservation, long after its artificiality had been demonstrated. That the early European Sanskrit grammars assumed the basis and worked in the methods of the Hindu science was natural and praiseworthy. Bopp was the first who had knowledge and independence enough to begin effectively the work of subordinating Hindu to Western science, using the materials and deductions of the former so far as they accorded with the superior methods of the latter, and turning his attention to the records of the language itself, as fast as they became accessible to him. Since his time, there has been in some respects a retrogression rather than an advance. European scholars have seemed to take satisfaction in submitting themselves slavishly to Hindu teachers, and the grammarians’ dialect has again been thrust forward into the place which the Sanskrit language ought to occupy. To refer to but a striking example or two: in Müller’s grammar the native science is made the supreme rule after a fashion that is sometimes amusing in its naïveté, and the genuine and the fictitious are mingled inextricably, in his
One more point, of minor consequence, may be noted, in which the habit of Western philology shows itself too subservient to the whims of the Sanskrit native grammarians: the order of the varieties of present stems, and the designation of the conjugation classes as founded on it. We accept the Hindu order of the cases in noun-inflection, not seeking to change it, though unfamiliar, because we see that it has a reason, and a good one; but no one has ever been ingenious enough even to conjecture a reason for the Hindu order of the classes. Chance itself, if they had been thrown together into a hat, and set down in their order as drawn out, could not more successfully have sundered what belongs together, and juxtaposed the discordant. That being the case, there is no reason for our paying any heed to the arrangement: in fact, the heed we do pay is a perversion. The Hindus do not speak of first class, second class, etc., but call each class by the name of its leading verb as, bhū-verbs, adverbs, and so on; and it was a decided merit of Müller, in his grammar, to try to substitute for the mock Hindu method this true one, which does not make such a dead pull upon the mechanical memory of the learner. As a matter of course, the most defensible and acceptable method is that of calling each class by its characteristic feature— 

as, the reduplicating class, the yā-class, and so on. But one still meets, in treatises and papers on general philology, references to verbs “of the fourth class,” “of the seventh class,” and so on. So far as this is not mere mechanical habit, it is pedantry—as if one meant to say: “I am so familiar with the Sanskrit language and its native grammar that I can tell the order in which the bodies of similarly-conjugated roots follow one another in the dhātupāthas, though no one knows any reason for it, and the Hindu grammarians themselves lay no stress upon it.” It is much to be hoped that this affectation will die out, and soon.

These and such as these are sufficient reasons why an exposition like that here given is timely and pertinent. It needs to be impressed on the minds of scholars that the study of the Sanskrit language is one thing, and the study of the Hindu science of grammar another and a
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very different thing; that while there has been a time when the latter was the way to the former, that time is now long past, and the relation of the two reversed; that the present task of the students of the grammar is to make their science accessible, account if possible for its anomalies, and determine how much and what can be extracted from it to fill out that knowledge of the language which we derive from the literature; and that the peculiar Hindu ways

of grouping and viewing and naming facts familiar to us from the other related languages are an obstacle in the way of a real and fruitful comprehension of those facts as they show themselves in Sanskrit, and should be avoided. An interesting sentimental glamour, doubtless, is thrown over the language and its study by the retention of an old classification and terminology; but that attraction is dearly purchased at the cost of a tittle of clearness and objective truth.

THE NUMBER OF STARS CONSTITUTING THE SEVERAL NAKSHATRAS ACCORDING TO BRAHMAGUPTA AND VRIDDHA-GARGA.

BY G. THIBAULT, PH.D.

The question as to the number of stars comprised in the different Nakshatras is known to possess some importance, in connexion with the history of the Nakshatra system as elaborated by the Hindus, and its presumptive original identity with the corresponding systems of other nations. The fullest accounts of the various opinions held with regard to that question by the different Hindu authorities, are to be found in Burgess and Whitney's translation of the Śāraśiṣṭha, p. 325 ff., and in Weber's second paper on the Nakshatras, p. 380 ff. The astronomical works quoted there are the Nakshatra-Kāla (a Pariśātha of the Atharva-Veda), the Śākalya-Saṅhita, some books belonging to a comparatively late period, as the Muhūrta-chintamāni and the Rattanamāni, and finally the Khaṇḍakāhādyaka by the famous Brahmagupta. The last-mentioned work, however, the original of which was hitherto unknown to European scholars, is quoted second-hand, viz. on the authority of the great Arabian scholar Albirūnī, who, in the eleventh century, travelled in India, and there studied with especial care the astronomy of the Hindus. The statements regarding the number of stars composing each Nakshatra, which Albirūnī takes from the Khaṇḍakāhādyaka, differ in many items from what the Śākalya-Saṅhita and other Hindu authorities have to say on the same subject; in some points so much so that Whitney is inclined to assume errors on the part of the Arab traveller. It will therefore be worth while to quote from the Khaṇḍakāhādyaka itself—manuscripts of which have recently

become available—the passage referring to the subject mentioned.

It is found there in the Tārāgrahavīkṣhāpādhyāya, and runs as follows:

"Mūla, Aja (Pārśvabhadrapadā) Ahirbūhyā (Uttarabhadrapadā), Aśvaśījā (Aśvinī), the constellation of Aditi (Panarasā), Indrāṇī (Viśākhā) and the two Phalgunī, consist of two stars each; the constellation of Trasā (Chitrā), that of Guru (Pushya), that of Varuṇa (Śatabhishaj), Ardrā, the constellation of Vāyu (Śvāt) and that of Pūshan (Rvenī) have one star each.

Brahma (Ahuji), Indu (Mrigadāsī), Yama (Bhaṣaṇ), Hari (Svāna) and Indra (Jyotishā) have three stars each. Vehni (Kṛttikā), the Sārpa (Śālāhā) and the constellation of the Fathers (Maghā) have six stars each. The constellation of Mitra (Aurākhā) and the two Ashādā have four each; Vassu (Svānāthā), Ravi (Hasta), and Rōhiṇi, have five stars each."

The numbers, given in the preceding verses, confirm throughout those stated by Albirūnī.

There remains the question if the numbers of stars given by Brahmagupta can claim to represent a nearer approximation to the numbers exhibited by the original Hindu system than the corresponding statements made by the Śākalya-Saṅhita and other books. This appears really to be the case, because, in several

\[1] A. B. "Pārśvabhadrapadā; "A. B. denote the two MSS. of the Khaṇḍakāhādyaka at my disposal.

\[2] A. B. "Pārśvabhadrapadā; "A. B. "Pārśvabhadrapadā;
instances where the *Khandakhādyaka* diverges from the later authorities on the subject, it agrees—not only with the *Nakshatra-Kalpa* (about which see Weber's paper referred to above), but likewise, and even more closely, with another old authority of great weight, the *Vṛiddhagāryya-Saṃhitā*. The latter work (of which two complete manuscripts are at my disposal, one belonging to the Bombay Government, the other forming part of the Bhaū Dājī Library) refers to the matter in different places, in the fourth chapter—*Nakshatrakāryavatam*—which treats of the works to be done under the different *nakshatras*, and mentions in passing how many stars belong to each, and then again in the so-called *Nakshatrakāryavatam* (if this reading of the MSS. is the right one) where among other matters the numbers of the *Nakshatra* stars, are connected stated in three *ālokas*. The text of the latter is, in both manuscripts, very corrupt, but may, with the assistance of the information derived from the fourth chapter, be restored with tolerable certainty. They run as follows:—

एकनां वाक्वमत्सः पुन्ताकां तान्त्रमानिणः ।
राशि भेदे सत्तालुगैः विज्ञानीयेनामयीम् ॥
विज्ञानीमतिः सार्य्य लेखा ब्राह्मण सर्वमायेः ।
चतुर्दशार्थायादि [हेतु] ॥
प्राक्तर वैज्ञानिक ॥
प्राक्तर कृतिका मुलामध्या वैमयेम् ॥

"One star have Śāṭhādhisūjā, Puṣya, Ārdrā, Chittā, and Svātī. Two stars have Rādhā (i.e. Viśākhā), the two Bhadrapadā, the two Phālgunī, Punarvasu (Arvā, the constellation of Ura, the latter being taken as synonymous with Aditi according to Neigh, I. 1) and Āśvini.

Three stars have the Ilvikā, Bharesī, Jyēśāhūthā, Abhiṣīt, Śravaṇa. Four stars have the two Aśāhūthā, Anuradhā, Rēvati and Sravāshāhūthā.

Five stars have Hasta and Rohiṣī. Six stars have Kṛiti, Mūla, Āśvini, and Māgāhā."

The statements made in the fourth chapter agree with the above in all points; only they do not give any information about Abhijit.

Comparing now the account given by Brahmagupta with that due to Vṛiddha-Garga, we find that they agree with regard to all *Nakshatras* excepting Āśvini, Mūla and Śravāshāhūthā.

It will moreover be of interest to compare the information furnished by Garga and the *Khandakhādyaka* with the statements made on the same matter by the other old authorities. A comparison of the kind was instituted by Professor Weber in the paper referred to, p. 380 ff., the authorities taken into account being the *Nakshatra-Kalpa*, Albidāni's account of the *Khandakhādyaka*, the *Śākyiya-Saṃhitā*, Ānṛtī, and others. In the following I limit myself to the older and therefore weightier authorities, viz. the *Nakshatra-Kalpa* which stands on the confines of Vedic literature, the *Vṛiddhagāryya*, which is anterior to the scientific Hindu works on astronomy evincing Greek influence, and the *Khandakhādyaka*, whose exact date is known, and shows the work to belong to the early period of scientific Hindu astronomy. Comparing these three, we find a general agreement with regard to the number of stars constituting Bharesī, Kṛiti, Māgāhā, Āsēnā, Āṇrā, Pushya, Aśvini, Māgāhā, the two Phālgunī, Hasta, Chiśā, Svātī, Viśākhā, Anuradhā, the two Aśāhūthā, Śravaṇa, Sābhishāj, the two Bhadrapadā and Rēvati, i.e. with regard to twenty-two out of twenty-eight *Nakshatras*. With regard to Āśvini and Śravaṇa, the N. and the Kā agree against the G.; with regard to Rēvati, Jyēśāhūthā and Abhijit, the G. and Kā agree against the N. There is a general disagreement about Mūla (and this continues in the case of the later authorities also, Mūla being the only *Nakshatra* about which no two writers agree). If we admit as a fourth term of the comparison the *Śākyiya-Saṃhitā*, we find that in fifteen cases it confirms the agreement about the twenty-two *Nakshatras* mentioned above; in the remaining seven cases its statements differ. But, on the other hand, with regard to the six *Nakshatras* about which the three older writers disagree, it regularly sides

* A. निकार्तिभीमत्। B. नित्यानिकार्तिभीमत्।
* A. निकार्तिभीमत्। B. नित्यानिकार्तिभीमत्।
* A. निकार्तिभीमत्। B. नित्यानिकार्तिभीमत्।

A. निकार्तिभीमत्। B. नित्यानिकार्तिभीमत्।
A. निकार्तिभीमत्। B. नित्यानिकार्तिभीमत्।

---

Mrigāsiras.—The reading of the text might also be emended into Ilvikā; Ilvakā and Invakā would be preferable forms.
with the majority of the latter (the case of Mūla excepted) and thereby strengthens their authority.

The consensus of the older authorities being so striking, no great weight can be attached to the fact of the later writers showing a number of deviations. Among the older authorities themselves, the Nakshatra-Kalpa is distinguished by apparently following a kind of system in assigning throughout two stars to those Nakshatras, whose old names are dual forms (aśvāyuja, pavanaṇa, phalgunya, vīśālikā, pravṛthapadau), and more than two to the Nakshatras plural in form; while to those singular in form it allows one star each, making an exception (as Prof. Weber has pointed out) in the case of those Nakshatras only whose names, although singular in form, denote objects which can be represented by a plurality of stars only (mṛgāka, hastā, karaṇa; the case of mūla is doubtful). Garga, on the other hand, gives three stars to Asvinī, five to Rākṣiṇī, three to Jyāṣṭhā, three to Abhijit; the only point in which his account seems to have an advantage over the Nakshatra-Kalpa, is its assigning four (not five) stars to Sṛvaṇa; an opinion countered by a passage of the Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa.

A BUDDHIST SANSKRIT INSCRIPTION FROM KOTA.

BY E. HULTSCH, PH.D.; VIENNA.

The subjoined Nāgarī inscription is edited from a slightly damaged paper-rubbing, which I owe to the kindness of Professor Bühler, who received it from Dr. Burgess. A label attached to the rubbing states that the inscription is engraved "on a stone built into a recess under a flight of stairs on the right hand as one enters the 'Barkhāl Gate' of the inner wall of the town of Shergadhī in Kōṭī."

The inscription consists of twenty Sanskrit stanzas, in various metres, and in a very turgid style. It professes to be a prāṣasti, or eulogy, and records the building of a Buddhist temple and monastery to the east of mount Kāśīvardhana by the feudal chief (Sāmanta) Devadatta, in whose seventh regnal year the document is dated, and whose genealogy is given as follows:

Bindunāga.
Padmanāga.

Sarvaṇāga, married to Śrī.

Devadatta.
This pedigree does not enable us to connect the Nāga kings here mentioned with the Nāga kings discovered by General Cunningham, or with the Nāga family of the Gurjara grants.

Both the composer of the prāṣasti, Jājīka, and its engraver, Chaṇaka, have done their work so conscientiously, that there are almost no mistakes to be found throughout the inscription. In spite of this, the deciphering, and the translation of this small Kāṣṭha has not been an easy task. To Professor Bühler I am indebted for several kind suggestions. The correct reading of the date, which I had perfectly misunderstood in my original paper, was pointed out to me by Paṇḍit Bhagwanlal Indraji.

TEXT.

[¹] ओऽ नमो रजनयव || ब्रजिति बादः सुविन्य निर्मितः समसंसर्वदिनाऴसभामुर || उक्तमेंस-स्माचित्तसहितः युक्तमान्यमवल्ल द्विवि

[²] यस्यन्तः || [¹] गोविन्दाय निर्भृति सदव हृदेन्द्रवयेन द्व भावितं च य निर्माणम आराम- दागर्ब्बस्यः पलितस्मयेत्य कथिततारित्तत्थ विष

[³] नः स कृष्णाय || [²] ब्रजिति कालायः तेजः वेदानितं दीपकर || कृष्णाय: सामगतो घम्मो भक्तमुक्तं चर्चासिद्धतिः || [³] आर्योपायक निमन्ता: गर्हच्यविज्ञानः ||

¹ Reprinted, after revision, from the Journal of the German Oriental Society.
³ ante Vol. XIII. pp. 82 and 83.
⁴ read शरच्चक्षपः.


[8] भैरवत: प्रजामधोपतो जातिकलाशिततापामयुक्तविशुद्धीः। [28] यें पृथविक्षण्य वर्षे न नी-राजक्रिया: उपाधिज्ञायनमशिमिहः पर: परमुद: स्वर्गे।


[10] लग्नशीलेः अबतमय भूतो गुणकर:। [10] विश्वासाचेतिने तृणीकाचित्तोत्सेवः। देवनाशावन: गुणितद्विज्ञानविकारः। गाथार्थकलिनातिरतः।


[13] अनि विन्यसिकलितमार्मणसत्सतीश्रव्यकारायस्या। भैरवे वृहतमार्मणशिष्यसंहोऽैत्तिकाश्चतममुख्ये कहाँ-कहाँ-कहाँहृताः। भैरवेः। शाश्वतासर्वशताशाली। कहाँहृताः।

[14] राजश्यामगुणकर न उपपालनसाराय स्व च गुणलेखनविषयं। यहां सर्वस्वाभावस्य न कहाँ सर्वस्वाभावस्य। यहां सर्वस्वाभावस्य न कहाँ सर्वस्वाभावस्य।

[15] दानानितरसाराय स्वाभावकष्टनको भूतविकारः।[14] वस्तुविकारः।

[16] राजस्थानाय: शासनियोज्यलिखितस्वति:। तत्त्वरिद तांत्रिकाः सुदानं सा वा सिद्धा साधुस: जागरणमार्मणविपरास्ते॥[५]॥


[18] प्रतिमें रिपुमांवः। वाक्यमार्मणविपरास्ते॥[१४] प्रयोगसाधनाश्च सुहसुकृतः॥ ह्य-वहला तांत्रिकाः सब्बनाशर्मते॥[१४] साधुमानवः॥[७]॥

[१९] [६] गाथार्थकलिनातिरतः। केसमिति: प्रायमानोकारे:। गुणकरानुसारस्थित: यथोर्विचारयुक्त। तेनारं उपपालनसाराय:॥[१७]॥

[२०] जन: पापाभूतं॥ [२०] प्रायमानोकारानुसार:॥ शासनाकरोऽयस्य। वजन: किम्बादशासनाय-विविधतत्त्वितिम्॥[२०]॥ समयं शाराकः॥ माण्डर करी।॥ उक्तरीण: चक्रेण॥[२०]॥

* read भाषी।
* read कोऽतिकोऽर्ध: and cancel the Anusudra above the य of साधनार्थ।

** कर: of करणा is entered below the line.
* read नात्तमः। * read जागुरु refresh; ** read सहस्रवर्ती।
+ read एकाौङ्गः। ** read सुधि.**** read शंकरहस्यः.
TRANSLATION.

Om! Adoration to the Triad of Jewels (viz. Buddha, the Law, and the Church).

1. Victorious are the pure doctrines of Sāgata, which drive away all doubts by their splendour, and which are the cause of the destruction of all false reasonings, as the winds at the end of the Yuga (are the cause of the destruction) of the whole world.¹³

2. May that Jina protect you, who himself unconquerable conquers all foes, who though formless ever bears a form, who though one appears (to possess) a great many (forms), and who far transcends the highest intellect while he is fit to be known by every mortal.¹⁴

3. May that Law of Sāgata protect you, which breaks the delusion of men, as a lamp (breaks) the darkness in a house, and which grants the fruit of deliverance to the faithful.¹⁵

4. Victorious are the pure and victorious feet of the Holy Church, which surpass the glory of the moon in autumn, and before which gods and demons bow their heads in reverence.¹⁶

5. There was one Bindaṅga by name, whose wisdom was as deep as the ocean, whose fame was as bright as the moon. His son was Padmanāga, who adorned his whole race by his matchless virtues. From him also sprang a heroic son Sarvaṅga,¹⁷ who gladdened (the world) and far surpassed all feudal princes (śāmantakāra) by his virtues, just as from the moon springs a mass of rays, which gladdens (the world) and far surpasses the neighbouring globes (śāmantakāra) by its brilliancy.¹⁸

6. This man of pure renown had a beloved wife called Śri, who resembled (the goddess Śrī) clasped to Krishñā's breast in happiness, the moon's light in beneficence, Gaurī (the spouse) of the three-eyed god in peerlessness,¹⁹ and in profundity either the wisdom of the tranquil Tayin²⁰ or the ocean's coast, which is encircled by high waves.²¹

7. From these two sprang a feudal prince called Devatatta, who was an ocean of virtues, had overcome mental impurity, and was the cleverest of the clever.²²

8. He, who possessed the peculiar virtues of the Kṛita-guṇa, (descended) from a race of men, who bowed to (nobody but) their Guru, the Jina, who showed respect²³ to virtues, to whom attachment (was known only) through mendicants coveting gifts (which were) constantly (attached to them),²⁴ and who were exceedingly afraid of sin, their only enemy in the world.²⁵

9. As the bright moon from the ocean, this pure saint was produced from a race of men, whose wealth was not looked upon like another's [śyā parā] by strange [parā] beggars, whose delight [śuddha] was the complete annihilation [śīvāparā],²⁶ but who never even in their dreams felt delight [śuddha] at the charms of another's wife [śatākṣara], and who for the welfare of their souls did not care for worldly existence (lit. the acquisition of the three guṇas or qualities).²⁷

10. After this mine of virtues, who inspired joy to mankind [jana], had gained offspring [śāntāti], he appeared to be the kalya-tree, which inspires joy to the inhabitants of the Janaloka [jana], come down among men in the company of Śāntāti [i.e. the tree Sāntāna].²⁸

11. Ah! forsooth, all excellent qualities have separated from the persons of their respective owners and united (in him). For in giving comfort to the universe he eclipses the bright rays of the rising moon; in scrutinising men's purity of mind he impart small significance even to the teacher of the gods;²⁹ and if the depth (of his wisdom) is considered, he far surpasses the excellence of the milk-ocean.³⁰

12. Others appear to be proud, famous, wise, imitating the sons (i.e. disciples) of Tayin.

---

¹¹ Metro Vamsāṭātha. ¹² Metro Vasanatāṭaka.
¹³ Metro Anusakhyā. ¹⁴ Metro Anusakhyā.
¹⁵ On the lingual ṅ in Sarvanaga, see Pāṇini, VII. 4. 3.
¹⁶ Metro Sragharā.
¹⁷ There seems to be a play on the two meanings of named, which means both 'unequalled' and 'of uneven number.' In the latter sense it is an appropriate epithet of the wife of the three-eyed god.
¹⁸ This word, which occurs also in stanzas 12, seems to be an epithet of Buddha. It may be derived from the root śī, Pā. śī, 'to protect.' The same expression is applied to the Mahāvīra of the Jainas in Hemachandra's Yogāchāra, 1. 1.
¹⁹ Metro Śāraṇa. ²² Metro Anusakhyā.
²³ Gurūḍh has here the same meaning as sāparsa 3) in Dr. Böhtlingk’s smaller Sanskrit dictionary.
²⁴ i.e. They were liberal, but free from attachment to the world (śaupsa).
²⁵ Metro Vasanatāṭaka.
²⁶ śīvāparā=śīvāparā; see Childers’s Pāli dictionary, s. v.
²⁷ Metro Śāraṇa. ²² Metro Anusakhyā.
²⁸ i.e. Bṛhaspati, who in his Nitiśāstra recommended austeres or distant. See Pāṇiṣṭhāyā, book II. sloka 41. 56 (= IV. 19). 1. 95.
²⁹ Metro Śāraṇa.
The rewards intended are heaven, prosperity, etc. They are transitory, and do not free the individual from re-birth.

Metro Śikharīnī.

A word meaning 'cloud' must have stood in the break; perhaps cañaka for cañhaka. But, 'crane,' gives no good sense.

See Childers's Pāli dictionary, s. v. arañī.

Metro Śāntiśūrya.

This seems to imply that he was a Śākyabārīkha or Buddhist monk.

Metro Anuṣṭubhā.
Vol. I. p. 73 ff., where the plates are entered as coming from the village of Korumelli in the Rājamahendri District; this is the village the grant of which is recorded in the inscription. They are five in number, each about 94" long, by 54" broad. The edges of them are raised into high rims, to protect the writing; and the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation almost throughout. The ring, on which the plates are strung, is about 3½" thick and 5½" in diameter; it had been cut before the grant came under my notice. The seal on the ring is circular, about 3" in diameter; it has, in relief on a countersunk surface, across the centre, the legend Śrī-TriśūlāvaraṇaMaṇḍapa; above the legend, a boar, recumbent to the proper left, with the sun and moon, two chauris, a double drum, a saṅkha-shell, and, close to the moon, something that may perhaps be the head of a spear (kuna); and below the legend, a floral device, an elephant-goad, a closed lotus on its stalk or perhaps a sceptre (kanaka-danda), and something like the letter ga, which may perhaps be meant for a makara-lohana. The characters are Old-Kanarese, of the period to which the grant belongs. The language is Sanskrit throughout, except in one or two Kanarese genitive cases in the passage describing the boundaries of the village that was granted.

The first plate is a palimpsest. On the outer side of it there are traces, distinctly visible, of twelve entire lines of writing, in a somewhat older and squarer form of the same alphabet; but the letters are so carefully beaten in, that no passages can be read with any certainty. The first plate has also a raised rim on its outer as well as its inner side. It is plain, therefore, that it was an inner plate of some older grant, utilised again for the present inscription.

The inscription commences with a Purānic genealogy, from Nārāyanap or Viṣṇu down to Udayana (line 18). Then comes the following passage, which however, is nothing but a mere farrago of vague tradition and Purānic myths, of no authority, based on the undeniable facts that the Chalukyas did come originally from the north, and did find the Pallavas in possession of some of the territories afterwards acquired by themselves, and on a tradition of the later Kāndambas that the founder of their family was named Tripônica or Trinātra:—"After that,—sixty emperors, less by one, commencing with him, in unbroken lineal succession, having sat on the throne of Ayōdhya (l. 19)—a king of his lineage, ViṣṇuMahādeva (l. 19) by name, went to the region of the south, from a desire for conquest, and, having attacked Tripônica-Pallava, lost his life through the evil influence of fate. In that time of disorder, his queen-consort, who was pregnant, came with the family-priest, and with a few of the women of (her) bedchamber, and with (her) chamberlains, to the agrahāra named Maṇivēnum; and, being cherished just like a daughter by the Śrīnā 건 Vīṣṇu Bhātha who dwelt there, she brought forth a son, ViṣṇuVardhana (l. 25). And having caused to be performed the rites of that prince, such as were befitting his descent from the two-sided god of the kindred of Mānava and the sons of Hārīti, she reared him. And he, being instructed in history by his mother, went forth, and, having worshipped Nālandh, the holy Gāuri, on the Chalukya mountain, and having appealed to Kumāra and Nārāyaṇa and the Mothers of mankind; and having assumed the emblems of universal sovereignty which had descended to him by the succession of his family, and which had been, as it were, (voluntarily) laid aside, viz. the white umbrella, and the single saṅkha-shell, and the pāñcakamahākabda, and the pāñcätāna, and the pratiśākabda, and the sign of the Boar, and the feathers of a peacock's tail, and the spear, and the (signs of the rivers) Gaṅgā and Yamunā, and other (such emblems); and having conquered the Kāndambas and the Gaṅgás and other kings,—he ruled over the region of the south, lying between the Bridge (of Rāma) and the (river) Narmadā, and containing seven and a half cores (of villages). The son of that same king ViṣṇuVardhana, and of his queen-consort who was born in the lineage of the Pallavas, was ViṣṇuMahādeva (l. 30). His son was Polakēśivallabha (l. 31). His son was Kṛttivarman (l. 31). His son was Kṛttivarman (l. 36).—the(younger) brother of Satyāśraya.

1 See the facsimile in the plate, ante Vol. VII. p. 233.
vallabhendra, who adorned the family of the Chalukya kings, who are glorious; who are of the lineage of Manarasya, which is praised throughout the whole world; who are the sons of Hariti; who have been nourished by the Mothers (of mankind); who have meditated on the feet of Svami-Mahisasena; who have had the territories of their enemies made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the excellent sign of the Boar, which they acquired through the favour of the holy Naraśa; and whose bodies have been purified by ablutions performed after celebrating horse-sacrifices,—ruled over the country of Vengi for eighteen years.

We next have the usual succession of Eastern Chalukya kings, down to Amma II. (l. 47),—with the statement that Indraraja reigned for seven days (l. 37). After him, his half-brother, Dânaraja, reigned for three years. The kingdom was then without a lord, and in a state of trouble, for twenty-seven years (l. 48). Then Chalukya-Chandra, the son of Dânaraja, succeeded to the throne, and reigned for twelve years (l. 51). He was followed by his younger brother Vimaladitya (l. 52). The inscription then mentions Rājarāja, of the Suryāvansya or lineage of the Sun (l. 55). His son was Rajendra-Chheda (l. 57), whose younger sister was Kûndavamahādevi (l. 61). Vimaladitya married Kûndavā, and reigned for seven years (l. 62). Their son was Rājarāja II. (l. 64), also called Vīshnuvardhana (l. 75), who ascended the throne in Śaka 944 (A.D. 1022-23), when the sun was in the sign of the Lion, on Garavara or Thursday, the second day of the dark fortnight of the month Bhadrapada (l. 65-67).

The remainder of the inscription records the grant, made by Rājarāja, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, of the village of Kornell (l. 103), in the Guḍḍavādi viśhaya (l. 77), to a Brāhmaṇa named Chhādanadya (l. 86) of the Bhāravāya gōtra and the Āpāstamba sūtra.

**Text.**

*First plate.*

['] Ōm (I*) Śrī-dhāmaḥ purushottamasya mahatō Nārāyaṇasya prabhōr-anābhī- paṅkarurahūb- baḥbhu.[*]
['] va jagata-svārāja Śrayaṁbhus-tataḥ jajō mānasā-sūnur-Atirītī yah['] tasman- munēr-Atirita-Somō
['] vañña-karasa-sudh-āṁsuras-udita['] Śrīkanta(gha)-chhāḍāmaṇi['] (I) Tasmād[']-āsīita- sudhā-sūtēr-Bubhā ṣudha-ṇutas-ta-
['] taḥ j['](a*)tataḥ Pururava nāma chakrava['](r*)ti sa-vikramaḥ (l['](I) Tasmād-Āyur- Nāhunaḥ tātō Yāya).[*]
['] yātēs-chakravartī vañña-kartā tataḥ Pururāsī tatrāvartī | tātō Janamējyōd- āvāmē-hūtā-tītā[']
['] yasaya kartā['](a*) tataḥ Prāchēsā tasmāt-Sainyayātī tātō Hayapatiḥ(ḥ) tatas- Sārvva-
['] bhō(bhau)maḥ tātō Jayasūnaḥ tātō Mahābhāmaḥ tasmād-Dēśanakaḥ | tataḥ Krūdhananāḥ |
['] tātō Dēvakī tataḥ Dēvakār-ī(ṛ)bhukalāḥ tasmād-ṛkṣakaḥ | tātō Mativarasa-satrawa- yāga-yājī Sara-
['] svād-nādānāhaḥ tataḥ Kātyāyanāḥ Kātyāyananā-Nilāḥ tātō Dushyantaḥ tata- aryāyā(ṛ)yo Gāṁ.[*]
['] gā-Yamunā-īrē yad-avīcchhīcha(chchhi)nu['](a*)n-nikāya yūpān-kramāsāh kṛtva tathā- āvamāḥḥ(ha)-yāmā mahā-kā.
['] rmaṃ Bhārata iti yō-yabhata | tātō Bhara'tād-Bhūmānaḥ tasmāt-Subhōtraḥ
tātō Haś[i] | tātō Virō.[*]

* The Śāktavarman of the genealogy given by Dr. Burnell in South-Indian Paleography, p. 22, and of No. CCLI, line 19, p. 56 below.

* No further details are given of the date on which the grant was made.

* From the original plates.

* Metro, Śrīlalavikrīdhita. 1 Metro, Śrīka (Anushabhābha).

* First tō was engraved here, and then it was corrected into dhara.
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[*] chanah tasmad=ajamila= tatas=sanvara= tasya cha Tapana-sutayas=Tapathy=s=cha Sudhanva | ta-
[*] tah Parikshit | tat= Bhumadeha= tata=t Pradipana= tasmachha(ch)=Cha-
(chha)ntanah tat= Vichitravirya= |

Second plate; first side.

[*] tata= Pandu-raga= tata= arya=putrasya= tasya cha Dharmmaja=Bhima=Arjuna=Nakul-
Sahade= pa-
[*] ch-endriya= vat pa=ma= shya= sru=svish=sha=gra=hi= pas=tatra ((( ))) Yen=si=adah= vi=ji=
ka=ka=na=ma=si= chak= avin= 
[*] Ma= yuddha= pasupat=astram=Adhas=rip=sh=al=abi= do=dai= ty=an
bah=ma=Ind=ar=ddhi-asan=ad=yar=oh= j=ja=ji= 
[*] n= yat=Kalik=adik=an=hat= swairam=ak=ra= va=ma= vip=ma=ch=ch=de=ha= Kuru(r)=ga= 
vi=bh=ho= ((( ))) Tat= R=r=ja=n=ma=Abhimanyu= 
[*] tata= Parikshit tata= Janam=ja= ji= tah= tata= Kau=ma= kau= tata= Naravahana= tata=
Sat= ni= tasa= Udayana= ((( ))) 
[*] Tat= para= tat= prabhi= n=shish= vishchhin= sa=nt= shis= Ay=do=ha=si=asn= sa=sh= av=
chak= avar=ta=ta=ta= 
[*] ja=ja=ja= j=na= a= p=vi=vi=ji= g=sh= va= d=sh= n=pa=ma= ha= g=va= Tri=lo=ch= na=Pallav=
adv=ch= kri= p=va= 
[*] dur= l=i=lo= lo= k=an= sam= tal= sa=man= sup=vi=ri=va= 
[*] Mud= men= na=m= ga=ra= n=ka= t= abhi= s= m= a= n= v= p= b= h= i= sa= sa= 
og= am= ga= 
[*] tad=va=st= va=ma= Vish= u= sh= ha= a= vi= ma= juga= ni= d= sh= i= n= 
[*] n= ma= na= s= do= ta= S= t= a= s= y= k= na= Ma= n= n= y= a= ga= go= a= Har= ti= put= 
pr=a= g= ha= a= go= k= a= r= kr= a= m= Na= 
[*] ni= k= m= m= a= k= a= ri= vi= tam= av= d= d= ha= va= Sa= cha ma= tra= 
vi= da= vi= t= 
[*] nda= bh= ga= va= t= Gaur= m= t= o= de= y= Mu= ra= Na= 
[*] nd= a= ma= li= s= sa= 
[*] kan= ka= da= Sa= Ga= m= ad= a= d= ma= s= k= a= k= r= 
[*] da= Ka= ma= m= Sa= t= sa= s= pa= la= ha= 

Second plate; second side.

[*] than= pah= a= m= ma= ((( ))) Sy= lo= ka= | Tasya= asid= Vijaya= di= Vishnu= vrdh= ha= bhupat= Palla= 
[*] y= ma= d= e= vy= a= sa= sa= na= n= [ [ ] ] Tat= sut= a= P= ak= s= va= lab= ba= Tat= putra= Krittir= 
[*] Srim= a= m= sa= kh= a= bha= su= mat= ta= y= a= Man= a= jaya= a= ga= go= a= Har= t= put= r= a= 
[*] sad= lab= ha= ra= yan= man= ma= a= tri= ga= par= p= lit= a= Svami= Mah= a= sa= p= ad= anu= 
[*] ya= pra= pra= sa= sam= Sa= di= ta= va= 

* Metro, Sādālakṣīvādītā.  
11 Metro, Śūkṣ (Anahubh).
10 Bead atidhadhā.  

76204
Third plate; first side.

13. This p, having been at first omitted, was inserted above the bh, in such a way as to look rather like the vowel i.
kravartiti(rtti) daṁbaṁ prachātī-da-mada-danti-kapōla-niryyad-dān-āvil-āmarasatīt-salīna-pravāhaḥ \(1\). Sa\(^{11}\) dvi\(^{11}\) pāṁ cha pa-
ra(yo)mburāy-parikhāṁ vīvartanbharān lī(t)laya daṁḍen-saiva vijitya cha pratī-dīsāṁ yō-tiṣṭhipat-saṃvaṅgā svair-ōdhrānti-ni-
vāraṇāya vijā(ja)sta-anūrāṁ svā-nām-ādikātān-ālaṇāṁ-iva baddhum-andha-manasā darppeṣa dig-dantinañ \(1\) Taṣṭa\(^{12}\) ānu-
jaṁ surūpyām-anūrūpāṁ Kūmāravān=mahādvāṁ sa upāyata kṛita-kṛityo Vimalādhiti jana-stutaya \(1\) Samu-
drām-anāṁ prithviṁ prithviṁ sa bhū(bhu)ja-vikramāta(m) samarakṣat-samāsa-saptasaptai-samās=sā(sa)maṁ \(1\) Samsaṁ

Third plate; second side.

Tasmāc\(^{22}\)=Chālukya-chāḍa maṇiṁ=atha Vimalādhityadēvām=mahīśāḥ=Chēḍa-kah naprawdę-
chikāyām iva

rachita-tanōḥ Kūmāravāya=cha dēvyā jatāś-śrīl-Rājarājō rajanikara-kula-śrīmad-
āmbōdhi-rājō rā-
jad-rājanya-sēvyām=aḥbhrīta bhujā-balād-rāja-lakṣhmīṁ prithvīyāḥ \| Yō\(^{22}\) rakṣitaṁ
vasmatiṁ Śaka-vatseshu

vēḍānūrāśi-nidhi-variṣṭha Śīmha-gōkā-kṛishṇa-dvītiya-divasā\(^{22}\)-ōttam-Bhadrikāyām
vārē Gūrvērvānijī
gana-varē=bhishiktaḥ \| Yāsya\(^{22}\)=[Ś]{ī}ttamāṅgaṁ paṭṭena samā(ma) bānīṁ mahāyāni
bhārttuṁ viśvambhara-bhārā-
jamā-rācōsī(ṛ)taṁ vi(chi)raṁ \| Prithvīṁ=imāṁ yatra Prīdhyā(thu)-prabhāvē
rakṣateṣa-varggāṃ khaṇapit-āri-varggē dūrākṛ-
tāvagreha-chōra-rōgāḥ prajā[†*]
labhantē sa-pa(ph)alaṁ trivargaṁ \| Sa(śa)ruyṭ-
[*] 3a[ṇu]ddryā-ābhīmāṇ-ā-
ym[*] py(dy)-agapā-guna-janaṁ=anurāktā mahīmā prakhyaṭeṇāti-kṛishṇā śaśadharā dhavālā
sa(janā-
naṁ guṇēṇa pitā prītaṁ karṇaṁ-līṁjaṁbhīr=abhīnāvā bhātī dig-dāvatānāṁ=nām-
varṇ[†*] 3a[ṇu]ddryā

tāna-riyām=atantarā tanvati yasya kṛttaṁ \| Pītrōr\(^{22}\)=vraṁśa-gurū babhuvatur=alaṁ
ysya spu(apu)ra-tējase saṁyṛya\(^{22}\)-vāmṛdamāsa(sau) nirasta-tamaso(sau) dēvō(vau)
ba(ja)ja(ga)čakṣuḥdaṃṣṭrāryṣiū-sa-
muddhir-ākhiśa-mahī-chakram=mahāta(t) kṛdāya Vīṣṇōr=ādi-varāha-rūpam=abhavād=
yych-chhāsāṇe lāṃchha-
naml || Sa sarvvalōkāṝṇaṁ=āṝl-Vīṣṇuvarṇa=dsaha-mahārājaḥhirāja-pārmeṣvara-parama-
bhāṭa[†*] 3a[ṇu]dā-
parama-brahmayāṁ mātā-śrī-tṛi-pūdāṁ=ānudhyātām tyāga-simhāsam-laṁña Chaṇḍikā-prasā-
dā-parilabha-sāṃbrāy(rā)ja-čiḥnāḥ Guḍdavāḍi[di]-vivi(sa)ha-yā-mvāsinā rāṣṭrakṛṇā(ku)-
ta-pramukh[†*] 3a[ṇu]dā

Fourth plate; first side.

ti(tu)mbināṁ=sarvaṁ[āṇ]*

samguṇaḥ(ha)ṁ maṁṣtri-purūḥita-sāṅkapu-yuvāra-jā-dō(ḍa)-
vārika-pradhanā-ā-
dhyakṣha[†*] 3a[ṇu]d(m)u=it(yu)=ādīṣiū || Åhyā-gn slit-ātyaṁstā dūrāṁ-samajani jagatāṁ jyotīṣhā
dānam-hēt[†*] 3a[ṇu]dā=Brahmā dhāma pra-
janām=aṭhavād=aṭhavād tataḥ Kaśyapā nāma vēthā(hu)ḥ Bhāravāṅsas=tatō-brāh-
munṣa-adhika-trāṇa-saṁyāgōrdē pa-

\(^{11}\) Metro, Sārdaḷavikrāḍita.
\(^{12}\) First part was engraved, and then it was corrected into dev.
\(^{21}\) Metro, Śākṣa (Anahijebh).
\(^{22}\) Metro, Aryan.
\(^{23}\) Metro, Śākṣa (Anahijebh).
\(^{24}\) Metro, Sārdaḷavikrāḍita.
\(^{25}\) The metre is faulty here.
\(^{26}\) Metro, Sārdaḷavikrāḍita.
vitrē tat=Āpā(ṣa)stanā-sūtrē śrutī-ṇidhir=udagāc=Chiḍamāyu(ryya)ḥ kramēṇa ||
Rajāṇaḥ"svarchchita-varchchasas=sa-
mundita[r*]=yayaḥ-dāv=guidhāśb[īt*a]-āṃghasō Yajū nāma sztas=tataḥ kṛita-dhiyō
javē śrīla-jīṣaṃ kṛitī||
vijñāt-ākhiṣa-vāda-āśatra-samayāḥ prājjva(jīsa)=sa+dā pāṣita-jā[a*]ti[r*]-jāna-nidhir=
gurj-ṛṣa-sarīra(dri)ṣṭi niśa-jīn.-
ṭāyāṁ bhū(bhū)vi || Yathā" Vasishṭhāḥ vidushāṁ varisṭhāḥ nirundhātū pō(dō)-
pa(ṣa)=M=Arundhatīṁ saṁ(ss) tathā=ā-
nurūm=aibh(bhū)rūpā-rūpasattm=apāyach=Chatmanakāv-ākhyāṁ || Putrā"="s=tayōr=Adi-
ti-Kaśyapayör=iv=ābhūp(d)=bhāṣān=apākṛita-tamāḥ khaṇ Chiḍamāryyaḥ yē(yō)
vōdā-ātā-
stra-sakalā-ṛṣtrī-ṛṣamī-ṛṣamē=sīhā-Ānan-āṇmobhūrah-ḥūdhakarō garīyān || Nityā"="ābhihaṭa-
pha(ph)ā-la-pra-
dāna-ṛuchuraṁ Lakṣhmiṁ-nīvīśa-āpadam bhīrānāṁ gurutāṁ prabhuddha-sumanaḥ-
sampūrṇaḥ(ṛṣa)-āśakrānūvi-
tāṁ chhīyā-saṁstītam=ākṣītā(taij)e=sha vibhuvai(dhaib) saṁstāyaṁānāṁ saḍā sūrvīva
sukham=āṣyate-
dvija-vararb-ṛyaṁ vipra-kalpadra(dru)maṇ(m)|| Yadh-gēhāhāṇa\n su-śrīrām vībhāti
paratām pūn aryāv-vvata(tā)ṁnaṁ pa-
tu-vṛav(r)*tty=aivātāṁ kramāt=kshama-paddo samathya-jugkhēghāṣaṁ=sāyō(ya)m
prārāṭa-upbhītaṁ hu-
ti-kṛita-svāhā-priya-pračchinal-dāmai=ch=āpi samantaṁ Kali-malaṁ prōtsāraya(d*)
duā(dū)rataḥ l(||)

Fourth plate; second side.

Tasmā" samasta-janatā-viśhāsasāyānā|| rai-sutarppita-mahidēva-dēva-gaṇāya | vīpra-
ānava-
y-ābdiḥ-āsasbhrit-prc(pra)tīcchan(r*[r*]jaya [†r*] vidvajjan-ā(m*)gkrīta-vīsīt-ānandāya |
janī(mna)=prabhīti-gīta-vōd-ārththa-
la[t*[r*]va | san-manṛ-vasuti-vāstavy-ātma-sat[t*[r*]va | laṁbhīta-sara(la*|tvä-parālīta-
charitrāya | āśūnbhīta-ma-
ti-svasita-jiva-bhrīsa(ṣa)-putrāya | Ādī-pijhīna-niḥthā-kṛiti-sūvita-manēhāya | ādī-
valuation-
sta-jana-dōshāya [†r*] samb-tā-ārādhiṭa-niḥ-svēmi-pādaṇya | chintīta-mana[ḥ*]sthā
sukhadēbhīta-supādaṇya | hō-
ma-dhūma-vinirmat-āṁita-kalāṅkāya | dhīmat-pragīta-ruchhina-sthīrā-ẹ(r)*a-gā(ṇa*)[m-le-
kāṅkāya | sakalā-muni-gāna-nut-Āpa-
sta-ma-sāṭrāya | tatra-saṅgīta-Bhārana(ras)dvīja-gōṭrāya | sapta-tantu-krīta-yūpa-
stanābā-sōbhāya | pāty-
[100] saptāvā-rūpa-sariś-ātma-tenulābāya | nītya-janatā-ōchita-susatya-saṇa-yuktāya |
bhalashita-kāyū(ṛṣya)-niḥpati-saktāya | paraṇa-paruha-ārththa-sāṃpadana-patiśthāya |
paramēśvara-sma-
[100] rāpa-pālana-varisēthaḥ | sakal-ārththasō(ha)strā-parēshchita-vinēdāye(ṛya) | sukumārata-
āvī(ṛṛhi)ka-sarōja-nīhha-
[100] pādāya | dhāra(rā)kapē-āgrahārikṛtiḥ Korumelli-nāma grāma iḥṇ-u(ḥ)parēg dat-
tō-mayā-chandra-tāra-
[104] kānḥ* hi tīṃphē(sēthē)τασί=avādhī-vyaktikē=āhāṛchāṭe-dya | pūrvvataḥ Kūḍak-
nīyōṇī Kāsamīkāyīya

25 Metro, Śardālavikṛṣṭītā. 26 Read vidhānt. 27 Metro, Upajāti of Īdravajś and Upendravajś. 28 Metro, Vasiṣṭhitakāa. 29 Metro, Śardālavikṛṣṭītā; and in the following verse. 30 Read yad-gāhān. 31 This passage is Gādaṇa, or rhythmical and alliterating prose. 32 Read vidhānaḥ.
The inscription commences with an invocation of Makunda or Vishnu. Then follows a mention of the Soma vamsa or lineage of the Moon (line 3), to which, it is evidently intended to imply, the kings mentioned in the grant belong. Lines 4 to 18 give the usual succession of Eastern Chalukya kings, from Kubja-Vishnyavardhana or Vishnuyardhana I., down to Amma II., with the statement that Indra reigned for seven days (l. 10.). Amma II. was succeeded by his elder brother Dānarāja, who ruled for thirty years (l. 18.). Then came Dānarāja's son, Sakti-varman, who ruled for twelve years. Then Sakti-varman's younger brother, Vīmalāditya, for seven years (l. 19). Then Vimalāditya's son, Rājarāja II., for forty-one years. Then Rājarāja's son, Kulottunga-Chōdēva I., for forty-nine years (l. 20). Then Vikrama-Chōda, the son of the preceding, for fifteen years. And then Kulottunga-Chōda-deva II., the son of Vikrama-Chōda (l. 21).

The inscription then mentions the city of Sarasipuri, in a lake in the Veśaī mandala (l. 22), the governor of which was Kolani-Kāta-manaya-ka (l. 28); otherwise called the Daṇḍhākindhaka Kāta (l. 51). And

**Fifth plate.**

The present inscription is from another set of copper-plates, which belonged to Sir Walter Elliot, K.C.S.I., and have been presented by him to the British Museum. They were obtained by him from Rajamahendri, through a Mr. Smith, who procured them from the Karpam of Chittār.

The plates are five in number, each about 10½ long by 4½ broad. The edges of them are raised into rims, to protect the writing; and the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation almost throughout. The ring, on which the plates are strange, is about ½ thick and 4½ in diameter; it had been cut before the grant came under my notice. The seal on the ring is circular, about 3½ in diameter; it has, in relief on a countersunk surface, across the upper part, the legend Śrī-Tribhūreṇa[dः]ja[kūsa], with an elephant-goad and the moon above it; and, below the legend, a boar, standing to the proper left, with a āṇāgha-shell, two chauris, two lamp-stands, and a floral device. The characters are Old-Kanarese, of the period to which the grant belongs. The language is Sanskrit throughout.

---

38 Read Bāruvudogu.
30 Metro, Śūka (Anuṣṭambh); and in the following verse.
41 See the facsimile in the plate, ante Vol. VII. p. 233.
* This period is obtained by adding to Daṇḍhuva's real reign of three years (No. CLIII. line 49), the ensuing twenty-seven years of anarchy (id. line 49); so no mention is made of the anarchy in the present inscription.
3 The Chālukya-Chandra of No. CLIII. line 51.
it then proceeds to record that, in Śaka 1056 A.D. (134-35) (l. 49), Kātiyāsana granted the agrahāra-village called Mañjardvīra, together with the village of Punduvagrama, in the Sāvattilī country, to a number of learned Brahmans, whose gotras, names, and shares, are detailed in lines 56 to 72. Lines 70 to 79 define the boundaries of the grant. And the remainder of the inscription contains some of the usual benedictive and imperative verses, and records the name of the writer of the charter.

**TEXT.**

First plate.

[1] Jayati* Jaladhikanyā-vaktra-padmahūsamālī sakala-bhuvana-ṣrīṣṭi-trāpa-sahihāra-hētuh upa-
[2] nishād-avagamayō yogi-vijñana-vędyas-tridāsa-vara-vacbóbhi[h*] stāyāmānō Mukum-
[3] da[h] [h*] Ja-
[4] [yati jagati nityam Sōma-vanāḥ mahābhūric-chhirasa nihiita-pādas-saṃsrayah kri-
[6] [t-örvrul-chakravāl-alavāldī-rīpu-rīpa-rudhir-ōdair-ukshitād-udgatāḥ]([]) Svasti Sār-
[7] matānā saka-
[8] [la-bhuvanasaṃstāyāmanā-Mānava-sagotraṃ̄ḥ Haritiputraṇāḥ Kauśikā-vara-
[9] pradāda-labha-rājānāṁ mātrī-gupa-paripilāmanām Śvāmi-Mahāśa-pādānu-
[10] dhīyatānāṁ bhagavan-Nārāyanaprasāda-samāskāra-vara-varālāṁchchha(chha)n-eksha-
[11] na-īkshana-
[12] vaśkrit-arati-maṇḍalaṇāṁ-asvamēdhāvabhrīdha(thā)-anāna-pavitrīkṛita-vapasahāṁ Chālu-
[13] kyānā hula-
[14] [m-alamkarishnāḥ] Satyāravavallabhadrasya bhrātā Kubja-Vishnuvardhanā=shūḍāsa varshaḥī Vēmāgī-
[15] [dēsam-apālayat [h*] Tat-pūrō Jayasimhas-trīṁśat [h*] Tat-kanlīyānīmīd[r*]a-rājas-
[16] saptāhām [h*]

Second plate; first side.

[11] Tat-pūrō Vishnuvardhanā nava varshāṇi [h*] Tat-pūrō Maṅgī-ya-varājah paś-
[17] cha-viṣāṭ[m*] [h*] Tat-pūrō Jaya-
[18] simhas-trāyōdaśā [h*] Tat-kanlīyān Kokkiliśa=saṅ-māsan [h*] Tad-bhrātā Vishnu-
[19] vardhanas-saptā-trīṁśat [h*] Tat-sūnu-
[20] r=Vṛjaya-dityā-sūṭkāsā [h*] Tat-sūnur=Vishnuvardhanas-satā-trīṁśat [h*] Tat-sū-
[21] nur=Narādhrī-sūṭkā-chatvārīṁśat [h*] Tat-sū-
[22] niyāma=dhīgara-varshaṁ [h*] Tat-sūnur=Gpanaga-Vṛjaya-dityā.s-
[23] chatuḥ-chatvārīṁśat [h*] Tat-bhrātṛi-Vikra-
[24] mádītym-putraḥ=Chuluka-Bhīnas-trīṁśat [h*] Tat-sūnur=Vṛjaya-dityaśa=sha-mā-
[25] sān [h*] Tat-sūnur=Amma-rā-
[26] jas-saptā varshaṁ [h*] Vikramāditya-bhrāṭi-putraḥ=Tādāpō māsaṁ [h*] Chālu-
[27] kyānā-

Bhīma-sūna.

[11] r=Vikramāditya ēkādāsa māsan [h*] Tat-sūnur=Yuddhamalla-saptā varshaṁ [h*]

Amma-rā-ānu-

[11] jō rāja-Bhūmī dvādaśा [h*] Tat-sūnur=Amma-rājah paṇcha-viṣāṭ[i[m*] [h*] Tat-
[18] yahthoh Dānakā-pravas-trīṁśat [h*] Tat-pūtra-
[19] ā-Sāktivarmanā dvādaśā [h*] Tat-ānuujō Vimalādityas-saptā [h*] Tat-pūrō Rīja-
[20] rājādēva ēka-chatvārīṁśat [h*] Ta-
[21] t-pūtra[h*] ārā-Kulottānagga(ga)-Chōdādeva ēk-bhā-passchlāḥ [h*] Tat-sutō Vikram-
[22] ma-Chōdā paṇchadaśā [h*] Tat-pūrē


dēsa-parivṛttaṁ pa-

* From the original plates.  
** Metro, Mīlini; and in the following verse.
Second plate; second side.

[20] râmpurâgata-mândâlèsâh-khâbhitâm Vengîl-mândâlè mahâ-sara[ḥ] sthirataram-sasti|| Tatr’‘sâ-lit-Sarasâ-
[21] parâiti jaladhau Vîshnû purûn Dvârâkâm-udhyam-lâvaâ-vâri-dôsha-kalushâ[ṁ] nyak-kuruvati yâ ni-
[22] âsân mât-êva sva-payaî-pravâhâ-nivâhais-svâv-dâhâs-sâtârâh svâ-hûhâ sahârita-
mândâlèsâh-vanmara-
[23] bichakrama svaiva rakshati || Garvâkâ-vad-rîjigstâhâ yuip-gaâsâ-sahâprâyas vêlâ-
talarâ hûlâ-stâdâna-
[24] vâjî-vâraâ-bhâtâ jîtunâ-sâktaî punaî yuddh-ûlôkana-lôlâ-vairî-lalâna-sôllâsa-
[25] hûs-ôdayâl-lajjâvad-rodhâna pravâsya sarasâm hûnti-êkatam kardamâi|| Tasyâh’
[26] patîl Kolam-Kâtama-nâyakdâ-bhûte-prakhyâtâ-dharma-nichayaî pratât-ôr-kîrito spûh-
[27] rîjat-sva-bhû-bala-nirjita-vairî-vargam-sarvârâyô naya-nidmîr-bhuvi satya-sa-arâ-
dhâ ((||) Yô” dharmapûrê Dharmaputraprati-
[28] nidhîr-avani-trâçanâ Kârttavyâ-prâyas-sânryô[t] Kîrito spûhta-mahima-rochâ tulya-
êva pratâpâ audâryâd

[29] Karopa-kalpa[ḥ] Smara iva vapushî kahmâ-sadrikshâh kahamâyam sanjanyô yasya lôkô kaďhâ(tha)m-sâpi sadriîtâ Vikramâditya éva ((||) Yô”‘drâya-
Third plate; first side.

[30] ta satân bhûtyai jala-durggâ śrayâ saha bhuvana-trîyamâ yhâs-ûbhâsrayan-rûmâ-
[31] chaityâ-vat ((||) Yas’‘sarvavyô-mavânim-arakhad-akshata-ôr-saînâbhî(bhî)=bhûru-rajâ-
êkî-nirjît-â-
[32] rih vira-ôri-vadana-nilasa-darpâs-êbhâ niî jîmî niyamita-vâg-sti-pragralbhâ ((||) Dvijâ-
[33] jana-pariraksha-ôdakham-akshaya-lakshmîn prâsîmata-rup-paksham kântkshîmâ-
kalpa-vriksham

[34] gu-paî-gaî-kripâ-ôkalpa-êkalpam-ûrvyaî dhrîita-tanum-iva Dharma-mam-mavatâ-
[35] mâncvâ yau((||)) Su’‘dhrîta yena dharitrî niîśâmakar-nirjît-ôr-varggupe chirata-
kalân
[36] kritinà Krita-yuga-vach-chhri samâîddh-êyam ((||) Vidushâh’‘ bhavâv grâmâ dêvânâm-
bhû-
[37] ri-harmyâpi jala-paripûrana( prás)-tatâkâ dêd-dêdê vinirmîtâ yena ((||) Yasmin’‘-
êkântkshî bahu-
[38] lañh dadati dravyam prabhûtam-arthôbhîyam upapada-râhitâ jâtâs-chintâmapi-
kâmadhunam-kalpa gâb ([i])

[39] Yasv’‘-âs-dhârasu niptam-antu dvisha-chhira-schhodam-karm(â) lêtu pravart-
[40] tân vairi-purânam Trí-
Third plate; second side.

[41] nêtrê-devy-sarú-ohchhalen-êva kritâ-sva-kârtyam ((||) Yad’‘ôr-dhasta-khadga-parishâta-
manâdhana-matta-matam-
[42] ga-mastaka-vinirgatta-mauktik-anghaî | suîyatsarû-nikarân-hastat-êva nânà-dik-
kaîpam(pa)

[43] 1-lâya-parân-mahat jaya-êrîh ((||) Kîrtte’‘yâsua mahôharâ tribhuvanaî vîbhâ- 
[44] jayanta bhrîsâm svachchhâ sat-kumud-ôkara-priya-kari ìn-ôuâsanaî tanvatî kur-
vâvā-

* The letters ramaśti are somewhat confused in the original, owing to something else having been engraved and cancelled before these letters were cut.
1 Metre, Śrâdulavikrâta; and in the following verse.
2 First’s was engraved, and then it was corrected into en.
3 Metre, Vasanatâlaka.
4 His syllable, γ, is formed very peculiarly, the γ being on the line and the y below it,—instead of the γ being on the line and the r above it, as is the custom in Southern India.
5 Metre Śloka (Anañjūbha).  6 Metre, Praharshat.
7 Here, and in one or two other places in this line, some letters or other letters engraved and cancelled before the existing letters were cut.
8 Metre, Mâliñ.  9 Metre, Ārya.
10 Metre, Udgâti.
11 Metre, Gî.  12 Metre, Upâjñî of Indrawajñ and Upâdharajñ.
Fourth plate: first side.

Tad-grāma-ālm-āṃtarvarṭinō yē kuṭumābhāna viḍ-chhūra-taksā-raja-karmāra-tilapaḥ
takāḥ [[*]] Suvarṇa-(ṛṣa)-kaṁsa-śastra-kūrba-kāraś-cha nāpiṭāḥ aja-gō-paṭakaḥ=
ch-aiva chaṇḍā.

1-ādyās-tathā-পार्क [[*]] Tair-ṛdhya-karam-apy-ebbhyō brāhmaṇa-ebbhyō-daddā-taddā | datv=
aivam-afraghānaḥ

tam-ṛśṭham-sudhāpasyat-asaḥ [[*]] Tad-ṛśṭrakotā-pramukhaṁ-samāhūya kuṭumā-
binaḥ dattam-ṛśṭtham-mayā sarvam-ṛdhya-viḍitam-astu vaḥ [[*]] Pratigrihitṛi-
brāhmaṇa-nāmāni [[*]]

Tatrā Bhārada-vijāṭhāḥ Drōṇārāyaṇaḥ Mādārāyaḥ Sūrārāyaḥ Nāmārāyaḥ Gudārāyaḥ
Vennārāyaḥ Nāmārāyaḥ Vāsānārāyaḥ Nāmārāyaḥ Madhurākhipārāyaḥ
Doddārāyaḥ Mādāvārāyaḥ Sīvārāyaḥ Komārāyaḥ Vāmārāyaḥ Pōṭārāyaḥ
Gōvindārāyaḥ

Chānadārāyaḥ bhāgīnāḥ Sōmanārāyaḥ Nāṭanārāyaḥ Sūrārāyaḥ Kuṇḍināḥ Bhīmārāyaḥ
Uṛyakāṅjārāyaḥ Vīśṇuvārāyaḥ ardh dināḥ Komārāyaḥ Krīṣṇārāyaḥ Vāmārāyaḥ
Kāmārāyaḥ

Fourth plate: second side.

Naṅgārāyaḥ Komārāyaḥ Maṇḍārāyaḥ Krīṣṇārāyaḥ Bīhmārāyaḥ Vāmārāyaḥ
Dārārāyaḥ

Vādhūlāḥ Adīrārāyaḥ Īśvarārāyaḥ Karuṅkārāyaḥ Haritāḥ Vīṣṇuvārāyaḥ
Mādāvārāyaḥ Ma-

liṅgāyaḥ Kōṭārāyaḥ Drōṇārāyaṇaḥ Kāmārāyaḥ Rēmārāyaḥ Nārāyanaṁ bhāgīnāḥ
Nāgārāyaḥ dvi Maitrāvārpaṁ Saty-

nārāyaḥ bhāgī Sūrārāyaḥ Kauśīkāḥ Nūṅkārāyaḥ Komārāyaḥ Sūrārāyaḥ
aruddhināḥ Tāṭārāyaḥ Vīśṇuvārāyaḥ Pennārāyaḥ Boppā-

rīyaḥ Śrīlārārāyaḥ Maitrēyaḥ Śaṅkarārāyaḥ Vatsāḥ Drōṇārāyaḥ Kapīḥ !
Pōṭārāyaḥ Yaskā Ṛ-

yavanāryaḥ Āṛṭrārāyaḥ Rāgavārāyaḥ bhāgīnāḥ" Tāḍārāyaḥ Arīḷārāyaḥ aruddhināṁ"
Saṅkākār

Pōṭārāya-Adīrāyaḥ paṁcāḥ a-ṛḍtha-bhāgīnāḥ Parāśara Komārāyaḥ Vīṣṇuvārāyaḥ
Purukūṭsaḥ Mahāyānārāyaḥ bhāgī-

naḥ Kāśyapaḥ Amrīrāyaḥ Appārāyaḥ aruddhināVAṣuḍārāyaḥ Māvārāyaḥ
Sūrārāyaḥ Amrīrāyaḥ śaśāna-kā-

vya-kṛiṣh-Chaṁkārāṇārāyaṇārāyaṇaḥ bhāgīnāḥ Īśavṛṣya-aikō bhāgāḥ Vīṣṇu-ekō
bhāgāḥ [[*]] Atha Pouṇḍuva-yuļkāśa-hyā grā.

22 Metre, Triśṭhīkh. 32 First keśa was engraved and cancelled, and then pa was cut.
23 Metre, Śrāghāra. 33 The passage from rādr to vi is engraved over a cancelled passage.
24 The metre shows that the anusvētra is a mistake and that we must read Maṇḍārāya.

31 Metre, Śīkā (Anashtubh); and in the following three verses.
32 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary.
33 First Tāṭārāyaḥ was engraved here, and then bhāgīnāḥ was engraved over it.
34 First Saṅkākār. was engraved here, and then aruddhinā was engraved over it.
Correspondence and Miscellanea.

S. B. DOCTOR'S PERSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

Sir,—In your review, in the September number of your journal, of the late Professor Palmer's English-Persian Dictionary, edited by Mr. G. Le-Strange, you refer to what I shall presently show to be a perfectly groundless and unwarrantable imputation brought against my literary honesty in a postscript to the preface. As you have brought into prominence Mr. LeStrange's statement, I trust you will not deny me the justice of publishing my refutation thereof.

I am accused of having passed off for my own composition a small Persian-English Dictionary, which is no more than an incorrect reprint of Professor Palmer's work.

I wish, in the first place, to point out that I have never for a moment professed that my Persian-English Dictionary is my own composition. Indeed it would be absurd of any one to so profess with respect to a work of the nature of a pocket dictionary of a language like Persian, on which so many learned lexicographers have laboured before. I quote below two paragraphs from the preface of my book, and leave it to your readers to judge how grossly Mr. LeStrange has misrepresented facts in accusing me of palming off on the public as my own the work of another compiler.

"The compiler begs to make his acknowledgments to the authors of the following works, which have chiefly been consulted in the preparation of this manual:—Johnson's Persian and Arabic Dictionary, the Hindustani Dictionaries of Gilchrist and Shakespeare, etc.

"In conclusion, it is hoped that, when the labours of such learned Oriental lexicographers as the above appear as the groundwork of the present dictionary, it will not fail to command the confidence of those for whom it is intended."

But although, as these extracts prove, I have never attempted to pass off my dictionary as entirely my own unaided production, Mr. LeStrange's assertion, that nine-tenths of my book has been copied verbatim from Professor Palmer's is altogether untrue. Even a superficial exami-
nation of my book will convince any unprejudiced critic that there are important points of difference between the two works, and that there are some special and (if I may be permitted to say so) valuable features in my book, which, so far as I know, are not found in any other dictionary, much less in Palmer’s, and the credit of which, if any credit there be, is entirely my own. Thus, for instance:—

(1) The arrangement of words in my dictionary is entirely different from that in Palmer’s; e.g., on page 1, the compounds formed with the word آب are all grouped together under that word, whereas in Professor Palmer’s work they are scattered over several pages of the book. And so with other similar words.

(2) The etymology of Persian and Arabic words, the assignment of the respective parts of speech to them, and the roots of Persian infinitives given in my book are not found at all in Professor Palmer’s work, or, so far as I am aware, in any other dictionary, and are entirely new features in my book.

(3) Then, again, the two dictionaries differ materially in many places with regard to (a) the pronunciation of Persian words, (b) their origin, and (c) their English synonyms. A few examples will suffice:—

**Doctor’s.**

(a) ناخی. nākhy.

نیم. nīm.
نیف. nīf.
نیش. nīsh.

(b) اسوار aswār. A horseman, cavalry.

(c) یاف یاف. čaf. Past tense.

**Palmer’s.**

(a) ناهی. nāhīy.

نیم. nīm.
نیف. nīf.
نیش. nīsh.

(b) اسوار aswār. Horseman.

(c) The past; the preterite tense.

The proprietor’s share of the produce of the soil.

ح H. The sixth letter of the Arabic alphabet; it does not occur in pure Persian words.

Of course, it cannot be denied that there is considerable similarity between my book and Professor Palmer’s, but this is simply due to the fact that we both consulted common authorities, as appears from the preface in our respective books. Thus, almost every English word given in Ogilvie’s dictionary would be found in Webster’s. Would Mr. LeStrange, therefore, accuse the one author of plagiarising from the other?

It was perfectly unnecessary for Mr. LeStrange to attempt to build the name of Professor
Palmer's book on the ruins of the fame of mine.
I shall be sorry if my refutation of his calumny in any way redounds against Professor Palmer's work, which, though not devoid of errors and inaccuracies, and lacking information on important points, still has, in my opinion, sufficient merit of its own to need no such doubtful aid as Mr. LeStrange has given it.

S. B. DOCTOR.

ORIGIN OF THE SRIVAISHNAVAS.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

Sr.,—In the September Number of your Journal, in an Article on the Origin of the Srivaishnavas of Southern India, the following occurs:—“A stanza was read in which the face of Vishnu was represented to be as red as the lotus. The Śankarachārya at once exclaimed that it was a luptāpad, or defective comparison, as there were objects surpassing the lotus in their redness, which might have been used for the simile.” Might I ask the writer whether there is any authority at all for this explanation of the term luptāpad? The word is translated in the usual way, but instead of meaning ‘a simile in which one term of comparison is wanting’ it is explained as meaning a feeble comparison. The story is stated to be improbable for two reasons, but no reference is made to this explanation of luptāpad, whereas unless such an explanation can be substantiated the foundation of the story goes.

Yours faithfully,

J. A. VANEES.

Bangalore, November 22nd.

A SINGHALESE PRINCE IN EGYPT.

I am not sure whether the following passage from Maqrīzī has been made generally accessible to Indian students:—“On the 14th of Muḥarram 638 (14th April 1238) envoys arrived in Egypt from the ruler of Ceylon, which is a part of India. This prince was called Abu Nekbāb Lebadah. They took with them a golden casket half an ell long, and three fingers in breadth. Inside it was a substance of a green colour which looked like palm leaves, and which bore characters that no one at Cairo could read. The envoys were examined, and from their report it would appear the letter contained formulae of salutation and friendship. The prince declared that he had broken off his alliance with the ruler of Yaman in order that he might enter into closer ties with the Sullān (i.e. the Sullān of Egypt). He announced that he possessed a great quantity of riches, of which he gave a list, such as elephants, precious stones, and costly goods of all kinds, and that he had sent a present to the Sullān. The kingdom of Ceylon contained 27 fortresses and also possessed mines of rubies and other precious stones, and the Royal treasure beamèd with precious stones.” Maqrīzī, ed. Quatremère, II. part i., 59 and 60.

HENRY H. HOWORTH.

CHANDRAGUPTA AND VIKRAMADITYA.

(ante Vol. XIII. p. 185).

With reference to Mr. Fleet's inscription No. CXLVI, in which Vikramaditya is placed after Chandragupta, I would call attention to one of the Mackenzie palm-leaf Telugu MSS. at Madras, described by the Rev. W. Taylor,—the Kaliyuga-rāja-Charitra, which states that Chandragupta reigned 210 years, and “his son” Vikramaditya reigned 2000 years, till the year 3044 of the Kaliyuga (Mad. Jour. Lit. Sec., Vol. VII. p. 351). May not this have been what was in the mind of the person who, in the 11th century, had the inscription referred to engraved? In that case it must be Chandragupta the Maurya who is referred to.

9th December 1884.

JAS. BURGESS.

NOTES ON THE JATTIS.

The Jaṭṭas appear to have spread rapidly from centres over the plains of the Panjāb. The great families are often represented by colonies, both Cis-Satāluj and Trans-Satāluj. It is common to hear them say, “We are so many villages (khāta) here and so many in Mālāvā.” The number of villages in a colony is sometimes very large, several hundred.

The practice of karrēd, or re-marriage of a widow to one of her deceased husband's family, is almost universal among the Jaṭṭas, but some tribes do not practise it; for instance, a large section of the Bains Jaṭṭas of Mahalpūr, in the Hooghly district.

The Emperor Akbar married a Jaṭṭā, a relative of one Mehr Miṭṭhā in the Mānjhā. To the celebration of this marriage 35 Jaṭṭ villages and 35 Rājpūt villages of the Jālandhār and Bārī Dōbhs were summoned. These villages enjoy a pre-eminence in the country side, and are collectively termed “the Darbūr.”

In olden times the Jaṭṭs of the Mālāvā used to be deemed so poor, and so likely to be driven by a season of drought out of their villages, that the Mānjhā tribes would not give their daughters to them in marriage. Now, say the people at Firoz-pūr, it is the other way: the Mālāvā tribes will not give their daughters to the men of the Mānjhā, as they have got so far ahead of their Mānjhā brethren by the great stimulus to agriculture which roads and railways and the development of trade have given.
The Jatáts of the "Jungle," or the great unirrigated tracts of the Firozpur and LuddiÁE districts, are a fine stawright race, equal, or nearly so, to their brethren of the MÁ¥nÁ¥h, but I have heard it said that they bore a bad reputation as soldiers with Ranjit Singh, as wanting hauold or courage; probably a very mistaken idea. No doubt the shrewd old king used to prefer to take his soldiers from tracts nearer home, and not so near the British border. Anyhow he did not like enlisting Málwáis. When Jatá recruits were brought before him he applied the test of a shibboleth by making them count between 20 and 30. The men of Málwá committed themselves at 25, saying peckh, while the MÁ¥nÁ¥h dialect says panjí. Nevertheless a few families of Málwá Jatáts rose to great distinction in the LÁ¥h Darbá; witness the MÁ¥náwalá family of the Gujráwalá district; the ÁEÁ¥ri family; and Fateh Singh MÁ¥n, a Málwá, commanded the LÁ¥h artillery in the Sikh campaign.

It is probable that certain Jatá tribes used to practice infanticide. I am not sure that among certain of the more exclusive Jatáts there is not to this day a method of treating female infants approaching nearly to infanticide.

There are old doggerel verses in the Jatá patois of pure, or tenÁÊ, Panjábí, which bear witness to the existence of the practice, e.g.—

**Munni dÁ¥ bdÁ¥ didá** Baby’s father came

**MÁ¥nÁ¥h káÁ¥h le didá** With mattock on shoulder,

**BhÁ¥r toÁ¥ khaÁ¥tÁ¥d** Dug a hole outside

**Munni nÁ¥n utte dabbid**. And there buried baby.

The Jatá conquest of the JÁ¥ndhar Doáb (about 1759 A.D.—1816 SaÁ¥vat, constantly referred to as "SaÁ¥vat Solah") was a marked era in the history of the Panjáb, and the overbearing haughty conduct of the tribe which had the upper hand is preserved in many a depreciatory proverb. For instance, he is represented in the following as very quarrelsome about land—:

**Pir vich Jatá na chhertey Don’t cross a Jatá in his field.**

**HatÁ¥t vich KarÁ¥r Nor a KarÁ¥r at his shop.**

**PÁ¥tÁ¥n MÁ¥nÁ¥ na chhertey Nor a MÁ¥nÁ¥ at the ferry.**

**BhÁ¥n dogá¥ bÁ¥thÁ¥r** They will break your head.

The following jingling rhymes are well known in the Doáb, and are by no means complimentary to the Jatá.

(a) Jatá nachÁ¥ dÁ¥r, oh bhÁ¥ burd,

BhÁ¥man phairid chhurid, oh bhÁ¥ burd.

BÁ¥wan chaÁ¥l burd, oh bhÁ¥ burd.

MÁ¥h kÁ¥l dhurid, oh bhÁ¥ burd, &c. &c.

A Jatá capering on a horse is a bad thing.

A BrÁ¥man handling a knife is a bad thing.

The East wind in BÁ¥wan is a bad thing.

Rain clouds closing in all round is a bad thing.

(b) Jatá mohdÁ¥s, BhÁ¥man sÁ¥h,

BÁ¥náÁ¥ hÁ¥kÁ¥m, gáÁ¥h kÁ¥nd.

A Jatá as tax-gatherer, a BrÁ¥man as money lender.

A Baniyá as ruler, is the very wrath of God.

Jatá bigáÁ¥re mÁ¥shÁ¥h nÁ¥l.

JáÁ¥ boÁ¥l kAlÁ¥h gÁl.

The Jatá falls out even with his priest.

Whenever he speaks he utters abuse. W.C.

---

**BOOK NOTICE.**

**REPORT ON THE SEARCH FOR SANSKRIT MSS.** in the Bombay Presidency, in the year 1882-1883, By Prof. R.G. BhaÁ¥ndÁ¥rká, Bombay, 1884 (pp. 229). 1

Professor R.G. BhaÁ¥ndÁ¥rká’s *Report* for 1882-1883 is, like Dr. P. Peterson’s publication on his operations during the same year (*Jour. Bo. Branch Roy. As. Soc., No. XII.*), a good deal more than an official document of ephemeral value. Like Dr. Peterson, Professor BhaÁ¥ndÁ¥rká has given us a summary of the most important historical and literary data, which a cursory examination of his numerous purchases, seven hundred and seventy-two MSS., revealed, and has added in Appendix II. such extracts from the originals as are required in order to substantiate his assertions. Both the summary and the extracts have been made in a scholarly manner, and the *Report* of 1882-83 will be an important help to every student who has to find his way through the tangled jungle of Sanskrit literature.

Under the head Vedas the most important acquisition is an old imperfect MS. of UÁ¥tá’s BhÁ¥shá on the KaÁ¥ya recension of the White Yajurvéda, which definitively settles the author’s date and shows that he wrote in the first half of the eleventh century A.D., during the reign of the famous king BhÁ¥jÁ¥ of DhÁ¥r. There are other MSS. of the BhÁ¥shá, e.g. the copy in the Elphinstone Collection of 1867-68, which state that Á¥ndapura was UÁ¥tá’s birth-place, and that in his time BhÁ¥jÁ¥ ruled the earth. As there are many Á¥ndapuras in India, and as many BhÁ¥jÁ¥s have lived at different times in different parts of the country, it was impossible to assert where and when the work was composed. The newly found copy adds an additional verse, which says

---

1 Reprinted from the Oesterreichische Monatschrift für den Orient.
that Uvata wrote in Avanti or Ujjain, while Bhaja ruled the country, and thus settles the chronological question. This discovery has already been published by Mr. S. P. Pandit, in his paper on Saya's commentary of the White Yajurveda, which he sent to the sixth International Oriental Congress. But the honour of the find belongs, as Mr. Pandit has stated, to Professor Bhunjdarkar.

Among the other Vedic MSS. the collection of 108 Upanishads (No. 487) is interesting. Such large collections are, as Professor Bhunjdarkar points out, rare. I remember only one MS. preserved in the library of the Bombay Asiatic Society, which I think contains more Upanishads than this.

The second class, Vedangas, shows no important novelties, but is remarkable for a good collection of Prayogas, or, manuals for Vedic sacrifices used by the Vajasaneyins, which will be serviceable to students of the difficult ritualistic questions. Class III. Nitihasas and Puranas is devoid of interest and contains too many Mathayyas and similar works which are already sufficiently represented in the collections of earlier years.

Class IV. Dharmas, on the other hand, offers a great many useful books and some really important finds. To the latter belong the rare Manartha-chandrika of Raghavamandala Sarasvat, the Mitikshari of Satyavat 1535, and the Dharma-dharam of the Madhva sect. The first-named work, which I have used for the notes to my translation of Manu, has suffered very considerably, but it is the only accessible copy besides the Paris MS. which D'Anquetil brought from Gujarat. If the Mitikshari, as Professor Bhunjdarkar assumes, is really dated in the Vikrama era, it is only 23 years younger than the MS. of the Elphinston College Collection of 1537-68 (Class VI. No. 9) which was written in Sakasamvat 1378 or 1456 A.D. With these two copies it ought to be possible to restore the text of the great lawbook, the editions of which do not seem to be very correct.

The lawbooks of the Madhvas were hitherto unrepresented in the Bombay collection. Nearly all the works in Class V. which belong to the elegant literature, occur already in the older lists. Yet the copies of the rarer commentaries on the Raghava and the Kirtitarjunya, as well as the Paishchalanatra, dated Satyavat 1534, are valuable acquisitions. The last MS. cannot, however, be "more than five hundred years old," but supposing that the date refers to the Vikrama era, only upwards of four hundred. I must, however, add that it is hazardous to assume, as Professor Bhunjdarkar seems to do throughout, that all dates preceded by the word "Satyavat" belong to the era of 57 B.C. In common with other Sanskritists I too held this opinion for many years. But recent discoveries have shown that even the scribes of Gujarat and Bajujet, where the Vikrama era is universally used in every-day life, sometimes put Satyavat instead of Sakasamvat.

As instances I may point out the MS. of the Mahabharata (Kielhorn, Mah. II. 3 p. 8), written at Iadurga (Idar) in Sakasamvat 1513 and 1514, where the mention (in the colophon) of the victorious reign of the illustrious Narayana or, the Rao Narondas of the Adivi Akbari, shows that Sakasamvat 1513-1514 is meant, and the copy of Govinda's Saripti Manuscript in the India Office Library (No. 1736), dated Satyavat 1467, which Colebrooke and the editors of the Palaeographical Series believe to correspond to 1410 A.D. In the colophon of the latter work the scribe states, however, that he wrote at Varadvi (Vaerav) during the reign of Maharan Adya SINHA. As Maharana Udai Sinha of Mewar came to the throne in 1541 A.D., it is not doubtful that Satyavat 1467 refers to the Saka era, and corresponds to 1548 A.D. Under these circumstances every "Satyavat-data" requires verification. The best means for this purpose is a calculation of the days of the week which usually are given besides the days of the month, according to the two eras.

Among the works on grammar (Class VI), there is another fragment of Isvarananda's commentary on the Mahabharata (No. 134) which is interesting. The first piece was found in 1873-74 (No. 38). The remarks (p. 11) on the Anekadha-kavani-manuscript of Mahakshapancaka (Class VII. No. 199) might have been completed by a reference to my Kastur Report, p. 76, and to the Kastur MS. No. 329 of 1767-77. It would thereby have become evident that the work really belongs to the Kasturaka dhanuka.

Of undeniable importance are the numerous acquisitions in Class X. Vedanta, especially those embodying the teaching of Madhva-Anandatirtha and of Nimbarka. The collections of earlier years contained, with the exception of the Madhavadipika (Elphinston Collection of 1887-68, Class XII. No. 6), nothing worth speaking of that could throw light on these two modern, but important sects. Professor Bhunjdarkar has now done a great deal towards filling up this lacuna. He has, moreover, given in Appendix II. p. 202, a carefully prepared list of the spiritual heads of the Madhvas, together with apparently trustworthy dates, and an extract from the Harigurucaramadit, which enumerates the successors of Nimbarka. These new lists allow us to correct many errors in Professor H. H. Wilson's Essay on the Religious Sects of India, where inter alia, the year after Madhva's death is given as.
the date of his birth. In his remarks on the age of śāṅkarācārya (p. 15) Professor Bhājājarākar is less fortunate. It is certainly inadvisable to assail śāṅkara’s date, which is given most circumstantially by his own followers (Yajñātīrī śāstrī’s Arnavaśīradhākara, p. 226) on the strength of such evidence as that adduced from the Saṅkhādāpātraka. The statement, made there, that śāṅkara’s grand-pupil Sarvaṛatikūṁ wrote during the reign of one illustrious king, the Āditya or sun of Manu’s race, a Kāhariya whose orders were never disobeyed, forces us by no means to push śāṅkara’s date back from 783 A. D. to 680. Though Professor Bhājājarākar is probably right in thinking that “the sun of the race of Manu” was a Chālukya prince, the Chālukya dynasty, which was overthrown by the Rātikūras in the eighth century, By the old Indian inscriptions many a prince is called “the sun of his race,” though his name is very different (see e.g., the case of Māhārāja I of Anhilvād, Jad. As., vol. VI, p. 199, 201, 203, etc.). As regards the second point, it must be borne in mind that the Chālukya kings who ruled, after Tālakapī, had restored the fortune of the family in the tenth century, likewise descended from Manu (Fleet, Southern Dynasties, p. 17, note 2). As far as I can see, the note in the Saṅkhādāpātraka is worthless for historical purposes.

In the next Classes, XI—XIV, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, Jyotisha, Medicine, and Tantras, there is nothing of special interest. The more important works acquired were already represented in the previous collection, while the new additions are mostly unimportant. But Professor Bhājājarākar’s remarks and extracts furnish a considerable number of very valuable data for the history of those sciences during the middle age. He finds the dates of a good many writers who, though themselves unimportant, are quoted by and quote greater men whose times are uncertain.

In Class XV., Art and Architecture, the copies of the Rājavalabhaṃdana and of the Vatamāṇana, manuscripts for stone-masons and architects composed in the first half of the 15th century, are of value. An edition and translation of these works, for which also the MSS. in the Elphinstone College Collection of 1867-88 (Class IX., Nos. 1—3) are available, could be easily prepared with the assistance of an intelligent Sūlīta or Rājputā or. During my tour in 1873-4 I met several men of this caste who could recite the Rājavalabha and explain it. The translation would be important for the officers of the Archaeological Survey. Of still greater interest is the letter writer entitled Lekhaṇaṭākī (Class XVI. No. 410), which gives fifty model forms for letters and deeds, including a land-grant and a state-treaty. Though the Bombay collections of former years contain several treaties of this description, there is none among them which gives forms for official documents, like that discovered by Professor Bhājājarākar. Its importance lies partly therein, that it shows us how the clerks of the Indian kings managed to draw up the deeds which we find engraved on copper. It is now evident that such deeds, like those given in the Pañchnāḍī, were the sources on which they drew. Moreover the two documents furnish, as Prof. Bhājājarākar has pointed out, interesting details from the history of Gujarāt. The land-grant which is represented as recording a donation made in Vikramasaṃvat 1288 by Rāṇa Lāvanyaprasāda, i.e. Lavanaprasāda, the father of Viradhavala of Dvārākā, while Bhumadeva II. ruled at Anhilvād, confirms the statements of the chroniclers regarding the relation between the last of the Chaulukyas and the Vāghēlās. The treaty of peace which purports to have been concluded in the same year between the same Rāṇa and Mahārāja Sinhgana, in all probability explains, as Prof. Bhājājarākar thinks, how the chief of Dvārākā got out of the difficulty mentioned in Somaśvara’s Kṛṣṭikāumudī.

It would have been well, if the dreadfully corrupt text of the land-grant had been corrected with the help of the Chaullkya land-grants, published in the Indian Antiquary. It is interesting to note that the treaty of peace shows in vahavāms (App. II, p. 235, 1-4) a Sanskritised Gujarāṭī word vahavāms instead of the correct Sanskrit sthāna-vāṃ.

The collection of Jaina books (Class XVII.) contains a number of MSS. of works already well represented in the earlier Bombay collections, which, I fear, will be useless. But it includes also various new books of importance, such as the Bhadraprabandha of Merutunga and Sumati’s lives of the Yugpradhānas, from which Prof. Bhājājarākar has extracted much useful literary information. The conclusion of the Report gives a short review of the whole collection of MSS. deposited in the Dakhan College, which shows also the number of works lent to various scholars in India, Europe, and America. It is a matter of great satisfaction to see that the splendid collection is well cared for, and that, owing to the wise liberality of the Director of Public Instruction and of its immediate custodian, it continues to render important services to Sanskrit philology.

G. Bührer.
THE LEGENDS ON THE SILVER COINS OF THE EARLY GUPTAS AND OTHERS CONNECTED WITH THEM.

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


The silver coins, however, so far as the legends on them are concerned, still remain to be disposed of. The present readings of the legends, as given by Mr. Thomas in Arch. Surv. West. Ind. Vol. II. p. 59ff., and by General Cunningham in Arch. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 21ff., are not quite perfect. And, approximately correct as they are, and good as are the plates that accompany them, it was impossible to complete them with certainty from those plates.

Recently, however, I have had the opportunity of examining the original coins in General Cunningham's collection. And I am, thus, now able to give correct and complete readings of the legends on them.

There is, in the first place, a point to be noticed, which, as far as I can see, has hitherto escaped attention. It is, that there are two distinct methods of writing the legends. In one set of legends, which I shall call Class A., though the lower vowels are always expressed, such vowels as, if engraved, would fall on or above the top line of writing, are uniformly omitted. In the other set of legends, which I shall call Class B., these upper vowels are always duly inserted. The legends of Class A. are always coupled in the Early Gupta coins with the ruder representation of the peacock on the reverse, with outstretched wings, but without expanded tail. The legends of Class B., on the other hand, are always coupled in the same coins with the far more finished representation of the peacock on the reverse, which shows, in addition to the outstretched wings, the tail, fully expanded behind, and very well depicted.

The same is also the rule with the silver coins of the Kshatrapas; and it is this that has led to the reading of saha or ska, instead of sīnha, as the termination of some of their names. Even some of the gold coins of the early Guptas have the legends written in the same imperfect way; but the instances available are not numerous enough to render a classification practicable yet.

CHANDRAGUPTA II.

Class A.

I.—One coin examined. Reverse,—rude peacock, with outstretched wings. (See Arch. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 23, and Pl. v. No. 1.)

The marginal legend, commencing above the head of the peacock, is:—

Śrā-Guptaku(?)[la(?)]/[sya maharajadhara- Śrā-Chandra*]gupta-Vakramāṇikaṣaya,

which represents—

Śrā-Guptaku(?)[la(?)]/[sya maharajadhara- Śrā-Chandra-Vikramāṇikaṣaya;—

"Of the supreme king of Mahārājas, the glorious Chandragupta-Vikramāṇa, who belongs to the glorious family of the Guptas."

The fourth and fifth syllables, kula, are doubtful; and the sya, which is supplied after them, depends of course upon the acceptance of them. The Vakramāṇikaṣaya at the end is very distinct; and, as 'Vikramāṇa' is constantly used as a synonym for 'Vikrama' and 'Vikramādiya,' both of which names are known from the gold coins to have belonged to Chandragupta II., we need not hesitate about supplying chandra before gupta. The remaining letters, here as in other places, are supplied from the legends of other coins, and according to the space that requires to be filled up. And, in fact, the letters rajā-Ś and a-chandra are supplied by the similar coin, the legend of which is represented by Sir E. Clive Bayley in Ind. Ant. Vol. VI. p. 576.

II.—Three coins examined. Reverse,—rude peacock, with outstretched wings. (See Arch. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 23f. and Pl. v. Nos. 2 and 3.)

The marginal legend, commencing opposite the left wing of the peacock, is—

Paramabhagavata-maharajadhara-Śrā-Śrā-Chandra-Vikramādiya,

which represents—

* The asterisks attached to letters in square brackets, denote letters which fall beyond the edges of the coins examined.

* In all probability the legend given in id. p. 576 is from another specimen of the same coin, and has vikramādiya, not vikramāṇika for vikramāṇika, at the end. The original coin, however, requires to be examined.
Paramahāgavata-mahārāja-dhīrāja-ārī-Chandragupta-Vikramādiya;

"The most devout worshipper of the holy one, the supreme king of Mahārāja, the glorious Chandragupta-Vikramādiya.

On one specimen, the syllables chandra are perfectly formed and are very distinct. In the remaining two specimens, the dra is so cramped, that it might easily be mistaken for kru. But the preceding syllable is an indisputable kha, not a va; so that, though we might, if possessed of no other guide, read chakra, we cannot possibly read vakra (bakra). The same remarks apply to Mr. Newton’s coin, figured by Mr. Thomas in Archæol. Surv. West. Ind. Vol. II. p. 63, No. XII.*; the correct reading is chandra, not baka as given by him;—and also to Sir E. Clive Bayley’s coin, described in Ind. Ant. Vol. VI. p. 57b, where even the lithograph, as given, suffices to show that the first syllable of the name is cha, not ka. Vakragupta or Bakragupta may certainly be discarded as a purely imaginative person.

Two of the specimens examined shew, on the obverse, in front of the king’s face, some marks, lying partly beyond the edge, which may perhaps be completed into the numerical symbols for 80 and 4, or 90 and 4,—or may perhaps be only remnants of what Mr. Thomas considers to be a legend, in barbarous Greek characters, constituting a corrupt rendering of the standard Scythian legend of PAO NANO PAO,—or may perhaps be parts of a marginal pattern round the edge of the coin.

Sir E. Clive Bayley reads on his coin, on the obverse, behind the king’s head, va (for varsh) 90. This, however, is so purely a Khaṭmapra method of expressing the date, that there can be no doubt that what he reads as va, is a numerical symbol, either 4 or 5, below the 90.

Class B.—Nil.

KUMARAGUPTA.

Class A.

I.—Twenty-four specimens examined. Reverse,—rupe peacock, with outstretched wings.

(See Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 24, and Pl. v. Nos. 4 and 5.)

The marginal legend, commencing opposite the left wing of the peacock, is—

Paramahāgavata-rajadharaja-śra-Kumaragupta-Mahendradayī, which represents—

Paramahāgavata-rājadhirāja-śra-Kumaragupta-Mahendradayī;—

"The most devout worshipper of the holy one, the supreme king of Rāja, the glorious Kumāragupta-Mahendradayī."

II.—Four coins examined. Reverse,—rupe peacock, with outstretched wings. (See Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 24, and Pl. v. Nos. 4 and 5.)

The marginal legend, commencing opposite the left wing of the peacock, is—

Paramahāgavata-maharajadharaja-śra-Kumaragupta-Mahendradayī, which represents—

Paramahāgavata-mahārāja-dhīrāja-ārī-Kumāragupta-Mahendradayī;—

"The most devout worshipper of the holy one, the supreme king of Mahārāja, the glorious Kumāragupta-Mahendradayī."

This legend differs from the preceding one, only in giving the fuller title of mahārājadhirāja, instead of rājadhirāja.

Class B.

Nine coins examined. Reverse,—finished peacock, with outstretched wings and expanded tail. (See Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 24, and Pl. v. Nos. 6 and 7.)

The marginal legend, commencing above the head of the peacock, is—

Vijit-āvanir-avanipati-Kumāragupto dēvaṃjñātajayati;—

"Victorious is his majesty, the lord of the earth, Kumāragupta, who has conquered the earth."

SKANDAGUPTA.

Class A.

I.—One coin examined. Reverse,—rupe peacock, with outstretched wings. (See Archæol.

*We may either accept this reading as it stands, and take avaspaśa as a part of a compound,—or, on the analogy of evaspaśa-āyati on the coin Class E. III. of Skandagupta, insert a ekaśpa which is always liable to be omitted before gutturals and sibilants), and read avaspaśa as a separate word.
*Read dēwa.—Gen. Cunningham reads dēwa-jantā.
The marginal legend, commencing a little to the proper left below the peacock, is—

Paramabdhagavata-maharajadhiraja-ag-Skandagupta-Kramaditya,
which represents,—

Paramabhadragavata-maharajadhiraja-ag-Skandagupta-Kramaditya;

"The most devout worshipper of the holy one, the supreme king of Maharaja, the glorious Skandagupta-Kramaditya."

II.—One coin examined. Reverse,—the chaitya symbol. (See Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 24, and Pl. v. No. 8.)

The marginal legend, commencing above the top of the chaitya, is perhaps—

Maharaja-Ku(?)ma(?)ra(?)putra-paramama(?)ha(?)da(?)tya(?)maharaja-Ska(?)n(?)da(?)
which represents—

Maharaja Kumāraputra-paramamahādīitya-

maharaja Skanda;—

"The most devout worshipper of the great Sun, the Mahārāja Skanda, the son of the Mahārāja Kumāra.

The legend, however, is very crowded and difficult to read; and the letters marked with queries are extremely doubtful. The omission of the gupta after Kumāra and Skanda is peculiar; and still more so is the minor title of Mahārāja, instead of the paramount title of Mahārāja-dhiraja. And the chaitya is an exceptional symbol for a Gupta coin.

Class B.

I.—Two coins examined. Reverse,—finished peacock, with outstretched wings and expanded tail.

The marginal legend, commencing over the head of the peacock, is—

Vijit-āvanir-avanipati-ag-Skandagupta
dēvah10 jayati;—

"Victorious is his majesty, the lord of the earth, the glorious Skandagupta, who has conquered the earth."

II.—One coin examined. Reverse,—finished peacock, with outstretched wings and expanded tail.

The marginal legend, commencing above the head of the peacock, is—

Vijit11-āvanir-avanipati-ag-Skandagupta
dēvah10 jayati;—

"Victorious is his majesty, the lord of the earth, the glorious Skandagupta, who has conquered the earth."

General Cunningham has been somewhat inclined to attribute this coin to Dāmodara Gupta, reading Dāmodara where I read Skanda. The letters here are a good deal damaged, but must, I think, be read as I read them. Also, there is not room enough between ārī and guptā for four letters, Dāmodara,—or even for three, Kumāra. And the letters are of exactly the same type as those of the silver coins of Chandragupta II., Kumāragupta, Skandagupta, and Budhagupta, and are decidedly too early for the time of Dāmodara Gupta.

III.—Twelve coins examined. Reverse,—finished peacock, with outstretched wings and expanded tail. (See Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 25, Pl. v. Nos. 9 and 10.)

The marginal legend, commencing over the head of the peacock, is—

Vijit-āvanir-avanipati-brajati dēvā13 Skandagupta-yām;—

"Victorious is his majesty, this same Skandagupta, who has conquered the earth, (and) who is the lord of the earth."

Of these coins, five have very clear dates on the obverse, in front of the king's face. Two coins have the symbols for 100 and 40 and 4; one has the symbols for 100 and 40 and 5; one has the symbols for 40 and 8, the symbol for 100 in this case falling beyond the coin; and one has the symbols for 100 and 40, and the upper part of another symbol which may be completed into either 7 or 9.

Budhagupta.

Class A.—Nil.

Class B.

Two coins examined, and casts of three others. Reverse,—finished peacock with outstretched wings and expanded tail. (See Archæol. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. p. 25, and Pl. v. No. 13.)

The marginal legend, commencing above the head of the peacock, is—

Vijit-āvanir-avanipati-ag-budhabhagupta
dēvah jayati;—

10 Read ṛdvah.
11 In this coin, all the upper vowels, except the 2 of ā, ē, and ō are omitted.
12 See note 5 above.
13 See note 5 above.
14 See note 5 above.
Victoriosus is his majesty, the lord of the earth, the glorious Budhagupta, who has conquered the earth."

The coin figured by General Cunningham has very distinctly on the obverse, in front of the king's face, the numerical symbols for 100 and 70 and 5. The other coin may have the symbol for 80, but it is very uncertain; and the other one or two symbols are illegible. The casts do not establish any dates.

**KRISHNARAJA.**

**Class A.**


The marginal legend, commencing above the bull's hump, is—

Paramamahäsvara-matapatripādaudhyātā-sūra-Kṛishṇarāja,

which represents—

Paramamahäsvara-matāpītrīpādānudhyātā-

śrī-Kṛishṇarāja;

"The glorious Kṛishṇarāja, who is a devout worshipper of (the god) Mahēśvara, (and) who meditates on the feet of (his) parents."

**Class B.—Nil.**

**ISANAVARMAN.**

**Class A.—Nil.**

**Class B.**

Two coins examined. Reverse,—finished peacock, with outstretched wings and expanded tail. (See *Archaeol. Surv. Ind.* Vol. IX. p. 27, and Pl. v. Nos. 20, 21, and 22.) On the dated coin, the head and neck of the peacock are turned to the proper right, as in the early Gupta coins; on the coin without a date, they are turned to the proper left.

The marginal legend, commencing above the peacock's head, is—

Vijītāv[n[i*]r]āv[n[i*]p]atiṣrī-Īśanvarmā
dēva" jayati ; —

"Victoriosus is his majesty, the lord of the earth, the glorious Īśanvarman, who has conquered the earth."

On the obverse of the coin figured by General Cunningham as No. 22, in front of the king's face, there are two marks which may perhaps be the numerical symbols for 40, 60, or 70, and 5. But they are very imperfect and doubtful.

---

**A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE YADAVA KING KRISHNA.**

**BY K. B. PATHAK, B.A.: MIRAJ.**

This inscription is from some copper-plates which were found in 1882 in the possession of Tippana Bin Somaṭa Tali, of Bēndigēri or Beṇḍigērē, about eleven miles south-east from Belgaum. The owner of the plates stated that they had been lying in his house for two or three generations, and that he does not know how and where they were first found.

The plates are three in number; but only the first two are inscribed,—the third being intended to serve as a guard for the writing on the outside of the second plate. They are each about 1' 4" high by 10½" broad. The edges of them were raised into rims to protect the writing; and the inscription is well preserved and legible throughout. The ring, on which the plates were strung, had not been cut when the grant came into Mr. Fleet's hands; it is about 1½" thick and 4½" in diameter. The seal on the ring is circular, about 3½" in diameter; the principal emblem on it, in relief on a countersunk surface, is Garuḍa, kneeling and facing full-front, and holding a bow in his left hand; over his left shoulder is the moon; and the sun, very small and indistinct, is cut over his right hand, which is raised above his shoulder. The three plates weigh 581 tolas, and the ring and seal 65½ tolas; total, 646½ tolas. The characters are Nāgarī. The language is Sanskrit; except in l. 118-19 where Kanarese is used, and except in a case of a few Kanarese genitives which occur as surnames.

The grant is of the time of Kṛishṇa,—or, as he is here called, Kānarṣa,—of the Yadava dynasty of Dévagīrī. It is dated in Śaka 1170 for 1171 (A.D. 1240-50), the Saumya sāhvātarṣa,² on Guruvāra or Thursday, the Śaka 1170 was the Kīlaka sāhvātarṣa, and the Saumya sāhvātarṣa was Śaka 1171.

² See note 5 above.
³ Read dévā.
⁴ By the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronology,
twelfth day of the bright fortnight of the month Śrāvaṇa. And the chief object of it is to record that Malliseṭṭi, the minister of Kṛishṇa, bestowed the village of Tāmbapuri, in the district of Vēṇugrāma or Belguam, upon a number of Brāhmaṇas—and that Chaunḍijaṭṭi, the son of Malliseṭṭi, obtained the king's sanction to the grant, and presented the copper-plate charter recording it.

TRANSCRIPTION. *

First plate.

[1] Ōṁ namaḥ Śivāya || Śrī-Gaṇḍhipatayē
[3] dēva dhētāt dhātī harsahā-[d*]vighuṣa-puṣṭatān || Asti svasya-yanān rājā Siṁhāṇaḥ Yadu-vanāṣa-jāḥ
[4] yasya kirtītī-tribhuvanē prathitā Hari-kirttī-vat || Pratyartha-kshitipāla-mauli-makuta-

vra(p)ryupta-mu-
sūdhaḥ Yādava
[8] payōdāvār chaṇḍaṁm،i || Yac-yā-
[9] niṛpāḥ || Jatīyati västra rājā sarva-bhūpāla-mauli-prathita-parama-ratna-prāḷīṣadat-
pāda-padmaḥ ||
[10] Yac-van-kulā-chīrī-ḥū ṁāśuḍāvē jañanaṁ nayana-kamala-sūryaṁ pritiṁ-kanhā-

akkhyāḥ || Yac-vasika
dadāṁ-iti vachṣya-api || Yac-yā-
[12] trayaṁ niṛpāḥ sarvē tatra tatra sthitā diś || bālair-aṅṭahpurin-hhyā 

kahiṇāḥvyā-sūryasī balīṁ ||
[13] Tasya-ānyah-kshitipāla-mauli-makuta-pratya-adat-ratnaṁ-chāraṁ nirājach-araṇa-

āvihō-yugalāḥ śūṣhya pri
[14] tvīpaṇēḥ | śūrō-mātya-dhūri sthitō vijayatō Bīch-āgraññā suṁtataṁ Malla-ākhyāḥ kīla Chīkkaḍēva

thāvīśaya yō rājēṇo daksinaṁ bhujāḥ || Yaḥ-Chau[ṁ*]disēṭṭīṁ prathita-pratāpāḥ 
sarvasu dīkṣa-ūṛjīta-pu-
[16] aya-kīrtīṁ | śrī-Sōmatēḥ-āṅgīh-yug-ātma-natāy pravardhita-āśeṣa-vibhūti-ramyāḥ ||

Dīos jī-
[17] gūhāṁ tam-avēkṣaya sarvē dvishaṁta ēnaṁ tv-athan Chau[ṁ*]disēṭṭīṁ valmekam-

āruhya trīṣaṁ charanītī grīha(h)paṁjūti
[18] nīvim-api karuṇapatraṁ || Yad-rūpa-saundarya-guṇa-pralabdha Ratiṁ samāśīya

punāḥ patiṁ sā ||(1)
[19] vismṛtiya ch-ānūga-sūkhan pravṛddha-sūkheṇa vikṛṭiṁ ladvha(bdha)-harshaḥ ||

Prasāya-ṣrīnāḥ prajripa
[20] chāpō dadāti ch-ārthēn kripāya dvijēbhayaḥ || Chauṣaṁset[ī*]y-ākhyā-va(b)duhan dāyāt-

dasmāi chir-āyō-bhu
[21] vi Sōmanāṭhaḥ || Chīha || Svasti śrī-Sāka-saṃvatsarasaya śat-adhika-sahas-sahā-kā-
saptayāṁ=ch-ā.
naṁtare Saumye-bdō Śravaṇe māsi sita-pakhe ḍvādaṣyāṁ Guruvaśe Śrī
dhambara-devasya mahārā
dasya Bhūnaiś[†]y-ākhyo mahāmātyaḥ kaṭaka-yāṭrayāṁ Bhimaraṭhāyaṁ
Pauṇḍariṣu-
ka-kṣhēte śrī-Viṣṇu-saṁnīdhau Vēṇugrāma-śēṣathāṁ Tāṁbrapūriṁ daś-ādhikā
satā-vṛttiḥ prakalya ashtabhō
gasamasra(sta)-tējā-sahitaṁ[ṁ]* sarva-namasyāṁ prasiddha-chatuḥ[ḥ]*-simā-mudrītāṁ
śrī-Kaṇhara-devasaya rājñō
dēṣa-śtā Tāṁbrapurī mama pītra brāhmaṇēbhyyo datt-ēti tasya rājñō nīvēdayītva
tena rājñā ma-
y-sāvata datt-ēti labdh-ābhyyamānāṁ tēbhyyo brāhmaṇēbhyyaḥ ashtabhōga-tējā-
śamanvītan sarva-namasyāṁ
śvār(ma)-sāsanāṁ Chau[ṁ]*dīṣṭīṁ dāpayītvā piitrum-dharmam-ā-čandr-ārkaṁ
sushthāṁ kṛitvā || Chha || Tasmāi sarva-
śvasty-suta || Chha || Tatha tasyāḥ Tā[ṁ]*brupūryāṁ pratigra[ṛ]hiṁśīṁ
brāhmaṇānaṁ gōtra-gūna-ṇāmaṁ
kramēya likhyāntē || Chha || Svasti || Chha || Vasissyagōtṛīya-
Lakṣ̄ñiḥṛiḥarabhattotpāḍīhyayā-suta-Nārā
yañabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyāyaḥ || Tasya putraḥ Lakṣ̄nādhakramitaḥ || Vasissyagōtṛīya-
Vāmanakramita-su-
ta-Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyāyaḥ || Ātrēyagōtṛīya-Ru[ṛ]garthada-Dugganabhaṭṭotpāḍīhyayā-
suta-Kri[ṛ]-
śnabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyāyaḥ || Tasya putraḥ Dugganabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyāyaḥ || Kāyapagōtṛīya-
Kāvadēva-
[a]varṭa(rddha)ḥa-suta-Rāmdēvarāpaṭṭava[r*]ddhānāḥ || Agasthagōtṛīya-āchārya-
Kesavabhattotpāḍīhyayā-suta-
[da]sgraṇūthi-Mādhavabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyayāḥ || Tasya bhratā Vēdārtha-Nāraṇabhaṭṭ-
-opāḍīḥyayāḥ || Ātrēy-
yagōtṛīya-Brahmadēva-paṭṭavaraddhān-suta-Nārāyaṇapāṭṭava(ddhā)ḥaḥ || Tasya
bhratā Śrīdhara-paṭṭa-
varddad(ddhā)ḥaḥ || Jāmadagnyā(ṛ)na Vatsagōtṛīya-Jakkadēvabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyayā-suta-
Śrīdharaḥbhattotpāḍīhyayāḥ || Kā-
[ś]yagōtṛīya-Śrīdharaḥbhattotpāḍīhyayā-suta-Śrī-Bhāgavata-Kalidēvabhattotpāḍīhyayāḥ ||
Ātrēy-
gōtṛīya-Nārāyaṇakramita-suta-Adhvari-Basavaṇabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyayāḥ || Bhāradvājgōtṛīya-
Nārada(?)-suta-Kāmadēvaghaśaṁ || Vasissyagōtṛīya(gō)triya-Bhāskara-suta-Rāmadēv-
ghaśaṁ || Bhāradvājgōtṛīya-
Second plate : first side.
Brahmadēvakramita-suta-Sōmēvaṇau[r*]jamītāṁ ||
Kāyapagōtṛīya-La-
kṣnādharaḥbhattotpāḍīhyayā-suta-Śrī(Ś)ōmevaṇarabhaṭṭotpāḍīḥyayāḥ ||
Bhāradvājgōtṛīya-
trīya-Vāmadēvapāṭṭavaraddhana-suta-Viṣṇupāṭṭavardhānāḥ ||
Bhārgavagōtṛīya-
Mādhavī-Ghalisāsa-suta-Gopaḥapāṭṭavarddhānāḥ || Tasya bhratā Utra(ṛ)ma-kramitaḥ
|| Tasya sutas Viṣṇunātha-Ghai(ṛ)a(?[s])liśaḥ || Vasitha(sṛtha)gōtṛīya-Dēvaṇa-
pataraddhana-suta-Sānkara-
[gh]aṛāḥ || Tasya sutas Chauḍaraṇyaṇeṇavaraddhanaḥ || Vasissyagōtṛīya-Jajatā-
[90] ठाकाह || तस्या ौऱता कृष्णपाठकाह || भारगवगोठ्रया-दामोदराद्वेद(दुवेद)सुता-सिवासिकापाठकाह || तस्या
[91] ब्रह्माता सर्वेशवरद्वेद(दुवेद)सुता(दल) || वासिष्ठशहोठ्रयाः देवदुवेद(दिः)सुता-लक्षांविधापाठकाह || पारसांगोठ्रया-साम-
[92] तिसु(सु)क्ला-सुता-जगदिश्वरपाठकाह || वस्तगोठ्रया-देशासर्वांक्ला-सुता-नरसिंहपाठकाह || भारगवगोठ्रया-
[93] त्रिल्य-कर्त्तिवसपाठकाह-सुता-नागदेवपाठकाह || गगपोठ्रया-देशासर्वांपाठकाह-सुता-आसा-
[94] धरापाठकाह || आर्यु(र्यु)क्लागोठ्रया-आमदेवा-पुप्प्वायसुता-समोदरापाठकाह || तस्या ौऱताः
[95] आन्य(यं)पुप्प्वायसुता || कपिष्ठश(श)क्लागोठ्रया-चागदेवापाठकाह-सुता-समोदरापाठकाह || देवार-
[96] गोठ्रया-सर्वगतिक्षिता-सुता-सवस(ससु)पुप्प्वायसुता || वस्तगोठ्रया-महोस्वरपाठकाह-सुता-महोस्वाः-
[97] रमापाठकाह || गगपोठ्रया-वाकुपाठकाह-सुता-सोद्घनपाठकाह || भारद्वाजगोठ्रया-यत्रिवावार्तः
[98] फिता-सुता-वाजिनाथपाठविनिताः || कौ(कू)क्लागोठ्रया-प्रभाकरावार्तविधि-सुता-समोदरापाठविधिः || काउँ-
[99] फिन्यागोठ्रया-वाकुद्वेद(दुवेद)सुता-जगदिशवरद्वेद(दुवेद)सुता || काउँक्लागोठ्रया-मदानितपाठकाह-सुता-मािगोठ्रयांपाठकाह-सुता-समोदरापाठकाह || तस्या ौऱताः
[100] भारद्वाजगोठ्रया-त्रिलोकह-सुता-विजए(ज्ञया)समापपाठकाह || तस्या ौऱताः शेशे-भगवा-रामावार्तविधिः
[101] जिल्या-गोठ्रया-हरिभयार्तविधि-सुता-महासुरमत्विधि-सुता-हमावार्तविधी || काउँक्लागोठ्रयाः-उत्तमानुपविनिताः
[102] त-क्षेत्रियापाठविनिताः || गगपोठ्रया-आसदहरापाठकाह-सुता-सावलपाठकाह || माउँगालयांगाः
[103] त्रिल्य-नारायणपुप्प्वायसुता-बसावणा-पुप्प्वायसुता || भारद्वाजगोठ्रया-चावगावार्त-मानुराः
[104] लारसवामिला(ला) || विस्रवित्रगोठ्रया-सर्वज्ञा-सर्वज्ञाती(ती)वहाँ-जा-धरारा || देवासपाठविधी
[105] तुपुप्प्वायसुता-सर्वज्ञा-वाजिनाथ-भावभाभतोपुप्प्वायसुता || अत्रल्यगोठ्रया-नागदेवा-सुता-वोपाडे-
[106] वापुप्प्वायसुता || कालापोठ्रया-वोजपुप्प्वायसु-कालाभिञ्ञासु-पुप्प्वायसु || गगपोठ्रया-
[107] व्र(व्र)ा-मध्या-वापस्तावर्द्धासुता-सोमांशतप्राप्तावर्द्धासुता || तस्या ौऱताः त्रिविक्रामाभाभतोपुप्प्वायसु || भाः-
[108] राजवाजगोठ्रया-मखिद्वापस्तावर्द्धासुता-सुटा-कालिदवाघोठ्रया-सु-देवासपाठविधी तस्या ौऱताः
[109] विस्नुर्द्वाभगोठ्रया-तुषारत्रमे[भाः] || त्रिचार्य-वामदेवाभाभतोपुप्प्वायसु-सु-नारसिंहभाभतोपुप्प्वायसु || विस्वां-
[110] त्रगोठ्रया-सोमेशवरपाप्तावर्द्धासुता-सु-साकंतितागितासुता || विस्नुर्द्वाभगोठ्रया-श्री-देवासपाठविधी
[111] सु-मध्यावपाप्तासुता(ता)वर्द्धासुता || करिगोठ्रया-मध्यावपाप्तावर्द्धासुता-सु-श्री-देवासपाप्तावर्द्धासुता || कालापोठ्रया-
[112] यु-कालापोठ्रया-वाजिनाथ-भावभाभतोपुप्प्वायसु || कालापोठ्रया-कालापोठ्रया-सु-स्वामी-
[113] देवागहिलासा || कालापोठ्रया-नारायणभाभताः || देवागहिलासा || भारद्वाजगोठ्रया-
[114] शापाद्वपाप्तावर्द्धासुता-सु-मखिद्वागहिलासा || तस्या ौऱताः देवागहिलासा || भारद्वाजगोठ्रया-

* Read svars.    ' Read Kausika.    " to 18 These are Kausika genitives.
[**] trīya-Rāmaṇḍaraghaśa-suta-Viṣṇughaśisāh || Vasīṣṭhagōtrīya-Ādityabhaṭṭopādhyāya-suta-Vārā-

[**] aggableōtrīya-Vāraṇāsiya.13Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭ-

[**] āṭra(trē)yagōtrīya-Sarvasatī(tī)-Padmanābhaṭṭ-ōpādhyāya-yāh || Kāśyapagōtrīya.

[**] Drāvīḍa-Viṣṇunāthaḥbhaṭṭopādhyāyaḥ || Kapigōtrīya-Dāmōdarabhaṭṭopādhyāya-suta-

Rāvaṇadāvābha.-

[**] tōpādhyāyaḥ || Kāśyapagōtrīya(tī)yā-Mādhavapāṭavardhā(rddha)na-suta-Māṇḍyaḥchya-p(ū)pādhyāyaḥ || Viśvī-

[**] mṛtagōtrīya-Vraṁ(brahma)maṇṭānignala(ī)a.14Vraṁ(brahma)haṇḍeśvabhahṭopādhyāya-suta-Aṭūna-

naḥtābhaṭṭopādhyāyaḥ || Harigōtrīya-

[**] tagōtrīya-Gōvindāpāṭavardhāna-suta-Vāmanapāṭava[r*]dhiṇa || Harigōtrīya-

Vāmanapāṭava[r*]dhiṇa-

[**] Suta-Govindaḥpāṭavardhāna || Tasya bhrātā Viśnudēvapāṭavardhāna || Bhārā-

dvājagōtrīya-Chaṇḍrabha.-

[**] tōpādhyāya-suta-Pśībhaṭṭopādhyāyaḥ || Bhāradvājagōtrīya-Viṇḍuvabhahṭopādhyāya-

-suta-Maṅ-

[**] dēvapāṭavardhānaḥ || Bhāradvājagōtrīya-Śrīkara-suta-Śvaramāhaisaḥ || Śrī-Vatsa-

gōtrīya-Māyi-

[**] dēvaghałisa-sa-suta-Gōvindaghaḷisa-saḥ || Śrī-Vatsagōtrīya-Dīvākaraghaḷisa-sa-sut-

[**] ta-Nāgadēvaghalisāsaḥ || Vasīṣṭhagōtrīya-Balaḍavaghaśa-suta-Maḷi-

[**] pāṭavardhāna(rddhā)naḥ || Mō(Maṅu)naBhārgavagōtrīya-Nārāyaṇapaghaḷisa-suta-Śavā-

gaḷisās;

[**] saḥ || Bhāradvājagōtrīya-Vēdārtha.12Bṛchayaṇa-suta-Maṅḍikaraḥbhahṭopādhyāyaḥ || Gau-

[**] tamagōtrīya-Lakṣmiḥdāna-suta-Viṣṇubhaṭṭopādhyāyaḥ || Bhāradvājagōtrīya-Pra-

[**] saṃnāna.13Sarvasatī(tī)-Śrīkaraḥbhahṭopādhyāya-suta-Viṇḍuvabhahṭopādhyāyaḥ || (||) Aṭrē-

yagōtrīya-Viṣṇubhaṭṭo.

[**] pāḍhyāya-suta-Śāmāvēdi-Hariharaḥbhahṭopādhyāyaḥ || (||) Mō(Maṅu)naBhārgavagōtrīya-

Bhā.-

Second plate; second side.

[**] skaraḥbhahṭopādhyāya-suta-Viṣṇuṇaṭavardhānaḥ || Bhāradvāja-gōtrī-

[**] ya-Kāśayavahaḥbhaṭṭopādhyāya-suta-Himadā-Kalidāvaṇaṭavardhānaḥ || Bhāradvāja-gō-

[**] trīya-Narasiṇhapaṭavardhāna-suta-Mādhavapāṭavardhānaḥ || Bhāradvāja-gōtrī-

[**] ya-Nāgadēvapāṭavardhāna-suta-Saravā(sva)ita(tī)-Nāgadevapāṭavardhānaḥ || Kāśyapa-gō-

[**] trīya-Viṇḍuṇaḥbhahṭopādhyāya-suta-Maḷiśdvabhahṭopādhyāyaḥ || Aṭrēyagōtrīya-Kāśaṇ-

[**] varddhanayaḥ bhrātā Madhusūdanapāṭavardhānaḥ || Aṭrēyagōtrīya-Varaṇḍāva-suta-

Purāṇa-Sarvasatīnaḥ

[**] vṛtti-dvayaḥ || Kāśyapagōtrīya-Viṣṇuv(dē)va || Vāmanabhahṭopādhyāyaḥ || Kāśyapa-

gōtrīya-Nāgadevā.-

[**] Nāgadevā10bhahṭopādhyāyaḥ || Kāśyapagōtrīya-Bonakama-Maṇḍyaḥbhahṭopādhyāyaḥ ||

Vasī(ś[i]rḍha-

[**] gōtrīya-Sāmāvēdi-Charayaḥbhahṭopādhyāyaḥ || Kāśyapagōtrīya-Svayāṃpākī-Viśvānātha-

bha.-

[**] tōpādhyāyaḥ || Kāśyapagōtrīya-Gōkāgaya.16Vēdārtha.10Nāgadevabhahṭopādhyāya-

yaḥ [||] 12 The engraver first engraved itf, and then corrected it into ūf. 13 This name is repeated unnecessarily. 14 These are Kanarese genitives.
TRANSLATION.

Om! Salutation to Siva! Salutation to the glorious Garapat! May that first bow protect you, reflected on whose trunk the earth was supported, and, through joy, became, as it were, twice as large as before!

(L. 5.)—There was a prosperous king Sähänâ, born in the race of Yadu, whose fame, like that of Hari, was celebrated through the three worlds. The glorious king Sähänâ, whose lotus-like feet were made radiant by the pearls inlaid in the diadems of hostile kings, and who was conspicuous in the Yädana race, pure and renowned in all the quarters, protected the earth which had a fine girdle in the shape of the ocean.

12 Read arma.
13 Vishnu, in his incarnation as a boar.
on his arm, there is the lady Victory; his glances are full of pity; and, in his mouth, there are always the words "I give." When he undertakes an expedition, all kings, remaining where they are through fear, cause offerings to be thrown quickly in various directions by their women and children.

(L. 13.)—Victorious is the valiant Malla, who stands at the head of the ministers of this eminent king; whose lotus-like feet have shone for a long time with jewels inlaid in the diadems of other kings; who is the son of Chikkadēva and the elder brother of Bicha; and whose fame is celebrated in the world. His son is the great minister Chauṇḍiṣeṭṭi, whose fame is great, who is the tongue and the right arm of the king. Chauṇḍiṣeṭṭi, whose prowess is proclaimed in all the quarters, and whose merit and fame are exalted, is beautiful on account of all his prosperity being increased by the prostration of his body at the feet of the holy Somanātha. Finding that he is intent upon conquering the regions, all the enemies of this Chauṇḍiṣeṭṭi climb an ant-hill, chew grass,38 wear a peticoat, and put on a karṇapātra.38 Charmed with the graces of his person, Rati has found a husband again and disports herself, replete with joy and forgetful of the pleasure of love. May Somanātha grant a long life in this world to that wise man named Chauṇḍiṣeṭṭi, who, armed with the bow, chastises his enemies, and gives wealth to the twice-born through charity.

(L. 22.)—Hail! One thousand one hundred and seventy-one years of the Śaka era having elapsed, in the Śaṅkara saṁvatara, on Thursday the twelfth day of the bright half of the month of Śrāvana, Malliṣeṭṭi, the elder brother of Bicha, and the great minister of the great king the glorious Kanharadēva, during a warlike expedition, gave at Pauṇḍarikakṣhetra on the Bhimarathī, in the presence of the god the holy Vishnu, a village named Tāmbrapaurī, situated in the district of Vēṇugrama, and divided into a hundred and ten allotments, together with the eight enjoyments and with the well-known four boundaries marked out, as a sarvanamaṣya-grant to Brāhmaṇas of various gōtras, with libations of water and daksīṇā, for the prosperity of the reign of the king, the glories of Kanharadēva. His son, the great minister Chauṇḍiṣeṭṭi, went to the king; received at his hands all the powers of his father; and said, "Tāmbrapuri, in the district of Vēṇugrama, has been given to Brāhmaṇas by my father." Having obtained the king's sanction to the gift, Chauṇḍiṣeṭṭi caused a copper-charter, conferring the eight enjoyments, to be given as a sarvanamaṣya grant to those Brāhmaṇas, and made his father's grant permanent as long as the sun and the moon might endure. May there be prosperity to him in all respects!

(L. 32.)—The gōtras, the virtues, and the names of the Brāhmaṇas, who are the recipients of Tāmbrapūrī, are now written in order.

[Lines 33 to 104 give the names, gōtras, and merits, of the persons to whom the grant was made. The gōtras mentioned are—Agastya, Ārahaṭṭa, Āśīva, Bharadāvāja, Bhārgava, Dēvarāja, Garga, Gārgya, Gaurama, Harita, Jāmadagnya-Vatas, Kapi, Kāpiḥthala, Kāsya, Kauṇḍinya, Kauṭika, Mandgalya, Mauna-Bhārgava, Pārāśara, Śaṇḍilya, Śri-Vatas, Vasishtha, Vatas, Vishnuvardha, and Viśravmitra. The grantees included—Aĉārya, Bhāṣṭa, Dīkṣita, Dwēdīna, Gāhisa, Gāhisa, Gāhisa, Gāhisa, Kramitas, Pauṣṭi, Pāṭhakas, Pāṭjāvardhana, Śudāra, and Upādhyāyas. Some of them are qualified by the titles of Adhvari, Bīhagava, Bramhmājānī, Daśarathin, Rīgarthada, Sāmavēda, Svayaņpākā, Trividā, and Vēdārthada. And some of them have surnames taken from Anāgīṣe (in the Dhāravād District), Gōkāge (the modern Gōkā, in the Belgaum District), Gaṅgakanur, Sarvajña-Sarasvatī-bhanḍāra, and Vāraṇāsi (Benares)].

(L. 105.)—The receiver and the donor of land are both meritorious and certainly go to heaven! He who grants to a Brāhmaṇ even a
cubit of land, is honoured in heaven for sixty thousand years! In (discriminating between) giving a grant and continuing (the grant of another), continuing (the grant of another) is the better; by giving a grant, a man attains paradise; but, by continuing (the grant of another), a man attains an imperishable state! He who appropriates land, whether given by himself or another, is born as a worm in ordure for sixty thousand years! He who appropriates a single bit of land, or one cubit or even one finger of land, falls into hell and remains there till the dissolution of the world! "This bridge of religion is common to kings, and should be protected by you from time to time;"—thus does Rāmachandra repeatedly entreat all future kings! May that Chaṇḍiṣeṭṭi live a long life, who is intent upon the worship of the gods, who is armed with a sword against his enemies, and who has offered heaps of gold to Brihmaṇa! The earth was enjoyed by many kings, commencing with Śagara; he who for the time being possesses land, enjoys the benefit of it! This act of religion performed by Chaṇḍiṣeṭṭi excels all charities; may it continue as long as a kalpa, and may he live a long life! The glorious Chaṇḍiṣeṭṭi is a worshipper of the prosperous lotus-like feet of the glorious Śomanātha. The writer is Basavaṇa, a priest and astrologer. Prosperity! Hail! Prosperity! May there be the most auspicious prosperity! Prosperity!

(L. 118.) Gopālapaṇḍita, son of Mahgalapaṇḍita of the Kāśyapa gotra, continues . . . . allotment to the Mahājana. Prosperity! Two allotments to Śomanāthaḍāvā, son of Vipradāsa-Padmānabhābhataṇḍbāhābhाब्रह्मण्डलीय धार्मिक विश्लेषण

AN EARTHENWARE FRAGMENT OF GUHASENA OF VALABHI.

BY E. HULTZSCH, PH. D.; VIENNA.

At the Darbâr of Wallâ, there was shown to me a lately discovered fragment of what seems to have been a huge earthen pot, with the following inscription on it in Valabhi characters, of which a facsimile is given below:

[200] ॐ श्रीगुहसेनोऽवनन्दनात्

The first word is the name of the well-known Valabhi king Guhasena, whose grants are dated in the years 246, 247, and 248. The pot (phata) itself is evidently alluded to by the second word, before which the sahādi is neglected. Of the date, the third symbol, for 7, is well preserved. The preceding symbol is partially destroyed. As Guhasena's reign is limited by the date of Dhruvasena I. (207) and the earliest date of Dharasena II. (252), this symbol may have been 200, or 10, 20, 30, or 40. Enough of it remains, however, to show, by a reference to Paṇḍita Bhagwânlâl Indraji's table, that it was the symbol for 40. The first symbol, which has been entirely lost, was of course 200.
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THE GANGA INScriPTIONS IN COORG.

BY LEWIS RICE, C.I.E., M.R.A.S.

Having occasion lately to examine the inscriptions in Coorg, my attention was directed to the three published by Mr. Kitto in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. VI. pp. 99-103. A cursory perusal of the translations discloses some very peculiar features; and I have already pointed out one obvious correction in No. 3, where line 5 should be read *Eryaŋgaś-
gaveṇḍana magaṇa, to the son of Eryaṅga-
gaveṇḍa.*

But it is No. 1 of the inscriptions which I find has been so seriously misread that it is desirable for purposes of future reference to republish it, and this I now venture to do.

TEXT.

1. Śvasti Saka-nṛpa-kāl-āṭita-saṅvatsara-sat-aṅga 899 taneya* Āśvara-saṅvata-
sraṃ prattise || Śvasti Satyavākyo-Koṅgaṇigvarmo dharmma-mahā-
rājādhyājā Koṅkalapura-vardhara Nandagiri-nātha śrīmat

2. Rāchamalla-Permaṇanda-gaḷa tad-varsh-ābhyaṇtara Pāṅguga-sukla-pakshaṇa Na-

3. ndesvarāṇi finejā-āvaseṃ āge Śvasti Samasta-vairi-gaṇa-gaḥ-āṭopa-
kumbhi-kumbkhaṭa-āphuṭi-anargiya-muktāpala-gaṇana-bhikara-kari-

4. se-nivāsa-atakṣṣha-gārdaṇḍa-maṇḍita-praṇaṇaṇa aṇṭa-baṇṭa-ba-

5. ta-dhara-nandāṁ śrīmat Rakkaṇa Beddoore-gaṇaṇya sālутire bhadram a-

6. stū Jina-saṃsāyā śrī-Belgola-nīvāsaṇaṇaṇa śrī-Bırasēṇa*śi-

7. ṃ ᵁ dhānta-dēva varā-sīśyāṁ śrī-Gorcaṇa-paṇḍita-bhaṭṭaṭaraṇa var-

8. śayaṁ śrīmat Ananta-bhṛyaśyaṅga Perggadārū povo-

9. sa-vādagaṇam-anabhyaṇtara śiddhiyaṅge paṭedar adarkke sā-

10. kshi tombhattra-sāśirbarum ay-sāmatarum Peddore-ga-

11. m yelpadbārum eṣṭ-draṁ idām kāvaṃ nīlvar Mnałemara-

12. n ayuṅbārum ay-damaṃgaraṇa Śripuraḍa Mahārāva-

13. m dattaṇya avon orbaṇ aṭidōṃ Bāgaṛaśyaṇa sāśirbar-bṛhaṇa-

14. m sarun saṁsāra-kaveyumaṇa ajida paṭeṣa-mahāpatakan aṇkuṇ-

15. m ida m orbaṇ kāra arvaṇ pīruṇaṃ ṇa�

TRANSLATION.

Be it well.—Of the years in the group of centuries elapsed since the time of the Saka king, the 899th, the year Āśvara, being current.

Be it well.—Satyaṃbāhya-Koṅgaṇigvaram Dharma-mahārāja-dhīrīja, boon lord of Koṅkalapura, lord of Nandagiri, Śrīmat Rāchamallapermaṇaṇī, at the rising of the happy house (or sign) of Taurus in the bright fortnight of Pāṅguga within that year.

Be it well.—While the terrible one adorned with a strong right arm in which dwells the sword vigorous in seizing the precious pearls scattered from the frontal globes of the globe-bearers, the troops of the elephants of all his enemies; delighting in the brave warriors of his elder brother; Śrīmat Rakkaṇa was ruling the bank of the Beddoore.*

Prosperity to the Jina-saṃsāya.—Śrīmat Ananta-bhṛyaśyaṅga, the beloved disciple of Śrī-Gorcaṇa-paṇḍita-bhaṭṭaṭaraṇa, who was the beloved disciple of Śrī-Virasaṇa-siddhiṇa-dēva, a resident of Śrī-Belgola,* acquired in full possession Perggadārū included within the new trench.*

Witnesses to this:—those of the Ninety-six Thousand, the five tributaries, those of the Peddopare Gajente, and the eight farmers.

1 ante, Vol. VII. p. 171.
2 Not as Mr. Kitto reads it:—"Eryaṅgaśaṇa Vangana magaṇa, Eryaṅga, the son of that Munda."  
3 Ta is redundant; or we may read tateya, the seasonable (āśvara) year, &c.—[The proposed reading of tateya is quite untenable. The ta is to a certain extent redundant. But it is only a part of tateya, the last syllable of the full word omhaṭta, or ombhāṭta, for the third numeral, 9, which would be spoken in reading the inscription, the u being elided before the ordinal suffix aneyya.— Ed.]

* Looks like Gvanaṇa, but in my copy the first letter is distinctly Bi. The proper division of the words here is not dēva vah-sahyaṇa, and bhaṭṭaṭaraṇa vah-sahyaṇa, but dēva vah (of them), i.e. of him) saṁsāya, and bhaṭṭaṭaraṇa avah saṁsāya; and the word 'beloved' requires to be expounded in the translation.—Ed.

* The "great river"—the Lakṣmanasthitaṇa apparently.

* Probably Śravaṇa-Belgola in the Mysore country.

* Most likely a kadaṇga, as one is named in No. 2.
Guardians of this,—the four Malepas, of the Five Hundred, and the five garland-makers.10
Whoso destroys a grant by the Mahārājas of Śrīpara incurs the five great sins of destroy-
ing (at) Benares a thousand Brāhmans and a thousand tawny cows! Whoso protects this acquires great merit!
Chandaṇḍiyāyā’s writing. The grant of the Perggadūr āsādi.

FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

VI.—VIDAMUNDAN KODAMUNDAN.

Mr. Won’t-Give and Mr. Won’t-Leave.

In a certain town there lived a clever old Brāhmaṇ, named Won’t-Give. He used to go out daily and to beg in all the houses round, under the pretence that he had to feed several Brāhmans in his own house. Good people, that believed in his words, used to give him much rice and curry stuffs, with which he would come home, and explain to his wife how he had deceived such and such a gentleman by the imposition of feeding in charity many persons at home. But if any hungry Brāhmaṇ, who had heard of his empty boast of feeding Brāhmans at home, came to him, he was sent away with some excuse or other. In this way Mr. Won’t-Give brought home a basketful of rice and other necessaries every day, of which he only used a small portion for himself and his wife, and converted the remainder into money. And thus by imposition and tricks he managed to live well for several years.

In an adjoining village there lived another very clever Brāhmaṇ, named Won’t-Leave. Whenever he found any man reluctant and unwilling to give him anything that he begged of him, he would persist in bothering him until he had wrung from him a dola. This Mr. Won’t-Leave, hearing of the charity of Mr. Won’t-Give and his benevolent feeding of Brāhmans, came to see him one day and requested him to give him a meal. Mr. Won’t-Give told him that for that day ten Brāhmans had already been settled, and that if he came the next day he would have his meal without fail. Mr. Won’t-Leave agreed to this, and left him for that day. Mr. Won’t-Give had, of course, told him the very lie he was accustomed to tell all that occasionally begged meals of him.

Now Mr. Won’t-Leave was not so stupid as to be thus imposed upon. He stood before Mr. Won’t-Give’s door precisely at the appointed ghatikā (hour) the next day, and reminded the master of the house of his promise. Mr. Won’t-Give had never before been taken at his word, and determined to send away the impertinent guest by some stronger excuse than the first, and so he spoke to him thus:—

"Sir, I am very sorry to say that my wife fell ill last night of a strong fever, from which she has not yet recovered. Owing to this unforeseen accident I have had to postpone my charitable feedings (samārādāhana) till her recovery, so do not trouble me please for some days more."

Mr. Won’t-Leave heard these words with an expression of sincere, or rather seemingly sincere, sorrow in his face, and replied:—

"Respected Sir, I am very sorry for the illness of the mistress of the house, but to give up charitable feeding of Brāhmans on that account is a great sin. For the last ten years I have been studying the art of cooking, and can now cook for even several hundreds of Brāhmans; so I can assist you now in preparing—necessary for the samārādāhana."

Mr. Won’t-Give could not refuse such a second syllable is intended to be ma, and the first, ‘ma, which would give us ayamārārāsa, the five drummers, ‘i.e. publiccries, ‘dāsana mārāsana, the proclamation by beat of drum, is a well-known custom in the Kānarese country.—This, at any rate, is certain,—that the word does not mean ‘garland-makers,’ any more than, if as much as, it means ‘spokesmen’; for the word for a ‘garland-maker,’ as derived from dāsana, a garland, would be dāsakāra, not dārāgū."
request, but he deceitfully determined in his mind to get Mr. Won't-Leave to cook for him, and then to drive him away without giving him his rice. And so he said:—"Yes, that is a very good idea. I am much obliged to you for your kind suggestion. Come in. Let us cook together." So saying the master of the house took Mr. Won't-Leave inside and they both went into the kitchen, while the mistress of the house, at the command of her husband, pretended illness.

Now Mr. Won't-Give was a good liver, and prepared with the assistance of Mr. Won't-Leave several good dishes. And then the difficulty was to drive the fellow out, for the long-maintained rule of never feeding a single Brāhmaṇ must not be broken that day. So when the cooking was all over the master of the house gave to Mr. Won't-Leave a kośu (copper coin) and asked him to bring some leaves from the bādār (for plates), and he accordingly went. Mr. Won't-Give meanwhile came to his wife and instructed her thus:—"My dearest wife, I have spared you the trouble of cooking to-day. Would that we could get such stupid fools as this every day to cook for us! I have now sent him out to fetch us some leaves, and it won't look well if we shut our doors against him, or drive him away: so we must make him go away of his own accord. A thought has just come into my mind as to how we can do it. As soon as he comes you should commence to quarrel with me. I shall then come to you and beat you, or rather the ground near you with both my hands, and you must continue your abuse and cries. The guest will find this very disgusting, and will leave us of his own accord." Mr. Won't-Give had just finished his instructions when he saw Mr. Won't-Leave returning with the leaves.

The wife, as prearranged, abused her husband right and left for his great impropriety and over-liberality in feeding the Brāhmaṇs. Said she: "How are we to get on in the world if you thus empty the house of everything we have in feeding big-bellied Brāhmaṇs? Must you be so very strict in inviting them, even when I am sick?" These and a thousand similar expressions were now launched at the husband's head. He pretended not to hear it for a time, but at last, apparently overcome by anger, he went in and with his hands gave successive blows on the floor. At every blow on the floor the wife cried out that she was being murdered, and that those who had mercy in their hearts should come to her rescue.

Mr. Won't-Leave from the court-yard of the house listened to what was taking place inside, but not wishing to interfere in a quarrel between husband and wife, left matters to take their own course, and got into the loft, where he hid himself, fearing that he would be summoned as a witness to the quarrel.

After a time Mr. Won't-Give came out of the room where he had been beating the floor, and to his joy he could not find the guest. He cautiously looked round him and saw no signs of Mr. Won't-Leave. Of course, having had no reason to think that his guest would be sitting in the loft, he did not look up there, and even if he had done so, he would not have found him, for he had hidden himself out of sight.

Mr. Won't-Give now carefully bolted the door and his wife came out and changed her dirty cloth for a clean one. Said her husband to her: "At last we have succeeded in driving him out, come, you too must be hungry; let us have our dinner together." Two leaves were spread on the ground and all the dishes were equally divided into them. Meanwhile Mr. Won't-Leave was examining all that took place below him and, being himself very hungry, was slyly watching for an opportunity to jump down. Mr. Won't-Give, gloating over his trickery, said to his wife: "Well, my love, did I not beat you without hurting you?" to which she replied: "Did I not continue to cry without shedding tears?" when suddenly there fell on their ears, "And did I not come to have my dinner without going away?" and down jumped Mr. Won't-Leave from the loft, and took his seat in front of the leaf spread by Mr. Won't-Give for his wife. And Mr. Won't-Give, though disappointed, was highly pleased at the cleverness of his guest.

This story is cited as the authority for three proverbs that have come into use in Tamil:

"Nolamal odtitën."
"Oyamal akwên."
"Pokamal wandën."

which represent the exchanges of politeness between the husband, the wife, and the guest, quoted in the foregoing paragraphs.
VII.—Vayalvallan Kaitalvallan.
Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth and Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands.

In two adjoining villages there lived two famous men. The one was called Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth—one that could accomplish wonders with words alone. The other was called Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands—one who could make no use of that glib instrument the tongue, but was able to bear burdens, cut wood, and perform other physical labour.

It so happened that they agreed to live together in the house of the Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth, to try and see which of them was the superior. They accordingly kept company for several months, till the great feast of the nine nights (navaratri) came on. On the first day of the feast Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands wanted to sacrifice a goat to the goddess Kājī. So he said to Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth, "My dear friend, we both are mighty in our way, and so it would be shameful for us to buy the goat that we want to sacrifice with money. We should manage to get it without payment."

"Yes, we must do so, and I know how," replied Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth, and he asked his friend to wait till that evening.

Now there lived a shepherd at one ghatikā's (hour's) distance from their house, and the two friends resolved to go to his fold that night and steal away one of his goats. Accordingly when it was dark they approached his fold. The shepherd had just finished his duties to the mute members of his flock, and wanted to go home and have his rice hot. But he had no second person to watch the flock, and he must not lose his supper. So he planted his crook before the fold, and throwing his blanket (kambait) over it, thus addressed it: "My son, I am very hungry, and so must go for my rice. Till I return do you watch the flock. This wood is rich in tigers and goblins (bhūtas). Some mischievous thief or bhūta—or kāta—may come to steal away the sheep. Watch over them carefully." So saying the shepherd went away.

The friends had heard what the shepherd said. Of course, Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth laughed within himself at this device of the shepherd to impress upon would-be robbers

that he had left some one there to watch his sheep, while really he had only planted a pole and thrown a blanket over it. Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands, however, did not see the trick, and mistaking the stick to be an actual watchman sitting at his duty before the fold, spoke thus to his friend, "Now what are we to do? There is a watchman sitting in front of the fold." Thereon Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth cleared away his doubts by saying that it was no watchman, but a mere stick, and entered the fold with his friend.

It had also so happened that on that very night a bhūta (goblin) had come into the fold to steal away a sheep. It shuddered with fear on hearing the shepherd mention the kāta, for having never heard of the existence of kūtas, it mistook this imaginary being to be something superior in strength to itself. So thinking that a kūta might come to the fold, and not wishing to expose itself till it knew well what kūtas were, the bhūta transformed itself into a sheep and laid itself down among the flock. By this time the two Mightyies had entered the fold and begun an examination of the sheep. They went on rejecting one animal after another for some defect or other, till at last they came to the sheep which was none other than the bhūta. They tested it, and when they found it very heavy—as, of course, it would be with the soul of the bhūta in it—they began to tie up its legs to carry it home. When hands began to shake it the bhūta mistook the Mighties for the kūtas, and said to itself:

"Alas! the kūtas have come to take me away. What am I to do? What a fool I was to come into the fold!" So thought the bhūta as Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands was carrying it away on his head, with his friend following him behind. But the bhūta soon began to work its devilish powers to extricate itself, and Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands began to feel pains all over his body and said to his friend: "My dear Mighty, I feel pains all over me. I think what we have brought is no sheep!" Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth was inwardly alarmed at the words of his friend, but did not like to show that he was afraid. So he said, "Then put down the sheep, and let us tear open its belly, so that we shall each have only one-half of it to

and other Dravidian languages allow rhyming repetitions of a word, like this—bhūtas-kūtas.
carry." This frightened the bhūtas, and he melted away on the head of Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands, who, relieved of his devilish burden, was glad to return home safe with his friend.

The bhūta too went to its abode and there told its fellow-goblins how it had involved itself in a great trouble and how narrowly it had escaped. They all laughed at its stupidity and said, "What a great fool are you! They were no kūtas. In fact there are no kūtas in the world. They were men, and it was most stupid of you to have got yourself into their hands. Are you not ashamed to make such a fuss about your escape?" The injured bhūta retorted that they would not have made such remarks had they seen the kūtas.

"Then show us these kūtas, as you choose to call them," said they, "and we will crush them in the twinkling of an eye." "Agreed," said the injured bhūta, and the next night it took them to the house of the Mighty, and said from a distance: "There is their house. I cannot approach it. Do whatever you like." The other bhūtas were amazed at the fear of their timid brother, and resolved among themselves to put an end to the enemies of even one of their caste. So they went in a great crowd to the house of the Mighty.

Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands was sleeping in the verandah, adjoining the courtyard, and when he heard the noise of people jumping, he opened his eyes, and to his terror saw some bhūtas in the court. Without opening his mouth he quietly rolled himself along the ground, and went to the room where Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth was sleeping with his wife and children. Tapping gently at the door he awoke his friend and said, "What shall we do now? The bhūtas have invaded our house, and will soon kill us." Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth told him quietly not to be afraid, but to go and sleep in his original place, and that he himself would make the bhūtas run away. Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands did not understand what his friend meant, but not wishing to contradict his instructions rolled his way back to his original place and pretended to sleep, though his heart was beating terribly with fright. Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth now awoke his wife, and instructed her thus: "My dearest wife, the foolish bhūtas have invaded our house, but if you act according to my advice we are safe, and the goblins will depart harmlessly. What I want you to do is, to go to the hall and light a lamp, spread leaves on the floor, and then pretend to awake me for my supper. I shall get up and enquire what you have ready to give me to eat. You will then reply that you have only pepper water and vegetables. With an angry face I shall say, 'What have you done with the three bhūtas that our son caught hold of on his way while returning from school?' Your reply must be, 'The rogue wanted some sweetmeats on coming home. Unfortunately I had none in the house, so he roasted the three bhūtas and gobbled them up.'" Thus instructing his wife Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth pretended to go to sleep.

The wife accordingly spread the leaves and called her husband for his supper. During the conversation that followed, the fact that the son had roasted three goblins for sweetmeats was conveyed to the bhūtas. They shuddered at the son's extraordinary ability, and thought, "What must the father do for his meals when a son roasts three bhūtas for sweetmeats?" So they at once took to their heels. Then going to the brother they had jeered at, they said to him that indeed the kūtas were their greatest enemies, and that none of their lives were safe while they remained where they were, as on that very evening the son of a kūta had roasted three of them for sweetmeats. They therefore all resolved to fly away to the adjoining forest, and disappeared accordingly. Thus Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth saved himself and his friend on two occasions from the bhūtas.

The friends after this went out one day to an adjoining village and were returning home rather late in the evening. Darkness came on them before half the way was traversed, and there lay before them a dense wood infested by beasts of prey; so they resolved to spend the night in a high tree and go home next morning, and accordingly got up into a big pipal. Now this was the very wood into which the bhūtas had migrated, and at midnight they all came down with torches to catch jackals and other animals to feast upon. The fear of Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands may be more
imagined than described. The dreaded bhūtās were at the foot of the very tree in which he had taken up his abode for the night. His hands trembled. His body shook. He lost his hold, and down he came with a horrible rustling of leaves. His friend, however, was, as usual, ready with a device, and bawled out, "I wished to leave these poor beings to their own revelry. But you are hungry and must needs jump down to catch some of them. Do not fail to lay your hands on the stoutest bhūta." The goblins heard the voice which was already very familiar to their ears, for was it not the bhūta whose son had roasted up three bhūtās for sweetmeats that spoke? So they ran away at once, crying out, "Alas, what misery! Our bitter enemies have followed us even to this wood!" Thus the wit of Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth saved himself and his friend for the third time.

The sun began to rise, and Mr. Mighty-of-his-hands thrice walked round Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth and said, "My dear friend, truly you only of us two are mighty. Mere physical strength is of no use without skill in words. The latter is far superior to the former, and if a man possess both, he is, as it were, a golden lotus having a sweet scent. It is enough for me now to have arrived at this moral! With your kind permission I shall return to my village." Mr. Mighty-of-his-mouth asked his friend not to consider himself under any obligation, and, after honouring him as became his position he let him return to his village.

The moral of this short story is that in man there is nothing great but mind.

CHINGHIZ KHAN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

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

(Continued from Vol. XIII. p. 304).

XXIX.

During the siege of Samarkand Chinghiz despatched, as we have seen, an army under Subutai and Chepe in pursuit of Muhammad Khwārizm Shāh. At the same time he sent a second army under two chiefs, whom Abu’l-faraj calls Galak Noyan and Yasur Noyan, towards Ṭālīkān. They apparently first crossed the Oxus and made for Balkh, where, according to Ibn-al-Athīr, the people asked for quarter, and the Mongols contented themselves with putting a shahānah. They then advanced to Ez-Džūzān and Maimand and Andakhai and Karyat (?), which they conquered and put garrisons in, and did not molest the inhabitants beyond taking the men as recruits for their armies.

They then reached Et Ṭālīkān, a province, says the same author, containing a number of towns and an inaccessible fortress called Manṣūrkōh. This fortress was also apparently definitely called Ṭālīkān, and is otherwise described as unequalled in loftiness, and as the strongest city of Asia, from its situation on a hill which Mirkhond calls Baṣrakōh. Erdmann calls the hill Nokrekhūh (i.e., the silver hill). De la Croix says it derived this name from its silver mines. D’Ohsson calls it Nusret-kūh (i.e. hill of victory). It was situated east of Kunduz. Marco Polo calls it Taican, and says it was a fine place with a great corn market, while the mountains to the south were composed of rock salt, for which people came from all the countries round. Other mountains close by abounded in almonds and pistachios. The people of the district, although good Musalmāns, were much addicted to wine; and wore nothing on their heads but a cord some ten palms long twisted round it. They were excellent huntsmen, and made their clothes and shoes from the skins of the animals they captured. Wood describes it when he visited it as a small place, containing but 300 or 400 hovels and situated about 300 yards from the river.

Ibn-al-Athīr tells us the Mongols attacked it valiantly for six months, night and day, but as they could not take it they sent for Chinghiz Khān himself. The latter, who, at this time had captured and desolated Balkh, as I described in the previous paper, advanced to the assistance of his people, taking with him, according to Ibn-al-Athīr, a large

---

1 Abu’l-faraj, Chron. Arab., p. 291.
2 The passage here quoted from Ibn-al-Athīr as well as others from that author, I owe to my good friend, Dr. Bien. See Erdmann, p. 415; D’Ohsson, Vol. I.
4 Wood’s Oxus, p. 164.
number of Muslim captives. Minhaj-i-Saraj says he first pitched his camp on the mound of Numan, and in the uncultivated plain of Kab between Talikán and Balkh, whence he presently advanced to Talikán. Ibn-al-Athir tells us that when Chinghiz Khan had continued the attack with great loss for four months, he ordered a huge mound to be built up, consisting of alternate layers of tree-trunks and of earth, which rose to the level of the walls, and on which was planted the siege machinery. The garrison thereupon opened one of the gates and made a sortie, and the cavalry managed to escape, but the infantry were slaughtered. The Tartars entered the place, made captive the women and children, and plundered the treasures and merchandize: "otherwise not a soul was left alive, nor, we are told, was one stone left on another."

Minhaj-i-Saraj says that three months before its capture the people of the fortress put on deep blue mourning garments, and repaired daily to the great mosque of the fortress to repeat the Qur'an, and mourn with each other, and ended by blessing each other, and, having said goodbye, donned their arms and engaged in combat with the enemy, thus securing martyrdom. He goes on to say that on the side of the fortress where the upper gateway was situated they had excavated a ditch in the rock, and the Mongols with stones from their catapults battered down the bastion at that point and filled in the ditch, and made a breach a hundred ells in extent, but as Chinghiz Khan had sworn that he would take the place on horseback, the attack had to be continued for fifteen days longer, until the ground was made smoother and more practicable. The Mongol cavalry at length charged into the place, whereupon 500 of the defenders in a solid phalanx rushed out by the gate called the Kūh-i-Janina of Talikán, broke through the Mongol ranks and cut their way out, and a large number of them escaped. Chinghiz ordered the rest of the inhabitants, adds our author, to be martyred, "(may God reward them!)") and the town to be destroyed.4

According to Rashidu'd-din Chinghiz Khan having been baffled by the pertinacity of the garrison determined to capture the fortress by assailing it from all sides at once, and prepared a number of grappling hooks, nails, ladders, and ropes, with which to scale the rock. After many attempts, which were defeated by the garrison, a number of men with their arms tied about them managed to scale the mountain. The besieged rushing to repel them left other posts undefended, and these the Mongols seized and thus possessed themselves of the place.5 The capture of Talikán was probably the most difficult exploit as an engineering feat which Chinghiz Khan accomplished, and the severity of the struggle may be gathered from the fact that he summoned his son, Tulun, to return to him from his expedition in Khorasan, and apparently also his other sons from Khwārizm. They arrived, however, after its capture.

Meanwhile let us return once more to Jalālu'd-din Khwārizm Shāh, whose retreat we traced as far as Shādyakh. He was closely followed by the Mongols, who would perhaps have captured him if they had not taken the wrong direction where two roads diverged, and, we are told, made a march of as many as forty farasaks in one day. He fled, closely pursued by way of Za'anzan, Mahsān (?), and Yazdavīah, or Zaundia (a dependency of Herat) about 75 miles S.W. of that city, where the pursuit was abandoned.6 Minhaj-i-Saraj says he passed through the districts of Nimroz, Bost and Dawar, and eventually reached Ghazni.7 Nissavi tells us he delayed a few days at Bost, a town of Seistan, but afraid lest the Mongols should reach Ghazni before him he set out with 20,000 men towards Zabulistān without staying anywhere en route, and reached Ghazni, which was twenty-four days' journey from Bost, in safety. "The people there were as much overjoyed at his arrival as the Musalmins at the end of Ramazan, when the new moon which terminates the fast appears."8

Ghazni had recently been the scene of considerable confusion. When Muḥammad Khwārizm Shāh retired westwards he entrusted it to a Ghurān chief, named Muḥammad All Kharpost. Meanwhile his maternal uncle, Amin Malik, who had similarly been entrusted with the protection of Herat, not feeling safe

---

5 Taḥakkīk-i-NSīrī, pp. 1011-1012.
6 De la Croix, pp. 323-329.
7 Taḥakkīk-i-NSīrī, p. 287, note 7.
8 Id., text.
9 De la Croix, pp. 301-302.
there retired with 20,000 Kankali Turks towards Ghazni. When he arrived within two or three days' march of the latter town he sent to ask Ali Kharpost if he would assign him temporary quarters and grazing grounds. His request was met by an uncivil reply in these terms:—"We are Ghuris, and you are Turks. We cannot live together. Various districts have been assigned by the Sultan to the various contingents of troops, let us each remain in our own territory." This refusal to admit so near a relative of the Sultan into the town apparently outraged two of the Khwārizmian officials, namely, Shamsu'd-din of Sarakhs, who happened to be at Ghazni at the time, and Salāhu'd-din, the commander of the citadel, who conspired against the Kharpost, killed him, and seized the citadel before his Ghurian troops were aware of matters, upon which the latter dispersed.

Amin Malik now entered Ghazni and assumed authority there. Presently the Mongols, who had secured possession of Herat, sent a body of troops in pursuit of him by way of Bost and Tigin absolutely. Amin Malik thereupon marched against them. At his approach, feeling themselves too weak, they once more withdrew to Herat, and he went to the Shoristan (the salt desert, between Herat, Kuhistan, and Seistan). When Amin Malik marched against the Mongols he took Sherif' u'd-din, the wazir, with him, and imprisoned him in the fort of Kajuran of Bost and Tigin absolutely. He left Ghazni in charge of Salāhu'd-din already mentioned. Against him a movement was started by the partisans of Ali Kharpost whom he had killed as we have described, and he was assassinated. Raziiu'l-Mulk, of Termend, one of the leaders of this outbreak, now assumed authority at Ghazni. Presently a larger body of Khalaj and Kankali Turks, fugitives from Khorasan and Mawarun-Nahr, under the command of Sai'fu'd-din Aghrak, assembled at Parshawar. Raziiu'l-Mulk marched against these invaders, but was defeated and killed, with the greater number of his men. He was succeeded in authority at Ghazni by his brother Umdatul-Mulk.

Meanwhile the partisans of the Khwārizm Shāh, against whom the movement of the two brothers at Ghazni was really directed, marched against Umdatul-Mulk. They were headed by Azamu'l-Mulk, the hakim of Nangrahar, and Malik Sher, the hakim of Kabul. With their Ghāri troops they marched on Ghazni and after an attack of forty days captured it. Just at this time there arrived the wazir, Sherif' u'd-din, who had been released from confinement by the Sultan Jalaluddin, and who went to prepare the way for him. Seven days later Jalaluddin arrived in person, and was speedily joined by various leaders. Amin Malik returned with his Kankalis, and the Sultan married his daughter. Aghrak Malik came from Parshawar with his Khalaj and Kankali followers, while 'Azam Malik and the governor of Kabul joined him with their Ghurians. Thus Jalaluddin found himself at the head of from 60,000 to 70,000 horsemen. We must now make a short digression. Minhaj-i-Saraj tells us that when Chinghiz Khan had taken complete possession of the district of Samarkand, by his command Acrilan, Khan of Kayalik, having 6,000 horsemen with him, being his own men, and the Juzbi Tulun, with a Mongol force, marched to the fortress of Walkh. They sat down before it for a period of eight months, and as it only had an approach in one direction, they ordered the trees to be felled in the district round, and threw them into the ravine which protected it, to make belief they would fill it up, where it could not have been filled in a hundred years. Presently the son of the Rais of Walkh came into the Mongol camp, and guided them along a path by which a light-armed man alone could pass, and concealed various Mongols in holes and recesses in the mountain. At length, on the fourth day, at dawn, the enemy raised a shout, and fell with their swords upon the band which guarded the gateway of the fortress until they cleared it of its defenders. They entered the place, and made a general massacre. The Mongol leaders then proceeded to attack the fortress of Fiwar of Kadas. The siege of Fiwar lasted a considerable time, and I shall return to it presently.

During the same year, 617 A. H., i.e. 1220 A. D., for a period of eight months, the Mongols continued their devastations in various parts.

11 Tabakat-i-Nasiri, pp. 1014-1015 notes.
12 Probably situated in Tokharian.
Our author tells us that he himself was at this time living in the fortress of Tulak, while his brother was living in the city and fortress of Firuzkoh. In that year a Mongol army attacked the fortress of Astiab, of Ghur, for eleven days. It was then governed by the Amir and feudal lord, Tajuddin, Habashi Abdu’ll-Malik, Sarizad, who submitted to the invaders, whereupon they took him to Chinghiz Khân, and he gave him the title of khanur, or prince of Ghur. He treated him with great honour, and sent him back again in order to secure the other fortresses. When Chinghiz Khân retired northwards, after defeating the Sultan Jalaluddin on the Indus, as we shall describe presently, Tajuddin deserted the Mongols, and fought with them, and was killed.

The same year, says Minhaj-i-Saraj, the Juzbi Ukhan appeared before the city of Firuzkoh, the capital of Ghur, and attacked it for twenty-one days, but could not take it, and retired from it baffled. The fortress of Tulak was then commanded by Habashi Nezahwar, who in early life was a maker of leather sacks, and who was very skilled with the bow. When the Noyan Fiku approached he agreed to become tributary to him, and came down from the fortress and did homage to him. The subsidy which the Habashi had agreed to pay to the Mongols he apportioned among the people of Tulak, and enforced its payment vigorously, which made him very unpopular, and the Khoja and Imam, Jamaluddin, the Khasanchi or treasurer, made a verse about him, as follows:—

I said: “Habashi, Nezahwar, what is this wrong?
What have the Tulakis to do with sack and prison?”
He replied: “I am a leather-worker, and
Fiku (a dog);
The dog knows and the leatherworker too
what the wallet contains.”

The people of Tulak presently revolted against him, and gave up the fortress to Malik Qutbud-din Husain, who kept him in confinement for a while, and then let him go to Fiwar, where he was put to death.

Tulak, we are told, was a very strong fortress between Ghur and Khorasan, whose history went back to the time of Manuchihir and Arash, his famous archer, so much spoken about in the Shâh Nâmah. In its upper part were chambers dug out of the solid rock, and called Arashi and Amur Nasr, the Tulaki, sank a well in its upper part, with a diameter of 20 ghas in the solid rock. Its depth was immense, and it showed no diminution, however much was drawn from it.

Another fortress of Ghur is said to have similarly submitted at this time: our authority being Mu’ainuddin, the historian of Herat, who tells us how Rakna’uddin, the lord of Khaizer, and ancestor of the Kert dynasty of Herat, succeeded in conciliating the great conqueror, and was left in possession of his fortress.

The number of Mongols and renegades who were at that time in Ghur was about 20,000 horse, and during eight months a portion of them made continual advances up to the walls of Firuzkoh, and had encounters with the garrison, of which Minhaj-i-Saraj himself was one, and he adds that trustworthy persons had related that there were so many Musulman captives in the hands of the Mongols that they had selected for Chinghiz Khân himself 12,000 young virgins, who followed on foot.

The result of these various raids is summed up by Minhaj-i-Saraj where he says that the whole of the cattle and flocks that were round about the cities, towns, kasri, and villages of Khorasan, Ghur, and the Garmar fell into the hands of the Mongols, and the country as far as the gate of Ghazni, the territories of Tukhristan and the Garmar was ravaged, and the greater part of the Musulman inhabitants were slaughtered and made captive.

When the news of Jalaluddin’s arrival at Ghazni reached Chinghiz Khân at Tâlikân he despatched an army of observation, says Abu’lghazi, towards Ghazni, Ghuristan, Zubul, and Kabul. This was commanded by Shigiz Kutuku Noyan. Minhaj-i-Saraj calls him the Noyan Fiku. He is called Shigiz Kutuku in the Yuan-ch’ao-pi-shih, and Hutuhu in the Yuan-shih. Kutuku was a Tartar by origin, and on the destruction of his people had been saved as a child in the cradle, and adopted by Burte,

14 Tabakht-i-Nasiri, pp. 1006, 1007.
15 i.e. Shigiz Kutuku, vide infra.
16 Id., p. 1059.
18 Id. pp. 1057 and 1058.
20 Tabakht-i-Nasiri, pp. 1006, 1007.
Chinghiz Khan's wife. He called Chinghiz tijeh, i.e. father, while Burte he called berigan cekh and sina cekh; Chinghiz called him akd. He sat above Mangu, Chinghiz Khan's grandson, and with Chinghiz's own sons. Among other stories it was reported that once when Chinghiz was changing his camp in the midst of a heavy snow, a number of deer galloped by, and Kutuku, who was only fifteen years old, asked permission from Gujukur, the governor of Chinghiz Khan's ordus, to be allowed to chase them. At the evening halt Chinghiz asked where the boy was, and on being told, he got angry, and said he would perish of cold, and he sharply reprimanded Gujukur and even struck him with the pole of a cart. Presently Kutuku returned and reported that out of 30 deer he had killed 27. Chinghiz was highly pleased, and sent to fetch the carcasses, which were duly found stretched on the snow. On other occasion a Tajunt marauder passing by Chinghiz Khan's camp, carried off his youngest son, Tului, who was then from five to six years old. He put him on his horse's back, and held him with his head under his arm. Although the boy's mother gave chase and seized one hand of the robber, while the young Kutuku seized the other, they could not release the young prince, nor was he released until a shepherd, named Shigi Barak came up, when the young prince was set free, and the robber killed.

When Kutuku was sent with an army to watch the movements of Jalalu'd-din he was accompanied by some other chiefs, named Tekejek, Molka, and Ukar Kilja by Abu'l-ghaiiz. Erdmann calls them Balughlan Kiljeh, Kutu, Uker Kiljeh, Dukulku, and Munga Kiljeh. Minhaj-i-Saraj says he was accompanied by Uklan, the Juzbi, and Sadi, the Juzbi. He also says his army consisted of 45,000 men, while the other authorities make it 30,000.

Shiici Kutuku detached two of his chiefs to attack Walian, which is doubtless the place called Gwalian on Colonel Walker's map, south of the Sar Alang Pass. Minhaj-i-Saraj also calls it Waliastan. When Jalalu'd-din heard of this he advanced to Parwan, i.e., probably the place of the same name, south of the Parwan Pass, and not far from Walian. There he left his heavy baggage, and advanced upon the enemy at Walian. His army was the more numerous, and the Mongols having lost 1,000 men withdrew across the river, destroying the bridge after them, and took up a position on the other side. Volleys of arrows were shot on either side till night closed, when the Mongols retired. Jalalu'd-din having revictual Walian withdrew to his camp at Parwan.

De la Croix, in describing this struggle from Nissavi, speaks of it as having been fought at Qandahar, which did not then exist so nomine, and is otherwise an impossible position for such a struggle at this time. In this account we read that two or three days after Jalalu'd-din reached Ghazni he learnt that the Mongols were attacking Qandahar; he therefore marched against them accompanied by Amin Malik, and sent on a messenger to apprise the governor of the citadel that relief was coming. It was resolved at a council to attack the enemy at dead of night. This was accordingly done, the Mongols had already taken the town, and were engaged in besieging the citadel. They were surprised and mercilessly slaughtered, and the town was filled with corpses. Very few escaped, and the victors secured a large booty, which would have been larger, but that they had to return to the townsmen what the enemy had recently taken from them.

The fugitive Mongols having rejoined Shiici Kutuku, the Sultan marched against the latter, and they faced each other in the neighbourhood of Parwan. Jalalu'd-din ranged his men in order of battle.

Amin Malik commanded the right wing, and Sairfu'd-din Agdrak the left, while the Sultan himself took charge of the centre. He ordered his men to dismount, and to fasten


Abu'l-ghaiiz says they were Teki Jek and Molka. Erdmann calls them Munka Kiljeh and Dukulku. Raverty Bakehak or Kamehak and Yaghur, Yaghur, Tamghur, or Balghur, all being possible variants. Miles in the Shahraj-air-drak, Boghuk, and Tomkuz.


Tabakhi-i-Natvi, pp. 388 and 389 notes.

Nissavi, in De la Croix, pp. 303 and 305.
their horses' bridles to their girdles. The Mongols first attacked his right wing, which was well supported by the centre and the left, and they had to retire. Successive charges cost the lives of many men without much affecting the result, and towards night each army withdrew to its camp. Meanwhile, to mislead his opponents into the notion that he had received reinforcements, the Mongol general mounted a number of manikins or puppets, made of felt, etc., upon spare camels and horses, and planted them behind his men. The Sultán's generals were misled by the manoeuvre, and wished to retire. He would not hear of this, however, but as on the day before, ordered them to fight on foot. The Mongols this time assailed the left wing, but being met by a volley of arrows, withdrew again. Having rallied, they renewed the charge and 500 of their opponents perished. The Sultán then sounded the great trumpet for a charge, and his men remounted and extended out, so as to enclose the enemy. Kutuk had ordered his men not to lose sight of the tusk or Imperial standard, but on noticing these tactics they could not be restrained and broke, and as the plain was much broken by gullies where their horses stumbled, they fell victims to the better-mounted soldiers of the Sultán, and the greater part of them perished. According to De la Croix, Jalâlu'd-din reproached the Mongol prisoners he captured with their cruelties, and drove nails into their ears to revenge the sufferings of his people.

When Chinghiz Khan heard of the disaster which had overwhelmed his men he concealed his anger, and contended himself with reminding Kutuk that he had been too accustomed to victory, and that he should profit by this severe lesson. He had a great affection for him.

The fruits of the victory were lost to Jalâlu'd-din by the disputes which arose among his subordinates, Amin Malik and Saifü'd-din, who, having quarrelled about an Arab horse, part of the booty secured in the recent fight, the former struck the latter over the head with a whip. The Sultán did not interfere, as he doubted whether the Kankals would submit to any decision. Saifü'd-din accordingly left him, and marched away towards the mountains of Karmân and Sankuran. D'Ohsson says to Peshâwar. He adds that Saifü'd-din was accompanied in his defection by 'Abâz Malik with his Ghurians. This was a serious blow to the Sultán.

After the capture of Talikân Chinghiz summered his cavalry in the adjoining mountains. The Yuan-shi says that after he had taken the city, to avoid the great heat of summer, he pitched his camp close by.

We now come to a great difficulty. Some of the authorities tell us that on hearing of the disaster to his people he at once set out for Ghaznî, stopping en route to take the fortress of Kerdwan, which was destroyed with all its people. Erdmann calls this place Kerzewan, and says it capitulated after a month's siege. Miles says it was Indarâb, i.e., Andarâb. Mirkhond apparently says that leaving his heavy baggage at Baqlân, Chinghiz advanced upon Bâmiyân by way of Andarâb. The Jahân-kâbâdî distinctly makes Bâmiyân the next point to which Chinghiz directed his march, but Bâmiyân is not only not on the route to Parwan nor even near it, but it is a very roundabout way to get thither by Andarâb. Major Raverty has suggested that Bâmiyân may be a mistake for Walian, and it is certainly consonant with Chinghiz Khan's policy that he should have punished that place after his men had suffered defeat there.

Whether it was Bâmiyân or Walian, we are told that he laid siege to the place, and met with a firm resistance. He built a large mound of earth, on which he planted his wooden battering engines, which he covered with the wet skins of cows and horses to prevent them from being fired by the enemy, but the town still held out, and the Mongols' store of ammunition began to get exhausted. During the siege Muatangan, the son of Jagatai, was killed by an arrow from the walls, and Chinghiz was determined to be bitterly revenged, and having animated his soldiers to renewed efforts he at length captured the town. Every living creature, man and beast, was destroyed, the mother of Muatangan entering the town with the soldiery superintended the hecatomb. The buildings

---
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in the town were destroyed, it was re-named Maubaligh, i.e., city of wool, or unfortunate city: the environs were reduced to a desert, and it remained so for a hundred years.33

An incident of the siege shows the hard lines of Mongol policy sometimes. We are told that Jagatai was absent when his son was killed, and returned while the place was being demolished. His father desired that the death of the young prince should be concealed from him, and an excuse was therefore made for his absence. A few days later Chinghiz being at table with his three younger sons, and feigning to be angry, reproached them for not being obedient to his orders, especially fixing his eyes on Jagatai. The latter, afraid, went on his knees, and protested he would die rather than disobey his father, a vow which he repeated. Thereupon Chinghiz said to him:—"Your son, Muatagan, has been killed. I forbid you to complain." Struck as by lightning by these words, Jagatai nevertheless restrained his tears, but after the meal was over he withdrew for a while to recover himself.34

Chinghiz Khan now continued his advance. We are told that he marched so rapidly that for two days his men had not time to cook their food. When he reached the field of Parwan,40 he asked Kutukan and another general to point out to him the positions of the two armies, and shewed them how they should have chosen their ground better, and blamed all of them for the recent defeat.41

The defection of Saiuf'd-din and his men had reduced Jallàu'd-din's forces by one half, and although he had, according to Ibn-al-Athir, sent a doughty message to Chinghiz Khan after the late fight, bidding him, "choose a battle-field, and he would meet him there,"42 he was constrained to retire from Ghazni, where he left a garrison, towards the Indus, the probable reason being, according to Major Raverty, that he claimed the western parts of the Panjâb and also of Sind as successor to Mu'izzu'd-din Ghûrî. Chinghiz, who was informed of the division in his camp, advanced rapidly towards Ghazni, where he arrived 15 days after Jallàu'd-din had left it, and where he left Mahmûd Yelvaj as governor. Jallàu'd-din had posted Uz Khan, called Orkhan by D'Ohsnon, at Kajla, with a small force to keep the Mongols in check till he could get across with his family and valuables, but he was defeated, and had to retire.43 Nissavi tells us the Sultan had since his departure from Ghazni suffered from a severe colic, which hardly permitted him to go about, even in a horse-litter. He was, nevertheless, obliged to mount, as he heard the enemy's vanguard had reached a place called Hardir. He accordingly hastened against them, and surprised them in their camp, and having killed most of them returned in safety to his camp.44

When Chinghiz came up he gave the command of his right wing to his son, Jagatai, and of the left to his other son, Ogodai, retaining the centre in his own hands, where he surrounded himself with 600 of his guards.45 Ukar Kiljeh and Katur Kiljeh were ordered to advance some distance in front, and to try and capture the Sultan alive.46

The place where Chinghiz came up with him was on the Indus, at a point nearly opposite the Niâb ferry. It was in September 1221. The small Khwârizmian army found itself with the river behind it, and the Mongols ranged in a bow-shaped formation around it on three other sides, and enclosing it in. According to Mirkhond, Jallàu'd-din had had the boats on the Indus sent away, so that his soldiers might not be tempted to rely on them, reserving one only for the passage of his harem, but it unfortunately broke in pieces, and the ladies had to remain in the camp. Jallàu'd-din commanded the centre, his left wing, which was covered by a mountain that prevented the Mongols from turning it, was entrusted to his vazîr, while Amin Malik commanded the right. The latter began the struggle, the left wing being used as a reserve, Nissavi reports how Jallàu'd-din put himself at the head of some of his men, and charged the main body of the enemy so bravely that they were thrown into disorder, and a broad way was cloven agânder to where Chinghiz should have been, but he had retired, after having had his

35 This fact makes it again probable that Abamiyân has been mentioned by Juvenal and others instead of Walian.
41 *Khâbâr-i-Nâzirî*, pp. 290 and 291 notes.
42 *De la Croix*, pp. 314 and 315.
43 *Id.*, pp. 315 and 316.
44 Abu l-ghâfî, p. 124; Erdmann, p. 430.
horse killed under him, and secured another mount, in order to bring up fresh troops. This advantage nearly won him the victory, for a rumour spread among the Mongols that the Sultán had broken their main body. Chinghis restored the fight by his personal bravery. Knowing that the Sultán had weakened his left wing, he ordered Bela Noyan to traverse some bye-ways in the mountain, which a native of the place told him was possible. He, accordingly under this man's guidance marched without losing many men between rocks and precipices, and fell upon the Sultán's left wing from behind, and being much weakened it could not resist. Another account says that the Mongols made their chief attack upon Amir Malik, and the right wing, which fled towards Peshawar. According to some accounts, he was killed by a body of Mongols who were posted on that side. This is not quite certain, however, and it is possible he escaped and afterwards met with his death in Sindh. The left wing was also broken and towards noon the Sultán was left with but 700 brave men of the centre, with whom he made daring but unavailing charges, and the ranks of the enemy, who had been ordered to take him alive, drew closer and closer. Thereupon Ujash Malik, also called Ahaas, son of Khan Malik, seized the bridle of his horse, and dragged him away. He bade a sorrowful adieu to his wife, and having taken off his arms and armor, except his sword, bow, and quiver full of arrows, he summoned a fresh charger, had it saddled, and boldly jumped with it from the bank into the rapid Indus, which flowed eight or ten yards below, and with his buckler on his back and holding his standard aloft he swam over in safety. Abu'l-Farsaj, apparently quoting Juvenal, says that when in mid-stream he stopped and discharged a volley of arrows at the Mongols. The gallant horse which had borne him over was kept by Jalâl’d-din without being mounted until the siege of Tiflis in 1226. Major Raverty says that there is a place on the west bank of the Indus, a little below Nillak, called Ghorr-
He says he got up into a tree to spend the night, and to secure himself from wild beasts, which were plentiful there.

As he was walking on the river bank he noticed a number of his men and officers, who, at the beginning of the late struggle had found a boat in which they had traversed the river amidst great dangers from rocks, &c. Among them were three officers, his particular friends, with whom he arranged plans. He was soon after joined by 300 horse, who told him 4,000 more had saved themselves by swimming two leagues from thence, but that they were in great distress from weariness and want of clothing. Presently an officer of his household, named Jamán-r-razad, who was not present at the battle, but having heard that his master had escaped, loaded a large boat with food, money, stiffs, bows and arrows, swords, &c., with which he cossed the Indus. This very seasonable relief greatly pleased the Sultán, who appointed his benefactor steward of his household, and carded him Ikthiār-ud-din, i.e., the saviour of the faith.

Northern India was at this time subject to the Turkish dynasty founded by Qutb-ud-din, Ibak-al-Mu'āzī. On the death of Qutb-ud-din, about the year 607 A. H. i.e., 1210, he was succeeded by his son, Arūm Shāh, who was speedily murdered. Thereupon a partial division of the heritage ensued. Qutb-ud-din left three daughters, one of these married Sultán Shamsud-din I-yal-tamash, who had been much cherished by his father-in-law, and given the title of Budan. He was now raised to the throne of Delhi. The other two daughters of Qutb-ud-din were successively married by Nasir-ud-din Kābajah, of whom Mīnāj-ī-Sarāj tells us that on the death of his father-in-law, "he proceeded to Uchchah and possessed himself of the city of Multān and Sindustān (i.e., Siwāli, the modern Siwān), and Diwāl, as far as the sea-coast. The whole he brought under his sway and subjected the fortresses, cities, and towns of the territory of Sindh, assumed two canopies of state, and annexed the country as far as the limits of Tabarhindah, Kuhram, and Sarsuti."

On the death of Qutb-ud-din the district of Lakhnāvati was appropriated by the Khalaj chiefs, while Lāhor was sometimes seized by each of the two brothers-in-law above named, the rulers of Dehlī and of Sindh respectively, and sometimes by Malik Tāj-ud-din Yalduz of Ghazni."

When Jalāl-ud-din, after crossing the Indus as we have described, had collected a few men about him, he set out eastwards. Raverty says he entered the Chūd desert tract of Jāruk, still called, perhaps, from this fact, Chūl-i-Jalāli, and sent on some one to explore, who reported that he had found a body of 2,000 Hindus encamped on the hills of Bilālah and Nikalāh. Jalāl-ud-din attacked and dispersed them and appropriated their horses, and thus mounted some of his followers. Having heard that the Mongols were pursing him, he now retired towards Dehlī, and sent an envoy to I-yal-tamash to recall the friendship which had hitherto subsisted between their peoples, and asking for shelter. I-yal-tamash charged this envoy with having conspired against him, and put him to death, and excused himself from granting him a settlement on the ground that the climate would injure the Sultán's health, but offered to welcome him if he would go on to Dehlī, an offer which perhaps meant that he would thus get him into his power. He sent a messenger with presents to excuse the murder of the envoy. According to Mīnāj-ī-Sarāj he, on the contrary, sent an army against him. At all events it was plain that he would not be welcomed at Dehlī, so he turned his steps elsewhere, and despatched a force into the hills of Jūd, in the midst of the Sindh-Sāgar Doab, which defeated the Khōkars, and returned with a great booty. Jalāl-ud-din married the daughter of the Rai of Khōkār, while the latter's son, who was given the title of Kutlugh, joined him with a force. D'Oఃson apparently calls this chief the prince of Jūdī. He says he had 1,000 horsemen and 5,000 foot soldiers with him; the Sultán, who had 4,000 men with him, defeated this army also. Its chief was struck by an arrow and killed, and he secured much booty.

There had long been strife between the Khōkars and Kābajah, the ruler of Sindh,
already named, who was encamped near Uchchā or Uch, with 20,000 men. Jalālū’d-dīn now sent Jahān Pahlavan against the latter at the head of 7,000 men. They surprised Kabajah in the night, and completely defeated him. He fled to an island on the Indus, and Jalālū’d-dīn occupied Uchchā. Presently he reached Multān, and on the Sultan’s demand paid him a considerable sum. Meanwhile the hot season being at hand Jalālū’d-dīn withdrew to the Salt Range, and captured a fortress called Bisiram or Biram, where he was wounded in the hand by an arrow. The Mongols impelled him to move further, and he approached Multān, where Kabajah, knowing he was hard pressed, refused him admittance. He then went on to Uch, where he stayed two days, and which he fired, and thence went on to Siwastān or Sīhwan, already named, which was held by a deputy of Kabajah, Fakhrū’d-dīn Sahari, who sent out a detachment, which was beaten, and he then thought it best to submit. Jalālū’d-dīn entered the town, where he remained a month, conferred a robe of honour on Fakhrū’d-dīn, whom he appointed his deputy in Sindustān, and then went on to Dībal and Damrilah, at the mouth of the Indus. There he encamped, its Abyssinian governor having meanwhile taken flight in a boat, and there he founded a Jama’ Masjid on the ruins of an idol temple. Thence he sent a force under Khas Khān towards Nahrwalah, in Gujarāt, which returned with a vast booty. He remained in this district till the Mongols returned home to their own country, when he also retraced his steps across the Indus. Thus did the young Sultan evade his merciless pursuers, to whom we will now turn.

Chinghiz Khān was not likely to allow him to escape without an effort. He accordingly sent Bēlā Noyan and Durbā Noyan, called Turtai by Raverty, and Durmun by Miles, with 20,000 men across the Indus in pursuit of him. They speedily reached the district formerly governed by Qamarū’d-dīn Qāmān, and which had recently been seized by one of the Sultan’s Amirs, a district which Raverty calls Baunab or Banian. Here was the strong fortress of Nandanah, called Bebeh by Erdmann, and rightly Biah by D’Ohsson, who says one of Jalālū’d-dīn’s officers was in command of it, and that it was taken with great slaughter. The Mongols now advanced upon Multān, along the western bank of the Jueam. Finding the river there unfordable, they constructed a bridge by means of rafts. They then invested the town, and battered it severely with catapults for 42 days, but were eventually obliged to raise the siege on account of the terrible summer heat. They therefore contented themselves with plundering the district round Multān, Labor, Peshāvar, and Mālikpur, recrossed the Indus, and went back to join their master. Meanwhile Chinghiz Khān, whose policy was to stamp out every ember of dissatisfaction, had despatched three fresh armies, southwards and westwards and northwards, under his sons, Jagatai and Ogotai, and the general Ichikdai respectively.

Abul’ghāzi says that Jagatai was sent to the provinces of Kesh and Makran. De la Croix, apparently following Bashidū’d-dīn, says he took 60,000 men with him, and was sent to the provinces of Sindh and Kirmān, to prevent Jalālū’d-dīn from sheltering there. He says further that Makran at this time appertained to Sindh.

His account is that Jagatai first captured the various principal places in Kirmān, then turned to Makrān, and captured Tiz which Ishakthari names as a sea-port of Makrān and some other places, and then wintered in Kilanjar, which Wolff identifies probably with a portion of the modern Baluchestān. Its ruler was the Salar Ahmad, who was submissive, and supplied the invaders with forage and other necessaries.

As he meant to stay there some time the soldiers built themselves houses, and even got themselves flocks of sheep. Their quarters were far apart, and they had plenty of slaves to wait on them. They planted gardens, and began, in fact, to behave as if they meant to settle there altogether. Presently, however, the hot winds, which prevail there in summer, began to blow,
many of the invaders were stricken down, and
the rest were reduced to great weakness.
This prevented them from attacking Fars and part of Khuzistán, which were under
the authority of Ghiasu’d-dín, Jalála’d-dín’s younger brother. We read that he sent
envoys to the countries of Kesh, Kash, Makrán, and the port of Surat, and received
their submission; troops being sent to those
who were not submissive, and that having put
governors in the districts and towns he had con-
quered, Jagatai marched northwards to rejoin
his father.65

While Jagatai was overrunning the province,
now called Baluchistán, Ogotai marched upon
Ghazni, at this time, we are told, called Dár’l-
Mulk, or the Royal City, the famous capital of
the great Indian conqueror Mahmód and of his
descendants. The statement that it was now
attacked and destroyed is not easy to reconcile
with that already made that it submitted to
Chinghiz Khán, who put Mahmód Yelvaj there
as its ruler, unless it had in the meantime re-
volted like Herat, &c. However this is to be
explained, we read that the place now resisted
bravely. Twice the citizens broke down the
mounds on which the besiegers had planted
their engines, while they disabled 100 of their
battering rams, but it was of no avail. The
wall of the town presently fell and filled up the
ditch with its ruins, over which the Mongols
hurried. The commander and his followers died
fighting. The place was then sacked during four
or five hours, the artisans were transplanted to
Mongolia, while the citizens who remained
alive were allowed to ransom their houses.66
Ogotai now advanced upon Ghur, the reduction
of whose various fortresses is described by
Minhaj-i-Saraj alone, and in a way which is so
embarrassing that it is impossible to reduce its
narrative to order. We read that Ogotai
having reached Pul-i-Ahingarán, i.e., the Black-
smith’s Boundary, near Firúkhâh, halted and
pitched his camp. Thence he sent the Juzbîs
Saadi and Mankadh or Mankadah, and some other
Noyans, with a large force to subdue Seistan.67
The Noyan Aba was sent with a

large force against the fortress of the Ashiyar
of Gharjistán.68 Another force under the Noyan
Ilji was sent into the hill country of Ghur and
Herat. In short, says our author, Sháhnáhá,
and bodies of troops were appointed to invade
every part of Ghur, Khurásán, and Seistan, and
during the whole of that winter slaughter was
carried by these Mongol divisions into all the
townships and villages.69

We will examine these expeditions in greater
detail.

To begin with Seistán. Rashidu’d-dín says
Ogotai sent to ask his father’s permission to
invade Seistan, but received orders to
rejoin him on account of the great heats, so
leaving his prisoners in charge of Kiku Noyan,
he advanced northwards to rejoin his father
by the Garmisir road.70 The Huang-yuan
says Ogotai approached Bu-sí-ze-dan, i.e., Bost
in Seistan, and wished to besiege it.71 To
return to the account of Minhaj-i-Saraj, he
says that the force which had advanced to
the gate of Seistán took that place by assault,
and it had to fight in every quarter of it before
it was subdued, for the people there, women
and men, great and small, all resisted obstinately
with knife and sword, and all were killed.72

Let us now turn to the campaign against
the fortress of Ashiyar. In order to under-
stand this we must digress somewhat. When
Chinghiz Khán marched across the Hindu
Kush into Afghanistan, he left behind at his
camp at the hill of Numun between Tálikán
and Balkh, his heavy baggage and treasures,
since it was impossible to traverse the mountains
of Gharjistán with such impedimenta. He
left a small force in charge of this camp.
Meanwhile a number of neighbouring fortresses
had not surrendered. The fortresses of Ghar-
jistán, says Minhaj-i-Saraj, were Rang or
Zang, Bindar or Pinda, Balarwan or Parwan,
Laghri, Siya-Khanah (variants of the name are
Shína Khanah and Sáta Khanah), Sabekjí,
or Sabankji, and Ashiyar. The majority of
these fortresses were galleries on the faces of the
mountains, &c.73 Within the fortress of
Ashiyar, we are told, was a Gharjah Amîr, of
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great determination and energy, named Amr
Muhammad the Maraghani. He started from
Ashiyar with a large force to try and secure
the vast booty which the Mongols had col-
lected, and he seized on as many wheeled
carriages laden with gold and other wealth as
he could in the Mongol camp, set free a large
number of captives, and secured many horses.
Ogotai having, as we have seen, reached Pul-
Ahingarán, seut the Noyan Abaka, who was
the commander of 10,000 Manjanikhis or
catapult workers, against Ashiyar, which he
proceeded to attack. As it was too strong to
storm they blockaded it, and this blockade
lasted for fifteen months, until the people inside,
reduced to great distress, were constrained
to eat the bodies of those who were killed
or died, and inter alia, it was reported that
there was there a woman of the minstrel class
who had a mother and a female slave. Both
having died, she dried their bodies and sold the
corpses for 250 dinars of pure gold, after which
she also died. The blockade having lasted for
fifteen months and ten days, only about 30 men
remained alive inside. They seized the Amr,
Muhammad the Maraghani, killed him, and
threw his head near the Mongol camp, hoping
thus for better treatment. When the Mongols
saw the head they at once assaulted and carried
the fortress and killed every one inside, and
then proceeded to capture the other strong-
holds of Gharjastán.10

THE PROVERBS OF ALI EBN ABI TALEBI.
Translated by K. T. Best, M.A., M.R.A.S.,
Principal, Gujarát College.
Continued from Vol. XIII. p. 272.
188. Honour is acquired in two ways—by acting
justly, and helping our fellow men.
189. The bitterness of this life is the sweetness
of the next.
190. He who is modest is worthy of respect.
191. Do not deceive him who asks your advice,
nor be angry with him who exhorts you.
192. He who consults a wise man reigns, but
he who takes no advice perishes.
193. The tongue of wisdom is truth, that of
folly falsehood.
194. The speech of a man is the balance of his
intellect.
195. Direct your tongue and you will be safe.
196. To eat in moderation keeps off many
diseases of the body.
197. Speak the truth even against your own
interests.
198. A little politeness is better than high rank.
199. The food of the world is poison, and its
furniture rottenness.

200. Blessed is he who puts on the tranquility
of a contented mind as a garment, and puts away
prodigality.
201. The fidelity of a man is known by his oaths.
202. He is your brother who helps you in
poverty.
203. The learning of a man is better than his
gold.
204. To pay debts is a part of religion.
205. By benefiting your enemy you will subdue
him.
206. He is your brother, who helps you with
his wealth, and not by the mention of his relation-
ship.
207. Wealth is increased by giving alms liberally.
208. Sell earthly things in exchange for heavenly
and you will gain.
209. If you rise early you will be prosperous.
210. Good works make life happy.
211. The troubles of man come from the
tongue.
212. He gives twice who gives cheerfully.
213. Trust in God and He will satisfy you.
214. Act in such a way that you may obtain in
old age what you missed in youth.

BOOK NOTICES.
Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol. LIII,
Part I. No. 5, 1884.
The first paper is a valuable contribution by
Mr. V. A. Smith, Bengal Civil Service, on the
Gold Coins of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty.
After some preliminary remarks, the most
important of which will be noticed below, Section
II. deals with the leading features of the

types and devices of the coins, and the principles
on which Mr. Smith's classification of them is
based. We are glad to find here that he dissects
entirely from the theory that the female figure
on the reverse of these coins is intended invari-
ably to represent Pārvati or Durgā. The Early
Guptas were certainly not exclusively of the
Vaishnava religion. But, at the same time,
there is nothing whatever in their history to lead to
the supposition that they made any such
profession of the Siva faith, as would be implied
by their adopting so uniformly the figure of
Parvati on their coins. As Mr. Smith suggests,
the interpretation of this figure as Parvati can
be due to nothing but the fact that it is identical
in all essential points with the figure on the
Indo-Syrian coins, which is connected there
with the name of Ardhagrih, or Ardhagrih, coupled
with the supposition that this represents a
Sanskrit word, Ardhagrih; and that the latter is
capable of being interpreted to mean 'half Siva,'
t.e. his consort Parvati, in allusion to his form
of Ardhanarisha, or the god half male and half
female. Ardhagrih is a possible Sanskrit forma-
tion; and that is all that can be said for it.
We have no lexicographical authority for such a
compound having been ever formed and used;
and, if it should be formed, it certainly could not
have the meaning of Parvati as the half of Ugra
or Siva. Mr. Smith's conclusion is that the
female figure represents, in almost every instance,
the goddess Sri or Lakshmi,—not specially as
the consort of Vishnu, and therefore symbolical
of the Vaishnava religion; but simply as repre-
senting Fortune, Victory, or relief splendid.
—As regards the 'bird-standard,' which appears
first on the coins of Samudragupta,—Mr. Smith,
differing from Professor Wilson and General
Cunningham, finds himself unable to accept it as
representing Garuda, and, while preferring the
simple term 'bird-standard,' as involving no
theory, shows a decided inclination to agree with
Mr. Thomas' interpretation of it as a peacock.
The copper coins of Chandragupta, however,
show plainly that it is intended for Garuda;
for the larger specimens have on the reverse
the similar representation of a bird, with wings
spread out sideways, and also with human
arms stretched out sideways and downwards
between the wings and the legs; this cannot
be meant for anything except Garuda. The
same bird, with human arms, occurs also on the
seal of a Gaya copperplate grant of Samudragupta,
which, though the plate itself seems to be
spurious, has apparently an antique and genuine
seal attached to it;—also on the seal of a grant of
the Mahdraja Sarvanaththa of Uchchakalpa, a

1 Mr. Smith, following Mr. Thomas, writes the first
part of this name Naria, with the vowel of the first
syllable long (which has been thought to be an abbrevia-
tion of Nardya) and attaches it to the syllables gupta.
But in the specimen figured by him, as also in General
Cunningham's coins, and in the coins belonging to the
Asiatic Society of Bengal, the name on the obverse is
very distinctly Nara, with the vowel of the first syllable
short. The coins furnish no authority whatever for the
addition of the syllable gupta; for the character be-
between the king's feet is certainly not gu, as Mr. Thomas

feudatory of the immediate successors of the
Early Guptas;—and also on the seal of the Raja
grant of Tirvandhy (Archaeol. Surv. Ind. Vol.
XVII. Pt. vi.)

Section III. is devoted to the so-called 'mono-
grams,' which are found on most of the Guptas' gold coins. As Mr. Smith points out, the term
'monogram' is a misnomer; since these marks
certainly contain nothing in the way of a
combination of alphabetical characters. The
more correct term would be 'emblems,' or 'symo-
logs.' The true purport of these symbols still
remains unexplained. But the theories that
they denote mint-cities, or mint-masters, or that
they are due to nothing but a blind copying of
the Indo-Syrian coins, must certainly be
abandoned. And Mr. Smith's suggestion that
they are of a religious nature, appears worthy of
further consideration and inquiry, as being
perhaps the closest guess to the true meaning
of them that has as yet been made.

Section IV. deals with a question to which
but little attention has as yet been paid,—that of
the weights of the coins. And the results of
Mr. Smith's experiments seem to shew that,—
whereas the coins of Nara-Balditya,1 and others of
the same class, clearly represent the ancient
Hindu weight and coin called swarna, and weigh-
ing 80 raktika, or, as Mr. Smith's results seem to
shew, 146 grams,—the coins of the imperial
Early Guptas denote at least three very different
standards of weight, of approximately
125, 130, and 134-35 grains respectively, and
follow old Roman, Lydian, and Macedonian stan-
dards.

Sections V. and VI. deal with the Find-apets of
the Guptas' coins, and as a result, with the ques-
tions of the Early Gupta Mint-cities and Capital.
The hitherto generally accepted opinion has been
that Kanauj was the Capital of the Early Guptas.
The facts put together by Mr. Smith, however,
"indicate, unmistakably, that the Gupta gold
"coining was struck and chiefly current in terri-
"tories far to the east of Kanauj; and that these
"territories may be roughly described as the
"Province of Benares, with some adjoining dis-
"tricts," and Mr. Smith, following a suggestion
made by General Cunningham, selects Patna, the
ancient Pataliputra, as the head-quarters of the
read it. Nor is it it, as Mr. Smith suggests. According
to the specimen figured by Mr. Smith, and according to
four others, the character is distinctly it. On one
other coin there is a slight mark which might turn it
into it; but this is very doubtful. The legend on the
reverse is not exactly Bidhyati, but Vidyatiali for
Bidhyati. As in the case of this coin, Mr. Thomas
interprets it as a character that is between the feet
of the standing figure on the obverse of a gold coin
of Vishnu-Chandrajitya (ante Vol. XII. p. 10). But the
real reading there is u.
eastern dominions of the Gupta kings, with the probability of their having also had important seats of government at Mahôba, Khajurâho, and Kîlañjâr. This conclusion, as regards Pâñali-putra, is well in accordance with the position of the localities in which the Gupta stone-inscriptions are found; and with the fact that at least two of those inscriptions mention Pâñali-putra, whereas none of them mention Kanyakubja or Kanauj. But, as regards the value of the evidence of coins on such a point, it must always be borne in mind that gold coins may easily be found, even in considerable numbers, at places far distant from those in which they are struck or are properly current, having been transported for purposes of commerce, or as votive offerings by pilgrims; and that the same want of conclusiveness, to a certain extent, attends the inference that may be drawn from the finding of silver coins also. On the other hand, copper coins would never be exported for such purposes; and the existence of them to any considerable extent in any particular locality, would be a more sure and certain sign that the capital of the king by whom they were issued was in or very close to that locality. The copper coins of the Early Guptas, however, that have as yet been found, are so very few and rare, that no conclusion can be arrived at on the support of them.

The remainder of the paper is occupied with Mr. Smith’s catalogue and detailed descriptions of the coins examined by him, and with his readings of the legends on them.

In his introductory remarks, Mr. Smith suggests that the name of the founder of the family was not simply Gupta, as it is usually accepted, but Śrîgupta, which form he uses throughout; the grounds for this being—that the past participle, gupta, ‘protected,’ can hardly stand alone for a proper name; whereas Śrîgupta, ‘protected by Śrî or Lakshmi,’ gives a suitable meaning, and is a complete name;—and that the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing (about A.D. 675 to 680) speaks of a king Śrîgupta, who preceded his time by five hundred years. This is a point that has doubtless occurred to others also; but it is not so easy to dispose of it. In the well-known name of the Buddhist saint Upagupta, we have a precisely similar instance of a past participle, meaning ‘hidden, concealed,’ standing by itself for a proper name. And, where Śrî is an integral part of a proper name, it is customary to emphasise it, and to prevent the possibility of doubt, by inserting the honorific prefix Śrî before it,—thus, mahādaśryān Śrî-Śrîmañjāya = utpaman, “born of the queen-consort, the glorious Śrîmañjāya,” in line 2 of the ‘Barnarâk’ inscription; and Śrî-Śrîpalâgâyān, puri, “a: the glorious city of Śrîpataḥ,” in line 5 of the Byâmā inscription. And, finally, the word gupta does not appear at all in the name of Ghaṭotkacha, the son of the founder of the family; it is only in the case of Ghaṭotkacha’s son Chandragupta I., and his successors, that the word is of necessity only an integral part of a fuller name. There seems no objection, at present, to accepting ‘Gupta’ by itself as the name of the founder of the family. And it is quite possible that it is not originally the Sanskrit participle at all, but is simply a Sanskritised form of a foreign name.

Following Mr. Thomas and others, Mr. Smith allot the first coin figured by him to Ghaṭotkacha, the son of the founder of the family. This, however, is by no means a certainty; and, indeed, facts tend strongly to negative the correctness of the assignment. Mr. Smith has pointedly impressed upon us that the coins attributed to Ghaṭotkacha have peculiarly distinctive features of their own. Thus, at page 121, he speaks of “the Hindo character of nearly all the Gupta gold coins.” Whereas, at p. 137 he writes—“The coins of Ghaṭotkacha possess no distinctive Hindo characteristics.

“The king, who sacrifices at a fire-altar, grasps a peculiar rose-headed standard, which seems obviously intended to symbolise the rayed sun.

“The Sun and Fire are, in mythology, almost convertible terms; and I think it may fairly be assumed, on the evidence of the coins, that Ghaṭotkacha (though he may have been a Hin.’3a), was a worshipper of the solar fire, as his Indo-Scythian predecessors undoubtedly were.” And again, at p. 129, he speaks of “the undisputed solar character of Ghaṭotkacha’s coinage.” The emblem interpreted as a ‘fire-altar,’ however, is not a peculiarly distinctive feature of the coins attributed to Ghaṭotkacha; for it appears again on some of the coins of Samudragupta, on one attributed to Chandragupta I., and on one of Kumāragupta. And we have it uniformly throughout the series of coins of the later Indo-Scythians, who were contemporaneous with the Early Guptas in the Falijâb. In these coins it is a question, and to show that the name was Gupta, not Śrîgupta. It happens, however, that the correct reading of the original here is Gupṭa-prakṛti, ganaṁtāṁ vikaḍhīya, “making the calculation in the reckoning of the Guptas.”


* In line 15 of the Girala inscription (Archæol. Surv. West. Ind. Vol. II. p. 203), Pâsâlī Bhaśâvalī Indrajñi reads Gupṭaśrañ kād-gamuṇha vikaḍhīya, “counting from the time of Gupta;” and this would seem to settle the
always coupled with the trisula, the special emblem of the Šaiva creed; which is certainly against the symbol being a distinctive sign of solar worship. In fact,—though other scholars, as well as Mr. Smith, interpret it as a 'fire-altar;' and though Mr. Smith states, at p. 126, that "in at least one specimen in the British Museum collection, the grains of incense falling on the fire-altar are plainly indicated."—it is still a fair matter of argument as to whether the emblem may not be a vessel containing the sacred tulasi-plant, as has been suggested, or even something of an entirely undeniﬁable character. There has always been a tendency to connect the Early Gupta coins with solar worship, by accepting them as belonging to the Śrāvakabhasa or lineage of the sun. And it is doubtless this tendency, coupled with "the connection which existed between the "aśāmādha-ceremony and solar worship," which has inﬂuenced Mr. Smith in suggesting, at p. 129, that Samudragupta also, "though a good Hindu, "may have been, as so many Hindus still are, "especially devoted to the worship of the sun."

This tendency, however, is due to nothing but a mistake, originating with Dr. Mill’s misinterpretation of the Allahābād inscription, where, in line 30, he reads rōma-charmanah ravi-bhūsw dākur-ayam= uchchhrisā stambhah, "of this child of the Sun, though clothed in hairy flesh, this lofty pillar is the arm;" while the original has dachakṣīka ina bhūsw &c., "this pillar has been erected, as if it were an arm of the earth declaring (the glories of Samudragupta)." There is, as a matter of fact, nothing whatever to connect the Early Gupta coins with solar worship, till the time of the last of them, Skandagupta, whose reign we have the Indr plate, of the year 146, which opens with an invocation of the sun, and records a grant to a temple of the sun at that town. So far as epigraphical evidence goes, it was only at this period that sun-worship became at all general in the more strictly Hindu part of northern India; and it was undoubtedly introduced by a purely sun-worshipping race from the north-west frontier of India, who then began to overrun the country, and finally overthrew the Early Guptas. The ‘rayed-sun standard,’ however,—if this is the correct interpretation,—is a far more distinctive symbol; as it appears nowhere again in any of the Early Gupta coins, except,—without the staff, and as a symbol only,—on one coin, bearing the name of Chandra (Pl. iii. No. 2), which is attributed to Chandragupta II. There is, in fact, nothing in the numismatic details of the coins attributed to Ghaṭotkacha to connect them conclusively with the undoubted coins of the Early Guptas. Again, like his father before him, Ghaṭotkacha was not a paramount sovereign, but only a subordinate ruler, his title being simply that of Mahārāja. The title indicative of supreme sovereignty in those times was Mahārajadhiraja, which was assumed for the first time by Ghaṭotkacha’s son Chandragupta I. On Mr. Smith’s own showing, therefore (p. 156), Ghaṭotkacha’s rank was not such as to entitle him to issue a coinage; and we have no reason to expect to find any coins of his time, any more than of his father, of whom none have been found. And finally, the name of Ghaṭotkacha does not appear on the coins that are attributed to him. The name on the obverse, under the left arm of the king, inside the spear, is Kāchā, which, meaning ‘glass, crystal,’ &c., is a very different word from ukacā, ‘having the hairs (of the body) standing erect (through pleasure),’ which is the second component of the name of Ghaṭotkacha. And the marginal legend, beginning at the top, behind the king’s head,—not, as Mr. Thomas and Mr. Smith take it, at the

The connection of Samudragupta with the aśāmādha-coin rests chiefly upon the occurrence of a certain unexplained syllable on that coin (Pl. ii. No. 9), and on the indelible lyre-coin of Samudragupta (Pl. ii. No. 7).—It is a little doubtful whether this syllable is identical on the two coins, or whether it is not on the former, and so on the latter. But, however this may be, the same syllable sī or sī,—again with nothing to explain it,—occurs also on one of the coins, belonging to General Cunningham, of the later Indo-Scythian series of the Pañabī.


This, however, is open to argument. In the case of the coin attributed to Chandragupta II., Mr. Smith himself interprets the symbol as a ‘wheel’ (p. 136). Precisely the same symbol, without the staff, occurs also at the beginning of a Buddhist inscription at Mahārā (Archaeol. Surv. Ind. Vol. III. Pl. XVI. No. 22.) And this inscription, as well as the general design of the symbol, is certainly in favour of interpreting the symbol as a form of the Buddhist wheel, rather than as a rayed sun or planet, with the unnecessary addition of a circle round the ends of the rays.

The only other coin, at all connected with the Early Gupta series, on which this symbol is known to appear again, and as a standard, is a coin belonging to General Cunningham, of Jaya-Prajapāyasas, of about the period of the Amsā inscription of Adityaśena.—A very similar symbol or standard, but more elaborate in its details, is on the rock at Tāsān, below the inscription which, as translated, records the conquest of Ghaṭotkacha by a Tāsān king Vaiśraṇa (Archaeol. Surv. Ind. Vol. V. p. 130, and Pl. XL.) This, however, is nothing but a piece of pure fabricated history. The Vaiśraṇa of this inscription is the god. The word tāsān is used in its meaning of ‘frost.’ And the syllables that have been manipulated into the name of Ghaṭotkacha, are in the original, dānā-dānagānd, ‘the women of the Dānas or demons.’

Mr. Smith gives this name as ‘ktaka; which is sometimes read as kādua.’ But the coin ﬁgured by him has distinctly the vowel a attached to the ﬁrst syllable; as also have the coins belonging to Cunningham, Mr. Gibbs, and the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and apparently the coin ﬁgured by Mr. Thomas in Archaeol. Surv. West. India, Vol. II. Pl. viii. No. 1.
bottom, in front of his feet,—is "K[da]kha\textsuperscript{9} gdm\textsuperscript{10} xyst\textsuperscript{i} *\textsuperscript{10} dya karma bhir\textsuperscript{11} uttanair\textsuperscript{11} jaya\textsuperscript{11} [\textsuperscript{11}].

"Kâcha, having conquered the earth, is victorious by (his) excellent deeds." There is no room here for the syllables ghast before the K[da]\textsuperscript{9}; and here, as below the king's arm, the k is formed in such a way as to shew distinctly that it is the sole consonant of the syllable, and is not merely the lower part of tk. The coins, therefore, are coins of a king named Kâcha, not Ghatvâkachâ, and, as pointed out above, the two names are utterly distinct. Nor does the legend on the reverse, sarva-râj-achchhëttä, 'the exterminator of all kings,' suffice to shew that these are Gupta coins; much less that they are coins of Ghatvâkachâ. This epithet does, it is true, occur in some of the Gupta inscriptions. But there is nothing distinctive about it, to restrict the use of it to the Gupta kings. And, in four of the five instances in which it does occur,—viz. the Mathurâ, Bihâr, and Bhitari inscriptions, and the spurious copperplate spoken of above,—it is to Samudragupta that it is applied. Only in the Bilsarî inscription is there any possibility of applying it to Ghatvâkachâ; and there, also, the probability is that it applies to Samudragupta. Accordingly, on the analogy of the similar expressions, apra\textsuperscript{9}, parakrama, and kridânta-parais, which are applied in inscriptions to Samudragupta and occur on undoubted coins of Samudragupta,—this legend, sarva-râj-achchhëttä, shows, if it proves anything at all, that the coins on which it appears are coins of Samudragupta. The name of Kâcha, however, prevents this attribution. Who the Kâcha of these coins was, cannot at present be said. The name is of rare occurrence. But it is met with elsewhere; e.g. in the case of two kings or chieftains, Kâcha I. and Kâcha II., mentioned in an inscription of the fifth or sixth century A.D. in the Ajanâ Caves.\textsuperscript{16} The Kâcha of these coins, however, is probably to be looked for among the later Indo-Sâmyâns, who were contemporaries of the Early Gupta in the Palîjâb and the north-west of India.


The study of Sanskrit has been greatly facilitated by the introduction of Prof. R. G. Bhânpârâkar's two books. But the chief aim in preparing these excellent books was, we think, to simplify the intricacies of grammar, and to present the subject in an easily intelligible form. They contain, therefore, rather too much grammar and too little reading. Sanskrit forms an important part of the studies taught in High Schools and Colleges in India; and the majority of students, who present themselves at the University Examinations, select Sanskrit as their second language. But though Sanskrit has been so largely studied, it is not uncommon to find that students, who can readily repeat a string of grammatical forms, however recondite and difficult, are hardly able to construe a single sentence, or to speak in the way in which people spoke Sanskrit when it was a living language. That is to say, they have no command of the language. The reason is not far to seek. The standard works, the Kâyasas and the Nîtats, are too high for beginners, and cannot be much utilized without the help of a teacher, which is beyond the reach of many students. This Monthly Magazine has, therefore, been undertaken to meet the desideratum of a good reading-book, which students can read and understand by themselves. The Sanskrit Reader contains, for the present, 16 pages. It is divided into four parts. Part I. contains sections 1-3, adapted for Anglo-Vernacular Standards IV—VII. respectively, and consists of easy exercises for translation. Care is taken that these exercises contain words and expressions with which students are familiar in Prof. Bhânpârâkar's books; but when any new words or forms occur, explanatory foot-notes are given. Part II. is meant for students of Standards VI and VII. It includes a collection of choice words, expressions, and idioms, from various Sanskrit writers, with their English equivalents. Part III. is intended for the candidate classes in High Schools. In it, it is proposed to give abstracts of the standard Sanskrit Kâyasas, Nîtats, Katha\textsuperscript{1}, etc., on the plan of Lamb's well known Tales from Shakespeare." Part IV. is expected to serve as reading for more advanced students. It contains elegant extracts from original Sanskrit works, with full explanatory notes in English. Thus it is intended that this serial shall be useful to those for whom it is meant, and shall be read as a companion to Prof. Bhânpârâkar's books. The parts and sections are so graduated as to meet the requirements of all classes of students, from beginners to undergraduates. It also aims at supplying interesting reading to those who do not read with a view to examination. The numbers are to be issued monthly, at a very small rate of subscription. We cannot too highly commend this undertaking, and hope that it may be widely known and used.

\footnote{The asterisks denote vowels and syllables that fall beyond the edges of the specimens examined.—After this there is a doubtful mark, somewhat like pra, or du, which may perhaps be part of a word or words falling in every specimen examined beyond the edge of the coin.}

\footnote{Archaeol. Surv. West. Ind. Vol. IV. p. 180.}
AN INSCRIPTION OF SIVADEVA AND AMSUVARMAN FROM NEPAL.

BY CECIL BENDALL, M.A. M.R.A.S.

The original of this transcript is in Gōlmādhi-tōl, Bhatgaun, and forms one of a series discovered by me in the valley of Nēpāl in November last. As my attention has been called by one of the Editors of this Journal to the interest attaching to its date, I publish now, at his request, a transcript and translation. In anticipation of my fuller study of the whole series. The few hours available for work of this kind before I leave India would have been insufficient but for the kind assistance of my friend Pandit Bhagwānlāl Indrajl.
The present inscription should be compared with others of the same two rulers, Śivaḍeva and Amśuvarman, published in this Journal in 1880 (Vol. IX. p. 168 ff.) by Faqit Bhangwâlî Indrajit and Dr. Bühler, who give the dates of Sañvat 34 and 39 (referred to the Śrī-Harsha era) for Amśuvarman. As we know from Hiuen Thsang that Amśuvarman flourished in the first half of the VIIIth century A.D., the date of this inscription may contribute to the solution of the vexed questions as to the era between the Śaka and that of Śrī-Harsha. Containing three numerals, of which the first is the symbol for 300, it can hardly refer to any other era than that commencing A.D. 319, which is still regarded by some as the Gupta-Valabhi era.

TEXT.

[1] स्त्रिति मानमूर्दपरिमित्ययसनुद्धोष्ठोऽस्वतिति[सिरिषि]शो[रि]
[2] पपानदुमानाठो लिङ्गविकुंकक्तेर्दीर्धासणमाः
[3] वः कुशली भाग्यविकांसरकेनांस्फातस्यम् पदानाय
[5] नामदुगम्यान् कुशलपरिमुखस्य समाखाययाः[सिडिः]
[6] तमत्रुत्तमस्य यथांत्रम परमस्य[नामां]सिवुलयां
[7] राज्महामुनिशिप्रमििस्यमेखन महातमानि
[8] एकुणि एकेनि ब्रह्मदशमुकायम् च
[9] विष्णुशिवमेघ सरमितिशिलिक्षमांसाधारनैव
[10] श्रे लेखादेशप्रकाशायेवस्यलम्बवेष इति
[11] बालकवसायकारणवः यस्तेतासायस्य सिल
[12] व्यूहावेशम् तमसार्थिस्य मध्यविशाययम् व...
[13] हृदयपुष्करे भव्यदत्तारतिनि वर्म्युक्तिमेचि
[14] दार्शनितिनिरपयमाः समायापारालितिः समा
[15] दुतक्षात्र भोगवती भामि(भ) सेवु् ३१८

TRANSLATION.

Hail! From Mānagriha. The illustrious Śivaḍeva, meditating on the feet of Bepas, who has illuminated the quarters by the day-spring of his countless virtues, being in good health, to the cultivators resident in the villages of Mākhśātā and Satsaradraiga (?) under the lead of their headmen, with due enquiries after their health, addresses the following order:

"Be it known to you that, at the request of the great feudatory Amśuvarman, who by his renowned ... doughty and ... prowess has subdued the might of his innumerable foes, out of regard for him and compassion for you, I grant you this boon, namely that the officials of Kūhērvati are allowed entrance for the levying only of not more than the three taxes, but not for granting writings or for the five offences. Therefore this boon must not be infringed by our dependants who have cogniscence of this, nor by any other parties whatsoever: and whosoever, in contravention of this order, does so infringe or cause infringement, him I will in no wise suffer; moreover such kings as shall be after us, ought, as guardians of religion and (thus) as followers of grants (made ... .), to preserve my order in its entirety. In this matter the executive officer is Bhōgavarmān Śvāṁin. Sañvat 318, on the 10th of the bright fortnight of Jyāshtha.

THE GAHARWARS AND RATHORS.

BY A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, PH.D.

With regard to the events that led to the change of dynasty in Kanañj at the time of the accession of the so-called Rāthors, I would venture to make a suggestion for further con-
historical notices contained in the opening verses of that grant have been quite correctly understood.

The vijayat or 'victorious king' of the second verse is Chandra Deva himself, whose descent is described in that verse. The following verse (No. 3) relates the circumstances under which he obtained the throne of Kanauj. In this verse, it is stated that, after the death of a king Bhoja, there were troublesome times under a king Karpa, to which Chandra Deva put an end by possessing himself of the country. The king Bhoja, I take to be Bhoja Deva II, of the earlier Kanauj dynasty, who reigned about A.D. 925-50; for his father Mahendra Pala was still reigning in A.D. 921. Bhoja Deva II's son, Vinayaka Pala Deva, may, therefore, be put down to A.D. 950-75. About this time a Rājā Kokalla II, of the Kalachuri dynasty, was on the throne of Chedi. He and his successors, Gāggeya Deva and Karpā Deva, carried on many successful wars. They must have invaded the territories of Mahoba and Kanauj; for Gāggeya Deva is recorded to have died at Prayāga, and his coins are found on the site of Kanauj. Karpa Deva must have reigned about A.D. 1025-50, as he is recorded to have had a contemporary of Bhima Deva of Gujarāt (A.D. 1022-72) and of Bhoja Deva of Dhār (A.D. 1021-42). This makes him also a contemporary of Chandra Deva, the first Rāthor king of Kanauj (about A.D. 1050). I take it, therefore, that the inscription refers to Karpa Deva of Chedi.

Further, in the second verse, Chandra Deva is called a son of Mahiala, which is either a mere provincialism, or a clerical error for Mahiala. By the same name (Mahiala) Chandra Deva's father is called in the Rāhan land-grant of Govinda Chandra, published in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Proceedings for 1876, p. 131. Usually his father is called Mahichandra; while his son is always called Madanapala. This fact shows that the term Chandra was by no means so distinctive, as is often thought, of the Kanauj royal family. Terms like chandra, tala, pala, were interchangeable appendages to the actual name; and Mahichandra might also call himself Mahiala or Mahiala. The Sārnāth inscription of Mahiala is dated A.D. 1026,—a date which synchronises with Chandra Deva's father Mahichandra, also Mahiala. The father of the Sārnāth Mahiala was Vigrapahāla; while the father of Mahiala is called Yaśo-Vigrahā. As Pāla and Chandra are interchangeable, I take Vigrapahāla and Mahiala of Benares as likely to be the same as Yaśo-Vigrahā and Mahiala (alias Mahiala), the ancestors of Chandra Deva. Dates and names favour the identification.

But more, the date of Vigrapahāla and Mahiala is from A.D. 991 to 1058, which synchronises with the date of the Chedi rulers, Kokalla II., Gāggeya, and Karpa. The Chedi rulers were of the Haihaya race; and Vigrapahāla is said to have married Lejji, a princess of the Haihaya race. The Pālas of Benares and the Kalachuris of Chedi, therefore, were closely allied. Now Vinaykapala Deva of the earlier Kanauj line possessed Benares about A.D.

---

* Not Karl, as given in the transcript in the Bengal Journal; see note 7 below, and p. 106, note 8.
* See General Cunningham's remarks in Archaeol. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX p. 63. [These remarks and dates, however, must be accepted with caution.—Ed.]
* id. p. 65.
* id. p. 66.
* The Basahi plate spells Mahiala, but the Rāhan plate spells Mahia. The name Mahiala means 'the very earth'. It is an unusual name, and if it were not for the fact that it agrees with the metre (Upendavajj) of the verse in which it occurs, one would be inclined to look upon it as one of the clerical errors (for Mahiala) with which this particular record abounds. The copper-plate is among the Société's collection, where I have examined it, and verified the correctness of the printed transcript of the second verse. As it is, 'Mahiala' evidently owes its origin merely to the exigencies of the metre. Of the other grant, published in the Journal for 1973, I have not seen the original, which is in the Locknow Museum. But I possess, through the kindness of Mr. Fair, a very carefully prepared ink-impression, which clearly shows the name to be Mahiala, not Mahiala as published in the Journal. In all probability 'Mahiala' is a clerical error, apparently for 'Mahiala'; but the latter is not required by the metre of the verse.

---

950-75; but, according to the Sārnāth inscription, in A.D. 1026, Mahipāla of the Bhār (and Bengal) line is in possession of Benares. The latter therefore must have changed hands in the interval. This must have occurred in the "troubious times," when the Chedi kings conquered Kanaunj, while the Pālas (allied to them by marriage) conquered Benares.

I imagine the events to have occurred thus. Towards the end of the tenth century the Kalachuris and the Pālas, being allied, attacked the kingdom of Kanaunj from the south and east; the former took Kanaunj, the latter Benares; for Jayapāla, the father of Vigrāhapaṇa, is recorded to have conquered Allahābād. While the direct descendants of Mahipāla continued to rule the Bhār and Bengal kingdom, including Benares,—one of his younger sons, Chandra Deva, obtained for himself the kingdom of Kanaunj, from the Kalachuri king Karṇa, and founded a new dynasty in Kanaunj, which henceforth took from him its special name Chandra, in order, perhaps, to distinguish itself from the original stock of Pālas. Hence Vigrāhapaṇa and Mahipāla, though named as the ancestors of Chandra Deva, are never included in the royal list of Kanaunj.

But further, the Basāhi plate of Sainvat 1161 distinctly states, that Mahipāla and Chandra Deva were of the Gahārwār race of Rājpūts. The same statement occurs in the land-grant, published in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Proceedings for 1876, p. 130. So far as I am aware, it does not occur in any of the land-grants of the Rāthor kings of Kanaunj, except these two. In all the other grants, I think, no information whatever is given regarding the particular Rājpūt clan to which the kings professed to belong. The Rāthor clan is not mentioned in any of them. It has always been taken for granted that the kings of Kanaunj were of the Rāthor clan. For this notion there appears to be no other ground than the tradition of the Rāthor princes of Jodhpur in Mārwar, who affirm that Sīvajī, their ancestor, was a son of a child of Jaya Chandra of Kanaunj. Now Jaya Chandra is a historical personage; he was the last of the Kanaunj kings, who fell in battle with Shāhāb-ud-dīn Ghūrī, as testified by contemporary Muhammadan historians. Sīvajī also is a historical personage, a real ancestor of the Mārwar Rāthor house. The connecting link between Sīvajī and Jaya Chandra is a child, otherwise unknown, who is said to have escaped the wreck of his father's house and reign. History, I believe, knows nothing about him; and the tradition about him suspiciously resembles similar traditions of princely houses, who claim ancient descent by the agency of some mysteriously born or preserved child. In any case, if the tradition is correct, it fails to account for the remarkable fact, how a family which was originally Gahārwār, as stated in their own grants, turned into Rāthors. In a matter of this kind the evidence of a contemporary land-grant is of more value than a tradition. But, in fact, the traditions, confused and sometimes contradictory as they are, rather support the theory here put forward. It is said that "the Gahārwārs are of the same family as the Rāthors, with whom they deem themselves on an equality and with whom it is said they never intermarry." The last statement, however, is only partially true. It does not appear that the modern Rāthors can be traced further back than the Kanaunj family; and Colonel Tod says that a doubt hangs over the origin of the Rāthor race; by the bards they are held to be descendants of Kaśyapa. In reference to the latter point, it may be noticed that the Gahārwārs are of the Kaśyapa gotra or order; though the Rāthors now profess to be of the Śūḍiyā gotra. All these circumstances point to the conclusion that the so-called Rāthors were an offshoot of the Gahārwārs; and it may well be that about the time of Mahipāla a separation took place in the Gahārwār clan, possibly on religious grounds; for the Pālas professed Buddhism, while the Chandas were Brahmans. The separation was marked by the secession of the latter to Kanaunj, and by a change in their nomenclature (Chandra and Rāthor, for Pāla and Gahārwār). "The
Gaharwârs are despised by the other Râjpût tribes, according to Tod. The original reason of this treatment may have been their heretical faith in the time of the Pâlas. The Râthors would not be the only offshoot from the Gaharwâr clan; the well-known Bandels (of Bundelkhand) are another prominent instance of Gaharwâr descent. Again, the Gaharwârs assert that they were originally masters of Kanauj; local tradition confirms their claims; and the Gantama Râjpûts attribute their own residence and possessions in the Lower Doib to the bounty of a Gaharwâr Râja of Kanauj. This tradition evidently refers to the Râthor rulers of Kanauj, and confirms the statement of their land-grants, that they were Gaharwârs. Again, the present chief of the Gaharwârs resides at Kantit near Mirzapur, and, tradition says, Gâdan Deo, who by some is reckoned the son of Mânika Chandra, brother of Jayachandra, the Râthor, came from Benares about the end of the 11th century, and settled at Kantit. This, as Sir Henry Elliot points out, is a confused tradition. Perhaps it points to the secession and emigration from Benares under Chandra, at the time of Mahâpâla. In any case, it clearly establishes the closest relationship between the Râthors and Gaharwârs. Again, Benares is generally considered the original country of the Gaharwârs, who, it is often asserted, are descended from ancient kings of Benares; and their chief seat is still in the Benares Division and in Bihâr. This makes in support of the theory that the Pâla kings of Bihâr and Bengal, who also ruled in Benares, belonged to the Gaharwâr clan, and consequently were closely related to the Râthors of Kanauj. It is true there is an indistinct tradition, which ascribes the Pâla Râjas to the Bihâr Râjas, but there is no proof of it. In their inscriptions the Pâlas make no mention of their caste. On the other hand, there are various incidental notices in them, which indicate their having been of a Râjpût caste. Thus Vignâhapâla is said to have married the princess Lajâ of the Haihâya race; this would hardly have occurred if the Pâla Râjas had really belonged to a nondescript race, like the Bihâr Râjas.

I only throw this out as a suggestion. It is by no means a new one; Mr. Prinsep already made it in the Jour. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. IV Part I. p. 670. But much additional information in support of it has since come to light.

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, BS. C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E.

(Continued from p. 59.)

NO. CLV.

BASahi PLATE OF GOVINDACHANDRA.

SAMVAT 1161.

The original plate containing the inscription now published is in the Government Museum at Lucknow. It was originally found in the village of 'Basahi,' two miles to the north-east of the head-quarters town of the 'Bilhunâ' Tahsil in the 'Etawah' District in the North-West Provinces, and was first brought to notice by Mr. E. T. Atkinson, of Allahâbâd. "The village is in a small khârd or mound, into which a Thâkur cultivator was digging for bricks to build a house. He came on the remains of a pakkâ house, in the wall of which there were two recesses (tâk)

11 See the traditions, above quoted, of the Gaharwârs and Râthors in Elliot's Races of the N. W. Provinces, pp. 121-124; and Sherrin's Hindu Tribes and Castes, Vol. I. pp. 140, 141, 175-177.
sunken surface,—across the centre, the legend Śrīmad-Govinda ākṣa[ṇ]drdēvaḥ; in the upper part, Garuḍa, half-man and half-bird, kneeling and facing full-front; and in the lower part, either a kālkha-shell or a chauri. Also the plate itself has a kālkha-shell, with a barred arrow below it, engraved on the left margin. The seal slides on a ring about 4" thick and 3½" in diameter, which had been cut when the grant came under my notice. This ring runs on a smaller ring, about 3½" thick and 2½" in diameter, which also had been cut. And this second ring runs loosely through the turned-over end of a copper band,—about 1½" broad at the widest part, and tapering to the other end; and with a pattern of cross-lines on part of the outside of it,—which is secured by a rivet which passes through a small hole in the top of the plate. The weight of the plate is 7lbs. 12½oz., and of the seal, two rings, band, and rivet, 2lbs. 13½oz.; total, 10lbs. 10oz. The characters are Nāgari. The language of the inscription is Sanskrit throughout.

The inscription opens with an invocation of Vāsudēva (line 1), or the god Krishṇa or Vishṇu, followed by a verse in praise of the same god under the name of Dāmādara. It then continues,—In the lineage named Gāhādavaḷa (l. 2), there was a victorious king, the son of Māhīḷa, named Chandrādeva (l. 4), who,—on the death of king Bhōja (l. 3) and king Karṣa, the world became troubled,—came to the rescue and became king, and established his capital at Kānyākūṭa (l. 5). His son was Madanapāla (l. 6). His son was the famous Gōvindaśaṇḍra (l. 7), the maker of the grant. Lines 8 and 9 record the date, in words and figures; viz. Samvat 1161, Ravidina or Śunday, the fifth day of the bright fortnight of the month of Puṣaṇa,—corresponding, by the northern reckoning, according to the Tables in General Cunningham’s Indian Eras, to Sunday, the 25th December A.D. 1194. Line 9 proceeds to record that, having bathed in the river Yamunā at the place called Asatiṅka or Āṣatiṅka, and having done worship to the Sun (l. 10) and Śiva and Vāsudēva, Gōvindachandra issues his commands to all the Mahattamas and other people of the village of Vāsabhī (l. 11) in the Śrī vā tī pattalā, to the effect that the said village of Vāsabhī,—bounded on the east by the village of Vāṇdhamaunī (l. 13) ; on the west by the village of Vādāvalā; on the south by the village of Pusāuli; and on the north by the village of Sāvabhāda,—was granted him, on the occasion of the uttarīvyāna-samātānti (l. 16) or the sun’s commencement of his progress to the north, to the Brāhmaṇ Ālīkē (l. 15), of the Bhārya śūkla, and the Gautama gūtra, with the three pravrajas of Gautama and Avitatha and Aṅgrīsas,—the son of Kalpē or Kalyē, and the son’s son of Mēṇē. Lines 17 to 21 contain five of the customary benedictive and impercative verses. And lines 21 and 22 record that the charter was written, i. e. composed, by the Paṇḍit Vijayadasa, the son of Kūkē, with the permission of the Purāṅa Jāgāka, the Mahattaka Śrī Vālaṃa, and the Praṭṭhāra Gautama.

Of the villages mentioned in this inscription, Vāsabhī is of course the modern ‘Basahi’ itself. Vāṇdhamaunī is the modern ‘Bāṇdhmau,’ three miles to the east of ‘Basahi.’ Pusāuli still exists under the same name, two miles to the south of ‘Basahi.’ And Sāvabhāda is the modern ‘Sahhād,’ two and a half miles to the north by west of ‘Basahi.’ These identifications were made by Mr. Atkinson. Jīvāṭalī, the name of the pattalā or district in which Vāsabhī was situated,—and Vāḍāvalā, on its western boundary,—have not been identified; but Mr. Atkinson suggested the modern ‘Jīva-Sīrśā,’ the ‘Jīva-Sīrśā’ of maps, eight miles south-east of ‘Basahi,’ for the former,—and the modern ‘Bantharā,’ one and three-quarter miles to the west of ‘Basahi,’ for the latter. Asatiṅka or Āṣatiṅka on the Jamnā, where Gōvindachandra bathed before making the grant, has not been identified.

and he straightway proceeds, through the introduction of Bhōja into this family, to “make the dynasty of Gāhādavaḷa to be the same with that of Dērāsaktī” (see General Stâty’s grant, Jour. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. XVII. Part I. p. 315, and Vol. XXXI. Part I. p. 14f., and the Dīgha-Debānanda grant, id. Vol. XXXII. Part I. p. 32f.).—All this is utterly untenable. The text is perfectly plain, if properly understood; and the purport of it is as I have given it.

* * *

* See note 36 below.
TRANSLATION.*

[1] Óūn Óūn Namô bhagavatô Vâsudêvâ || Tam'âdyäma sarvâ-devânâm Dâmôdaraù
upâsmahaù | trailôkyâma yaça v âkt-eva !
dhô || kshôjÇpatin-tu-tilakô ripu-raiñiga bhãngô || Gô
vrikshâcãndrama iti viśrata-râjaputra || Saññvat sahasaikô || èka-åsha-yutta-sât-ùbhôyadhike Pausa-mâsê ùîkì-paśhê painchamyùnâ Râvindî-sêkê saññva
[8] t 1161 Pausa su(ù) di 5 Râvau | ady-ôh=Ascikâyùn sakala-kalmasa-khôjã
kârînyam Yumunâyam snâtâ vayô-vídhânâ || mantrâvadé-rîshi || ma
[9] nushya-bhûta-pîtrî(ôtrî) ùs=tarpîvã || sùryan bharatrapa sarvâ karttaraù bhagavat
[10] ta Sivaù vívbhâranaù Vâsudêvâ samabhyajâ || hutavaham huvâ || (11) Jîvâtô ||
tahê || sa-daâpârâda-daâdañ bhâgakûta-kaô-sâvam(ba)hî-vistosâ(hô) || prastth-åksha-pa
talâparatha-pratlâpartha-kârara-turnakâdanâ varvajô(hô) || bi
[13] grâmâ(ma)h ävam chatur-âghasta-viçuddhaù | mâtâpitôr=atmanâ-sa yasa-pûnayà
vivridhâhayê || jala-vudvud=âkaraù jivañâm dâna-bhôga-philân lakshmi[im]jñâvât
[14] ||
Mêmê-paçtraya Kalpû(îyê)-putraya jyôtr-viçèd vâ(ç)hâmanâ-Ålihê ||
[16] || kâya mahàrâjaputra-årîmad-Gôvîndachandrâdeva uttarâyana(ôs)=sañkraùtañ kuśa
pûtêna hast-ôdakêna chandrîrâkkanô ýâvat sasânâvatna pradattathô ||
[17] Yë || yasyant Ô mahîbhirôt mama kulô kîmô parasmin puras-têshâm=êshâ may=|a
Âjilirî=viçrîhitô n-ådâyam=asmat=kiyat || dûrvvâ-mûtram-api su-dharmam-ni

---

*From my own ink-impression.

Metro, Sûkka (Anushabha); and in the following verse.

6 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary.

7 Metro, Sragadhâra.

8 Dr. Râjendralal Mitra read Karîl; but wrongly.

9 Read vicetas. 10 Metro, Sûkka (Anushabha.)

11 After vîç, an anâgra, which does occur in line 8, appears to have been engraved and cancelled.

12 Metro, Vasantatilaka; and in the following verse.

13 Read ésâhikô. 14 This mark of punctuation is unnecessary. If required at all, it should have been inserted after sâmâtv.

15 Read dé-cavahô. 16 Read tarpayivâtô.

17 Dr. Râjendralal Mitra read Jîvônas; but I think the last akshara is ë, not â, though the burr of the copper makes it look rather like ì.

18 This mark of punctuation should properly stand after yatâô.
THE EXPLANATION OF THE TERM PALIDHVAJA.

BY K. B. PATHAK, B.A.; MIKAJ.

The term pālidhvaja, or pālidhāna, is of frequent occurrence in inscriptions, and also in Jainas books; but no satisfactory explanation of its meaning has as yet been arrived at.

I have, however, lately come across a passage in the Akṣ-Purāṇa, given below, in which Jinasāñdrakṣyas, the preceptor of the Rāṣṭrākutās emperor Amogha-varsha I., while dwelling on the subject of flags, incidentally explains this term.

We learn from what he says, that the term pālidhvaja, or pālidhāna, does not itself mean any particular kind of flag, but denotes a peculiar arrangement in rows of the ten kinds of flags described below;—pāli, in Sanskrit, in fact, signifies 'a row.' In each direction, a hundred and eight flags of each kind, or, in other words, a thousand and eighty flags in all, are ranged in lines. Thus, the total number of flags, in the four directions, is four thousand three hundred and twenty.

We are further told that the Lord Jina adopted the pālidhvaja, as an indication of his universal empire over the three worlds after the conquest of Mōkha or Madya, or 'delusion.' Lakṣmaṇaśāhātārakā, the head of the Jina Muṣṭi at Kolhipur, says that some years ago a pālidhvaja was constructed there in honour of Mahāvīra.

Text.

वर्णपञ्चसाहसमानेष्वर्णी मुनिविद्याय ।
पुष्पमेचरणान्ध्रयास्य नुस्त्रर्यभरकः। ॥ २१९
अंतिर्विद्युत्क्रियम् योयं कपलितमाना। ॥ २२०
क्रीणस्य दिविधित्रेष्वर्णतेर्भालोपयेति। ॥ २२१

७३ मेत्र, शिल्का (अमुश्वकभ); and in the following three verses.
९० This, which is a very unusual word, is probably a mistake for महाठमान, which we have in line 11.—Dr.

The original manuscript is in Old-Kanarese characters.
TRANSLATION.

(Verse 219). There are ten kinds of flags, such as those of garlands, cloths, peacocks, lotuses, geese, eagles, lions, bulls, elephants, and wheels.— (220.) A hundred and eight flags of each kind, raised aloft in each direction and resembling the waves of the ocean, are to be known as Pāliṣṭhavījas:— (221.) The group of those streamers flowing in the wind, shone, as if it were desirous to invite the gods and men to the worship of Jīna.— (222.) In the garland-flags, heavenly wreaths of flowers, made by the gods, hung for the delight of the virtuous:— (223.) The fine-cloth-flags, moved and raised by the wind, shone like big waves, rising in the ocean of the sky.— (224.) In the peacock-flags, peacocks, sportively throwing up their plumage, and with cloth in their mouths, shone, swallowing the discarded skins of snakes which they mistook for the snakes (themselv— (225.) In the lotus-flags, lotuses, by the spreading of a thousand leaflets, blown about in the sky which resembled a lake, shone as though they were real lotuses.— (226.) The images of them, reflected below on the surface of the earth, deceived the black bees which followed them from an idea that they were real lotuses.— (227.) Seeing their beauty at that time, nowhere else to be found, Lakśmi abandoned all the lotuses, and took up her abode in them.— (228.) In the geese-flags, geese, holding white cloths in the points of their beaks, appeared to extend the whiteness of their bodies5 in the shape of a white cloth.— (229.) Eagles, seated on the tops of the eagles-flags, shone as if desirous to take flight, with their faces turned upwards by the movements of their wings.— (230.) The eagles, reflected on a ground studded with blue gems, appeared like the images of eagles entering the lower world to catch the kings of the serpents.— (231.) On the lion-flags, lions, about to spring, appeared intent upon vanquishing the heavenly elephants.— (232.) The large pearls, hanging from the faces of the lions, looked like flame acquired by breaking open the temples of great elephants.— (233.) Bulls, with long streamers attached to the tips of their horns, shone as if they had gained banners of victory by conquering their foes.— (234.) Large elephants, holding flags with their uplifted trunks, shone like lordly mountains with torrents descending from their peaks.— (235.) Flags of wheels, having a thousand spokes with waving streamers, shone as if desirous of rivalling the sun.— (236.) The great banners shone, as if brushing the sky, and as if embracing the women who are the distant regions, and as if causing the earth to shake.— (237.) Thus these flags, gained by his victory over delusion, shone, announcing the undivided way of the Lord over the three worlds.— (238.) In one direction, all the flags were one thousand and eighty; and, in the four directions, they were four thousand three hundred and twenty.

THE MALAYAS OF THE MUDRARAKSHASA, AND THE DOMINIONS OF KING PARVATESVARA.

BY KESHAV H. DHRUVA, B.A.; AHMADABAD.

In his Introduction to the Mudrārakshasas, lately published in the Bombay Sanskrit Series, Mr. Telang has succeeded in determining the geographical positions of most of the various peoples and localities whose names are mentioned in the play.

* Conf. कलित्वी हरिजनस्य वाक्याँ कथा मृत्यु यथा. हस्तिएण्ड मित्रां: || २० || तापकाशाश्रयै प्रयोग्या शिरातितिसिद्धिनां || ॥ ॥

Adi-Purāṇa, chap. XXXIII.
There is one name, however, viz. Malaya, about which he expresses himself with doubt. His remarks are:—“Malaya, if our reading is correct, is the only southern locality alluded to in the play. It is near the southernmost extremity of the Western Ghats.” And, a little further on, in concluding his examination of the various elements that constituted the armies of Chandragupta and Malayaketa, the son and successor of Parvatavara, in their successive attempts upon Pushapura, he writes—“A review of all these names shows that, except the name Malaya, they, one and all, belong to the northern parts, and most to the northern frontier, of India.”

These quotations seem to show that Mr. Telang has misgivings as to the correctness of the reading of the name of Malaya, on the grounds—I. that the localities, alluded to in the play, all belong to the country north of the Vindhyas; II. that there is no locality known by the name of Malaya in the north;—and III. that it is, therefore, identical with the Malaya which is situated near the southern extremity of the Western Ghats.

If this statement be analysed, it will be found to involve two suppositions;—I. that the name Malaya, occurring in the play, is meant to be the name of a locality; and II. that, as there is no locality of this name in the north, it must be identified with the country of that name in southern India.

Now the word Malaya is never used singly in the play. It is always found conjoined with others, so as to form compound words. It occurs for the first time at page 48, in the compound Malayanapati, which is the reading of all the copies consulted by the editor. The name of this Malayanapati is Siinhanka. The passage, where the word is next met with, occurs at page 204. The reading adopted there by the editor is Malayanapati (= Malayanapatri). In its place, the manuscripts marked P. and M. seem to read Malayanapati (= Malayanapatri), which is softened to Malayanapati in manuscript E. The Bengal text of Professor Tarana Tarka-Vachaspati, i.e. the copy denoted by B., gives Malayanapati (= Malayanapatri);

... and manuscript G. reads simply Malavanaka (= Malavanapati). The word occurs for the last time at page 221. Here the text reads Malavanapati;—whereas manuscripts B. E., and N. give Malavanapati;—and G. gives Malavanapati.

We must here consider what the word Malaya is commonly used to denote, as a name of a locality. Mr. Telang observes that it is used to signify either the mountain Malaya, or the country about it; it is never known to stand for a particular place or city.

If the reading Malavanapati at page 204 be accepted as correct, it must be taken to mean either “the lord of the city of Malayanagara,” or, what is equally probable, “the lord of the country so named after its capital Malayanagara.” In either case, the name Malayanagara must be interpreted as “the city of the Malaya people.” To interpret it as “the city named Malaya (Malayanakarah),” goes against the fact that there was no place of that name. Nor can it be understood to mean “the city situated on the Malaya mountain,” or “in the country named after it”; for that way of interpretation is unusual. Thus, then, it follows that the word Malaya is used to denote a particular tribe, and not a locality. Independently of this, the readings of manuscripts P., M. and E. here, and of manuscript G. at page 221, prove the same fact. They state in clear terms that Siinhanka was the lord of the Malaya people (Malavanapati). Hence the word Malavanapati occurring in the text at page 48 and in the footnotes at page 221, and its equivalent Malavanapati in the text at page 221, must be interpreted in the same way. And in support of this interpretation, I would refer to page 207 of the play itself, where the words Shankapati and Shankapatil are used in a similar way. In conformity with this view, the reading Malavanaka of G., which apparently stands alone, must be understood to mean “the lord of the Malayas.” That this is the meaning intended to be conveyed by it, is evident from the variant Malavanapati given by the copy for Malavanapati at page 221. The correctness of the text of B. is open to much suspicion. Its reading Malavanapati is not...

1. The term Malavanaka is not so loosely used as the term श्रृणुति, नरपाति, &c., which simply mean ‘a king.’

It denotes something more, viz. a king of a particular tribe or people (अत्र).
supported by any of the manuscripts consulted by Mr. Telang. It, therefore, appears that the superfluous syllables बद are spurious additions. If these redundant syllables are rejected, the copy will be found to agree in many respects with manuscripts P. and M., and, in material points, with manuscript E. also. Thus the copies P. M. E. and B. will be all in favour of the reading that is rendered into Sanskrit by मलयानाथियोः, “the lord of the Malayam people.”

The omission of the syllables अन in the reading मलआहियोः, and the addition of the syllables बद in the reading मलाधनानवराहियोः, seem to be due to a preconception that the word Malaya designates a country here. And this must have originated from the fact that Kuluta and Kasmira, both names of countries, are mentioned immediately before and after Malaya.

Mr. Telang expresses considerable doubt as to whether the reading मलयनगर given by the other manuscripts, is right; and there is little doubt that the reading is incorrect. Though the copies are here almost equally divided in reading मल्लक्ष्मिनाथियोः and मल्लक्ष्माराहियोः, yet their unanimous concurrence at page 48 in reading मलयनराहियोः, and not मल्लक्ष्मिनाथियोः,—which ought to have occurred at least as a variant* if मल्लक्ष्माराहियोः were correct,—inclines us to believe that the original reading in this place was मल्लक्ष्माराहियोः, and that a second अ was afterwards interpolated by ignorant copyists. By this slight alteration, the various readings of page 204 are made to accord one with another. मल्लक्ष्माराहियोः is the same thing as मल्लक्ष्माराहियोः; since the word नर is synonymous with अन. For its interpretation it may be compared with मल्लक्ष्माराहियोः, मल्लक्ष्माराहियोः, शक्ताराहियोः &c. The reading thus arrived at renders irrelevant all search for the assumed Malayananagara, which appears to be simply the production of a clerical error.

From all that is set out above, it follows that Malaya, as used in this play, was the name of a people, and not of a locality. It now remains to attempt to identify the people, and to ascertain their geographical position.

The internal evidence furnished by the play certainly points to the northern frontier of India as the seat of these people. The territory of the prince Malayaksetra must have been bounded by the states of Kasmira and Kuluta, and the land of the Malayas; for the kings of these provinces are represented, by a secret agent of Chakravyuha, to be all intent on seizing the kingdom of the prince and partitioning it among themselves. Hence the Malayas must be looked for in the vicinity of Kuluta and Kasmira.

We turn now to the testimony of the Chinese traveller, Huen Tsiang, who observes that to the north of Kiu-lo-to (Kuluta) there was the country of Lo-u-lo (Lahul). Still further to the north he places the country of Mo-lo-so, which would thus fall just about on the eastern boundary of the Kasmira of the seventh century. The name and position accord so well with the brief description of the land of the Malayas given by the author of the play, that it makes it almost certain that the country of Mo-lo-so, spoken of by the Chinese pilgrim, must be the land of the Malayas. General Cunningham, it is true,—in identifying the country mentioned by Huen Tsiang with Marpo or Ladakh,—prefers reading Mo-lo-pu for Mo-lo-so. But Mo-lo-so seems to be so easily derivable from such a word as Malayavas, 'the habitation of the Malayas,' that I would accept it as the proper reading. And Marpo itself is derivable from any such synonymous expression as Malayapada, which has the same meaning.

Thus, then, both the internal evidence of the play, and the independent testimony of the Chinese traveller, agree in locating Mo-lo-so or Malayapada, 'the habitation of the Malayas,' on the northern frontier of India, and somewhere on the eastern limits of the Kasmira of the seventh century.

The result thus arrived at will enable us to ascertain the position of the kingdom of the king Parvatēśvara, or Śailēśvara, as he is generally called in the play. The name Parvatēśvara or Śailēśvara literally means 'the king of the mountain,' by which is commonly understood the Himalaya mountains. What portion of the Himalaya range formed the kingdom of Parvatēśvara, can be easily determined from the geographical data given at

* It may be remarked in further corroboration of my supposition, that, even at page 221, no such variation as मलयनराहियोः or मल्लक्ष्मिनाथियोः is to be found.
FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY S. M. NATESA SASTRI PANDIT.

VIII.—The Mother-in-law Became an Ass.

Little by little the mother-in-law became an ass—varavara māma kaṭudai pōl ānl, is a proverb among the Tamils, applied to those who day by day go downwards in their progress in study, position, or life, and based on the following story:

In a certain village there lived a Brāhmaṇ with his wife, mother, and mother-in-law. He was a very good man, and equally kind to all of them. His mother complained of nothing from his hands, but his wife was a very bad-tempered woman, and always troubled her mother-in-law by keeping her engaged in this work or that throughout the day, and giving her very little food in the evening. Owing to this the poor Brāhmaṇ’s mother was almost dying of misery. On the other hand, her own mother received very kind treatment, of course, at her daughter’s hands, by whom the husband was so completely ruled over, that he had no strength of mind to oppose her ill-treatment of his mother.

One evening, just before sun-set, the wife abused her mother-in-law with such fury, that the latter had to fly away to escape a thrashing. Much vexed at her unhappiness she ran out of the village, but the sun had begun to set, and the darkness of night was fast overtaking her. So finding a ruined temple she entered it to pass the night there. It happened to be the abode of the village Kāli (goddess), who used to come out every night at midnight to inspect her village. That night she perceived a woman—the mother of the poor Brāhmaṇ—lurking within her prādhānas (boundaries), and being a most benevolent Kāli called out to her, and asked her what made her so miserable that she should leave her home on such a dark night. The old Brāhmaṇ told her story in a few words, and while she was speaking the cunning goddess was using her supernatural powers to see whether all she said was true or not, and finding it to be the truth she thus replied in very soothing tones:—

“I pity your misery, mother, because your daughter-in-law troubles and vexes you thus when you have become old, and have no strength in your body. Now take this mango,” and taking a ripe one from out of her hips, she gave it to the old Brāhmaṇ with a smiling face—“eat it, and you will soon turn out a young woman like your own daughter-in-law, and then she shall no longer trouble you.” Thus consoling the afflicted old woman, the kind-hearted Kāli went away. The Brāhmaṇ lingered for the remainder of the night in the temple, and being a fond mother she did not like to eat the whole of the mango without giving a portion of it to her son.

Meanwhile, when her son returned home in the evening he found his mother absent, but his wife explained the matter to him, so as to throw the blame on the old woman, as she always did. As it was dark he had no chance of going out to search for her, so he waited for the daylight, and as soon as he saw the dawn started to look for his mother. He had not walked far when to his joy he found her in the temple of Kāli.

“How did you pass the cold night, my dearest mother?” said he. “What did you have for dinner? Wretch that I am to have got myself married to a cur. Forget all her faults, and return home.”

His mother shed tears of joy and sorrow, and related her previous night’s adventure wherein he said:

“Delay not even one nimisha (minute), but eat this fruit at once. I do not want any of it. Only if you become young and strong enough to stand that nasty cur’s troubles, well and good.”

So the mother ate up the divine fruit, and the son took her upon his shoulders and brought
her home, on reaching which he placed her on the ground, when to his joy she was no longer an old woman, but a young girl of sixteen, and stronger than his own wife. The troublesome wife was now totally put down, and was powerless against so strong a mother-in-law.

She did not at all like the change, and having to give up her habits of bullying, and so she argued to herself thus—"This jade of a mother-in-law became young through the fruit of the Kāḷī, why should not my mother also do the same, if I instruct her and send her to the same temple." So she instructed her mother as to the story she ought to give to the goddess, and sent her there. Her old mother agreeably to her daughter's injunctions went to the temple, and on meeting with the goddess at midnight gave a false answer that she was being greatly ill-treated by her daughter-in-law, though, in truth, she had nothing of the kind to complain of. The goddess perceived the lie through her divine powers, but apparently seeming to pity her, gave her also a fruit. Her daughter had instructed her not to eat it till next morning and till she saw her son-in-law.

As soon as morning approached the poor hempecked Brāhmaṇ was ordered by his wife to go to the temple and fetch his mother-in-law as he had some time back fetched away his mother. He accordingly went, and invited her to come home. She wanted him to eat part of the fruit, as she had been instructed, but he refused, and so she swallowed it all, fully expecting to become young again on reaching home. Meanwhile her son-in-law took her on his shoulders and returned home, expecting, as his former experience had taught him, to see his mother-in-law also become a young woman. Anxiety to see how the change came on overcame him and at half way he turned his head and found such part of the burden on his shoulders as he could see to be like parts of an ass, but he took this to be a mere preliminary stage towards youthful womanhood. Again he turned, and again he saw the same thing several times, and the more he looked the more his burden became like an ass, till at last when he reached home his burden jumped down braying like an ass and ran away.

Thus the Kāḷī, perceiving the evil intentions of the wife disappointed her by turning her mother into an ass, but no one knew of it till she actually jumped down from the shoulders of her son-in-law.

This story is always cited as the explanation of the proverb quoted above—varavara mānū kuladai pōl kaddi—little by little the mother-in-law became an ass, to which is also commonly added sur varumbūṇā āhāyāda talīappattāl— and as she approached the village she began to bray.

IX.—The Story of Appattā.1

अपूपफ़ा हत्या; धराफ़ 
हता वरुण मेसरी।
दुर्गोण हते सन्नमु
विचिन्नायकासरणी।

In a remote village there lived a poor Brāhmaṇ and his wife. Though several years of their wedded life had passed they unfortunately had no children; and so being very eager for a child, and having no hope of one by his first wife, the poor Brāhmaṇ made up his mind to marry a second. His wife would not permit it for some time, but finding her husband resolved, she gave way, thinking within herself that she would manage somehow to do away with the second wife. As soon as he had got her consent the Brāhmaṇ arranged for his second marriage and wedded a beautiful Brāhmaṇ girl. She went to live with him in the same house with the first wife, who, thinking that she would be making the world suspicious if she did anything suddenly, waited for some time.

Īśvara himself seemed to favour the new marriage, and the second wife, a year after her wedding, becoming pregnant, went in the sixth month of her pregnancy to her mother's house for her confinement. Her husband bore his separation from her patiently for a fortnight, but after this the desire to see her again began to prey upon his mind, and he was always asking his first wife as to when he ought to go to her. She seemed to sympathise fully with his trouble and said:

"My dearest husband, your health is being daily injured, and I am glad that your lover for her has not made it worse than it is. To-morrow you must start on a visit to her.

1 [Compare the tale of Pātā, the Valiant Weaver, ende Vol. XI. p. 282 ff.—Ed.]
It is said that we should not go empty-handed to children, a king, or a pregnant woman: so I shall give you one hundred apūpa cakes, packed up separately in a vessel, which you must give to her. You are very fond of apūpas, and I fear that you will eat some of them on the way: but you had better not do so. And I will give you some cakes packed in a cloth separately for you to eat on your journey."

So the first wife spent the whole night in preparing the apūpa cakes, and mixed poison in the sugar and rice-flour of those she made for her co-wife and rival; but as she entertained no enmity against her husband the apūpa cakes for him were properly prepared. By the time the morning dawned she had packed up the hundred apūpas in a brass vessel, which could be easily carried on a man's head.

After a light breakfast—for a heavy one is always bad before a journey on foot—the Brāhmaṇ placed the brass vessel on his head, and holding in his hand the kherchief containing the food for himself on the way started for the village of his second wife, which happened to be at a distance of two days' journey. He walked in hot haste till evening approached, and when the darkness of night overtook him, the rapidity of his walk had exhausted him, and he felt very hungry. He espied a wayside shed and a tank near his path, and entered the water to perform his evening ablution to the god of the day, who was fast going down below the horizon. As soon as this was over he untied his kherchief, and did full justice to its contents by swallowing every cake whole. He then drank some water and, being quite overcome by fatigue, fell into a deep slumber in the shed, with his brass vessel and its sweet, or rather poisonous, contents under his head.

Close by the spot where the Brāhmaṇ slept there reigned a famous king who had a very beautiful daughter. Several persons demanded her hand in marriage, among whom was a robber chieftain, who wanted her for his only son. Though the king liked the boy for his beauty, the thought that he was only a robber for all that prevented him from making up his mind to give his daughter in marriage to him. The robber-lord, however, was determined to have his own way, and accordingly despatched one hundred of his band to fetch away the princess in the night without her knowledge while she was sleeping, to his palace in the woods. In obedience to their chieftain's order the robbers, on the night the Brāhmaṇ happened to sleep in the shed, entered the king's palace and stole away the princess, together with the cot on which she was sleeping. On reaching the shed the hundred robbers found themselves very thirsty—for being awake at midnight always brings on thirst. So they placed the cot on the ground and were entering the water to quench their thirst. Just then they smelt the apūpa cakes, which, for all that they contained poison, had a very sweet savour. The robbers searched about the shed, and found the Brāhmaṇ sleeping on one side, and the brass vessel lying at a distance from him, for he had pushed it from underneath his head when he had stretched himself in his sleep. They opened the vessel and to their joy found in it exactly one hundred apūpa cakes.

"We have here one for each of us, and that is something better than mere water. Let us each eat before we go into it," said the leader of the gang, and at once each man swallowed greedily what he had in his hand, and immediately all fell down dead. Lucky it was that no one knew of the old Brāhmaṇ's trick. Had the robbers any reason to suspect it they would never have eaten the cakes. Had the Brāhmaṇ known it he would never have brought them with him for his dear second wife. Lucky was it for the poor old Brāhmaṇ and his second wife, and lucky was it for the sleeping princess, that these cakes went, after all, into the stomachs of the villainous robbers!

After sleeping his fill the Brāhmaṇ, who had been dreaming of his second wife all night, awoke in haste to pursue the remainder of his journey to her house. He could not find his brass vessel, but near the place where he had left it he found several men of the woods, whom he knew very well by their appearance to be robbers, as he thought, sleeping. Angered at the loss of his vessel he took up a sword from one of the dead robbers and cut off all their heads, thinking all the while that he was killing one hundred living robbers, who were sleeping after having eaten all his cakes. Presently the princess's cot fell under his gaze, and he approached it and found on it a most beautiful lady fast asleep. Being an
intelligent man he perceived that the persons whose heads he had cut off, must have been some thieves, or other wicked men, who had carried her off. He was not long in doubt, for not far off he saw an army marching up rapidly with a king at its head, who was saying, "Down with the robber who has stolen away my daughter." The Brāhmaṇ at once inferred that this must be the father of the sleeping princess, and suddenly waking her up from her sleep spoke thus to her:

"Behold before you the hundred robbers that brought you here a few hours ago from your palace. I fought one and all of them single handed and have killed them all."

The princess was highly pleased at what she heard, for she knew of all the tricks the robbers had previously played to carry her off. So she fell reverently at the Brāhmaṇ's feet and said:

"Friend, never till now have I heard of a warrior who single-handed fought one hundred robbers. Your valour is unparalleled. I will be your wife, if only in remembrance of your having saved me from falling into the hands of these ruffians."

Her father and his army was now near the shed, for he had all along watched the conduct of the robber chieftain, and as soon as the maidservants of the palace informed him of the disappearance of the princess and her cot, he marched straight with his soldiery for the woods. His joy, when he saw his daughter safe, knew no bounds, and he flew into his daughter's arms, while she pointed to the Brāhmaṇ as her preserver. The king now put a thousand questions to our hero, who, being well versed in matters of fighting, gave sound replies, and so came successfully out of his first adventure. The king, astonished at his valour, took him to his palace, and rewarded him with the hand of the princess. And the robber chieftain, fearing the now son-in-law who single-handed had killed a hundred of his robbers, never troubled himself about the princess. Thus the Brāhmaṇ's first adventure ended in making him son-in-law to a king!

Now there lived a lioness in a wood near the princess's country, who had a great taste for human flesh, and so once a week the king used to send a man into the wood to serve as her prey. All the people now collected together before the king and said:

"Most honoured king, while you have a son-in-law who killed one hundred robbers with his sword, why should you continue to send a man into the wood every week. We request you to send your son-in-law next week to the wood and have the lioness killed."

This seemed most reasonable to the king, who called for his son-in-law and sent him armed to the teeth into the wood.

Now our Brāhmaṇ could not refuse to go for fear of losing the fame of his former exploit, and hoping that fortune would favour him, he asked his father-in-law to have him hoisted up into a big banyan tree with all kinds of weapons, and this was done. The appointed time for the lioness to eat her prey approached, and as she saw no one coming for her, and as sometimes those that had to come used to linger for a short time in the tree in which the Brāhmaṇ had taken refuge, she went up to it to see that no such trick has been played upon her this time. This made the Brāhmaṇ tremble so violently that he dropped the sword he held in his hand. At that very moment the lioness happened to yawn and the sword dropped right into her jaws and killed her. As soon as the Brāhmaṇ saw the course which events had taken, he came down from the tree and invented a thousand stories of how he had given battle to the terrible lioness and overcome her. This exploit fully established his valour, and feasts and rejoicings in honour of it followed, and the whole country round blessed the son-in-law of their king.

Near this kingdom there also reigned a powerful emperor, who levied tribute from all the surrounding countries. To this emperor the father-in-law of our most valorous Brāhmaṇ, who, at one stroke, had killed one hundred robbers and, at another, a fierce lioness, had also to pay a certain amount of tribute; but trusting to the power of his son-in-law, he stopped the tribute to the emperor, who, by the way, was named Appayya Rāja, and who, as soon as the tribute was stopped, invaded his dominions, and his father in law besought the Brāhmaṇ for assistance.

Again the poor Brāhmaṇ could not refuse; for if he did all his former fame would be lost. So he determined to undertake this adventure also, and to trust to fortune rather than give up the attempt. He asked for
the best horse and the sharpest sword and set out to fight the enemy, who had already encamped on the other side of the river, which flowed at a short distance to the east of the town.

Now the king had a very unruly horse, which had never been broken in, and this he gave his son-in-law; and, supplying him with a sharp sword, asked him to start. The Brāhmaṇ then asked the king's servants to tie him up with cotton strings tight on to the saddle, and set out on the expedition.

The horse, having never till then felt a man on its back, began to gallop most furiously, and flew onwards so fast that all who saw it thought the rider must lose his life, and he too was almost dead with fear. He tried his best to curb his steed, but the more he pulled the faster it galloped, till giving up all hopes of life he let it take its course. It jumped into the water and swam across to the other side of the river, wetting the cotton cords by which the Brāhmaṇ was tied down to the saddle, making them swell and giving him the most excruciating pain. He bore it, however, with all the patience imaginable. Presently the horse reached the other side of the river, where there was a big palmyra tree, which a recent flood had left almost uprooted and ready to fall at the slightest touch. The Brāhmaṇ, unable to stop the course of the horse, held fast on to the tree, hoping thus to check its wild career. But unfortunately for him the tree gave way, and the steed galloped on so furiously that he did not know which was the safer—to leave the tree or to hold on to it. Meanwhile the wet cotton cords hurt him so that he, in the hopelessness of despair, bawled out āppa! āppa! On went his steed, and still he held on to the palmyra tree. Though now fighting for his own life, the people that were watching him from a great distance thought him to be flying to the battlefield armed with a palmyra tree! The cry of lamentation āppa āppa, which he uttered, his enemy mistook for a challenge, because, as we know, his name happened to be Āppaṇa.

Horror-struck at the sight of a warrior armed with a huge tree, his enemy turned and fled. Tathā rajā tathā prajā—"As is the king so are the subjects,"—and accordingly his followers also fled. The Brāhmaṇ warrior (!) seeing the fortunate course events had again taken pursued the enemy, or rather let his courser have its own furious way. Thus the enemy and his vast army melted away in the twinkling of an eye and the horse, too, when it became exhausted, returned towards the palace.

The old king had been watching from the loftiest rooms of his palace all that had passed on the other side of the river, and believing his son-in-law had, by his own prowess, driven out the enemy, approached him with all pomp. Eager hands quickly cut the knots by which the victorious (!) Brāhmaṇ had been held tight in his saddle, and his old father-in-law with tears of joy embraced him and congratulated him on his victory, saying that the whole kingdom was indebted to him. A splendid triumphal march was conducted, in which the eyes of the whole town were directed towards our victorious hero.

Thus, on three different occasions, and in three different adventures, fortune favoured the poor Brāhmaṇ and brought him fame. He then sent for his two former wives and took them into his palace. His second wife, who was pregnant, when he first started with the apāya cakes to see her, had given birth to a male child, who was, when she came back to him, more than a year old. The first wife confessed to her husband her sin of having given him poisoned cakes and crave his pardon; and it was only now that he came to know that the hundred robbers he killed in his first adventure were all really dead men, and that they must have died from the effects of the poison in the cakes, and since her treachery had given him a new start in life he forgave her. She, too, gave up her enmity to the partners of her husband's bed, and all the four lived in peace and plenty for many a long day afterwards.

OMENS FROM THE FALLING OF HOUSE LIZARDS.

BY K. RAGHUNATHJI.

Men.
If a lizard falls on a man's head or top-knot, he will be happy; if on the exact spot where the hair is tied by a knot, it causes a disease; if on the ends of the hair, it means ruin, and if on the skull, it denotes death. If a lizard

1 Which in Tamiḻ are exclamations of lamentation, meaning, Ah! Also
falls on the forehead wealth is obtained; if on the right cheek, any wealth specially wished for is obtained; if on the left cheek, the man is blessed with a sight of his deceased relations; and if in the middle of the cheek, he will get his "daily bread."

If a lizard falls on the eye-brows, there will be a loss of wealth, but if between them, there will be an accretion of wealth. If it drops on to the right eye, the omen is good, but if on to the left, imprisonment is sure to follow.

If a lizard fall on to the right ear, gain, but if on to the left, trouble will follow. Should one fall on to the nose, it is lucky, but if it fall on to the end of it it is calamitous. If one fall on to the mouth, a feast of sweet dishes is imminent; if on to the upper lip a beating, but if on to the lower lip, wealth and splendour. If one should fall on to the joined lips, death is certain, and if below the lips and above the chin, know there will be enmity with the king. If one fall on to the throat, there will be a meeting with friends, and if below it, there is a fear of the action of enemies.

If a lizard fall on to the right shoulder, there will be a success shortly, but defeat if one falls on to the left shoulder. The greatest happiness ensues on a lizard's falling on to the middle of the hand, but if it fall on to the other parts of the hand or on to the back of it, loss of property is sustained. If one falls on to the wrist, it means jewels and ornaments, and if on to the fingers, it means the fulfilment of the heart's desire, but if on the nails, a loss of wealth.

If a lizard falls on to the back, there will be news of friends, and if on either side, a meeting with an absent brother. A lizard falling on to the heart increases happiness, on to either breast, fortune; into the arm-pits, bestows happiness on the women of the household.

A lizard falling on to the left upper arm, will cause much agony of mind, but good luck if on to the right arm. If one fall on to the left hand, a quarrel will arise in the family; if on to the left wrist, a loss of property will be sustained. If one fall on to the back of the left hand or fingers, it gives fame or renown; but if on the nails of the left hand it will cause destruction, and if on to the middle of the left hand, it brings wealth.

If a lizard fall on to the belly, it brings riches; on to the waist, clothes; and on to the navel, victory and fame. If on to the buttocks, it brings disease, on to the anus, death; on to the thighs, a loss of clothes; on to the pubes, destruction of property; on to the private parts, a sore disease; on to either knee, imprisonment; on to the ankle-bone, the death of a wife.

If a lizard fall anywhere below the knees to the feet, it bodes a journey; on to the feet, imprisonment; and on to the feet joined together, death; on to the heel, it will cause happiness; but on to the toes, a son's death; and on to the toe-nails, the death of domestic animals and household servants.

But the luckiest thing of all is that of a lizard falling on the soles of the feet, as then all enemies are sure to perish!

WOMEN.

If a lizard fall upon the head of a woman, she becomes wealthy; but if upon her skull it means death; upon the knot of the hair, disease; and on to the end of the hair, death. If one fall on to the neck there will be constant strife; if on the forehead, a loss of property; and if on the right cheek, be sure that widowhood will be her lot. But if a lizard fall on her left cheek she will meet her beloved; and live long, if it fall on the right ear. She will obtain golden ornaments if it falls on her left ear. There will be misery if it falls on her right eye, but if on the left eye the Sāstras assure her that she will meet her absent husband.

If a lizard fall on her nose, she will get some disease; if on the upper lip, strife; if on the lower lip, wealth and splendour; and if on the closed lips, destruction. If a lizard fall below the lips, and above the chin, strife will follow; if on to the mouth, a sweet feast; if on to the throat, ornaments; if on to the shoulders, ornaments set with precious gems; if on to the loins, immediate happiness and wealth; if on to the back, enmity with brothers; if on to either side, she will meet her brothers.

If a lizard fall on a woman's right hand, a loss of property will be incurred; if on to her

\footnote{But some say that this means misery.}
left hand, there will be gain; if on the right wrist, anguish and loss of wealth; if on the left wrist, she will get ornaments; if on the middle of either hand, very great happiness; if on to the back of either hand or of the fingers, ornaments; if on the nails, destruction; if on the breasts, great sorrow; if on the heart, increase of happiness, and if on the parts about the belly, she will be blessed with a virtuous boy.

If a lizard fall on to the belly of a girl, she will get married early; if on to the belly of a woman, it bodes luck; if on to the navel, an increase of good fortune; if on to the anus, death; if on the waist, clothes; and if on to the private parts, she will suffer from some disease.

A woman will be blessed with a child, if a lizard fall on her thighs; if on the knees she will suffer imprisonment; if on any part between the knees and the ankles, loss of wealth; if on the ankle-bone, death; if on the right foot she will have to go to her native country. Immense wealth and a son are hers on whose left foot a lizard falls, and she will be rich in grain if one falls on her toe-nails.

**General.**

Should a lizard fall while a person is sleeping on a bed, consider it lucky; while sitting down, either lucky or unlucky. If a lizard falls on a dining plate, after the meat is over, it is a sign of friendship between brothers; if on the body of a person while walking, that will befall an enemy which was to have happened to himself.

If a lizard falls on food after it is served, throw it away; and if one falls on a plate on which food has not yet been served, it brings fear, grief, and disease. If one fall on the fire at which a man's food is about to be cooked, his wife dies. If one fall in a temple, the king dies; if in an assembly, it causes the death of the president; if in the middle of the house, the death of the owner of the house; if between two persons, the best one of the two dies. If one fall while a man and woman are cohabiting, they become separated from each other for the rest of their lives; but if one falls while they are *in coitus* and on the man's private parts, it is lucky, and the woman is blessed with eight very beautiful sons.

If any one sees two lizards fight and drop down, all his troubles are at an end and his household will become happy. If a lamp is extinguished by the falling of a lizard, the household will be ruined, but this may be averted by not living in the house for the next three months. If a lizard falls on any part of the clothing, it destroys position in society, and raises quarrels; if on to a sword or other implement of war, enmities will perish; and if on a horse or other riding animal, painful travelling will be the result.

If a lizard falls on a person on his birthday, birth-planet, on the day on which he has *bārdhā-chandra,* at the time of *Vaitṛiti, Vyatīpāta,* the *Uṣṇa* day, eclipses, *Yamakṣaṇa, Mṛityuyōga, Daṇḍīyōga, Kāliṇī, Sravaṣa,* or other unlucky stars, be sure that evil will befall him.

If a lizard falls upon any person, and runs towards the east, then any event he is looking for will end according to his expectations. If it runs towards the south-east danger is to be apprehended from fire; if towards the south, death; if towards the south-west, strife; if towards the west, gain of wealth; if towards the north-west, disease; if towards the north, much profit; and if towards the north-east, then any event anxiously expected will end according to expectation.

If a lizard falls on a person on the first day of the moon, then all things will be propitious to him; if on the second day, he gets a kingdom; if on the third day, gain; if on the fourth, sickness; if on the fifth, sixth, and seventh days, wealth; and if on the eighth, ninth, and tenth days, death. If it falls on the eleventh day, he will be blessed with a son; if on the twelfth day, with both son and wealth; if on the thirteenth day, he will sustain a loss; if on the fourteenth, loss of wealth; and if at the full moon or new moon, loss of brothers and wealth.

If a lizard falls on a person on a Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, he will gain wealth; but if on a Sunday, Tuesday, or Saturday, he will lose it.

If a lizard falls on any one at the time of the first two signs of the zodiac, viz.:—Mēsha or

---

* When the moon enters into the twelfth sign from his birth star.
Vrishabha, there will be gain; if in Maithuna or Kanyā, he will be blessed with a daughter; if in Śūkra, he will suffer loss of wealth; if in Tulā or Vriśchikā, he will obtain rich clothes; if in Dhanu or Makara, wealth; if in Kumbha, great loss; and if in Mūla or Karka, joy.

Excepting at the Śīla, Vajra, Vyāpatā, Parāshu and Pādārpiṇī yogas (or junctions of planets), the falling of a lizard at any of the yogas is lucky.

Excepting the periods of Nāga and Chatahpresa, when it occasions lamentation, and of Bhadra, when it produces death, the falling of a lizard during the astronomical period called Kārana, of which there are eleven, is lucky.

If a lizard falls during Aśvinī, the first of the twenty-seven lunar asterisms, it gives health and wealth; if during Bhraspati, the second asterism, it produces disease; during Kṛiṣṭi, loss of wealth; in Rṛhiṇi or Mrīga, wealth; in Aṣvini, death; in Mūlā, gain of wealth; in Pūshya, gain; in Śālādhā, death; in Mṛgā, welfare; in Pūrva, an increase of illness in the family; and in Uttarā, Hastā, Chitrā and Swātī, it is lucky; while in Viśākhā loss of wealth will be sustained. In Anurādhā it gives a kingdom, in Jyāśādvā it causes ruin; and in Māla it gives happiness; but in Pūrva it causes death. In Uttarā, it is lucky; in Śravaṇa, it gives a kingdom; in Dhanishtā, it causes ruin; in Satarādā it bestows happiness; in Bṛhat, it gives a kingdom; and in Pūrvabhadrā or Uttarabhadrā, it is lucky.

The fall of a house-lizard on a person, or a field-lizard (sārda) running up his body are both unlucky; but if a house-lizard is found creeping up him, or a field-lizard falls upon him, it is lucky. If a field-lizard falls on a person and tries to creep up him, it is luckier than when it merely falls upon him. If a field-lizard climbs up any one's body with its face upwards, and an ordinary lizard (pāl) descends down anyone with its face downwards, then luck is instant.

CHINGHIZ KHAN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

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

(Continued from p. 92.)

The division which Ogotai sent under the Noyan IIji towards the mountains of Ghur and Herat apparently assailed Firuzkoh, which Min-
after assailing it for twenty days the invaders had withdrawn again.\footnote{Tabakht-i-Nasiri, pp. 1007, 1055 and 1056.} The second attack, to which we are now referring, took place two years later, and its governor, Malik Imad-u'd-din Zangi, with the people there, were slaughtered.\footnote{Id. p. 1057.}

Another exploit of a portion of Ognotai's army in 1222 was an attack upon Saif Rud, which is described as the most powerful fortress in the mountains. I do not know its situation. Raverty says the name is also written Sankaran, it was also written Balarwan, Yalarwan or Badwan. When the Khvárezm Sháh Muhammad retired westwards he left it in charge of the Malik Kutb-u'd-din Husain, who was ordered to put it in a state of defence. He had barely time to build a reservoir to contain 40 days' supply, when the Mongols overran Ghur and drew near, under the Noyan Mangutah, Karachah and Utsah, and for 50 days they attacked it with great loss on either side. There were a great many quadrupeds in the fortress, and they killed as many as they could dry, and the rest, 24,400, died for want of water, and were thrown over the rampart, and we are told the face of the glacis for a depth of 40 gaz was completely strewn with their carcasses; half a man of water and a man of grain were assigned to each person except the governor, who had a man of water, one-half for his ablutions and one-half for drinking purposes; the former was afterwards given to his horse, which was the only horse that remained alive there. When the siege had lasted 50 days only another day's supply of water remained. The Malik thereupon convened the men in the fortress, and proposed that the next day they should put the women and children to death with their own hands, and, having thrown open the gateway and concealed themselves in some place inside, when the Mongols entered they should rush in upon them and fight them until they had attained martyrdom. They made up their minds to follow this advice and bade adieu to each other, when that very night there came a heavy fall of rain and snow, so that, to use the rhetorical language of our author, "they who had endured the thirst of 50 days, and during that time had not drunk the sherbet or their fill of water, drank from the coverings of the tents and sayah-bans so much snow water in satisfying their longing that for a period of seven days after smoke issued from their throats along with their saliva." \footnote{The variants of this last name are Albar, Alsar, Abar, Abar, and Abas, Aba, Abar.} The summer was now virtually over, and the rainy season at hand, and this supply of water would last them a month or more. The Mongols, seeing this raised the siege, "and went to hell till the following year." \footnote{Tabakht-i-Nasiri, p. 1062 note.} The next year after the defeat of Jelal-u'd-din the Mongols (as I argue, a portion of Ognotai's army), again appeared at Saif Rud. Its governor, the Malik Kutb-u'd-din Husain had meanwhile put it in a state of repair, constructed fresh reservoirs, and provisioned it amply. The investment continued for two months, but in vain, when the people, who had grown weary and exhausted, in spite of the advice of the governor, agreed to a truce by which the people should go down into the Mongol camp for three days, and dispose of the commodities they possessed for gold and silver, cattle and woollen garments as they required, and that after this truce the Mongols should march away. For two days the traffic went on amicably and without interruption, but on the evening of the second day the Mongols concealed a number of armed men behind rocks, bales of clothes, pack saddles, and in the broken ground about their camp, and when the people came down as usual to do their bartering on the third day, and mixed with the besiegers, all at once the drums were beaten, a shout was raised, and the Musalmans seized and deprived of their arms or killed. A shrewd person, who was among the traffickers, and was named Fakhru'd-din Nishapuri, had a dagger in the leg of his boot, which he drew upon a Mongol who seized him. The latter let him go, and he escaped again to the mountains. This incident is made the text of a homily by our chronicler. He adds that 280 of the principal men of the place were treacherously captured on this occasion. The Mongols now proposed that the people of Saif-Rud should ransom their relatives, but the governor, Kutb-u'd-din, would not hear of it. They thereupon fell upon and killed them with
their knives, stones, &c. &c. Preparations
to renew the attack on the fortress were now
vigorously made, but the governor was a man
of resources. A large number of big stones
were planted, so that a slight touch would send them
rolling to the bottom, and other stones as big
as millstones were fastened to beams, and these
were fastened to the battlements by ropes.
Meanwhile the garrison was divided into two
sections, one behind the ramparts, the other
behind the great blocks of stone, and orders
were given that no one should move till the
drums sounded. When at dawn next day the
Mongols sent a force of 10,000 against the
fortress, they were allowed to mount up about
two arrow flights before the Musalmans showed
themselves. When only a hundred yards separated
them the kettle-drums were beaten inside,
all raised a shout, the ropes were cut, and the
mill stones, beams, &c. went rolling down,
and we read that from the summit of the hill to
the bottom the Mongols and renegades lay
prostrate together, and a great number of the
Mongol grandees, Noyans and Bahadurs, “went
to hell.” This disastrous assault, which we are
told took place in the year 620 Hj. i.e. 1223,
put an end to the siege, which was now raised.
A few days later the Mongols made another
attempt to surprise the fortress of Tulak, but
had to retire after losing many men. 5

Having traced the operations of Ogotai and
Chagatai, let us turn to the third army which
was sent against Herat. When the news of
Jelalu’ddin’s victory at Parwan reached
Khorasan, according to Minhaj-i-Saraj, in
every town and city of Khorasan, wherever
Mongol shahs or commissaries were station-
ed the people sent them to hell. 6 Among the
places where an outbreak occurred after this
fashion was Herat, which, unlike the other
great cities of Khorasan, had been spared by
the Mongols, as I have already described.
The special chronicle of Herat, written by
Mu’ayyinu’ddin Muhammad El Esfekari, gives
some interesting details of this revolt, which
have been abstracted by D’Ohsson.

Not far from Herat, in the district of Badghiz
was a very strong fortress, called Kalyun. 7

D’Ohsson says it was afterwards also known
as Nerretu. It was built on a rock, and the
approach to it was so difficult that a narrow
path, half a league long, had to be traversed,
along which only two men could pass to
reach it. Minhaj-i-Saraj describes it “as
an exceedingly strong fortress, the like of which
for height and for solidity was not to be found
anywhere. From Herat to Kalyun was a dis-
tance of 20 farsangs, the road mounting all
the way to the foot of the rock on which the
fort was planted. From the foot of this rock
to the ramparts was another farsang.” The
height of the rock was about 1,000 cubits and
the face of it like a wall, so that no living
thing could mount it save reptiles. The sum-
mit was a plateau of a considerable extent.
Within the fortress the inhabitants had dug
seven wells in the solid rock, which were
supplied with perennial water. 8

The Mongols had already attacked the place
twice without result, and feeling that they were
certain to return, and would employ against
them the soldiery at Herat, the garrison deter-
mimed to compromise the people at the latter
place so much with the Mongols that they
would have to make common cause with them.
They accordingly wrote to Abubekr and Man-
gatai, 9 saying they were willing to surrender,
but that fearing the Mongols greatly they first
wished to obtain a promise in writing from
their Khan that their lives would be safe. The
two governors already named promised to
secure this, and also proposed to re-open com-
munications between the two places. This
was what the people at Kalyun desired, in order
to secure their purpose. They thereupon
despached 70 brave men, disguised as mer-
chants, who having concealed their arms in their
bales entered the place separately and assassina-
ted the two governors, whereupon the citizens
of Herat put to the sword all the dependents of
the murdered chiefs, and elected two others of
their own. 10 Malik Mobarizu’ddin Sebezvari,
who had been nominated governor of Firuzkoh
by the Khurazm Shah Muhammad, and dis-
agreeing with the people there had gone on to
Herat, had the military supervision of the

---

5 Tabakht-i-Nasiri, pp. 1065–1070.
6 Tabakht-i-Nasiri, p. 1042.
7 Erdmann calls it Kalebmin and D’Ohsson Caliou.
9 Called Mingatai by D’Ohsson and Mengbai by Erdmann.
place while the civil administration was made over to the Khoja Fakhir-ud-din Abdu'r-Rahman, who was apparently a Jewish banker of great wealth, and the two proceeded to put the place in a state of defence. When Chinghiz Khan heard of this outbreak he reprimanded Tulai severely for his generosity to the Herat people, and sent his nephew the Noyan Ichikadai, son of his younger brother Kachiun, with an army of 80,000 horsemen, and with the grim remark that inasmuch as the dead had come to life again, he was to take care this did not occur again, by cutting off the heads of the citizens and sparing nothing. He set out in January 1222, and having reached the river of Herat halted for a month, while he collected his siege machinery, and also got together an army of 50,000 men from the neighbouring districts of Khorasan, Balkh and Shaburgha. This raised his army to 130,000 men, and he seems to have disposed the greater part of them in four bodies of 30,000 each, about the four sides of the city, and sent a menacing message into the place to say that those who resisted would be punished with death, while those who did not would be spared.

The place was well prepared for defence, and its governor was an indomitable person. Minhaji-i-Saraj describes him as "an aged man of fine and handsome presence, who rode through the city, fully armed and who arrayed in defensive armour and lance in hand fought against the infidels until he attained martyrdom." The siege lasted for six months and seventeen days, during which several assaults are said to have lost 5,000 men. At length a long stretch of wall was battered down, and according to one reading buried 400 of the besiegers in the ruins: another is that they took possession of the ruins. Dissension now arose inside, one party being for capitulating and the other for continuing the struggle. At length, on the 14th of June 1222, the Mongols forced their way in at the gate afterwards called the Khakassar Burj or Gate of Arches, and began a terrible slaughter, neither age nor sex being spared, and for seven days a continual scene of bloodshed ensued, while the buildings were torn down and burnt. 1,600,000 people are said to have perished in this butchery, and Ichikadai sent his master the most precious things he had captured, with several thousand young captives. Having captured Herat Ichikadai marched very naturally to revenge himself upon Kalyun, and when he reached the Kasbah of Aobah, he sent a body of 2,000 men with orders to return to Herat and to kill any fugitives who might have returned and reoccupied it. They thus slaughtered 3,000 more. D'Ohsnon says 2,000 people. Of the famous men of Herat only Khalif Mulana Sherif-ud-din Chaghratan remained alive. He had 15 companions with him, and they sheltered on a scarped rock in that district till the danger was over. This small band, which had only grown to 40 a year later, constituted the entire population of Herat, and they lived together in the great mosque, a proof of the terrible punishments the place received. Meanwhile Ichikadai proceeded to attack Kalyun, which was governed by Ikhtiyar-ul-Mulk, engrosser of the Imperial seals, assisted by two famous champions, sons of Abubekr, also called the Sozangar. They were so tall that it was said when they accompanied Sultan Muhammed Khurazem Shah with their hands placed on his stirrups, their heads rose higher than his. They were also famous for their valour. The fortress was well provisioned, and abundantly supplied with men and weapons, and had only recently been conquered, together with the neighbouring fortress of Fiyar, by the Khurazem Shah. The garrison made numerous sorties, and so harassed their assailants, that the latter eventually surrounded the fortress with a wall in which were two gates with walls before them, or as some copies of the work say with a double wall, and men were assigned to keep watch at night. A trustworthy person related how a fox was entrapped inside this wall between it and the fortress for a period of seven months and could not get away, showing how closely the place
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was watched." The siege had lasted for twelve months when Saadi, who had been attacking Seistan, as I have described, arrived with a reinforcement, and the attack became more vigorous. Meanwhile a pestilence broke out inside the fortress from the people constantly having to eat dried flesh, pistachio nuts and clarified butter. The place had held out for 16 months, and so many of the garrison had been carried off that but 50 persons remained alive, and of these 20 had swollen feet, one of the symptoms of the pestilence. A fugitive informed the Mongols of this, who thereupon made an assault. The garrison, we are told, threw their gold and silver treasures and other valuables into the wells which they filled up with large stones and then burnt the rest. They then opened the gateway, drew their swords, threw themselves upon the Mongols, and were slaughtered. About 10 farsangs from Kalyun, and within sight of it, was another fortress, named Fiwar of Kadas, and Minhaj-i-Saraj tells us if strange horsemen should reach the base of the former in the day the people there made a smoke and at night lighted a fire as a beacon, and vice versa. We have seen how Arslan Khan of Kaialik and Tulun the Juzbi were sent by Chinghiz to attack the fortress of Walkh in Takharistan, and how they captured it. They afterwards were told, advanced upon Fiwar. This stronghold was even more impregnable than Kalyun, and it is said that it could be defended by 10 men. The two Mongol chiefs pressed their attack for ten months, when provisions began to run short in their camp. They thereupon sent to Kalyun and brought up stores from that recently captured place. Meanwhile a messenger came down from the stronghold into their camp, and reported how nearly all the garrison were dead, not more than seven remaining alive, and of these four or five were ill. They then attacked and captured it, and put these seven to death. This, we are told, took place in the latter part of the year 619 Hj. i.e. 1222.

The exact situation of Kalyun and Fiwar, beyond that they were somewhere in Ghur, I cannot identify.

This completes the account we can give at present of the Mongol campaign in the mountain country of Ghur, which is almost entirely derived from the Tabakht-i-Nasiri. It will not be inopportune to conclude with a characteristic anecdote, showing what manner of men these were before whom the stupendous difficulties of campaigning in this most difficult country were overcome. The story is told of the Chief above mentioned, and whose name is given as Uklun the Juzbi by Raverty.

Minhaj-i-Saraj tells us that on one occasion Habashiii-Abd-ul Malik Saur-Zarrad, to whom the Mongols had given the title of Khusrav of Ghur, having returned to Ghur from Taikkan, with Chinghiz Khan's permission, reported that on a certain occasion when seated in the presence of the great conqueror Uklun the Juzbi and other Noyans, Uklun being the highest in rank, someone brought in two Mongols who had fallen asleep at their posts the night before. Uklun asked who had brought them, upon which a Mongol bent the knee and said he had done so, and being further asked what offence the men had committed he said they were mounted on horseback when he was going round examining the guards. He came up to them, and found them both asleep, and he passed on, and now he had brought them up. Uklun asked them if it was true, and they assented. He then said, cut off the head of one of them and fasten it to the double "pigtails" of the other. Parade him round the camp, then put him to death also. The accused and accusers all made obeisance, and the command was duly carried out. The Ghurian chief was astonished at what he saw, and said to Uklun, "There was no evidence or proof on the part of the accuser, and how was it the accused confessed, knowing their punishment would be death, which a denial would have saved them from." Uklun replied, "Why are you astonished? You Tajka do such things, and tell lies. A Mongol, were a thousand lives at stake, would rather be

Ulkunst Kunkurat. Nothing is more certain than that these other persons were not Olknoouts or Uklunata but Urmants, a very different tribe altogether, and if the relationship as stated by Raverty be authentic, then Uklun must be the same person who is called Sulkhan by Erdmann, and by him called a commander of the left, op. cit. p. 215.
killed than speak falsely; lying is your occupation, and this is why the Almighty God has sent a calamity like us upon you.\textsuperscript{22}

Such was the Draconic code of the Mongols, and such also the stern virtue of the race, which like the rigid creed of the English Puritians, was a terrible ally against the frivolity and lack of principle on the other side.

ON THE DESCENT AND SPEECH OF THE TRANSGANGETIC PEOPLE.\textsuperscript{1}

This is an interesting paper, and worthy of attention for its relations both to its special theme and to certain points in the general study of language upon which it touches. The author introduces his subject by pointing out the natural nexus of interest which leads us on from the institutions of India to their extension over neighbouring parts of the earth, and then to matters concerning the older history of the populations to whom they were communicated. A consideration of the geographical conditions of Further India shows him that the history of emigration in that peninsula is governed by the river-courses; and he assumes that the successive waves of population will have followed one another downward from the central uplands of the interior, each driving its predecessor to the lowest coastline, or crowding it out of the fertile and desirable valleys into the bordering mountains. We find, then, in the Peguans, Cambodians, and Annamites the remains of prior settlements, expelled from their first seats by the intrusive Siamese and Burmese; and supporting indications are claimed to be discovered in the traditions of the various peoples, and the changes of location of their capitals. The south-western parts of China, also, are occupied by tribes that appear to be plainly related with the Siamese and Burmese. North of Yun-nan, again, are the original seats of the Tibetans, and not far away, on the middle course of the Hoang-ho, is the theatre of the earliest Chinese history. It is the question, then, whether any linguistic signs of relationship are to be traced among the four peoples thus inferentially brought into geographical neighbourhood.

Professor Kuhn here gives a sketch of the history of investigation among the transgangetic languages. A complete bibliography of the subject, prepared as an intended supplement to the present paper, he has decided to reserve for publication in another form. But he regards it as an unquestionable inference from the facts already made accessible, that the languages of south-eastern Asia fall into two groups, corresponding with the division of the peoples stated above: namely, Annamite and Peguan and Cambodian on the one side, and the rest of the peninsular tongues, along with the Chinese and Tibetan, on the other. And the movements that have carried the Burmese and Siamese southward, and crowded the Tibetans westward, up the course of the higher Brahmaputra, behind the Himalayas, are, we are told, to be ascribable with probability to the growing extension of Chinese power. The northern group is divisible into an eastern and a western sub-group, Chinese-Siamese and Tibeto-Burman, the latter having on the whole the more primitive character. There are perplexing diversities in the way of more detailed classification; and to account for them the author seems disposed to call in that \textit{deus ex machina} of the classifier in difficulties, the influence of neighbouring tongues of a wholly different stock. Doubtless it would be better to let the problem simply pass as one yet unsolved.

The leading common characteristic of all these tongues is, as every one knows, their monosyllabism and their lack of grammatical structure, the place of which is to a certain degree supplied by a fixed order of arrangement of the words composing a sentence. As regards lexical evidence, Professor Kuhn considers the common origin of the languages in each of the two chief groups above distinguished to be proved by the agreement of numerals within the group, and the diversity of the groups by their discordance with one another in the same respect. It must be confessed, however, that the comparative table of numerals in the northern group, given by him in a note, is very far from convincing; as, on the other hand, for reasons to which he himself alludes (and which are abundantly illustrated, for instance, in American Indian languages), discordant numerals need not be disproof of relationship. The laws of arrangement in the sentence are looser in the Tibeto-Burman sub-group, which also makes freer use of auxiliary particles; and the order followed is by no means the same in all the languages. But this difference, we are told, should not be regarded as having grown out of an original agreement, but rather out of a condition of greater freedom of arrangement; and this must be held to involve the former possession of a fuller grammatical apparatus. The suggestion is a very ingenious

\textsuperscript{22} Tobadill-\textit{Gesta}, pp. 1079 and 1081.

and significant one, and ought to be received with respectful attention, whether we are or are not ready at once to accept it. Our author proceeds to bring up facts from the various languages which may be regarded as giving it support. These are, in his opinion, manifold. The Chinese, in the first place, shows in some of its existing dialects and in its older phases remains of a greater fulness of phonetic form, especially having final consonants which the classical language has now lost. Similar facts are found in Siamese and Burmese. But the most striking case is the Tibetan; the written forms of this language, dating from the seventh century, present numerous consonant combinations, now silent except in certain dialects, and indicating former possession by its words of more than the single syllable to which they are now restricted. In some cases, it is asserted, these affixes have an apparent grammatical character; and Professor Kuhn ventures to claim that in the other languages also are seen signs of fusion of a numeral particle with the proper numeral: but, as already stated, the comparative table he gives to show this is extremely unconvincing. He regards, however, the evidence he presents as absolutely demonstrating that the Chinese monosyllabism is no original one, but a result of phonetic decay. Such is well known to be the opinion of Lepsius, and of more than one other recent authority; and the indications must be confessed to point decidedly that way, although by no means so unmistakably as is here assumed.

So far, however, as regards the bearing of this new (asserted) aspect of the Chinese upon the question as to an original root-stage of language in general, the views of our author are open to criticism; and it is the more desirable to spend a few words upon the matter, inasmuch as there are others now-a-days who go even further than he in claiming that the root-theory breaks down hopelessly if the support of Chinese original monosyllabism is withdrawn from under it. No misapprehension could well be greater than this. A root, in the first place, is not a phonetic element of a given extent. It is simply a significant element lacking any grammatical character, not admitting an analysis which demonstrates in it a formal part, marking it as a part of speech, a derivative from a more primitive word, or an inflectional form. A language composed only of such elements is a root-language, whatever be their length. Disyllabism does not take away the radical character. There are languages enough to be found—for example, the ancient Egyptian and the modern Polynesian—of which the roots are in part or prevalingly of more than one syllable.

One may be strongly persuaded that the really ultimate roots of human speech were monosyllabic, and may devise theories to account for these longer radical entities, without yielding their radical nature. A combination, for example, of root with root makes only a root, unless one of the two enters, with a recognized and correspondent value, into a whole series of combinations, becoming thus a modifier to its fellow in each combination. The lost Chinese finals have yet to be shown to possess in this way a grammatical character, before they can be held to prove the Chinese not a language of roots. That the Chinese and its relatives "have run a long career of development, and grown worn with age, like the languages of Europe," is of course true. All existing languages, so far as we know, have behind them the same immense past, and a past of never-ending growth and change. Of this past, the period covered by the development of the Indo-European inflective system is probably only a small part. At any rate, he who imagines that in determining the Indo-European roots he has arrived at a point anywhere near the actual beginnings of human speech is immensely mistaken. But that the Chinese has never had a development even remotely like that of European tongues is sufficiently shown by its present condition, which is so unlike as possible to that of the monosyllabic part of English, wherein are lacking neither parts of speech, nor derivatives, nor inflections. If the Chinese, in growing out of a presumable original monosyllabism, acquired nothing in the way of structure of which it could retain the results when phonetically decayed, it is still a root-language, and almost or quite as good as ever for the use long made of it:—namely, to show how a language destitute of grammatical structure can answer the needs even of a gifted and highly civilized people, and thus to take away all difficulty from the assumption that the first rude human beings made a language of roots serve their restricted purposes.

For the impregnable basis of the radicarian theory, as it has been repeatedly pointed out, is twofold. In the first place, its theoretic necessity; since anything devised and created by human beings, as part of their progress upward toward a state of culture, must have begun with what is simplest in its kind. To regard men as using from the start words made up of a radical part and a formative or grammatical part is precisely equivalent to regarding them as having begun to fight and to work with tools that had handles. He who does not see this has still to learn what language is and what has been its history. The other and completely correlative part of the basis
is this: that, in the observable history of languages, we see abundant instances of the production of new formative elements, new signs of grammatical distinction; and that it is always and only by a reduction to formative or grammatical value of previously existing material elements of speech, whence a sound linguistic philosophy forces us to the inference that the same has been the case from the beginning; that the way to grammatical expression lies only through combination. With regard to this point, Professor Kuhn is in a very hopeful state, as appears from the concluding paragraphs of his paper. He ventures there to raise a word of protest against what he calls the “hitherto accepted philosophy of language.” The latter, he says, is at a loss to find out words of condemnation severe enough for languages guilty of mixing up material and form, by applying words of recognizably material content to those uses for which we provide by suffices:—as is to a great extent the case in the tongues of which he has been treating. He, on the contrary, is inclined to note their analogy with such elements in his own language as -th, -schaft, -heit, -bar, all of them demonstrably material in origin. “Wherever,” he adds, “we see suffices come into being, they come in this way; and we may with some reason (mit einigem Rechte) infer that they have in general been thus originated.” Here is a very encouraging bit of independence and good sense; and the author has only to go on boldly on the same track to escape altogether the shackles of the now prevalent philosophy of language in Germany, and to substitute for it the true scientific and historical method. That philosophy has really as little to do with the science of language as the Hegelian philosophy with geology or zoology. The former is all well in its way, but it does not stand upon the same plane with the other, and nothing but detriment and confusion can come of their mixture. The only justifiable scientific method, in the study of language, as in every other branch of scientific inquiry, is to reason back from the known to the unknown. And the argument, as not long ago stated in the pages of the American Journal of Philology, Vol. I. p. 337, runs thus:—If in the historical periods of language we see formative elements made by the agglutination of independent material words, and do not see them made in any other way, and if the grammatical relations thus provided for are of the same kind, and not less difficult, than those expressed by the other formative elements whose history is beyond our ken, then it necessarily follows, not merely that we have “some reason” to regard the latter elements as having been made in the same way as the former, but that we have no reason to regard them as made in any other way. That is to say, this is the only, and the sufficient, method of explanation of the structural growth of language, which the historical study of language has yet brought to light. Any other, even concurrent one, must wait for admission until a historical basis has been found for it. Moreover, this kind of reduction of material elements to a formative value is only one division of the most pervading of all movements in the development of language. It is not easy to see why Professor Kuhn should have referred only to the suffices of our European languages. Their auxiliaries and form-dords are a still closer parallel to the formative apparatus of less developed tongues and involve processes of adaptation as gross and coarse as any that the latter can exhibit. Thus, to take the nearest example at hand, the German and English alike have a substantive verb, expressing the fundamental grammatical relation of predication, which is pieced together out of fragments of three verbs having the material senses of ‘grow,’ ‘stay,’ and ‘sit’ (or else ‘breathe’): the Romanic tongues have pached in ‘stand’ instead of ‘stay.’ And to denote its temporal and modal relations, they employ various verbs traceable to the material senses of ‘turn,’ ‘seize,’ ‘be big or strong,’ ‘select’ (with a probable further background of ‘surround’), ‘be under penalty’ (perhaps ultimately ‘have committed a crime’), and so on. Our phraseology, too, is crammed with examples of the same kind. What has the present accepted philosophy of language to say of such expressions, for example, as es fällt mir ein (‘it falls in to me’) or “it occurs to (i.e. ‘runs against’) me,” for that extremely familiar but also transcendently mysterious act of framing a sudden conception? And is not all our intellectual and moral language made up of such grossly material elements? Of their grossness, the mind that uses them is totally unconscious, and the intellectual action that underlies them is alike in all those who employ their unending variety. To say heap-man instead of men or Mann, to us who have the latter forms, is of an amusing rudeness; so would be I shall have been, if employed with etymological understanding of its elements by one accustomed to say fuer; but to one whose habitual expression it has become, the sense of the grammatical relation, of plurality and so forth, is in either case just as pure and as integral as is that of the synthetic form to its user. Those who have to learn a tongue of ruder structure do not find the character of their mental apprehensions degraded by it. The process of thought is the same with either instrument. To get at the
CORRESPONDENCE
AND MISCELLANEA.

NARIAD, IN THE KAIARA DISTRICT.

Mr. H. H. Dhrupa, of Surat, has submitted for inspection a rubbing of a Sanskrit inscription in verse and prose, (30 lines of about 40 letters each, in Nāgār characters; covering a space of about 1' 9" high by 1' 4" broad) from a well at Nariad.—It is a prose, composed by an Udchya Brähman named Rāmachandra (line 3), recording the building of the well by a Gurjara Baniya named Vēṇidāsa (1. 9), whose family had emigrated, under his ancestor Dēvavṛiddha (1. 6), from the Vaishnavi city of Stambhatīrtha (1. 5), the modern Khamby, and had settled at Natapatra (1. 11), where the well was constructed.

The inscription is dated in the reign of the glorious Mūḍāpār (1. 23) (Muzaffar Shāh, the successor of the celebrated Mahamūd Bāigara of the Dōhad inscription of Vikrama-Samvat 1545, who appears to have been reigning at Ahmadābād). The details of the date, given in words in line 17f., and in figures in line 26f., are—Vikrama-Samvat 1572 and Śaka1 1437 or 1438; Śomadina or Monday, the thirteenth day of the bright fortnight of the month Vaiśākha, corresponding, by the Tables in General Cunningham's Indian Eras and Cowasjee Patell's Chronology, to Monday, the 14th April A.D. 1515. The chief interest of this inscription

1 The last figure of the Śaka date, in the units place, is almost illegible and is quite uncertain.
lies in its giving Naṭapatra, as the ancient name of Narad. Mr. Dhruv states that it is still known by natives as Naṭapura,—a substitute for the original name which he compares with their using Dadhipura, instead of the Dadhipadra of inscriptions, as the ancient name of Dohad.

J. F. FLEET.

THE KONGUDESA-RAJAKKAL.

To the Editor of the Indian Antiquary.

Sir,—May I suggest the following as an explanation of the earlier portion of the puzzling list of kings given in the Kongudēsa-Rajakkal?

The chronicle says that the kings, Nos. 1 to 6 of the list (ante Vol. I. p. 361), were Raṭṭas; and this assertion seems to afford a clue to the mystery.

In the Chronicle:—

1. Vacirāya Chakravarti, (this is only subsumed the W. Chahār in his title; not his modern name).
2. Gōvidārāya I.
4. Gōvidārāya II.
5. Kālavallabhaṭtāya.
6. Gōvidārāya (the conqueror).
8. Gōvidārāya III., the final conqueror of the Ganga (A.D. 863).

The chronicle has apparently transposed the names of Krishna I. and Gōvidārāya II.; and he is wrong in the relationships between Nos. 1, 2, and 3, but right as to the last two names.

Of No. 6 (Chaturbhuj Kanara Chakravarti), the Chronicle says: “he was of the same race.” The Raṭṭakāṭṭa Krishnās were called Ñanhāra; and the chronicle would appear to be right, if, by his No. 6, he referred to Krishnā (Kanara) IV. (A.D. 945). Up to this time the Ganga or Kongu were certainly feudatories of the Raṭṭas (ante Vol. XII. p. 253); and the chronicle, not having been able to trace the relationship between Nos. 5 and 6, clearly intended, I think, to suggest that some surrenders were omitted.

In succession to No. 6, he places his son (No. 7) Tiru Vikramaditya Chakravarti; and this king may, in all likelihood, be identified with the W. Chalukya Taila II. (son of Vikramaditya IV.)” who lifted up the royal Chalukya family, which had been sunk down by the deceitful practices of the Raṭṭakāṭṭas” (ante Vol. VIII. p. 16). It will be noted also that Taila II. was the husband of Kannaraṭṭa’s grand-daughter Ṫakābhā. The date of Taila II. is A.D. 973; and the chronicle states specifically that he governed Karnāṭa as well as Kongudēsam.

Further, it will be seen that this chronology fits in pretty accurately with Mr. Fleet’s opinion (ante Vol. VII. p. 101) as to the dates of the next kings (Nos. 8, 9, and 10) of the list given in the chronicle, who were Ganga proper, and who probably again attained independence during the period when the suzerain Raṭṭa power was on the wane and before the consolidation of the W. Chālukya dominion following on the overthrow of the Raṭṭas.

It may eventually be found that the Kongudēsa-Rajakkal is tolerably accurate in its lists of suzerain kings, while, like most other native histories (?), it is utterly wrong as to its chronology.

Coonoor.

W. LOGAN.

CURIOUSITIES OF INDIAN LITERATURE.

A Macaronic Verse of Gumanti Kai.

This and some subsequent verses were collected in Tirhut, and are said to be by Gumant Kawi of Paiṇā. His name however is quite unknown in Paiṇā itself. Each verse consists of four lines; the peculiarity of them being that the first three are in Sanskrit; and the last introduces a Hindi proverb.

पुष्पलुभय वे तुह वहन मञ्जरी निकृपयाः
तुम नसतान प्रभाले देने कारण तुम प्रणमयाः
केंद्र युमानिर्विशेषभर्तिरह तूनमलिका
भिषी विषी राखे राखे उसी विषी रहना नैषाः

Nala, who formerly slept upon a golden couch, found in the forest, when reduced to misfortune, not even a bed of straw. Saith Gumant Kai, the power of fate, of a verity, is here shown to be unconquerable; yea,—“Stay in that state of life to which it hath pleased God to call thee.”

G. A. GRIEBSON.

THE PROVERBS OF ALI EBN ABI TALEBI.

Translated by K. T. Best, M.A., M.R.A.S.,
Principal, Gavserat College,
Continued from p. 92.

215. Langnor in prayer weakens faith.
216. Shun what you ought to shun and you will be honoured.
217. Modesty, intelligence and liberality are the three parts of religion.
218. The death of wise and learned men is destructive.
219. The gaping mouth of avarice is not filled except in the grave.
220. Justice is the stability of a kingdom.
221. The reward of another life is better than the pleasures of this world.
222. To praise a giver too much is to ask for more.
223. The excellence of a speech consists in its brevity.
THE RELIGION OF THE ABORIGINAL TRIBES OF INDIA.

BY PROFESSOR J. AVERY, OF BOWDOIN COLLEGE, BRUNSWICK, MAINE.
UNITED STATES.

If an apology were needed for bringing to the attention of students of religion the crude notions of savage tribes regarding their relations to the unseen world, and the often revolting practices which have sprung therefrom, this would not be founded solely upon the claim which they rightly make upon Christian philanthropy, but as well on their scientific interest and value. If we have observed aright the course of thought at the present time, there is a growing disposition to study attentively all the systems of religion which at one time or another have been devised or accepted by men, with the view to discover their origin, and the laws which have governed their development. There is a tendency also to withdraw the study of religion from the exclusive dominion of sentiment, and to apply to it the same rigid canons of criticism which have been used so successfully in other fields of inquiry. There has been a time when the Christian Church viewed everything called religion outside its own fold much as the Greeks looked at the world beyond the confines of their peninsula, and lumped together alien beliefs of every variety and merit under the general title of heathenism; but, happily, a more appreciative spirit now prevails, and we are coming to see that there is much in other systems of belief which deserves our admiration. The study of religions has a scientific as well as a practical aim, and scholars have employed in it the inductive method of investigation with such a degree of success, that we may feel assured that the foundations are being laid for a science of religion. Indeed, some writers talk as if such a science were already constructed, but we are constrained to believe that this use of language is premature. So vast is the field of inquiry, so important is it that every part of its surface be explored and carefully mapped out, and so recently have scientific methods been employed in its survey, that investigators in this domain may well at present be content with modest claims for their study. It cannot be denied, then, that we shall not have a complete science of religions—much less of religion—until we shall have measured and deposited in its proper place in the building every variety of religious belief, no matter how crude it may seem, or how near the bottom of the social scale its professors may stand. If we feel any diffidence, therefore, in presenting a sketch of the religious beliefs and practices of the aboriginal tribes of India, it is not on the score of the subject possessing no intrinsic interest, but rather because of the present lack of materials in some parts of the field and our consequent inability to present the theme with the fulness of illustration desirable. And here we desire to express our great indebtedness to Colonel Dalton's invaluable work, the *Ethnology of Bengal*, without which many facts stated in the following pages would have been beyond our reach. Before proceeding with our inquiries, it will be useful if we state the location of the tribes to whom we shall repeatedly refer; for, though British power has existed in India for nearly two centuries, it has only been within a very recent period that we have been able to get trustworthy information concerning the aboriginal population; and even now that information is largely confined to a few persons, whom official duties or missionary efforts have brought into close relations with it. It has been usual to divide these primitive races into three groups—viz., Tibeto-Burman, Kolarian, and Dravidian. Without entering upon the question of the correctness of this classification, or the ethnic connexion of its several members, we shall find it sufficiently convenient for our purpose.

The tribes comprising the first group are found in their most primitive condition scattered along the foot-hills of the Himalayas, from Nepal eastward to the farther extremity of Assam, thence along the range forming the eastern and southern border of that province back to the valley of the Ganges. Some tribes of the same stock are also found in the lowlands on either side of the Brahmaputra; but they have to so great a degree exchanged their ancient customs for those of the Hindus, that they offer fewer points of interest for our

1 Read before the Victoria Institute.
present inquiry than their kindred in the jungles upon the hills.

Following the route just indicated, we find on the northern border of Nepál the Kirantis, the Limbus, and some other tribes of inferior importance. Passing across Sikhim and Bhután, whose inhabitants, the Lepechas and Blútas, have adopted Buddhism, we come to the Akas, and next in order, to the Doías, the Miris, and the Abors, which last tribe has settlements as far east as the Dibong, a northern tributary of the Brahmaputra. The Dibong serves also as an ethnic boundary, the tribes already named to the west of it showing a decided affinity to the Tibetans, and those beyond the stream exhibiting a closer likeness to tribes in Burmah. Between the Dibong and the Digaru are the Chalikata, or Crop-haired Mishmis. Next to these, on the north-eastern border of Assam, is another tribe, also called Mishmis, but differing in many respects from the one last mentioned. South of the Mishmis, partly within and partly beyond the eastern boundary of the province, are the Khamits and the Singphos. Now, turning westward, and still keeping within the mountain district, we come first to the numerous tribes of Nágas spreading westward to about the 93rd deg. of E. long. On their western border are the Mikirs and the Kukis. Continuing in the same direction across the Kapili river, we meet, first, the Saintengs or Jaintías; next the Khásias; and last of all, at the end of the range, the Gárós. At the foot of the Gáro hills are the Pani-Koch, a tribe partly converted to Hinduism. The tribes of the lowlands might be left out of view altogether, were it not that their conversion has not been so radical as to quite efface their primitive superstitions. The most important of these tribes are the Ahamis, the Chutias, the Koch and the Kacharía. They are scattered here and there over the entire valley, and are reckoned as inferior castes of Hindús.

Crossing the lower Ganges valley, and ascending the rugged highland which forms the core of India, we find ourselves in the home of a most primitive population. Here tribes of both the Kolarian and the Dravidian stock, protected by the nature of the country, have long resisted the advance of a higher civilisation. Of the un-Hinduised Kolarians, the Santáls occupy the Santál Parganas and the hill tracts of Orissa, on the eastern border of the highland. Adjoining this tribe, on the south and south-west are the Bhumij, the Mundas, the Kharris, and the Hos or Larka-Kols. Still farther south, in the tributary states of Katak, are the Juangs. In the Ganjam district of the Madras Presidency are the Savaras. Directly west of the Kharris are the Korwas, and, extending in scattered settlements across the plateau to the Narbas and Taptí rivers, are the closely-allied tribes of Kurs and Kurkus. Of the Dravidian tribes, the Khonds live just north of the Savaras, in the tributary states of Orissa; the Oráoks are found in Chuntí Nágpur; the Pahárijis or Máters occupy the Rájmahal hills, where they overlook the Ganges; the Gonds spread over a large area in the centre of the plateau; while the Tojas, Badagas, and one or two other small tribes, are far away on the Nágíri hills of Southern India. It is hardly necessary to add that the tribes of the last group do not represent the whole Dravidian population; with the civilised portion, which constitutes the majority, we have here no concern. In addition to the tribes already named, there are certain partly-Hinduised tribes to whom we shall occasionally refer. These are the Cheros and Kharwares of the Sháhábád and Palaman districts; the Parheyas, the Kisans, the Bhuizers, the Boyars, the Nágbanis, and the Kars about Palamau, Sirgúji, and Jashpúr.

Proceeding now to the subject of our inquiry, after this preliminary explanation, we shall describe the religion of the aboriginal population under the following heads:—1st, the gods, and the kind of worship paid to them; 2nd, places of worship; 3rd, images and other representations of Deity; 4th, the priesthood; 5th, divination; 6th, witchcraft; 7th, the future life and the worship of ancestors; 8th, speculations regarding the origin of the world and of man; 9th, influence of Buddhism and Hinduism. It is almost needless to say that these tribes, without exception, and in common with the lower orders of men generally, have an unquestioning belief in the existence of spirits, both human and divine; sometimes they go even farther than this, and attribute to animals and inanimate objects immortal souls, like their own. The materialistic theories which have been reached
by the speculations of civilised philosophers seem never to have clouded their child-like faith. But, teeming as is the unseen world with beings created by a savage imagination, we are not to look for an orderly and consistent arrangement of powers and spheres of activity among these deities, such as we find in the Pantheons of Greece and Rome; rather, we are to expect the condition of things out of which these developed. Whenever such an elaborate system of theology is described as worked out by a tribe in other respects low down in the social scale, it is to be viewed with extreme caution, and by no means accepted as genuine, until attested by more than one skilful observer. An example in point is the account of the Khond religion by Major Macpherson. We shall be more likely to find confused and even flatly contradictory notions of the gods, blind attempts to properly adjust human relations with the higher powers. Though the gods served by these tribes are for the most part of a low order, scarcely rising above the level of their worshippers, still there are here and there indications of a dim conception of a God exalted far above these inferior deities, and more deserving of reverence and love. We will first search for these. The Singhpos have a tradition that in a former sinless state they worshipped a Supreme God, of whose attributes they can give no account; but that they fell from that condition, and have since adopted the superstitions of surrounding tribes. The Abors and Miris have a vague idea of a God who is the Father of all; but as they connect him with the abode of the dead, and call him Jam Raja, it is easy to see that their conceptions are derived from the Hindu god, Yama. The Kukis, who seem to have advanced farther in their reasoning, or borrowed more, believe in a Supreme God, whom they call Puthen, who not only created the world, but governs it and rewards men according to their deeds. It is in the last particular that their views are in marked contrast with those generally held by these tribes. Puthen has a wife, Nongjar, whose good offices as an intercessor with her husband can be secured by suitable offerings. The children of this benificent pair are, like the other inferior gods, of a malicious disposition. With most of these tribes the sun is regarded as the impersonation of their highest god. The Garos call him Saljang, or Rishisaljang, and sacrifice white cocks in his honour. They say that he resided for a time on the Garo hills with his wife, Apongma, and begat children, but subsequently returned to heaven, where he now dwells. The Bhuiyas call him Boram, and likewise offer to him a white cock at the planting season. He is worshipped by the Kharias under the name Beru, and every head of a family is bound to offer to him five sacrifices in a lifetime, each oblation exceeding in value the last one. The Hos and Santals call the sun-god Sing Bonga. He is represented as being self-created, and the author of the universe. He does not inflict suffering, but is sometimes invoked to remove it when appeals to the inferior gods have proved ineffectual. The Hos observe a yearly festival in honour of him, at which a white cock and the first-fruits of the rice harvest are offered. Among the Santals, the head of the family, every third or fourth year, sacrifices a goat to Sing Bonga in an open space at sunrise. The Mundas pray to him when selecting the site of a house. The Korwas worship him under the name Bhagavan, a Sanskrit word. The Musis pay homage to both the sun and the moon. The Orios reverence the sun as Dharmesh, the Holy One. They say that he created the world, and that he preserves men, unless thwarted by the malice of demons. No oblations are presented to him, since his good-will is already secured. The Khonds are divided into two sects, if Major Macpherson's statement can be trusted. One sect worship Bara Pennu, who manifests himself in the sun, and is the creator and benefactor of mankind. The other sect have chosen as their highest object of regard his wife, the bloodthirsty earth-goddess, Tari, who demands a yearly offering of human victims. The Todas regard the heavenly bodies as gods, and address them in certain set phrases, but have no clear idea of their attributes or requirements.

It seems plain, from the facts cited, that most of the aboriginal tribes of India have some vague notion of a Power exalted far above the world, who was concerned with its

* [This also must be Dharmesh, = Dharmaraja, = Yama. — Ed.]
creation; who manifests himself in the heavenly luminaries; whose disposition towards his creatures is benevolent, but is sometimes unable to reach its aim; and who demands from them only a distant and formal recognition, or none at all. Whether these are vanishing traces of a primitive revelation, or the result of their own reflections, or have been borrowed from the religion, particularly the Hari-worship, of the Hindús, we will not here inquire. It is, at any rate, certain that the contemplation of their highest god has little effect in regulating conduct.

Another god of a similar character, but second in rank, is worshipped chiefly by the Kolarian tribes in Central India. This is Marang Buru, or Great Mountain. Remarkable peaks, bluffs, or rocks, not unnaturally suggested to their simple minds an idea of Divinity, and called forth their reverence. Since from such places descend the streams which irrigate the fields, Marang Buru has become the god to be invoked for rain. Offerings are made to him on the summit of the hill, or other object, in which he is supposed to reside.

It is not, however, with the superior gods and their decorous worship that we have most to do in describing the deities of these rude tribes. Their chief concern is to keep the peace with a host of minor gods, with whom their imagination has filled the whole realm of nature. In the forest, the field, the house—everywhere these beings throng. They are mostly of a jealous, revengeful disposition, and seem to take a malicious pleasure in teasing mankind. Fortunately, they are not insensible to human blandishments, and he is pretty sure to prosper who most assiduously cultivates their good-will, which can best be done by providing for them some toothsome dainty. It would be quite unnecessary to record lists of these lower gods, whose names are legion, since their attributes and the worship by which they are propitiated are everywhere of the same general type. A few characteristic examples will suffice. The Singhpos recognise three spirits called Nhat, who preside respectively over the higher, the lower world, and the household. Offerings of fowls, dogs, and on special occasions a buffalo, are made to them. The Chnunaka Mishmis declare that the spirits whom they worship are mortal like themselves. The gods of the Abors and Miris dwell in the trees of the woods which cover their hill-sides. They love to kidnap children, whom they can generally be made to restore by proceeding to fell the trees in which they reside. The Nágas say that their gods are created beings, and they are accustomed to vary their offerings according to the dignity of the recipient. Sèmes, the god of wealth, gets the larger domestic animals; Kachimpai, the god of fertility, receives fowls and eggs; while Kangniba, who, on account of blindness, cannot distinguish offerings, gets nothing of any value. They believe that each disease is the work of a special demon, whose business and pleasure it is to spread it abroad; but his malicious design is sometimes thwarted by hanging bunches of withered leaves on the lintels of the door to frighten him, or branches of trees are stuck in the paths leading to the village, that the spirit may take them for untravelled ways. Since the tiger is of all beasts in India the most dreaded, it is not strange that a tiger-demon should be recognised. He is worshipped by the Kisans, who think in this way to escape the ravages of that animal. Among the Santás in Rámgarh, only those who have lost relatives by the tiger think it necessary to propitiate the tiger-demon. The Gonds also pay him reverence. Since the deities of these tribes are anthropomorphic, it is a matter of course that gender should be allotted them; hence goddesses are frequently worshipped, and they show themselves not a whit behind their male consorts in malignant and blood-thirsty disposition. The Bhuiyas and Savaras, though recognising the benevolent sun-god, pay special honour to a savage goddess called Thakuráni, who was formerly propitiated by human sacrifices. It is thought that upon her worship is founded that of the Hindú Kall, who once received human victims in this very part of India.

But the most remarkable system of human sacrifices, in connexion with the worship of female deities, was that instituted in honour of Táli, the earth-goddess of the Khonds. Since she
presided over fertility, victims were immolated chiefly at the time of sowing. The persons destined for sacrifice, called Merias, were kidnapped from the plains or from other tribes, and, under strict guard, were petted and fed like cattle fattening for the slaughter. Children were allowed to grow up, and were encouraged to marry and rear families, but parents and offspring were equally devoted to the goddess, and were liable at any moment to be sacrificed to quench her thirst for blood. When the time of offering came, the body was hacked into small pieces, and each worshipper struggled to secure a shred of flesh or piece of bone to bury in his field. It has been about forty years since an end was put to these horrid rites by the combined efforts of Major S. C. Macpherson and General John Campbell. The Khonds say that Tārī lives in heaven with her beneficent husband, Bārā Pennu, while numerous inferior gods roam the earth, seen by the lower animals, but invisible to men. It cannot be doubted that the custom of human sacrifice was once wide-spread in India, as indicated not only by the facts just stated, but by the practice of sham offerings existing among other tribes at the present time. The Orākos and Gonds even now make a wooden or straw image of a man, and after prayer to a divinity for the blessings desired, sever its head with the stroke of an axe. As a general rule, the inferior gods stand in no clearly recognised relation of dependence upon the superior gods. Their will is usually exercised independently of higher control. We have noticed an interesting exception in the case of Kols, who assert that there are certain blessings reserved for the sun-god, Siā Bonga, to grant; and that offerings made to the lower gods will induce them to intercede with their master in behalf of the suppliants. One of the simplest, most child-like forms of worship is that practised by the Todas, on the Nilgiri Hills of Western India. Almost the sole means of support possessed by this tribe are their herds of buffaloes; hence these, together with the implements and persons specially connected with them, have come to assume a sacred character. Certain old cow-bells, said to have come originally from heaven, are worshipped as gods; and the priests or milkmen who tend the sacred buffaloes, of which several herds are specially set apart, are during their time of service also gods, and as such cannot be touched by any mortal. The duty of the priest is to perform a few simple rites daily before the cow-bells, and to care for his buffaloes, in which labour he is assisted by a semi-sacred herdsman. He can return at pleasure to ordinary human life, when, though no longer the embodiment of deity, he is treated with marked respect. The Todas believe in other gods, who are invisible, and whom the priest salutes as fellow-deities, but their ideas regarding them are extremely vague.

The residence of the gods is sometimes localised by these aboriginal tribes as heaven, some distant and lofty mountain peak, a huge rock, or a grove of ancient trees. Spirits who are likely to prove good neighbours, are sometimes enticed to take up their abode near a village by liberal offerings. Among the Kolarians of Central India every village has several sacred groves consecrated to tutelary gods. The trees in these groves must be left undisturbed, on pain of divine displeasure. It is true, as a rule, that the Tibeto-Burman and Kolarian tribes construct no temples nor images of their gods, while images, or something answering to them, are common among the Dravidians. Still among the former tribes there is usually some spot where village or family worship is commonly performed, and which is marked by certain objects designed to suggest the sacredness of the place. The Gāros set up before their houses bamboo poles, with fillets of cotton or flowers attached, and before these make their offerings. The same thing is done by the Limbus. The Kacharis, the Bodo, the Mishmis, and some of the tribes of Central India worship the sīj (euphorbia) plant as an emblem of deity. The Juangs, the Kharrias, and Korwas regard the ant-hill as a sacred place, and use it to take an oath, or to sacrifice upon. The Akas alone of these north-eastern tribes have images of their gods, and little huts to serve for temples; but, as they are partly converted to Hinduism, this custom is probably derived from that source. In the villages of Dravidian tribes one finds some objects set up to represent the tutelary gods. These are often rude in shape—a lump of earth, a stone, or stakes of different heights to represent the two sexes.

Having spoken of the deities reverenced by these primitive races and of the worship
accorded to them, we proceed to describe the persons, whenever there are any such, whose special duty it is to perform that service. It may be said that, with few or no exceptions, all the tribes employ priests regularly or occasionally. When a tribe has no priests of its own, it borrows them from another tribe. Moreover, the office is usually not hereditary, but may be taken up or laid down at pleasure. In this respect the priesthood among the aboriginal population of India stands in marked contrast with that of the Hindús. The Singapos have no regular priests of their own, though members of the tribe sometimes act as diviners. The Buddhist priests of their neighbours, the Khamtis, are greatly esteemed by them. Among the Gáros the priest leads the same kind of life as the laity, and the only preparation needed by him before assuming the sacred office seems to be an ability to repeat the usual incantations. The Orkós, when in want of a priest, discover the proper individual by divination. Taking a winnowing sieve in their hands, they march about the village, and are involuntarily led away by movements of the sieve to the right house. Among the Páháriás, persons desiring to enter the priesthood are required to retire for some days to the jungle, and commune in solitude with the deity. Before they are confirmed in their office they are expected to perform some marvellous act, as evidence of having acquired superhuman power. They wear their hair uncut while acting as priests. The same tribe have also priestesses as well as priests. Some tribes, that have in other respects adopted the religion of the Hindús, employ the priests of neighbouring unconverted tribes to propitiate local deities. The distinction between priests and laity among most tribes is so slight that unconsecrated persons not unfrequently perform the offices of religion. The Juanás, who are among the lowest of all the tribes described, employ an old man as priest. Among the Kiarrias the head of the family presides at offerings to the sun-god in behalf of the household, but a priest is employed to act for the community. The Kols allow certain elders or the heads of families to perform the service. Among the Santálas the head of the family offers the ancestral sacrifices, but other services are performed by village priests, who fit themselves for the purpose by prayer, fasting, and silent contemplation of some god until they are possessed by him. Among the Khonds a regular priest always officiated at the festivals in honour of the earth-goddess, but it appears that on ordinary occasions any one, who chose to do so, could assume the priestly functions, his reputation being dependent upon his skill as a diviner. We are told by Hodgson that among the Bodos and Dhimals the priests do not form an hereditary class, though it is not uncommon for the son to take up the business of his father; but that the elders of the people, heads of families or clans, frequently act as priests. We have already seen that among the Todás the manager of religious affairs is at once priest and god. His novitiate is passed by retiring to the jungle, and remaining there alone and without clothing for eight days, during which time he performs certain purificatory rites. On the eighth day he returns and enters upon the discharge of his duties.

Among the hill tribes generally the principal duties of a priest are to cure sickness, to ascertain coming events by divination, and to preside over the public offerings. The theory of the Nágás that sickness is caused by a demon, who takes this way to gratify a personal spite against some mortal, is shared by other tribes. This being the diagnosis, the only rational course to pursue is to call in the priest. Among the Kukis, when this personage arrives, he first determines from the symptoms which one of the gods is offended. He then roasts a fowl, and eats it on the spot where the sick man was first seized with his malady. After throwing the fragments away, as an offering to the demon, he goes home. Should the gravity of the case demand the sacrifice of a larger animal, the priest collects his friends and shares the feast with them. In case the first application of the remedy does not prove effectual, it has to be repeated until the man dies or his resources fail. Among the Gáros, the priest, with the patient lying beside him, takes his seat near a bamboo altar, round which an assistant leads the animal to be sacrificed. From time to time it is taken away and washed, and then brought back and fed with salt and caressed. Its head is then severed with a single blow, and its blood smeared upon the altar. A somewhat more economical plan is in-vogue among
the Bodos. The exorcist places before him on the ground thirteen leaves, with a few grains of rice upon each. Over these leaves, which represent the names of divinities, he causes a pendulum suspended from his thumb to vibrate, and the leaf towards which it moves indicates the god to be propitiated. An appropriate victim is then promised him, but only on condition that the patient recovers. The same use of a pendulum has been observed among the Pahāriās. Sometimes the sickness is due to the spell of a witch, and then the following method is employed by the Kols for the detection of the offender. A large cone-shaped wooden vessel is placed apex downward upon the ground, and on this is laid a flat stone. A boy is made to balance himself upon the stone, while the names of all the people in the vicinity are slowly repeated. With the mention of each name a few grains of rice are thrown at the boy; and when the right name is uttered the stone moves, and he falls off. The foretelling of future events by the observation of omens is one of the most important functions of the priest; although the interpretation of these is among some tribes the duty of a special diviner, who is another person than the priest. Among the Singhis the diviner holds over the fire joints of a large sort of grass until they explode, and then examines the position of the minute fibres thrown out beside the fracture. The Abors scrutinise the entrails of birds, but get the best results from pig's liver. They informed Colonel Dalton "that the words and faces of men were ever fallacious, but that pig's liver never deceived them." The Khásias seek omens from the contents of eggs. The western Ñāga tribes put the village under tabā when the omens are to be observed; and no one is permitted to enter or leave it, or to engage in labour for two days. This especially occurs when they are about to cut down the jungle for their rude agriculture. At this time all fire is extinguished, and new fire is produced by the friction of two sticks. When there is a birth or death in a family the house is put under tabā for five days, and no one but the inmates can enter or leave it. The same practice of tabā is observed among the Mishmis, who, when misfortune visits a house, thus isolate it by placing the sprig of a certain plant at the door. A common mode of divination among the Nāgas is to cut slices from a reed, and observe how these fall. They also kill a fowl, and notice how the legs lie. If the right leg lies over the left, the omen is favourable; but if the reverse is the case, it is unlucky. Among some of the tribes the diviners are called ojhs, a Hindi word derived from ojh, "entail." Among the Mundas a common way to ascertain which of the gods ought to be propitiated is to drop oil into water, at the same time naming a deity. If the globule remains whole, the right name has been pronounced, but if it divides, the experiment must be repeated. A method sometimes employed by the Oronts to show whether the god is pleased with a proposed sacrifice is to make a mud image of him, and to sprinkle upon it a few grains of rice; then the fowls designed for the sacrifice are placed before it, and if they peck at the rice the omen is favourable. Belief in witchcraft is not uncommon. The Kachāris regard sickness as frequently due to this cause; and, having discovered by divination the old woman exercising the spell, they fling her until she confesses, and then drive her from the village. This belief in witches, and wizards as well, appears to be most prevalent among the Kol tribes of Central India. Sometimes a magician pretends to have discovered that the evil influence proceeds from a rival in another village. The latter is then summoned and beaten until he finds it best to admit his fault. If he is unable to undo the evil caused by his spell, the beating continues, sometimes with fatal results. If the Gonds have reason to think that death has been caused by witchcraft, the funeral rites are postponed until the sorcerer has been pointed out. This is accomplished by the aid of the corpse. They first make a solemn appeal to it, and then taking it up carry it about the village. It will lead the bearers to the house of the guilty person, and if this is done three times it is regarded as conclusive evidence, and summary vengeance is inflicted upon him. It is easy to see that this is a convenient way to get rid of an obnoxious individual. Witches are supposed to have demon lovers; with whom they dance and sing at night in the forest. The Khonds believe that some women can transform themselves into tigers; and occasionally individuals endeavour to spread this impression regarding
themselves in order to extort presents from their neighbours as the price of immunity from their ravages. Trial by ordeal is also resorted to by the Gonds for the conviction of a person suspected of witchcraft; but it is so arranged as to make escape impossible in any case. The woman is securely bound and thrown into deep water. If she swims, she is guilty; if she sinks, she is drowned. Or the witch is beaten with castor-oil rods; if she feels pain, it is proof of guilt. Women, and those not always the old and ugly, are more often suspected of the black art than men are.

We have reserved to this place an important feature of the religion of the aboriginal tribes of India, namely, their views concerning future life and the customs connected therewith. While it is true that savage races generally have held to the survival of the soul after death, their notions regarding the character of the future life and its bearings upon the present existence have greatly varied. Among the lowest tribes the future life has been commonly imagined to be a continuation of the present life, though under conditions more favourable for physical enjoyment. In a more advanced stage of society, where the moral powers have reached a fuller development, men have looked upon that life as an opportunity to balance the accounts of this life, to render to every man according to that he hath done. We therefore proceed to inquire with much interest what these tribes have to say concerning the world of the dead. The Chulikata Mishmis deposit in the grave with the dead his weapons, clothes, and ornaments, and some food; but they affirm that this is done only as a mark of affection, and not with the idea that he can make any use of them. They declare that there is no future life, but that they and the gods whom they worship have but a temporary existence. The Jangals are said to have no expectation of survival after death. The Mundas have a vague notion that the ghosts of the dead hover about, and they sometimes set apart food for them in the house. The same vagueness of conception is characteristic of the Oraons. They say that those who have been killed by tigers are transformed into that animal; also that the ghosts of women who have died in childbirth hover about graves, clad in white garments, and having lovely faces, but hideous backs and inverted feet. But as a general rule, the tribes not only believe in a future life, but are able to tell something more definite of its nature. The Abors think that the character of the future state is determined in some degree by present conduct, but this advanced conception is perhaps due to the Hindús, whose god of the dead they have borrowed. Their neighbours the Miris share the same views, and bestow unusual care upon the bodies of the dead. They are completely dressed, and supplied with cooking vessels and every appliance for a journey, and are placed in graves lined with strong timbers to protect them from the pressure of the earth. The Eastern Nágas tribes believe that the future life is like the present one, or on the whole rather more to be desired. Their belief in immortality is shown by the care with which they place in the grave the belongings of the dead. The residence of the disembodied spirit is not necessarily a distant region. The Nágas suppose that the soul hovers about its former abode, and considerable anxiety is felt for its convenience. Captain Butler mentions an instance where a native was buried midway between two villages in which he had resided at different times in order that his soul might most conveniently visit either. Some tribes place the body in a wooden hut, in the wall of which an aperture is made for the ghost to pass to and fro. When a Gáro dies, his soul goes to Chikmang, one of the highest mountain peaks in their country. Food is provided for the journey, and dogs are slaughtered to track out the path for him. Formerly slaves were killed at the grave to attend persons of note, but the custom was stopped by order of Government. A choice offering on such occasions, and probably for the same purpose, used to be heads of Bengalis from the plains. An incident observed by Colonel Dalton shows that the Gáros believe not only in the survival after death of the souls of men and animals, but in that of inanimate objects. Witnessing the funeral of a young girl, the friends were observed to break all the earthen vessels placed on the grave. In answer to inquiry he was told that only in this way could they be used by the girl, that for her the pieces would reunite. In other words, the

* [This is the universal Indian belief in the chapel.—Ed.]*
vessels must die like men, but their ghosts survive. The Khásias, while burning the corpse, make offerings to the ghost, that it may be kindly disposed to them hereafter, but take little thought about the future life. The Kukis imagine a paradise in the north, where the good will enjoy abundance without labour, where the enemies one has slain will attend him as slaves, and the cattle he has killed in acts of hospitality will be restored to him. The wicked will be subjected to the worst tortures the imagination can devise. The Todas after death go to a home in the west, where he is joined by the ghosts of his buffaloes, and goes on living just as before. It does not appear that he ever returns to trouble his relations.

According to what seems to be the prevailing view, however, the spirit acquires after death divine powers to some degree, and forever about its former abode in a restless and uncomfortable state. It has wants much like those experienced in the body, and if these are not attended to it becomes malicious, and the cause of innumerable vexations to its kindred and neighbours. The Panikach offer some of the first-fruits of the harvest to the ancestral spirits, clapping the hands to attract their notice. The priests of the Kirantis celebrate two festivals yearly to ancestors. Among the Kharwars, each family sacrifices annually a wether goat to the dead. The Hos celebrate a festival to the shades, after the sowing of the first rice-crop, in order that they may favour the sprouting of the grain. It is also the custom with them to prepare for a visit from the ghost of the deceased on the evening when the body is consumed. Some boiled rice is set apart in the house, and ashes are sprinkled on the floor, by which its footsteps may be detected. The relatives then go outside, and, walking round the funeral pile, invoke the spirit. If, on returning to the house, the ashes are found disturbed, they are filled with terror at the supposed presence of the ghost. The Santals have very little to say about a future life, though offerings are made to ancestors at the close of the late harvest. The Korwas, of Sirgúpá, told Colonel Dalton that they worshipped no gods, but that the head of each household made offerings to the dead. The Gonds say that one of their chiefs was, in early life, devoured by a tiger, and that he afterwards appeared to his friends, telling them that, if worship were paid to him, he would protect them from that animal. They acted upon the suggestion, and he was duly installed among their gods. The Bhuiyas, of Keonjhar, after the funeral rites are concluded, place a vessel, filled with rice and flour, upon the grave. This has the effect of recalling the ghost, for, after a time, the print of a fowl's foot will be plainly visible at the bottom of the vessel.

It would be interesting to know how the speculations of these rude tribes regarding the origin of the universe and of the human race compare with those of more civilized peoples; but we have little information on this point. It does not seem to be a subject upon which they have spent much thought. It is enough for them to know that they and the world are, without taking the trouble to inquire how they came to be. A few exceptions are worth noting. The legend of the Singhpos, to which we have already alluded, is that "they were originally created and established on a plateau called 'Májai-Singra-Bhum,' situated at the distance of two months' journey from Sadiya, washed by a river flowing in a southerly direction to the Irwálí. During their sojourn there they were immortal, and held celestial intercourse with the planets and all heavenly intelligences, following the pure worship of the Supreme Being." They, however, fell by bathing in forbidden water, and, descending to the earth, became mortal, and adopted the debased worship of their neighbours. The Abors get back as far as the first mother of the race, who had two sons, the elder of whom was skilled in hunting and the younger in handicraft. Like Rebecca, she loved the younger son better than the elder, and migrated with him to the west, taking along all the products of his skill. Before forsaking her elder son, she gave him a stock of blue and white beads, and taught him how to make the dăo, a sort of hill-knife, and musical instruments from the gourd. The Abors are the descendants of the elder brother, while the younger brother became the progenitor of the English and other Western nations. The Gáros, who do not seem lacking in imagination, explain the origin of the world as follows:—The germ of creation was a self-
begotten egg. From this sprung the goddess Nashu, who sat, for a time, on a water-lily; but finding her quarters too restricted, she sent to Hirāman, the god of the lower world, for some earth, upon which she successively fixed the different objects of nature. First, rivers proceeded from her, then a reptile of the crocodile type, afterwards grasses and reeds, an elk, fishes, trees, buffaloes, a priest, and last of all a woman. The Hos relate that their god Sing Bonga, who was self-created, made the earth and furnished it with vegetation and animals,—first the domestic and then the wild ones. He then created a boy and a girl, and taught them how to make rice-beer. This produced amatory desires, and they became the parents of twelve boys and twelve girls. For these children Sing Bonga made a feast, providing all manner of food. The guests were told to pair off, and taking the kind of food they preferred, to go away and shift for themselves. They did so, and their choices can still be discerned in the various modes of life among mankind. The Santāls say that a wild goose came over the great ocean, and laid two eggs, from which the first parents of their tribe were hatched.

We have more than once intimated that it is impossible in all cases to draw the line sharply between what is primitive in the religious beliefs and usages of these tribes, and what has been borrowed in whole or in part from Brahmanic or Buddhist sources,—chiefly the former. It is not uncommon to observe Hinduism and paganism struggling for supremacy in the same tribe and the same village, now the one and now the other claiming the larger share of interest.

Hinduism, with its extraordinary power of assimilating alien systems, has usually been content to insist upon some general and public observance of caste rules, while not interfering with the private observance of the old religion; or it has given to the ancient superstitions some new explanation or purpose, and fitted them into its own system. So it would be hard to find an aboriginal tribe so completely transformed into Hindūs in language, dress, and manner of life, that its non-Aryan origin may not be detected by its private religious usages, as well as by its physical traits. Facts illustrative of this have already been cited. We have spoken chiefly of the influence of Hindūism upon the pagan religion, and it cannot be doubted that this will ultimately result in the effacement of the latter, unless this work be done by Christianity; but the counter-influence of the elder faith upon Hinduism is not less certain, if less easily traced, and would form a most interesting theme for inquiry; but we cannot enter upon it here.

In conclusion, we trust that this necessarily imperfect sketch of the religion of the aboriginal tribes of India may at least serve to attract those who are interested in the history of the religious development of the race to an important source of evidence. If Hinduism, whose many-sidedness is well symbolised by the many-faced images of its gods, furnish greater attractions to the majority of students, still it must not be forgotten that the simple beliefs and rites that we have sketched belong to a much earlier stage of religious growth, and may, if attentively studied, throw much welcome light on the genius of all religion.

FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY PANDIT S. M. NATESA SASTRI.

X.—THE BRAHMAN GIRL THAT MARRIED A TIGER.

In a certain village there lived an old Brāhmaṇ who had three sons and a daughter. The girl being the youngest was brought up most tenderly and became spoilt, and so whenever she saw a beautiful boy she would say to her parents that she must be wedded to him. Her parents were, therefore, much put about to devise excuses for taking her away from her youthful lovers. Thus passed on some years, till the girl was very near attaining her puberty and then the parents, fearing that they would be driven out of their caste if they failed to dispose of her hand in marriage before she came to the years of maturity, began to be eager about finding a bridegroom for her.

Now near their village there lived a fierce tiger,
that had attained to great proficiency in the art of magic, and had the power of assuming different forms. Having a great taste for Brāhmaṇa's food, the tiger used now and then to frequent temples and other places of public feeding in the shape of an old famished Brāhmaṇa in order to share the food prepared for the Brāhmaṇas. The tiger also wanted, if possible, a Brāhmaṇa wife to take to the woods, and there to make her cook his meals after her fashion. One day when he was partaking of his meals in Brāhmaṇa shape at a śatrap, he heard the talk about the Brāhmaṇa girl who was always falling in love with every beautiful Brāhmaṇa boy. Said he to himself, "Praised be the face that I saw first this morning. I shall assume the shape of a Brāhmaṇa boy, and appear as beautiful as beautiful can be, and win the heart of the girl."

Next morning he accordingly became in form a great Śaśtri (proficient in the Rāmāyaṇa) and took his seat near the ghāṭ of the sacred river of the village. Scattering holy ashes profusely over his body he opened the Rāmāyaṇa and began to read.

"The voice of the new Śaśtri is most enchanting. Let us go and hear him," said some women among themselves, and sat down before him to hear him expound the great book. The girl for whom the tiger had assumed this shape came in due time to bathe at the river, and as soon as she saw the new Śaśtri fell in love with him, and bothered her old mother to speak to her father about him, so as not to lose her new lover. The old woman too was delighted at the bridegroom whom fortune had thrown in her way, and ran home to her husband, who, when he came and saw the Śaśtri, raised up his hands in praise of the great god Mahēśvara. The Śaśtri was now invited to take his meals with them, and as he had come with the express intention of marrying the daughter he, of course, agreed.

A grand dinner followed in honour of the Śaśtri, and his host began to question him as to his parentage, &c., to which the cunning tiger replied that he was born in a village beyond the adjacent wood. The Brāhmaṇa had no time to wait for better enquiry, and as the boy was very fair he married his daughter to him the very next day. Feasts followed for a month, during which time the bridegroom gave every satisfaction to his new relatives, who supposed him to be human all the while. He also did full justice to the Brāhmaṇa dishes, and gorged everything that was placed before him.

After the first month was over the tiger-bridegroom bethought him of his accustomed prey, and hankered after his abode in the woods. A change of diet for a day or two is all very well, but to renounce his own proper food for more than a month was hard. So one day he said to his father-in-law, "I must go back soon to my old parents, for they will be pining at my absence. But why should we have to bear the double expense of my coming all the way here again to take my wife to my village? So if you will kindly let me take the girl with me I shall take her to her future home, and hand her over to her mother-in-law, and see that she is well taken care of." The old Brāhmaṇa agreed to this, and replied, "My dear son-in-law, you are her husband and she is yours and we now send her with you, though it is like sending her into the wilderness with her eyes tied up. But as we take you to be everything to her, we trust you to treat her kindly." The mother of the bride shed tears at the idea of having to send her away, but nevertheless the very next day was fixed for the journey. The old woman spent the whole day in preparing cakes and sweetmeats for her daughter, and when the time for the journey arrived, she took care to place in her bundles and on her head one or two marigosa leaves to keep off demons. The relatives of the bride requested her husband to allow her to rest wherever she found shade, and to eat wherever she found water, and to this he agreed, and so they began their journey.

The boy tiger and his human wife pursued their journey for two or three ghaṭākās in free and pleasant conversation, when the girl happened to see a fine pond, round which the birds were warbling their sweet notes. She requested her husband to follow her to the water's and on her head a few marigosa leaves as a talisman against demons. A ghaṭākā is 24 minutes. The story being Hindō, the Hindō method of reckoning distance is used.
edge and to partake of some of the cakes and sweetmeats with her. But he replied, "Be quiet, or I shall show you my original shape." This made her afraid, so she pursued her journey in silence until she saw another pond, when she asked the same question of her husband, who replied in the same tone. Now she was very hungry, and not liking her husband's tone, which she found had greatly changed ever since they had entered the woods, said to him, "Show me your original shape."

No sooner were these words uttered than her husband remained no longer a man. Four legs, a striped skin, a long tail and a tiger's face came over him suddenly and, horror of horrors! a tiger and not a man stood before her! Nor were her fears stilled when the tiger in human voice began as follows:—"Know henceforth that I, your husband, am a tiger—this very tiger that now speaks to you. If you have any regard for your life you must obey all my orders implicitly, for I can speak to you in human voice and understand what you say. In a couple of ghatikas we shall reach my home, of which you will become the mistress. In the front of my house you will see half a dozen tubs, each of which you must fill up daily with some dish or other cooked in your own way. I shall take care to supply you with all the provisions you want." So saying the tiger slowly conducted her to his house.

The misery of the girl may more be imagined than described, for if she were to object she would be put to death. So, weeping all the way, she reached her husband's house. Leaving her there he went out and returned with several pumpkins and some flesh, of which she soon prepared a curry and gave it to her husband. He went out again after this and returned in the evening with several vegetables and some more flesh and gave her an order:—"Every morning I shall go out in search of provisions and prey and bring something with me on my return; you must keep cooked for me whatever I leave in the house."

So next morning as soon as the tiger had gone away she cooked everything left in the house and filled all the tubs with food. At the 10th ghatiku the tiger returned and growled out, "I smell a man! I smell a woman in my wood." And his wife for very fear shut herself up in the house. As soon as the tiger had satisfied his appetite he told her to open the door, which she did, and they talked together for a time, after which the tiger rested awhile, and then went out hunting again. Thus passed many a day, till the tiger's Brahman wife had a son, which also turned out to be only a tiger.

One day, after the tiger had gone out to the woods, his wife was crying all alone in the house, when a crow happened to peck at some rice that was scattered near her, and seeing the girl crying, began to shed tears.

"Can you assist me?" asked the girl.

"Yes," said the crow.

So she brought out a palmyra leaf and wrote on it with an iron nail all her sufferings in the wood, and requested her brothers to come and relieve her. This palmyra leaf she tied to the neck of the crow, which, seeming to understand her thoughts, flew to her village and sat down before one of her brothers. He untied the leaf and read the contents of the letter and told them to his other brothers. All the three then started for the wood, asking their mother to give them something to eat on the way. She had not enough of rice for the three, so she made a big ball of clay and stuck it over with what rice she had, so as to make it look like a ball of rice. This she gave to the brothers to eat on their way and started them off to the woods.

They had not proceeded long before they espied an ass. The youngest, who was of a playful disposition, wished to take the ass with him. The two elder brothers objected to this for a time, but in the end they allowed him to have his own way. Further on they saw an ant, which the middle brother took with him. Near the ant there was a big palmyra tree lying on the ground, which the eldest took with him to keep off the tiger.

The sun was now high in the horizon and the three brothers became very hungry. So they sat down near a tank and opened the bundle containing the ball of rice. To their utter disappointment they found it to be all clay, but being extremely hungry they drank all the water in the pond and continued their journey. On leaving the tank they found a big iron tub belonging to the washerman of the adjacent village. This they took also with them in addition to the ass, the ant and the palmyra tree.
Following the road described by their sister in her letter by the crow, they walked on and on till they reached the tiger’s house.

The sister, overjoyed to see her brothers again, ran out at once to welcome them. “My dearest brothers, I am so glad to see that you have come here to relieve me after all, but the time for the tiger’s coming home is approaching, so hide yourselves in the loft, and wait till he is gone.” So saying she helped her brothers to ascend into the loft. By this time the tiger returned, and perceived the presence of human beings by the peculiar smell. He asked his wife whether any one had come to their house. She said, “No.” But when the brothers, who with their trophies of the way—the ass, the ant, and so on—were sitting upon the loft, saw the tiger dallying with their sister they were greatly frightened; so much so that the youngest through fear began to make water, and, as he had drunk a great quantity of water from the pond, he flooded the whole room. The other two also followed his example, and thus there was a deluge in the tiger’s house.

“What is all this?” said the terrified tiger to his wife.

“Nothing,” said she, “but the urine of your brothers-in-law. They came here a watch ago, and as soon as you have finished your meals, they want to see you.”

“Can my brothers-in-law make all this water?” thought the tiger to himself.

He then asked them to speak to him, whereon the youngest brother put the ant which he had in his hand into the ear of the ass, and as soon as the latter was bitten, it began to bawl out most horribly.

“How is it that your brothers have such a hoarse voice?” said the tiger to his wife.

He next asked them to show their legs. Taking courage at the stupidity of the tiger on the two former occasions, the eldest brother now stretched out the palmyra tree.

“By my father, I have never seen such a leg,” said the tiger, and asked his brothers-in-law to show their bellies. The second brother now showed the tub, at which the tiger shuddered, and saying, “such a lot of urine, such a harsh voice, so stout a leg and such a belly, truly I have never heard of such persons as these!” he ran away.

It was already dark, and the brothers, wishing to take advantage of the tiger’s terror, prepared to return home with their sister at once. They ate up what little food she had, and ordered her to start. Fortunately for her her tiger-child was asleep. So she tore it into two pieces and suspended them over the hearth, and, thus getting rid of the child, she ran off with her brothers towards home.

Before leaving she bolted the front door from inside, and went out at the back of the house. As soon as the pieces of the cub, which were hung up over the hearth, began to roast they dripped, which made the fire hiss and spatter; and when the tiger returned at about midnight, he found the door shut and heard the hissing of the fire, which he mistook for the noise of cooking muffins.*

“I see!” said he to himself, “how very cunning you are! you have bolted the door and are cooking muffins for your brothers! Let us see if we can’t get your muffins.” So saying he went round to the back door and entered his house, and was greatly perplexed to find his cub torn in two and being roasted, his house deserted by his Brâhmaṇ wife, and his property plundered! For his wife, before leaving, had taken with her as much of the tiger’s property as she could conveniently carry.

The tiger now discovered all the treachery of his wife, and his heart grieved for the loss of his son, that was now no more. He determined to be revenged on his wife, and to bring her back into the wood, and there tear her into many pieces in place of only two. But how to bring her back? He assumed his original shape of a young bridgroom, making, of course, due allowance for the number of years that had passed since his marriage, and next morning went to his father-in-law’s house. His brothers-in-law and his wife saw from a distance the deceitful form he had assumed and devised means to kill him. Meanwhile the tiger Brâhmaṇ approached his father-in-law’s house, and the old people welcomed him. The younger ones too ran here and there to bring provisions to feed him sumptuously, and

---

* Tamil, ṭiṭtai.
the tiger was highly pleased at the hospitable way in which he was received.

There was a ruined well at the back of the house, and the eldest of the brothers placed some thin sticks across its mouth, over which he spread a fine mat. Now it is usual to ask guests to have an oil bath before dinner, and so his three brothers-in-law requested the tiger to take his seat on the fine mat for his bath. As soon as he sat on it the thin sticks being unable to bear his weight gave way and down fell the cunning tiger with a heavy crash! The well was at once filled in with stones and other rubbish, and thus the tiger was effectually prevented from doing any more mischief.

But the Brāhmaṇ girl, in memory of her having married a tiger, raised a pillar over the well and planted a tulasi shrub on the top of it. Morning and evening, for the rest of her life, she used to smear the pillar with sacred cow dung and water the tulasi shrub.

This story is told to explain the Tamil proverb "Summa arukkira, sūravalli kāṭatūna," which means—

"Be quiet, or I shall show you my original shape."

THE SUNGA INSCRIPTION
OF THE BHARHUT STUPA.

BY E. KULTZSCH, Ph. D., VIENNA.

I re-edit this well-known inscription from the original pillar, which, along with most of the treasures discovered at Bharhut, by General Cunningham, is now preserved in the Indian Museum, Calcutta. The chief value of the inscription consists in the mention in it of the Śuṅgas, the successors of the Mauryas; by which the Stūpa is proved to have existed in the second or first century B.C. The pillar in question was erected by a prince, Dhanabhūti, who was contemporary with the Śuṅgas,—probably one of their vassals. His genealogy is given in the inscription as follows:

Visadeva, son of Gāgī.

| Āgaraju, son of Goti.
| Dhanabhūti, son of Vāchhi.

The custom, in accordance with which these three princes had second names derived from their mothers, deserves to be noted, as it was adopted by the Andhras,—the successors of the Śuṅgas,—whose inscriptions contain the terms of the Vāsishthas, Vāsishthas, and Mādhavas.

A son of Dhanabhūti, prince Vādhapāla(1), is mentioned, according to General Cunningham, in one of the smaller Bharhut inscriptions. And he deduces from his transcripts and eye-copies of a mutilated inscription from Mathurā, that this Vādhapāla was again succeeded by one Dhanabhūti. But to this there is the objection that the word putrā, 'of the son [of,]' which, in that case, should stand between [Vadhapala]a and Dhanabhūti, is wanting. A mechanical copy of this inscription is much to be desired.

Prākrit Text.

[1] सुगन्धि रवि रवि गार्गुपत्स विश्वदेवस
| देववा गोविन्दकान्त गाओपुरुष पुत्रेश
| वाङ्गिरार सेवात्मित कारिते तीर्थना
| ल्याराम्यों ता उपर्य

Sanskrit Rendering.

[1] शुगन्धि रवि रवि गार्गुपत्स विश्वदेवस
| देववा गोविन्दकान्त गाओपुरुष पुत्रेश
| वाङ्गिरार सेवात्मित कारिते तीर्थना
| ल्याराम्यों ता उपर्य

* A fragrant herb, held in great veneration by the Hindus; Orzyxum sanctum. This herb is sacred alike to Śiva and Vishnu. Those species specially sacred to Śiva are—Vindulaliṣṭa; Śaiva-laliṣṭa; and Śiva-laliṣṭa; those to Vishnu are—Sudāra-pāta, Kuruṇa-pāta, and Vāsishthā-pāta.

1 [The 'Barred Chatrī' of the Grand Trigonometrical Survey Map, Sheet No. 89. The correct spelling of the name appears to be Bharhut. The place is in the Nāgara ('Nagara') State in Baghirīkhand; six miles to the north-west from Uchhāra ('Uchera'), the chief town of the State.—Ed.]
TRANSLATION.

During the reign of the Sugas (Sūṅgas), (this) gateway was erected, and the masonry finished, by Vāchhi-puta (Vātsi-putra) Dhanahūṭi, the son of Goti-puta (Gaupi-putra) Āgarajus, (and) grandson of king Gāgi-puta (Gārgi-putra) Viśadeva (Viśādeva).

THE SARNATH INSCRIPTION OF MAHIPALA.

BY E. HULTZSCH, PH. D., VIENNA.

When, in January A.D. 1794, the workmen of Bābū Jagatsīnha, Diwān of the Rāja of Benares, were digging for old stones at Sārnāth, they found a stone containing the subjoined inscription, a rough transcript of which was first published by Mr. Jonathan Duncan. The stone was then removed to the Jagatgajaj, a market-place built at Benares by Jagatsīnha; but it was rediscovered by Major Kittoe at the suggestion of General Cunningham, who published an imperfect translation made by a student of the Benares College, and, later on, the text of a transcript received from Kittoe. I edit the inscription from the original stone, which is now preserved at the Queen's College, Benares.

On the top of the stone there was originally a squatting figure of Buddha, which is now broken off above the hips. The historical part of the inscription (A) is engraved below the statue. Then follows a band of sculpture, consisting of seven panels which are separated by six pillars. The central panel contains the Dharmachakra; the third and fifth an antelope; the second and sixth a tiger; the first and seventh a kneeling male figure, which supports the stone above it with its hands, like the giants in front of Cave III. at Nasik. Below the band of sculpture, the usual Buddhist creed (B) is engraved.

The inscription records that, in Sānuvat 1083, a Buddhist Stūpa and a Dharmachakra were repaired, and a new Gandhakūṭī was built, by the two brothers Sihirapāla and Vasantapāla, who were probably the sons of Mahīpāla, king of Gauḍa, who is mentioned in the first stanza of the inscription. The Gurava-Śrī-Vāmarāsi, to whom king Mahīpāla is said to have paid his respects, must have descended from the line of hereditary spiritual guides of the Pāla kings, which is recorded on the Buddha Pillar. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that

---

* Literally, "and the stone-work house."—
Dr. Rājendralīl Mitra 1 recordings of the Bengal Asiatic Society 1880, p. 28, reads silakkānamata; but the second assedra of silakkānamato is quite distinct on the stone.

* The Sanskrit equivalent of this name does not sug-

---

1 See Pāṇīit Bhagwanīlā Indrajit's Pāṇīit Līlā Caves, p. 5.
the curious name Gurava is borne by a member of that family, viz. by Śrīgaravamisra, the contemporary of king Nārāyasapāla.* The 'eight holy places,' which furnished the materials for the building of the Gandhakuti were very likely decayed Stūpas situated in the neighbourhood. The exact spot where the stone was found by Jagatsinī's men, and where the Stūpa repaired by the two brothers must have stood, has been ascertained by General Cunningham as lying 520 feet to the west of the great tower of Dhamek.†

TEXT.

Inscription A.

[1] जै न नेमे युक्तम् || वाराणिशिस्थर्ष्यं पुरव-श्रीविषयधारितायाम् || आराध्य निन्दकूलित-सरिष्टः || चैतन्येश्वरायम् || इत्यादिविणिस्तरिश्च इत्यादिकृतायां धारितायां यः || [ग्रंथितः]धिनो महीसः दामों श्रीमोहनरायण (युवः)।।

[2] सम्प्लुः कुपालिकाम् || श्रीविषयधारितायां || तै स्थविरंक्तः सार्वं धर्ममेऽपमेऽ || कुतलाने न निन्दकूलितादि यथाश्रवयोः श्रीमोहनरायण।।

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

Om, adoration to Buddha! The illustrious Sthiraśāla (and his) younger brother, the illustrious Vāsaṃṭapāla, whom the lord of Gaṇḍa, the illustrious Mahaśīla, caused to establish in Kāśī hundreds of precious monuments of his glory, such as Śānas (i.e. Līlagā), paintings, and bells, after he had worshipped the foot of Gurava-Śrī-Yāmarākśi, which is like a lotus in the lake of Vārāṇaśī surrounded, as it were, by śāvalla-plants through the hair of bowing kings,—they, who have made their learning fruitful, and who do not turn back (on their way) to supreme knowledge (bodhi), repaired the Dharmarājakā (and) the Dharmachakra with all its parts, and constructed this new Gandhakuti (made of) stones (coming from) eight holy places. Saṁvat 1083, on the 11th day of Pauha.

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, B.H., M.B.A.S., C.I.E.

(Continued from p. 109).

No. CLVI.

BRITISH MUSEUM PLATES OF VIRA-SAṬTASAYA.

The original plates containing the present inscription belong to the British Museum. No information is forthcoming as to where they were found; but, judging from the language used and the localities mentioned, it must have been somewhere in or near the Native State of Miraj in the Bombay Presidency.

The plates are three in number, each about 8½ long by 5½ broad. The edges of them are here and there very slightly raised into rims to protect the writing; and the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation almost throughout. The plates are numbered, at the beginning of the first and third plates, and of the second side of the second plate. The ring, on which the plates are strung, is about 3/4 thick and 2½ in diameter; it had not been cut when the grant came under my notice. The seal on the ring is rectangular, about 1½ by 1¼. It has, in relief on a deeply countersunk surface,—a very rudely executed figure of a boar, standing to the proper left, with the sun and moon above it. The characters are Nāgarī. The language is partly Sanskrit and

---

* See stanza 18 of the Budda inscription; Journ. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. XLIII. Part I. p. 358. The Dittaka or royal messenger of the Bhagulpur grant was also called Gurava; see id. Vol. XLVII. Part I. p. 406.—(We find similar names or titles of priests in Southern India: thus Gurava, applied to a Jain priest, ante Vol. XI. p. 71—; Gurava, applied to a Śaiva priest, id. p. 127—; and Gurava, applied to in all probability a Śaiva priest, p. 12 above.—Ed.)

† Archæol. Soc. Ind. Vol. I. p. 113f. and Plate xxxii.

5 Dharmarājakā = stūpa. The Petersburg Dictionary considers the word as a compound of dharmas and rājakā; but it seems better to derive it from dharmārāja (Pali dhammarāja), a name of Buddha.

Perfumed chamber, any private chamber devoted to Buddha's use; Childers, 6. c. gandhakuti. The gandhakuti at Jetavana near Sāvatthī is represented on a Bharhut bas-relief; see General Cunningham's Bharhut Stūpas, Plate LVII.
partly Kanarese; in addition to the orthography
being very bad, the language is very corrupt
throughout,—so much so, that it is inexpedient
to burden the text with corrections and foot-
notes pointing out the mistakes.

The inscription, if it is genuine, is one of
Vıra-Satyaśraya, the son of Gōvinda-
raya, of the very latest Chālukyas of
Kalyanapura, and of the Soma-
aviśa, which purports to be dated in Śaka 366
(A.D. 444-45), but which, like the present
inscription, is not earlier than the twelfth
century A.D.¹

In line 16 of this inscription, we have the
expression kaṭakawva-alākāla, which, according
to the Kaṭapayāti numeral system,⁴ has been
interpreted⁵ in other grants of the same kind,
as denoting the year 111. But it means
nothing more than "a camp was pitched."

TEXT.

First plate.

First plate; first side.

Second plate; first side.

¹ Published by Mr. Rice, ante Vol. VIII. p. 94 ff.
⁴ From the original plates.
⁵ Read pā́-dārākha.
Second plate; second side.

bhūma 200  paṁma-bhūmi 200  Mailārādēvā-bhūmi 200
mūlāstānādēvā-Māli-Bireyanāyakā-bhūmi 500  gri-
hē hasta 12  kusmān avsavanāda lāmanavu mudātā  Brahmādēvā
100  ṣoṁvarā 200  dvārāpatyā 100  nāvāyā 100
anāmikā 100  jāmā  grānā  isānyā  Koṅgulavā-
li-grāmā-Brevali-grāmā-Selagāra-t[ṛ*]grāmā-
trisāṅgaḏau  mārjāla-punja  vaḥalā  chhaṇka  saṁma-
tā  ṣaṁva-pāda  dakṣaḥ-abhimukhaṁ  gavā
Brevali-Selagāra-dvāngrāmā-sīmā-sarvāhiṁ-suchiya-
tē  jala-pravāha  vaḥalā  dhanu  vaṅka  sarpa-mukha-sa-
mī-saṁbhāṁ  chauḍra-silē  5  Virāḍharavuna-grāmā  āgnēya  Ma-
dubāviya-grāmā-Vorabali-Selagāra-t[ṛ*]grāmā-triśaṅgaḏau
pāśaṇa-punja  vupanidhi  tāraṁtaraṁlekaṭi  prāmaṇu  pa-

Third plate.

śchim-abhimukhaṁ  gavā  Madubāvi-Selagāra-sīmā-sa-
sāṁka-punja  Svayāmbhu-Krishṇa sarri  sumkiga-taṭāka-pachima-pār-
pathaṁ  Baragiri-Madakunikeya-sīme  varāha-taṭāka
ṛṣa-sīlā-punja  5  pachima-nairitya  Beluvali-
ke-Madakunike-Selagāra-[ṛ*]grāmā-triśaṅgaḏā  pa-
rasi-punja  2  vupanidhi  pāvak-bhṛṣiṣṭha-vuttar-abhimukhe
Beluvalike-Selagāra-dvāngrāmā-sīmā  sīlaḥ-
giri  3  achala-taṭāka  sīla-punja  6  vaṁda-parbata  ṣaṁ-
grāmā-vaṁdāya  Koṅgulavali-Beluvaliike-Sel-
gāra-triṣaṅgaḏau  pūrva  vaṁda-giri  mone  dvaṁ va-
ṇidhi  Bhairava-pāda  pūrva  Koṅgulavali-Selagāra-
sīme  raja-taṭāka  hēma-mrittikā-punja  4  kārāṣa-sīle  jala-pravāha
virāvaṁkadhār tathā isānyā-sīmā samāptāḥ  Sva-dataṁ para-dataṁ
vā yō ḍhēti  vaṁdaḥraṁ  sāṣṭiṛ-tasha-sahasraṁ  viśṭāyaṁ  jāyate  kṛmi

CHINGHIZ KHAN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

BY HENRY H. HOWORTH, F.S.A.
(Continued from p. 120).

XXX.

Having traced the doings of the three contingents which Chinghiz sent from the Indus, let us now turn to those of the great conqueror himself. After Jalālūd-dīn's army had been dispersed, and he had been driven across the river, Chinghiz, we are told by Minhaj-i-Sarāj, went in pursuit of the Ighrakī Musalmāns (who were very numerous) towards Gibari, which Major Rawerty identifies as "the country north of the Kabul river, between the Kaman or river of Kunar, and the Landey Sind, i.e. Bajawr, and the tracts forming its southern boundary." Chinghiz took the fortress of Gibari, probably Gabarkot, which Sultan Babar afterwards captured from Mir Haidar, the Gabari, and other forts in the Kohpayah or skirts of the hills, and stayed in this district three months. Thence he sent envoys to Iyal Tamsi, the Sultan of Dehli, apparently to ask his permission to be allowed to return home to Mongolia through Hindustan by way of Lakhnawati and Kamrud, or as Minhaj-i-Sarāj says, in another place, by way of Koh-i-Karachal and Kamrud. Our author tells us that Chinghiz consulted the burnt shoulder-blades of sheep as to the advisability of taking this route, but finding the augury unpropitious he determined to return home by another route. He first went, we are told, to Persia, where he waited

1 Tabakē-i-Nācir, 1043 and note.
2 ibid. pp. 1044-1045.
4 ibid. p. 1047.
during the summer and till he was rejoined by Bela and Darbâi, whom he had sent in pursuit of Jalâlu'd-din. Thence he went to the fortress of Kunanahu Kurghan, probably the modern Khinjan, north of the Pâropa pass. There Ogotai rejoined him, and they went on to Debuyah Ketur, to pass the winter, where he was supplied with forage and other necessaries by the governor of the district, called Salar Ahmed. This hilly country was much encumbered with snow, and by impassable forests. It was also very sickly, and the water was bad, so Chinghiz ordered his prisoners to shell a large quantity of rice. They cleaned from 300 to 400 mans in each household. He then had them put to death.

He now, as we are told, retraced his steps to Peshawar, which seems an inconsequent act, unless he merely went north temporarily for summer quarters, and thence went by way of Bamiyan to Baklan, where he had left his Ugruks, or heavy baggage. Having appointed daruqhas or commissaries to take charge of the various towns he had conquered, and having spent the autumn there he again advanced towards the Oxus. In passing near Balkh he had all the people put to death who had returned to occupy the place. The people there for twelve months had had to live on dogs, cats, &c., for the Mongols had destroyed all the crops. Ibn Batuta, who travelled through this district about a century later, tells us that Chinghiz destroyed at Balkh a third of its principal mosque, because of a treasure which was reported to have been buried under one of its columns. He tells us it was one of the finest and largest mosques in the world, and was reported to have been built by the wife of Daud-ibn-Ali who governed Balkh for the Abassides, and who devoted to its construction the value of a splendid pearl-embroidered robe, which she had offered the Khalifa in lieu of a contribution he had imposed upon the town. The Khalifa, touched by the generous offer, returned the robe. We read that after the building of the mosque one-third of the value of the robe still remaining, she ordered it to be buried under a pillar to be used in case of need.

Chinghiz, having heard of this, had one third of the pillars of the mosque pulled down to find this treasure, but nothing being discovered the rest were spared. Ibn Batuta speaks of Balkh as still in ruins when he passed through it.

To return to our story, Minbaj-i-Sârî and Rashidu'd-din tell us that Chinghiz was induced to return by news of a revolt in Tangut, but this is hardly likely, as he would not have withdrawn so leisurely if he had had such a pressing cause. The real explanation was probably the death of Mu-khu-li, his commander-in-chief in China, who died in April 1223. The Chinese accounts give a different reason for his retreat. We read in the biography of Yelini Chutsai, that Chinghiz carried his arms as far as the Eastern Hindus. While his troops were halting in the "Iron Gate," he saw an animal like a stag with the tail of a horse, with a green body and having a single horn on its head. This extraordinary animal had the faculty of human speech, and cried out to the emperor's guards that he should at once retire. Chinghiz, astonished at this prodigy, consulted Yelini Chutsai, who replied:—"This remarkable animal is the Kuituan. It understands all languages. It loves living beings, and has a horror of carnage. It has come to tell you that you are the eldest son of heaven, and that the people are your children, and it tells you how heaven would have you treat them." Whereupon the emperor ordered the army to retire. The biography just cited has preserved another anecdote of Yelini Chutsai of this campaign. We there read that a violent epidemic broke out in the Mongol ranks, and that the generals had thought of nothing but amassing gold and rich stuffs. Chutsai, on the other hand, had collected books, and among other natural products a large quantity of medicinal rhubarb, whose qualities he knew. He now used it, and thus saved the lives of 10,000 people.

The Chinese accounts give us additional information about Chinghiz Khân's doings at this time. The Yuaa-ch'ao-pi-sh'i tells us that after the
defeat of Jalâh'-d-dín Chinghiz went up the river of Shin (i.e. the Indus, took the city of Batkesie (?), arrived at the rivers of Ekei-borohan and Geun-borohan (doubtless the Gunam Kurgan of Rashidu-d-dín already mentioned which was no river, but a hill, Kurgan meaning a mound or hill), and pitched his camp at Barana Keber, i.e. the plain of Peruan. The same authority tells us that Chinghiz spent a year in the mountains of Altan-hor-huan, where the king of the Muwashmadans was accustomed to encamp. In the Yuma-shi we read, under the year 1223:—“In order to avoid the heat of summer the Emperor moved to the valley (or river) Ba-lu-wan, i.e. Peruan, after which he was joined by the princes Juchi, Cha-ho-tai, and Wo-k'uo-tai, and the general Ba-la, on their return from their expeditions. When the conquered realms in the Si-yu were pacified, da-lu-hua-chi were appointed to govern them.” Again, in the year 1224, the emperor advanced as far as Tung-yu-dukno, where he met the Kiotuan, and then turned back. In the Kang-mu we read that Chinghiz recrossed the river Simotai with his army, and returned westwards. Having made himself master of the city of Seistan he went to pass the summer heats on the river Balu-wan, i.e. Peruan, and subjected all the neighbouring tribes, and having reached the fortress of K'hohe nominated Ta-huh-tai-wen or governors in each town of Si-yu, and then continued his march. The Yuma-shi-lee-pien says that Chinghiz having passed the great heats at a place called Pa-lu-wan, Juchi, and his brothers and the generals assembled there, and a form of government was devised for the western conquests, and this was the first occasion that Chinghiz appointed in addition to military commanders Ta-lu-hoa (daraghaz), i.e. Mandarins, who had seals and decided causes. After reporting the story about Yelín Chutai already mentioned, the author of this work goes on to say what is indeed most probable, that seeing that the leaders of the army were weary of a war in such a distant country, Chinghiz said he wished to return to Tartary. The Huang-yuan tells us that in the spring of 1223, Chinghiz marched northwards along the Sin-tae-su, i.e. the Indus. He spent the summer on the River Ba-lu-wan (Perruan), and defeated the enemy in the neighbourhood. After the arrival of the corps under Ba-la he again advanced to the fort of Ke-un, where the third prince, i.e. Ogotai, also arrived. He then placed a da-lu-hua-chi, i.e. daraghaz, in every city, and returned homewards.

While Chinghiz was in this mountain district he was visited by the famous Taouist philosopher Ch'ang-Ch'un, whom he had summoned to his presence as I have mentioned in a previous chapter. I described how he obeyed the great conqueror's summons, and how he and his companions left Peking and traversed the Ku-yung Pass in the Great Wall. Soon after they met a band of robbers, who, however, did them no harm, but passed on, saying, “We do not harm the master.” Having reached To-hing, now Pao-auchau, N.W. of Peking and south of Sunan-hun-fu, they passed the summer and winter of 1220 there, in the temple of Lung-yang-kuan.

In the autumn Ali-sien arrived as a messenger from Ochin (Ochigin), Chinghiz Khan's youngest brother, asking Ch'ang-Ch'un to call on him on his way to the emperor. Early in February, 1221, the travellers again set out, the old sage promising his sorrowful disciples that he would be back in three years. They passed Ts'ai-ping-k'u, a defile 30 li west of Kalgan, and next day the mountains Ye-hu-ling. “The mountain air was delicious,” says the biographer. “Towards the north were only cold, sandy deserts and parched grass. These are the limits of the breath of Chinese nature. We saw a field of battle, covered with bleached bones.” Proceeding northwards they passed Fu-chau, the Kara-balghasun of the Mongols, 30 miles from Kalgan on the road from Peking to Kia-khta. It is called Little Yen, i.e. Little Peking, in one of Ch'ang-Ch'un's poems. Passing the lake K'ai-li, probably the K'ol-eh-lu of the Chinese maps, they five days later passed the earthen Rampart, traversing Southern Mongolia, called Ming-ch'ang, from its having been built in the years so styled, 1190-1196, by the Kia emperor

14 Altan-hor-huan, the golden hills.
15 Bretschneider, Notes, p. 62.
16 i.e. Juchi, Jagatai and Ogotai. The mention of Juchi, as we shall see, is a mistake.
17 i.e. western regions.
18 The kingdom of Eastern Yindu or Hindu.
19 ibid. pp. 63 and 64.
20 Gunam-kurgan above cited.
22 Gambl., pp. 41 and 42.
23 Bretschneider, Notes, etc., p. 67.
Madaku. They then traversed the great sandy desert, Sha-mo, and reached the lake Yu’r-h-li, where Chinghiz retired to after his campaign in China in 1215. The name means the fishing lake, and is identified by Dr. Bretschneider with the Po-yu-rh-hai of other Chinese writers, situated in Southern Mongolia, lat. 43° 50’ N., called Tar-nor by the Mongols. Leaving here they travelled towards the north-east, passing a number of black carts and white tents, and eventually reached a tributary of the Lu-ku, or Kerulen, which they forded. Early in May, 1221, they reached the camp of Ochigin. The ice was only just beginning to melt, and the first green was appearing on the ground. A wedding was being celebrated, and many Mongol chiefs had arrived with mare’s milk, and several thousand black carts and white tents were ranged in rows. Ch’ang-ch’un had an interview with Ochigin, who inquired about the means of prolonging life. It was thought more becoming that the sage should reserve his precepts for the hearing of Chinghiz Khan, and he promised to call again, and impart his knowledge on his return. Ochigin supplied the party with 100 horses and 10 carts, and they again set out, and soon reached the Kerulen, where it spreads itself out into a big lake, i.e. probably Lake Ku-lun, the Dalai Nor. They went along the southern banks of the Kerulen, and an eclipse of the sun took place at noon. This was early in June, 1221. The high willows on the banks of the Kerulen were utilized by the Mongols for making their tents.

After 16 days’ journey, they reached a place where the river changes its direction towards the north-west, and they took the direct post road from Yu’r-h-li to Karakorum. The Mongols presented him with millet, and said they had been waiting a year for him, and he gave them jujubes. The country now was well peopled, the natives living in black carts and white tents, and being engaged in cattle-breeding and hunting. They dressed in furs and skins, and lived on milk and flesh meat. They passed a ruined city traditionally built by the Khitans, where they found a tile with Khitan characters on it, and which was probably Karakorum. They then entered the rugged passes of the Khang-kai chain where our chronicler noticed the immense pine-trees and very severe cold, and eventually reached one of Chinghiz Khan’s ordu, where one of his wives lived. The sage received an invitation to visit the ordus, and we are told the Chinese princess and the Princess of Hia (i.e. two of Chinghiz Khan’s concubines, daughters respectively of the Chinese Emperor and the Emperor of Hia) sent presents of millet and silver. Flour here cost 50-ch’iu for every 80 kin (one kin = 1½ lb.) It had to be brought on camels from beyond the Tien Shan, or Celestial Mountains. Leaving the ordus they proceeded several days in a southerly direction, and apparently approached the country of the Uighurs, passing near the ruins of an ancient city called Ho-la-Siao. Not far from the modern Ulussutai they met some Hui-ho or Uighurs, who were engaged in irrigating the fields. Several days later they reached a range of snowy mountains called A-bu-han in the Si-yu-kí and A-ju-huan in the biography of Chen-hai in the Yuan-shí. I cannot identify it. Perhaps the name survives in that of the River Jabkan. South of these mountains the travellers found a town called T’ien-ch’en-hai—ba-la-ho-sun. There were more than 300 families from Western Asia there, engaged in weaving gold brocade, and 300 from Pien-king (i.e. Kai-feng-fu in Honan) making woollen cloth. The people came out to meet the sage with great joy, bearing variegated umbrellas and presents of flowers. There also went to him two concubines of the Kin Emperor, and the mother of a Chinese princess, trophies of the Mongol campaign in China. The latter said she had often heard of and wished to see him, and expressed her wonder at having at length met him under such strange circumstances. Chen-hai paid the sage a visit, who expressed his surprise that agriculture should be carried on in such a desert. He also asked him if he should stay there till Chinghiz Khan’s return. Chen-hai replied that, on the contrary, he had received orders to expedite his journey. He
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22 Balgasun in Mongol means town, t’ien means field. Chen-hai is the name of a high official in the Mongol service, called Ching-kai by Bashidu’d-din, who was a Uighur. In his biography in the Yuan-shí we are told that a military settlement was established at A-la-hu-nan by Chinghiz Khan and Chen-hai was appointed its governor, whence, no doubt, the place was called Chen-hai—ba-la-ho-sun. It was also called T’ang-t’u, from the magazines of corn there.
also said that in the country they would now have to traverse there were precipitous mountains and wide marshes which could not be crossed by a cart. He proposed that they should travel on horseback, and leave some of their people behind. Ch'ang-Ch'un agreed, and left nine of his disciples, for whom he built a monastery, the rich contributing money and the poor labour. It was completed in less than a month, and was called Si-hia Khan, from the name of Ch'ang-Ch'un's birthplace, Si-hia.

Early in September 1221, the sago again set out with 10 disciples and 20 Mongols from the station with two carts. Chen-hai also accompanied him with an escort of 100 horsemen. The district they now traversed, apparently the so-called Sukhe Gobi, was said to be infested by goblins, and one of Chen-hai's servants reported that he himself had been pulled by the hair by one, while the Khan of the Naimans was also charmed there by a goblin, to whom he had had to offer a sacrifice. After travelling S. W. for 3 days and then to the S. E., passing a great mountain and traversing a vast defile, the travellers reached the Kin-shan, or golden mountains, i.e. the Altai, or rather that branch of them known as Ek-tag, over which the road had been planned and constructed by the 3rd prince, i.e. by Ogotai, when the army marched westwards. This pass was probably the one followed by the modern road from Kobod into the valley of the Urunga. The Mongol escort was employed in dragging the carts up the steep ascents and putting drags upon the wheels when descending. Having crossed the mountains, upon which Ch'ang Ch'un composed a poem, they proceeded southwards, and traversed the wastes of the Western Gobi, the most difficult part of their journey. "We have before us," said Chen-hai, "the po-hu-tien (field of white bones). All over is thickly strewn with black stones. * * * That is an old battle-field, a field of death. One time a whole army perished there from exhaustion; no one escaped. A short time ago, at the same place, the army of the Naimans was destroyed by Chinghis." It is curious to find this waste still called Naiman Minggan Gobi, while a range of hills traversing it is called Naiman Ula. To prevent being charmed by the goblins: Ch'ang Ch'un's companions rubbed their horses' heads with blood.

The old man smiled at this, and remarked that goblins fled when they met a good man, and that it did not behove a Taoist to entertain such notions.

Presently the travellers reached a small Uighur town, north of the Tien-shan range, probably Gu-ch'en, where the road from the north joins that going west. The Uighurs went out to meet the sage and presented him with fruits and Persian linen cloth. Travelling westwards he crossed a river and passed two small towns; the land was artificially irrigated, and wheat was just beginning to ripen. This was in September. He now reached Bie-sze-ma, i.e. Bish-balgh (the modern Urumtsi), the capital of the Uighurs, where the king and officers and people, the Buddhist and Taoist priests, went out to meet him.

He lodged in a vineyard outside the city, and was supplied with wine made from grapes, fruits, &c. by the relatives of the king. People crowded round him, and about him were seen Buddhists, Taoists and Confucianists. Leaving again, they in four days halted east of Lun-t'ai, where they were met by the chief of the Tiusi (i.e. the Tersa of the Persian writers) by whom a high dignitary of the Nestorians is probably meant. Thence they went on again to Ch'ang-balga (i.e. Chang-balgh), which is also mentioned in the itinerary of Yelisa-Hiliang and is there placed east of the river Ma-na-sze. It is probably the modern Maans. Its ruler was also a Uighur and an old friend of Chen-hai, and went with his relatives and the Uighur priests to meet him. He entertained the sage with a dinner on a terrace, and his wife gave them wine. They also supplied them with very large water-melons and sweet melons. Here he also conversed with a Buddhist priest by means of an interpreter. West of this there were neither Buddhists nor Taoists. Going onwards along the sandy deserts north of the Tien-shan, the travellers reached the rugged country about Lake Sairam, through which we are told roads had been cut by Chinghis' second son, i.e. Chagatai. He made these roads through the rocks, and built 48 bridges with the wood which grew on the mountains. The bridges were so wide that two carts could pass over them abreast. The travellers having crossed the Borohoro Mountains entered a more fertile
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country, where mulberries and jujubes grew, and reached A-li-ma, i.e. Almaligh, the modern Ilī or old Kulja, where the ruler of the realm of Pasu-man (? a form of Flano Carpini’s Besserman, the old Russian Bussurman, i.e. Musulman) together with the Mongol ta-lu-hua-chi (darughra) went out to meet them. The biographer of Ch’ang-Ch’un mentions the apples (alino) for which Almaligh was famous, and also that the people there used a kind of cloth called tutuna, made of vegetable wool (i.e. of cotton), which was then very little known in China.\(^{21}\) He also mentions the aqueducts used in irrigation.

Moving on from Almaligh the travellers in four days reached the River Talas which they crossed at the end of October. Chung-lu now hastened on as a courier, to announce the saxe’s approach to Chinghiz Khan, while Chen-hai continued to escort him. A few days later they met the envoy of the Kin emperor whom we have already named, who was on his way back to China, and reported that Chinghiz was pursuing the Sultan Jalalu’d-din towards India.\(^{22}\) This part of the country, we are told, belonged to the empire of Si-Liao or Kara Khitai, and its people were engaged in agriculture, and in raising silk. They also made grape wine there. As it did not rain during the whole summer and autumn, the land had to be artificially watered by canals.

Passing along the northern flanks of the Alexanderfoki Mountains, the travellers reached a ruined city built of red stones, a military encampment, and great grave-mounds, i.e., the neighbourhood of Avlie-ata. Crossing the mountains by the well-known gorge at Avlie-ata they speedily reached Sairam, whose Muhammadan ruler went out to meet them and directed them to their lodgings. There one of Ch’ang-Ch’un’s disciples, named Ch’ao-tsin-ku, died.\(^{23}\) Going onwards now to the southwest they arrived in three days at a town whose Muhammadan ruler also entertained them. After passing another town they reached the Ho-ch’ao-mullen, i.e., Ho-ch’ao-Muran, or river of Khojend, meaning the Sihun or Jaxartes. This they crossed by a floating bridge, the guardian of which presented Chenhai with a fish having an enormous mouth and without scales (probably a silurus). They passed two towns, outside one of which they were entertained with dinner and wine, while boys performed some plays, dancing with swords and climbing on poles to amuse them. Passing two more towns they traversed a valley running north and south, where they passed the night under a wide-spreading mulberry-tree, which could shelter 100 men. At another town they saw a well over 100 feet deep, where an old Muhammadan had a bullock which turned the draw-beam and thus drew water for people. Chinghiz had noticed him on his march, and ordered him to be exempt from taxes. At Siem-siz-kan (Samarkand), the Tai-shi-yi-la-kuo-kung doubtless as we have seen, Yeliu Chutai with the other officials went to meet them. Chung-lu informed the saxe that some rebels had recently broken the floating bridge over the Amu Daria or Oxus, and that as it was the depth of winter he had better wait at Samarkand till the spring, which he agreed to do. He tells us that in the midst of the city was an elevated place about 100 feet high on which the Sultan’s new palace had been built. This had been afterwards occupied by the Taishi, who on account of some robberies no longer lived there, and it was given up to Ch’ang-Ch’un, who said the Taouisists had no fear. The Taishi supplied everything needed for his daily wants. He was frequently visited by Chinese, who went to pay him their respects, and he also discussed the eclipse of the sun, which he had seen on the Kerulon with an astronomer. He tells us this eclipse was total at noon on the Kerulon, that 1/10ths of the sun were alone eclipsed at the Kin Shan Mountains, and the eclipse there was at its height at 10 in the morning. At Samarkand only 1/10ths were so eclipsed. He explains the nature of solar eclipses in naive, but accurate language. Meanwhile Chingslu, who had been sent on to explore, returned with the report that the second prince, i.e. Chagatai, had moved with an army and had repaired the bridges, and that Chinghiz Khan was then south of the Ta-sue-shan, i.e. the Hindu-Kush, and that the road by which he would have to travel was thickly covered with snow. The prince, i.e. Chagatai, invited the saxe to pay him a visit, and wait till the time was more convenient for starting, but he declined on the plea that he only lived on vegetables, rice meal, &c., and understood there were none there. He describes the balus or almonds trees at Samarkand and also the peacocks and
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elephants from India he saw there. He speaks of the environs of the city as very beautiful, everywhere lakes, orchards, terraces, towers, and tents. “We lay down on the grass,” says the narrator, “and were all very happy together, talking about matters sublime.” Even Chinese gardens, we are told, were not to be compared to those of Samarkand, but there was an absence of birds.

Ch’ang-Ch’un now received an urgent summons at the hands of Ali-sien to go to Chinghiz, who was impatient to hear him explain the doctrines of Tao, and who had ordered Bo-lu-ji (or Borji, the Borommi named in an earlier chapter) to escort him through the pass of Derbend. Leaving three of his disciples behind, he set out in the beginning of May, taking five or six others with him, still accompanied by the adjutant Ching-ju and by Chen-hai. They passed Kesh (Timur’s birthplace) and the defile of Derbend, through which he was escorted by Borji with 100 Mongols and Musalmans, who helped to pull the carts on the different roads. Eventually they reached the Ama Daria. The narrator’s naive statements are curious. He mentions the reeds that grew along an old artificial watercourse as being so stout that they used them for supporting the shafts of their carts. The spears of the soldiers were shafted with bamboo. They also saw lizards three feet long, and of a dark colour.

At last, about the 22nd of May, they reached Chinghiz Khan’s camp, which was then apparently at Peruan. He sent a high official to greet the sage. After he had been settled in his quarters he had an audience with Chinghiz who remarked, “You were invited by the other courts (i.e. the Sang and Kin) but you refused, yet you have come 10,000 li to see me; I am gratified.” To which Ch’ang-Ch’un replied, “The wild man of the mountains came to see the Emperor by order of your Majesty, it was the will of Heaven.” Chinghiz then turned to business, and asked him if he had a medicine of immortality. The sage announced, “There are means for preserving life, but no medicines for immortality.” This answer was no doubt very disappointing to the Mongol Chief who, however, praised him for his candour. He had two tents pitched for him to the east of his own, and gave him the title of Shen-sien, i.e. “the immortal.” In the summer they went to the snowy mountains to pass the hot season. Meanwhile the exigencies of war afforded little time for explaining the doctrines of Tao, and as Chinghiz had to be away on a fresh campaign, the sage returned to Samarkand to await the great Khan’s leisure. He was escorted thither by Yang Aku, with 1,000 men, and the narrative describes the road traversing the Hindu-Kush in which was the Shi-men (i.e. stone gate) and at a distance rocks on each side looking like candles, an immense slab lay across these rocks like a bridge, and beneath it ran a rapid torrent. Many of the soldiers’ donkeys were drowned in crossing and the sage, who composed an ode on the passage, complains of the bad smell from the dead bodies, and how he had to hold his nose in passing. They passed soldiers carrying trophies from the war, inter alia, trees of coral, some a foot long. Some of their escort bought 50 coral-trees for 2 yis of silver, but journeying on horseback it was impossible to prevent breaking them. The travellers again reached Samarkand which was called Ho-chung-fu, i.e. Between-the-rivers, by the Taishi, i.e. by Yeliu-Tashi. Ch’ang-Ch’un took up his quarters in the palace where he had previously lodged. In the hot season he was accustomed to sit at the northern window and enjoy the breeze, while at night he slept on the flat roof.

The Chinese traveller gives us an interesting picture of Samarkand. He tells us the arable land there was well suited for growing corn, but that buck-wheat and the soy bean (soya hispida) did not grow there. Wheat was ripe in May, and when ready was piled up in heaps. He describes the watermelons as very fragrant, sweet and large, no melons like them being found in China. Some of them were given him by the Taishi’s attendant, and Chung-ju begged some of them for the prince, i.e. for Chagatai. Other fruits abounded there, but not chestnuts or the colocasia. The egg-plants were shaped like fingers, and of great size. Men and women braided their hair, and the caps of the former at a distance resembled mounds. They were adorned with embroidery and tassels. All officers wore them. The lower orders wrapped their heads in turbans of muslin about 6 feet long. Most of their
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vessels were of copper, but they also had porcelain as in China. Their money was of gold but had no holes in it (i.e. was not like the Chinese cash), and had Muhammadan letters on each side. The people were very strong, and carried heavy burdens on their backs without any crossbeam. They had men well versed in books, and exclusively devoted to writing, who were called Dāshīma, i.e. Dānishmand (Persian for a learned person), doubtless denoting the mullah. In winter they fasted for a whole month (i.e. during Ramazān), during which the Superior (Ch'ang) killed a sheep for the meal and all sat round cross-legged and ate the whole night. They had high buildings (i.e. minarets), with galleries with rafters standing out about 10 feet at the top, on which a pavilion was planted, hung round with tassels. Every morning and evening the Superior went up and bowed to the west (i.e. to Makkā). He sang in a loud tone there (i.e. repeated the asān), and the people gathered below to pray. Whoever neglected these duties was executed. The Superior was dressed like the rest, except that he had a turban of white muslin. In the middle of August 1222 the sage sent A-li-ien to Chinghiz to inquire when he would be ready to be instructed in the doctrine of Tao, and the following month, having heard from Chinghiz, they set out for his camp.

He was accompanied for some distance by the Taishi. They went by way of Kōshi, i.e. Kash, and were escorted by 1,000 men on foot and 300 horsemen, and afterwards, instead of traversing the Derbend defile passed round it. The Chinese travellers were struck by the deposits of red salt on the hills in this district, as at home salt was only found in the plains. They were also surprised to find the Muhammadans drinking water even in winter, the Chinese only drinking tea. After crossing the Oxus in a boat, they went past a mountain fortress called T'uan-ba-la where they met Chen-kun, physician to the third prince, i.e. Ogotai. They went up the river in a boat past Banli, i.e. Balkh, whose inhabitants had rebelled shortly before and had fled. The travellers heard the barking of dogs inside. Chen-hai, who had stayed behind when Ch'ang-Ch'ün went to the camp before, now went to meet him and asked him if he would be presented at once or rest. He begged to be presented at once. We are told that the professors of Tao, when presented to the Emperor, were not required to fall down upon their knees or bow their heads to the ground like others, but on entering the Imperial tent merely made a bow and put their hands together. Chinghiz preferred the sage some kuan, which he refused to take. He also wished him to dine every day with him, but he replied that he preferred seclusion, he was only a wild man of the mountains, who cultivated the true doctrine of Tao, and therefore liked seclusion, so he was allowed to live as he liked.

In the beginning of October 1222, Chinghiz set out on his return journey north, and was accompanied by Ch'ang-Ch'ün, to whom he sent presents of grape-wine, water-melons, &c. A few days later they crossed the Oxus on a floating bridge and shortly after, at the instance of Ch'ang-Ch'ün, a tent was prepared where he might explain the doctrine of Tao to the Emperor. Chen-hai and Chung-Iu were present, and the taishi or councillor A-tai acted as interpreter. We are told Chinghiz was much edified with the discourse, had the conversation renewed, and ordered the doctrine to be written down both in Chinese and Mongol. When they reached Samarkand, Ch'ang-Ch'ün had another audience with Chinghiz, who asked him if the bystanders should withdraw. He said they might remain. He always referred to himself as the wild man of the mountains, and went on to say he had for many years devoted himself to the study of Tao, and liked to be in solitude. He could not pursue his contemplations amidst the uproar of the camp, and asked permission to be allowed to travel alone, either in front or behind the camp, which was allowed him. At Samarkand he distributed the remains of his provisions among the hungry people, who were very numerous. He left that city in the beginning of January 1223. The weather was very severe and many of their bullocks and horses died on the way. Having crossed the Sihun they reached Chinghiz Khan's camp, who was also en his way home. He was told that the night before the bridge over the river had been broken and swept away. Heagain had a
conversation with Chinghiz. Early in February 1223, the commander-in-chief, the physician in ordinary, and the chief diviner went to congratulate him. Having stayed a while to recruit his cattle in a large valley three days' journey S.W. of Sairam which was rich in grass, he set out, in March 1223, urged upon Chinghiz that when he set out from home he promised to be back in three years and that he wished to see his native mountains again in this, the third year. "I am myself returning to the East, won't you go with me?" said the Emperor. "I have explained all your Majesty wished to hear; I have nothing more to say," was the reply. On his pressing hard to be allowed to leave, Chinghiz refused, saying his sons would be there in a few days and that there were some points in his doctrine which he did not quite understand, when he did so he would let him go. Having crossed the Sihun they travelled onwards to a valley about 3 days' journey from Sairam, where they stayed awhile to recruit their horses.

In the middle of March 1223, Chinghiz was thrown from his horse while boar-hunting, the wounded boar stopped and the Emperor was in danger. The sage admonished him on the dangers of hunting at his advanced age. He now again asked leave to go, but Chinghiz bade him wait a little so that he might explain the parting gift he intended giving him. On his renewing his request a number of bullocks and horses were given to him. These the sage refused, saying post horses were all he needed. Chinghiz evidently treated the sage with great consideration, and there is a tradition that he wished him to marry his daughter, an embarrassing request, which he evaded by performing a surgical operation on his body. He issued a decree exempting all the professors of the Tao doctrine from paying taxes, and sent A-li-sien to accompany him home, and with him Meng-gu-dai and Go-la-ba-hai. The sage took leave of the Emperor in the middle of April 1223. All the officers, from the Terkhanas down to the lower ranks accompanied him for 20 li on his way with wine and rare fruits, all being in tears. When they reached Sairam some of his disciples went to sacrifice at the tomb of their companion who had died on the journey west, as we mentioned. They wished to transport his remains to China, but Ch'ang-Ch'un said, "The body, formed temporarily of the four elements, decays without any value, but the soul has a real existence, is free, and cannot be grasped;" they then spoke no more about it, but went on. Presently they were joined by the Suan-chai (Imperial envoy) A-gu, who had received orders to accompany him. They travelled along the southern bank of the river Chai. When they arrived near Almaligh, the architect-in-chief to the 2nd prince, i.e. Chagatai, wished him to cross the Ill to inaugurate some buildings there, but this was not carried out.

The statement is curious, and points to Almaligh having been Chagatai's capital even before his father's death. Starting again they crossed the 48 bridges already mentioned, and approached the sacred lake, i.e. Lake Sairam. They travelled along the same road by which they had previously gone, and crossed the Kin-Shan or Chinese Altai mountains, i.e. the Ek-tagh. As they neared A-bu-han the disciples whom they had left there went out a long way to welcome them to their new monastery of Si-hia-kaan, from which we are told the Kin-Shan range could be seen. The master's descent from his cart was marked by a propitious fall of rain. The people there artificially irrigated their fields, the corn was generally ripe in September, and when ripe it was often damaged by mice, which were white. The biographer says that the seasons here were late, and in June they found ice a foot thick at a depth of about a foot from the surface, some of which they got daily for their use. Close by were high mountains covered with perpetual snow and tornados sometimes sprang up tearing up trees, stones, and houses. Coal existed in the mountains, the streams from which were often so swollen in winter that they caused floods. About 100 li to the north-west was the country of Kemjemjen, where iron was found and squirrels abounded. Many Chinese lived there, manufacturing silk, &c. The natives of the country about A-bu-han, we are told, called water wu-su and grass at-su; the Mongols still call water wu-su and grass ubusu. The people told Ch'ang-Ch'un that formerly they had followed the cult of mountain goblins and other spirits, but since the foundation of the monastery a service of true doctrines (Tao) had been established, and men had made a vow to kill no
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living creature. At first we read the Taoists there had a bad time of it, and were much persecuted, the physician Lo-sheng having especially persecuted them, but on one occasion as he was passing the Temple he was thrown from his horse and broke his leg, when he was moved to repentance and begged pardon. By degrees the demoniacal influences also disappeared. A-li-sien now told the sage that the southern route was very stony and sandy, with little grass and water, and their party being numerous their horses would suffer considerably, and there would be much delay. Ch'ang-Ch'un therefore advised that they should divide the party into 3 sections. He sent six of his disciples in advance, and seven days later started himself with six others and was accompanied by the most respectable people in the place, who shed tears as he departed. A few days later five more of his disciples set out. They travelled day and night through a sandy, barren country, and eventually reached the northern frontiers of Hia or Tangut, where they were joined by the disciples who had been left behind. In July 1223 he reached Yü-Yang-Kuan, a defile leading through the In-shan range north of Kuku-khoto. Hence his journey through northern China was a continuous ovation. "Invitations succeeding each other like the spokes of a rolling wheel." He eventually arrived at the temple of Ch'ang-tien-kuan on the 7th of the 1st month of 1224, three years after he set out. He lived at Peking till 1227 when he died, in the very same month as Chinghiz Khán himself. A large concourse of Taoists assembled there and built a monastery to hold his remains. This monastery still exists west of Peking, is known as Po-yün-kuan, and is the principal Taoist monastery in China. 30

For the account of the journey above described I am under complete obligations to Dr. Bretschneider. It is assuredly one of the most extraordinary incidents in Asiatic history that Chinghiz Khán, the scourge of God, should in the very middle of his terrible career be visited at his own request by the professor of such a harmless and humane philosophy as Taoism, should listen patiently to its transcendental vagaries, and treat its pro-

30 The chronology of Chinghiz Khán's monuments, as described by Rashidu'd-din and by Ch'ang Ch'un's biographer, involves a discrepancy of 12 months. Rashidu'd-din makes Chinghiz resolve to return home in the spring of 1223, spend the summer of 1223-4 near Samarkand, and start on his return in 1224, which in fact agrees with the Ts'an-shi, but the Si ya he dates the same events 12 months earlier. 33 De la Croix, pp. 339.
and markets were in ruins, except a few. Its inhabitants were despised. Their testimony was not received at Khurásan, nor elsewhere, on account of their proneness to lying, impudence, and partiality. There is not at present, he adds, a man of learning in Bukhara nor who desires to become one. From Bukhara Chinghiz went on to Samarkand, where he also had an interview with the grandees, and told them that God had given him the victory over their former Bādhshah (i.e. the Khurásan Shāh) and had enabled him to overthrow and destroy him, and that they must now devote themselves to his praise and glory. The head Kāzī then asked that they might have a diploma exempting them from taxes called a Tarkhan *yariagh*. He then asked them if the Sulṭān exacted these dues from them, and on their saying yes, he deemed it unreasonable that they should pay them when they devoted themselves to praying for his welfare, and he accordingly granted *yariagh*, exempting all the kāzīs and imāms from taxation.

---

**BOOK NOTICE.**

_The Book of Sindibad: or the Story of the King, his Son, the Damel, and the Seven Vaisrs. From the Persian and Arabic; with introduction, notes, and appendix, by W. A. Clouston._ (Privately printed), 1884.

This volume gives us a "compendious account of the Eastern and Western groups of romances, known respectively under their generic titles of the Book of Sindibad and the Book of the Seven Wise Masters." In his Introduction, extending over 40 pages, Mr. Clouston gives a clear and interesting account of the structure of the _Book of Sindibad_, and the probable sources of the several Eastern versions; and to this is prefixed a comparative table of the Tales in this group, illustrating the relationship which the different texts bear to one another. As Benfey has pointed out, the frame-work of the _Book of Sindibad_ is very similar to the well-known Indian legend of Kunāla and his step-mother, Tshayarakshī; and in the _Srāngadharachārīta_ and the _Kundradīma-charita_ we find stories of like character. But while the book is almost certainly of Indian origin, our oldest text is an imperfect MS. of a Syriac version, made from the work of Mūsa, a Persian, who probably rendered it into Arabic about the middle of the 8th century. From Arabic it was translated into Syriac, into old Spanish (in 1233), and into Hebrew; and from Syriac into Greek (about 1190 A.D.) under the title of Gnatipas.

This is followed by a reprint (from the _Asiatic Journal_, Vol. XXXV. and XXXVI, 1841) of an epitome or analysis of a unique Persian MS. poem—the _Sindibād Nāma_, by Prof. Forbes Falconer. Of some of the tales in this imperfect MS. Falconer gave only the titles, and others he presented in a very abridged form; Mr. Clouston has, therefore, added translations of the (ten) tales omitted by the first translator, and has rectified several grave errors, while he has carefully edited the whole with explanatory notes.

The _Seven Vaisrs_ is the translation made by Dr. Jonathan Scott—not a very accurate Arabic scholar—from the _Thousand and One Nights_, and published in 1860. This is also edited with corrections and additions.

Lastly comes the Appendix (pp. 217-278); which is interesting as tracing the migration westwards of an Eastern fable, and the modifications which it underwent in transmission. Altogether, this volume is a most welcome addition to our collections of Folklore, and we trust the author will be encouraged to add other works to those he has already published.

---

47 Erdmann, pp. 433-434; De la Croix, pp. 342-343.
XI.—The Good Husband and the Bad Wife.

In a remote village there lived a Brāhmaṇī whose good nature and charitable disposition were proverbial. Equally proverbial also were the ill-nature and uncharitable disposition of the Brāhmaṇī—his wife. But as Paramēśvara (God) had joined them in matrimony, they had to live together as husband and wife, though their temperaments were so incompatible. Every day the Brāhmaṇī had a taste of his wife's ill-temper, and if any other Brāhmaṇī was invited to dinner by him, his wife, somehow or other, would manage to drive him away.

One fine summer morning a rather stupid Brāhmaṇī friend of his came to visit our hero and was at once invited to dinner. He told his wife to have dinner ready earlier than usual, and went off to the river to bathe. His friend not feeling very well that day wanted a hot bath at the house, and so did not follow him to the river, but remained sitting in the outer verandah of the house. If any other guest had come the wife would have accused him of greediness to his face and sent him away, but this visitor seemed to be a special friend of her lord, so she did not like to say anything; but she devised a plan to make him go away of his own accord.

She proceeded to smear the ground before her husband's friend with cowdung, and placed in the midst of it a long pestle supporting one end of it against the wall. She next approached the pestle most solemnly and performed worship (pujā) to it. The guest did not in the least understand what she was doing, and respectfully asked her what it all meant.

"This is what is called pestle worship," she replied. "I do it as a daily duty, and this pestle is meant to break the head of some human being in honour of a goddess, whose feet are most devoutly worshipped by my husband. Every day as soon as he returns from his bath in the river he takes this pestle, which I am ordered to keep ready for him before his return, and with it breaks the head of any human being whom he has managed to get hold of by inviting him for a meal. This is his tribute (dakshina) to the goddess; today you are the victim."

The guest was much alarmed. "What! break the head of a guest! I at any rate shall not be deceived today," thought he, and prepared to run away.

The Brāhmaṇī's wife appeared to sympathise with his sad plight, and said—

"Really, I do pity you. But there is one thing you can do now to save yourself. If you go out by the front door and walk in the street my husband may follow you, so you had better go out by the back door."

To this plan the guest most thankfully agreed, and hastily ran off by the back door.

Almost immediately our hero returned from his bath, but before he could arrive his wife had cleaned up the place she had prepared for the pestle worship; and when the Brāhmaṇī, not finding his friend in the house inquired of her as to what had become of him, she said in seeming anger:

"The greedy brute! he wanted me to give him this pestle—this very pestle which I brought forty years ago as a dowry from my mother's house, and when I refused he ran away by the back-yard in haste."

But her kind-hearted lord observed that he would rather lose the pestle than his guest, even though it was a part of his wife's dowry and more than forty years old. So he ran off with the pestle in his hand after his friend crying out, "Oh Brāhmaṇī! Oh Brāhmaṇī! Stop please, and take the pestle."

But the story told by the old woman now seemed most true to the guest when he saw her husband running after him, and so he said, "You and your pestle may go where you please. Never more will you catch me in your house," and ran away.

XII.—The Good Wife and the Bad Husband.

In a remote village there lived a man and his wife, who was a stupid little woman and believed everything that was told her. Whenever people wanted anything from her they used to come and flatter her; but this had to be done in the absence of her husband, because he

\[\text{[Compare the Sinhalese folktale given at p. 62, Vol. I. of the Orientalist.—Ep.]}\]
was a very miserly man, and would never part with any of his money, for all he was exceedingly rich. Nevertheless, without his knowledge cunning beggars would now and then come to his wife and beg of her, and they used generally to succeed, as she was so amenable to flattery. But whenever her husband found her out he would come down heavily upon her, sometimes with words and sometimes with blows. Thus quarrels arose, till at last, for the sake of peace, the wife had to give up her charitable propensities.

Now there lived in the village a rogue of the first water, who had many a time witnessed what took place in the rich miser's family. Wishing to revive his old habit of getting what he wanted from the miser's wife he watched his opportunity and one day, when the miser had gone out on horseback to inspect his lands, he came to his wife in the middle of the day and fell down at the threshold as if overcome by exhaustion. She ran up to him at once and asked him who he was.

"I am a native of Kailása," he said, "sent down by an old couple living there, for news of their son and his wife."

"Who are those fortunate dwellers on Śiva's mountain?" said she.

On this the rogue gave the names of her husband's deceased parents, which he had taken good care of, of course, to learn from the neighbours.

"Do you really come from them?" said she.

"Are they doing well there? Dear old people. How glad my husband would be to see you, were he here! Sit down please, and take rest awhile till he returns. How do they live there? Have they enough to eat and to dress themselves?"

These and a thousand other questions she put to the rogue, who, for his part, wanted to get away as quick as possible, as he knew full well how he would be treated if the miser should return while he was there, so he said:

"Mother, language has no words to describe the miseries they are undergoing in the other world. They have not a rag to cover themselves, and for the last six days they have eaten nothing, and have lived on water only. It would break your heart to see them."

The rogue's pathetic words fully deceived the good woman, who firmly believed that he had come down from Kailása, sent by the old couple to her.

"Why should they suffer so?" said she, "when their son has plenty to eat and to dress himself, and when their daughter-in-law wears all sorts of costly ornaments?"

With that she went into the house and came out with two boxes containing all the clothes of herself and her husband and gave the whole lot to the rogue, with instructions to take them to her poor old people in Kailása. She also gave him the jewel box to be presented to her mother-in-law.

"Bat dress and jewels will not fill their hungry stomachs," said he.

Requesting him to wait a little, the silly woman brought out her husband's cash chest and emptied the contents into the rogue's coat, who now went off in haste, promising to give everything to the good people in Kailása. Our good lady, according to etiquette, conducted him a few hundred yards along the road and sent news of herself through him to her relatives, and then returned home. The rogue now tied up all his booty in his coat and ran in haste towards the river and crossed over it.

No sooner had our heroine reached home than her husband returned after his inspection of his lands. Her pleasure at what she had done was so great, that she met him at the door and told him all about the arrival of the messenger from Kailása, and how she had sent clothes and jewels and money through him to her husband's parents. The anger of her husband knew no bounds. But he checked himself for a while, and asked her which road the messenger from Kailása had taken, as he said he wanted to follow him and send some more news to his parents. To this she willingly agreed and pointed out the direction the rogue had gone. With rage in his heart at the trick played upon his stupid wife our hero rode on in hot haste and after a ride of two ghātikās he caught sight of the flying rogue, who, finding escape hopeless, climbed up into a big pīpal tree. Our hero soon reached the bottom of the tree and shouted to the rogue to come down.

"No, I cannot, this is the way to Kailása," said the rogue, and climbed up on the top of the tree. Seeing no chance of the rogue's coming

*Uparāśi or upavasatra, an upper garment.
down and as there was no third person present to whom he could call for help, our hero tied his horse to an adjacent tree and began climbing up the pipal tree himself. The rogue thanked all his gods when he saw this, and waited till his enemy had climbed nearly up to him, and then, throwing down his bundle of booty, leapt quickly from branch to branch till he reached the bottom. He then got upon his enemy's horse and with his bundle rode into a dense forest in which no one was likely to find him. Our hero being much older in years was no match for the rogue. So he slowly came down, and cursing his stupidity in having risked his horse to recover his property, returned home at his leisure. His wife, who was waiting his arrival, welcomed him with a cheerful countenance and said,

"I thought as much. You have sent away your horse to Kaillasa to be used by your father."

Vexed as he was at his wife's words, our hero replied in the affirmative to conceal his own stupidity.

Thus, some there are in this world, who, though they may not willingly give away anything, pretend to have done so when by accident or stupidity they happen to lose it.

THE DEHLI DALALS AND THEIR SLANG.


I have lately published a paper in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (Vol. LIII, pp. 1-24) on the Trade Dialect of the Naqqâsh, or painters on papier mâché, in the Panjâb and Kashmir.

The conclusions I drew in that paper were, that though the Indian trade dialects contained slang terms and slang perversions of ordinary words, they were mainly real dialects, and that the great majority of their peculiar words were easily traceable to the old and modern languages of Northern India. Some of their slang words I will now show to be directly taken from the well-known Dalâls of Dehli, who do not talk any dialect, but a real slang for purposes of secrecy, i.e. of taking in the customer (kharīdār) for their own benefit and that of the trader (saudāgar). But first, a few words about the Dalâl himself and his methods of proceeding.

The real swindling Dalâl is not a broker (ārathā), but a tout, middle-man, or go-between, a man that procures custom for his employers, who are shopkeepers and general dealers of all kinds: nor does he get his living by brokerage (āratha), but by what he can make out of the customer through the trader (dādār), and what the customer pays him for his trouble (bakcharish), as will be explained herein. He hangs about sarîs, hotels, railway stations, dîk offices and other places, where strangers and visitors to the town he lives in are apt to congregate, and makes it his business to know whence every kind of article they are likely to require is to be got. The stranger, his victim, goes forth to buy; straightway the Dalâl ingratiates himself, and offers to take him where he will get what he wants. Whether the trouble he takes pays him or not depends entirely on the temperament and character of the purchaser, and this he has to study; long practice having usually made him an adept in turning every kind of idiosyncrasy he may chance upon to his own advantage.

The traders thoroughly despise him, but as he is useful and brings them chance custom, which they would otherwise miss, they condescend to enter into certain relations with him. They do not, however, pay him anything, but always leave him to make the whole of his profits out of the customers he brings. This is done thus. The Dalâl and trader having made a private arrangement regarding the percentage or pay the former is to get for the profits he brings the latter, the customer is made to pay this percentage over and above the price the merchant demands for himself, or in other words, the merchant agrees to add this to the price he finally agrees to take for his goods. The customer will, of course, also pay the Dalâl something besides, on his own account, for the trouble taken on his behalf. As the Dalâl deals with all kinds of people and in all classes and kinds of goods

---

1 Nothing in this paper has any reference to the respectable body of street brokers also known as Dalâls.
no fixed rate of percentage can be agreed upon. Moreover, whatever arrangements he
and the trader make between them must be kept from the customer, as the latter would
naturally never knowingly agree to pay the Dalål's percentage in addition to his own
present to him. Consequently an ingenious method of talking has been invented, and in
practice, by which the trader and the Dalål understand one thing and the customer another,
this last being, of course, the natural sense of
the words used. In fact a kind of vocal cyphers
or secret code has been adopted.

The native keepers of hotels for the use of
the English; the khānāmāns, khānāmatghārs,
coachmen, chuprāsīs, and similar servants
of such hotels and at dākh bungalows, the
owners and drivers of carriages and cabs that
frequent these hotels, are all Dalāls. The
Dalål, too, is to be found in all the large
towns. In Lakhnau, Āgār, Īllāhābād, Kānpūr, in Amīltar, Lāhor, Multān, &c., he
flourishes; but his home, the place where he
luxuriates and prospers, is Dehli. He is a
sorry creature, and essentially a cheat and a
bumbug. The natives have capital proverbs
about him to show their appreciation of his
der character.

Dillī ka Dalāl,
Kabhi dhannī, kabhi kangālī.
The Dehli Dalål,
Rich to day, poor to-morrow.

And again:

Dillī ke Dalāl,
Khānāmā makhā, dikhāwē makhāl.
The Dehli Dalāls,
Eat maize and show sweetmeats.

This last is especially cutting, and hits off a
habit these gentrity have. Being poor as a
rule, they partly support life by throwing
grains of maize (Indian corn) into the mouth,
a very cheap (and indigestible) way of eating;
this they take out of one pocket, while in
another they keep a small store of makhāl or
tādāyāch-dānd, a sweetmeat made of cardamoms,
which is very expensive. Should any one ask
what they are eating they will show this, and
offer some to the enquirer out of bravado and
to show off.

There is an effectual way of counteracting
the machinations of the Dalāls, and that is
to buy goods on nafā', the profit the trader
agrees to make on the cost price, or on the
price he gave. Among native traders them-
selves most bargains are made as to this nafā',
and not as to the cost price of the goods.
Thus, A, a trader, wishing to buy from B,
another trader, 100 thāns of pashmīnā, would
say to him, "Tim khyā nafā' lāyγγ? What
profit on cost price will you charge?" He
answers, "Four dāns in the rupee," and the
bargaining then goes on regarding this nafā',
without reference to anything else at all.

Supposing the matter to be settled for two
dāns in the rupee, A will then ask B, "'aul
dám khyā tāν? What was the cost price?"
B answers, "Rs. 20 per thāν," and the
bargain would be settled then and there for
Rs. 2000, cost price, plus 4th or Rs. 250, profit,
or Rs. 2250 for the lot, which then becomes the
'aul dām of the purchaser. No
questions would be asked as to the cost price,
because it is looked upon as a point of honour
among respectable traders, both with Mūsalmāns and Hindūs, never to answer falsely as
to the 'aul dām, or cost price. Any trader
found out in doing so would be cut at once by
the whole trading community, nor would they
again deal with him, nor trust him. Considering
that buying and selling, at any rate on a
large scale, is conducted on nafā', only, it is
easy to see that honesty regarding the 'aul
dām is a matter of trade necessity. I remem-
ber a case in Ambalā, where a trader was
practically expelled the cantonment bāzārs for
cheating about the 'aul dām.

The secret arrangements between Dalāl and
trader as to the former's percentage are made
on the spur of the moment, according to the
circumstances of each case. The Dalāl watches
the character of the customer he introduces,
gauges the depth of his pocket, perceives the
class and amount of his probable purchases,
and demands his percentage accordingly.
This he has to do secretly, so as not to rouse
the suspicions of his client. His means to his
end are his slang vocabulary and expressions;
all his phrases having a secret and a patent
meaning.

His first method is to talk without using a
single slang word, but so as to convey his
meaning to the trader, and conceal it from the
customer. Thus, supposing a bargain to be
going on about a piece of cloth, he will say to
the trader, as if taking the side of the customer, "bas, bas, is thään ki ek Ḍī bāt kah do; there, that will do, say the real price for this piece." But by saying, "ek Ḍī bāt," he conveys his intention of demanding one anna in the rupee for himself. Then the trader, supposing him to be satisfied with Rs. 10 for the piece, will not settle under Rs. 10-10, the 10 annas going to the Dalál later on. This is the Plain Language Trick or Skálh Bāt kī Dalálix.

Here are other specimens; but it must be understood that the talk always refers to actual circumstances. Suppose the shop to have a roof of seven rafters (kārī), the Dalál will look about him and say, "is mākan kī tūn kārī maṃbāt haiṇ; Chār to ghūn gal haiṇ; this house has only three sound rafters, four have gone bad (weevil eaten)," i.e. "I want three annas in the rupee." Again looking at a bell he would say, "tumhāre pās ek Ḍī guṇṭi hai? Have you only one bell?" i.e. "I want one anna in the rupee." "Is chhāṅī kē Ḍī tām-hāre pās haiṇ? Have you only five pieces of this chintz." i.e., "I want five annas in the rupee." "Sālijh sau rupee dā kapra mul lāu, the Sālijh will buy Rs. 100 worth of cloth," says the Dalál in Pāṅjáli, and presently adds, "tahāḍā mūṇḍā kujh pāṛhdā hai? Sāḍē mūṇḍe ne ṭī pattrā us potāl de pāṛh īte hain. Can your boy read? My boy has read twenty pages of that book," conveying "I want Rs. 20 or 20 per cent. on the bargain," This method of talking no doubt requires cleverness and quickness both on the part of the trader and the tout, but I suppose practice teaches the ear what words to catch.

The second method may be called the Finger Trick or Angulī kī Dalálix, and is used where the customer is sharp, and watches the Dalál. If he sees this he will ask the trader such as, "is kā kyā deing? What do you want for this?" putting two or three or as many fingers on the article as he may want anna in the rupee.

The third method may be called the Swagger Trick or Jhīkī kī Dalálix, and is practised thus: The Dalál enters the shop in a swaggering kind of way, and commences to bully the shopkeeper for the apparent benefit of the customer. All his conversation has a magnificent hectoring tone, as if he were lord and master of the whole place. Amid his copious flow of words he manages to convey his wants to the trader by a simple code of word-signals, using the parts of the body as his means. The deception is sure to be pretty complete, as personal allusions are so common in the mouth of the swaggering Native. This code of words is as follows: —

nāk, nose, for one anna in the rupee.
dākh, eyes, for two annas in the rupee.
dākh, and nāk, eyes and nose, for three annas in the rupee.
dākh and ān, eyes and ears, for four annas in the rupee.
dākh, ān, and nāk, eyes, ears and nose, for five annas in the rupee.
dākh, ān, and āq, eyes, ears, and hands, for six annas in the rupee.
dākh, ān, āq, and nāk, eyes, ears, hands and nose, for seven annas in the rupee.
dākh, ān, āq, and pāha, eyes, ears, hands, and feet, for eight annas in the rupee.

The manner in which these words are used is best illustrated by a specimen of the kind of conversation that ensues on such occasions.

Thus: —

(1). I want one anna in the rupee.
Dalál. Āchā kapra dikhlios: kā kāyā dāṃ hai?
Trader. Is thūn kē pāṭch Ḍī puyā dāṃ hai?
Dālxī. Tum ko nāk hai yā nāliā? Ham sach bāt pāchhte hain; jhūṭe ko wāste ham yahīn nāliā āe, nāliā to, ham dusre dākān par jāege.

Translation.
Dālxī. Show me good cloth; what is the price of this?
Trader. The price of this piece is Rs. 5.
Dālxī. Have you a nose or not? I want the truth. I did not come here for lies, or I could go to another shop.

This would be pretty sure to deceive, as "tum ko nāk hai kī nālīā? Have you a nose or not?" is a common idiom for "Have you any honour or no?" A noseless man (nākdā) is popularly supposed to be without honour and a scoundrel, whence the well-known proverb

Das nāktān men ek "nākdā".

Among ten noseless men one is nicknamed "whole-nose," i.e., an honest man is a scoundrel to blackguards.
The fourth method is the one that concerns philologists most. In this the Dalái uses regular slang words, having a definite meaning with reference to his demand of ānds in the rupee. I have only a few of them, and the natural dislike of the traders to give away any of their secret words accounts for the difficulty in procuring even these. They are:

- aikāl, one ānd in the rupee.
- suān, two āndas.
- rakh, three āndas.
- phūkh, four āndas.
- buddh, five āndas.
- kulangan, six āndas.
- pāint, seven āndas.
- mājh, eight āndas.
- waan, nine āndas.
- sałāh, ten āndas.
- akalā, eleven āndas.

Some of these slang words, for, as will be seen herein, they are purely slang, have been adopted into the trade dialects, e.g.:

(2) suān, suān or suānd is seen in the Zargarī of the Pañjāb, in saun; and in the Zargarī of Hindūstān, in saunād.
(7) pāint appears in the Hindūstānī Zargarī.
(8) mājh, mājhī in the Kaśmīrī Zargarī, as mañās.
(9) waan is the waan of the Kaśmīrī Zargarī.

And their occurrence explains the existence of forms otherwise unexplainable or not satisfactorily explainable.

None of these Dalái numerals have any reference to, or connection with any numerical system, but owe their origin to a purely slang application of ordinary words for purposes of secrecy.

(1) aikāl is said to be the same thing as ek ki bāt. Cf. aṅkhar = anghar, Hindī, rough, rude. Aikāl means the true price, as would ek ki bāt in this connection.

Dalái. I want one ānd in the rupee.
Is thān men aikāl bāhā kyā hai?

(2) suān, suān or suānd, means pleasant, agreeable.

Dalái. I want two āndas in the rupee.

O Lālā suān, dikhā kapre de thān.

Friend Lālā, show me some cloth.

(3) rakha, means place, put.

Dalái. I want three āndas in the rupee.

O bāhā, kujh thān ethe rakha.

Friend, put some pieces here.

(4) phūkh (= phūkā) means throw away, destroy.

Dalái. I want four āndas in the rupee.

Lālā, change kapre dikhā, attē is thān nān pare phūkā.

Show me some good cloths, and throw this piece away.

(5) buddh, is wisdom, brains, knowledge.

Dalái. I want five āndas in the rupee.

Achhe kapre dikhā, is ko uthāo. Kyā, tumhārī buddh mārī gal hai?

Show good cloths, take this away. Have you lost your with?

(6) kulangan (= kalānd), is a bad character, a man whose character has been lost.

Dalái. I want six āndas in the rupee.

Tushū ni kulangan ho! Kujh lāge līkā gānā kān nā dikhā.

You are a bād lot too! Show some good cloths to the customer.

(7) pāint (= penth), is a market.

Dalái. I want seven āndas in the rupee.

Paaint dā tushū kiū faisalā kītā haiga? Answer.
Maṅ tainūn pichhī dasāṅgā.

What arrangements did you make in the market? I’ll tell you presently.

(8) mājh, mājhī in Pañjābī, middle, between.

Dalái. I want eight āndas in the rupee.

Is thān aur us thān de mājh ki faraq hai?

Answer. Do āne dā faraq hai, jī!

What is the difference between this piece and that piece? Two āndas difference, sir.

(9) waan, wān (= bān, bān) in Pañjābī, is a kind of twine or string made of mājhī.

Dalái. I want nine āndas in the rupee.
Kal tainūn wos miliā sl?

Did you get the twine yesterday.

(10) sałāh, is advice, arrangement.

Dalái. I want ten āndas in the rupee.

Is thān dene dī ki sałāh haiga? Answer.
Jīkār tūshū akhoge maṅ dasedāṅgā.

* I believe a good many are to be found scattered up and down Follen’s New Hind Dict., but I do not think he understood their true import.
* Follen, e. v., gives suān, suānd, as the ‘broker’s’ word for two.

For the general numerals in these dialects see my paper on the Naqāshā Dialect above mentioned. Dr. Leitner, Analysis of ‘Abdul-Gafur’s Dictionary, does not give any of the thieves’ or bad characters’ numerals, or we should probably see some of the above in their slang too.
What arrangement will you come to about this piece? I'll take what you say.

Dalái. I want eleven dāsas in the rubia.


Yesterday he was alone in the house, no one was with him. Yes, I know.

The above sentences show clearly that the so-called numerals of the Dalās are not such at all, but merely slang words. Their presence in the trade dialects is interesting, as showing how some of the apparently inexplicable words peculiar to these last are procured. But they could never be of much help in deriving trade dialects, owing to their necessary pacity, and to the fact that the words in the trade dialects not directly explicable by ordinary etymology are comparatively few.

A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF VAKPATIRAJA OF DHARA.

BY PROF. KIELHORN; GOTTINGEN.

This inscription of Vākpatirāja of Dhārā, of which at the request of the Editors I furnish a transcript and translation from the photo-lithograph supplied to me, has already been published by Dr. Rajendralal Mitra in the Jour. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. XIX. p. 475ff. And another inscription of the same king, very similar to the above now edited, and dated five years before it, has been published in the Ind. Antiquary, Vol. VI. p. 31ff. (See also Hall in the Jour. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. XXX. p. 205ff.)

From Dr. Rajendralal Mitra's published notice, it appears that these plates were discovered in digging a ruin in the vicinity of Ujjain in Central India, and were presented by Mr. R. N. C. Hamilton, of Indore, to the Bengal Asiatic Society. Now, however, they are in the India Office Library in London. The plates are two in number, each measuring about 12½" by 9½. The edges of them are fashioned thicker, so as to serve as rims to protect the writing; and the inscription is in perfect preservation almost throughout. Each plate has two ring-holes,—at the bottom of the first plate, and the top of the second,—but only one ring is now forthcoming; it is a plain copper ring, about ½" thick and 2½" in diameter; it had been cut before the grant came under notice for photo-lithography. The weight of the two plates is 6 lbs. 6½ oz., and of the ring, 3½ oz.; total, 6 lbs. 10 oz.

The inscription is composed in Sanskrit, and written in Devanāgarī characters. The grant recorded in it was made on the full-moon day of the bright half of the month Karttika in the [Vikrama] year 1036, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon; and the deed was drawn up on the 9th day of the dark half of the month Chaitra in the same year. The former day was the 26th October A.D. 980, on which date, according to the calculations of Professors Jacobi and Schering, an eclipse of the moon did take place.

The object granted is the village of Sambalapura, belonging to the Tīnisa-pandra Twelve. The king when making the grant was at Bhagavatpura; and the place at which the grant was written is stated to have been Guṇapura. I am unable to identify these places.

The donee is the Bhaṭṭārīkā, the goddess Bhaṭṭēśvari at Ujjayanī; and the purpose for which the grant was made is the one usual in such cases, viz. to provide for the religious worship, and for the keeping in repair of the temple. As Bhaṭṭārīkā is an epithet of Durgā, I suspect Bhaṭṭēśvari to have been one of the local names of that deity.

in the grant. By the same Tables, and by the same reckoning, the recorded date of the full-moon of Karttika of Vikrama Saṅvat 1036, answers to Thursday, the 6th November A.D. 979,—when also there was an eclipse of the moon; and this seems to satisfy the requirements of the record.—Ed.]

[2] किरिक्षेत्र[स्तोत्र]ः करुणरामभवानाः। श्रीकात्यात्रूपः। यवः। शायासि।

[3] यहन्त्य[सु]ः सुखस्नितिमित्रेश्वर्ये यह निबेन नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[4] जस्ते [I] गाजसपिकानसहसरकु"। श्रीसने वाणसिकं तद्नाशिलहरे नु राजापोलस्वरुः।

[5] 'शकु' वः। 'परमहरिलक्ष्मीरामभवानाः। श्रीकात्याकायाशिक महाशारणकु"।

[6] महाराज्यरामभवानाः। श्रीकात्याकायाशिक महाशारणकु"।

[7] नाभिमित्रेश्वर्ये भदरकाशीतिष्ठिता। यवः। शायासि।

[8] यहन्त्य[सु]ः सुखस्नितिमित्रेश्वर्ये यह निबेन नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[9] ्या [कु]ः। तिनिस्तरा काश्वरुः। महाशारणकु"।

[10] 'यंत्र' स्नानन्यात्मकः ्या नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[11] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। तिनिस्तरा काश्वरुः ्या नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[12] 'यंत्र' स्नानन्यात्मकः।

[13] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः।

[14] करुणरामभवानाः। 'यंत्र' स्नानन्यात्मकः।

[15] 'श्रीकात्याकायाशिक महाशारणकु"।

[16] यवः। शायासि।

[17] यहन्त्य[सु]ः सुखस्नितिमित्रेश्वर्ये यह निबेन नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[18] नाभिमित्रेश्वर्ये भदरकाशीतिष्ठिता। यवः। शायासि।

[19] यहन्त्य[सु]ः सुखस्नितिमित्रेश्वर्ये यह निबेन नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[20] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[21] यहन्त्य[सु]ः सुखस्नितिमित्रेश्वर्ये यह निबेन नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[22] यहन्त्य[सु]ः सुखस्नितिमित्रेश्वर्ये यह निबेन नाभिसंपिन्येन जान्ये।

[23] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[24] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[25] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[26] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[27] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[28] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[29] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[30] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

Second plate.

[31] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[32] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[33] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[34] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[35] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।

[36] 'दत्ते' यवः। दत्ते स्नानन्यात्मकः। करुणरामभवानाः।
TRANSLATION.

Om! May the lustre of the hardy throat of Śrīkaṇṭha increase your happiness!—(that lustre) which, meeting the poison-fire of the hissing serpents, appears like the smoke (of it); which, when in contact with the horns of the shining moon fixed on his head, is like Rāhu; and which, rolling over the quivering cheeks of the daughter of the mountain, is beautiful like musk (applied to them)! May the trembling frame of Mura’s face protect you!

-(that frame) which, distressed by separation from Rādhā, was not comforted by the moon-like face of Lakṣmi,—nor refreshed by the water of the ocean,—nor calmed by the lotus (growing out) of his own lake-like navel,—nor soothed by the sweet breaths from the thousand hoods of the serpent Śesha!

(L. 5.)—The most worshipful, the supreme king of Mahārāja, the supreme lord, the illustrious Vākpatīrājādeva, the favourite of the earth, the royal ruler of men, who is a favourite of Fortune, also called the illustrious Amogha-varahādeva,—who meditates on the feet of the most worshipful, the supreme king of Mahārāja, the supreme lord, the illustrious Siyakādeva,—who meditates on the feet of the most worshipful, the supreme king of Mahārāja, the supreme lord, the illustrious Vairisīnādeva,—who meditated on the feet of the most worshipful, the supreme king of Mahārāja, the supreme lord, the illustrious Kṛiṣhṇarājādeva:

(L. 9.)—He, being in good health, gives notice to all king’s officers, Brāhmaṇas and others, and to the resident Pattaṅkila people, and others assembled at the village of Sembala-puraṅa, which is held by the Mahāśēkhanika, the illustrious Mahāika, and appertains to the Tiṃisapādra Twelve:

(L. 10.)—‘Be it known to you that, to increase the (spiritual) merit and the fame of Our parents and Ourselves, (and) believing in a future reward (of pious deeds), We, encamped at the glorious Bhagavatpura, have, in this year 1036, on the full-moon day of the bright half of Kārttika, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, at the request of Āsini, the wife of the Mahāśēkhanika, the illustrious Mahāika, with great devotion and (confirming our gift) with (the pouring out of) water, granted by an order, for such time as the moon, the sun, the ocean and the earth endure, this the above-written village up to its proper boundaries, the grass and pasture land, with the money-rent and share of produce, with the upārikara, (and) including all dues,—to the Bhagavatī, the glorious goddess Bhagavati, at the glorious Ujjayini, for the purpose of (defraying the expenses of) bathing, anointing, flowers, perfumes, incense, the naivedya (offerings) and public shows, and also for the putting in order of the temple buildings, when damaged or out of repair.

(L. 17.)—‘Being aware of this, the resident Pattaṅkila and people, being ready to obey our commands, should at all times make over to her everything, all due share of the produce, taxes, money-rent, and so forth. And knowing that they share in the reward of a pious deed like this, those who may be born in our own family, and other future rulers, should assent to and preserve this religious gift that has been conferred by us.’

(L. 20.)—And it has been said:—[Here follow five of the customary benedictive and impercative verses, which it is unnecessary to translate.]

(L. 28.)—In the year 1036, on the 9th day of the dark half of Chaitra, (this grant was written) in the famous most victorious camp located at Gunaṅpura; and (the official) who conveys (the king’s) own orders regarding this is the illustrious Rudrāditya. This is the own sign-manual of the illustrious Vākpatīrājādeva.

of the cattle and for cutting grass” extends, covering the space of one bālā. 23 23 I am somewhat doubtful about the exact force of the word jagati after devaghrāt; jagati is said to be used synonymously with viśva; and devaghrāt-jagati may mean the temple and the grounds or ‘the temple and the buildings’ (such as a Dharmaśāla) connected with or attached to it.

Ajāṭhāpuṇa appears to be the same as the Dālaka, ‘royal messenger’: compare the more common ājāṭhāpuṇa and ājī, ante, Vol. XII. p. 138, l. 26; p. 123, l. 24, &c.
General Cunningham says about Sūrapāla, that "he was the son and successor of Devapāla Deva; and further it would appear that he had an elder brother named Rājaśva, who had been declared Yuvāraja by his father." I do not know whether the statement is made on any direct documentary evidence, or whether it is merely an inferential combination. But if it is the former, it confirms my deduction, above given, that Vigrahapāla, alias Sūrapāla, was a son of Devapāla, and not of Jayapāla. The same conclusion follows from the fact that the Budhāl inscription in all probability mentions Nārāyaṇapāla as the immediate successor of Sūrapāla. The Bhagalpur grant says that Nārāyaṇapāla was the son and successor of Vigrahapāla. Hence Sūrapāla and Vigrahapāla are the same person.

The conclusion to which the evidence, such as it is, appears to point is, that Nārāyaṇapāla and Mahipāla were contemporaries; the former being a son of Vigrahapāla, and the latter being also a son of Vigrahapāla, or perhaps his nephew and son of Rājaśva. Nārāyaṇapāla probably ruled the eastern portion (Bengal) of the Pāla kingdom, while Mahipāla reigned in the western half (Bihār, Benares). There is no direct evidence on the point; but there are some circumstantial indications. Vigrahapāla was a stout Buddhist, so was Mahipāla; but Nārāyaṇapāla was a Bārāmaṇṣ. The latter fact is expressly stated in the Budhāl inscription, and it is clearly implied both in the Bhagalpur grant and in the Gayā inscription No. 6; and his very name, Nārāyaṇa, tends to prove it. That a division of the great Bengal and Bihār empire took place on account of religious differences is shown by the secession of the Sena family. It took place about the beginning of the 11th century, which, as will be presently seen, synchronises with the time of Nārāyaṇapāla.

Therefore, instead of thirteen or eleven ruling princes of the Pāla family, as generally believed, there are only six (excepting the later Pālas), though there were altogether nine members of the Pāla family, of whom, however, three did not actually reign.

Accordingly, the genealogical table stands thus: reigning members are indicated by Roman numerals; the numbers in round brackets give the highest known number of regnal years; the numbers in square brackets give the supposed full numbers of regnal years; the dates are the calculated years of accession:

I. Gopāla (7) [20]
A.D. 906.

II. Dharmapāla (26) [39] Vākṣapāla
A.D. 926

III. Devapāla Jayapāla
(or Nayapāla)
(33) [35]
A.D. 956

IV. Vigrahapāla Rājyapāla
(or Sūrapāla)
(13) [15]
A.D. 991

VI. Nārāyaṇa V. Mahipāla
(of Bengal) (of Benares)
(17) [20] (48) [50]
A.D. 1006 A.D. 1006

The date of Mahipāla is known from the Benares inscription to be A.D. 1026, assuming it (according to the usual and probably correct interpretation) to be given in the Vikramaditya era. His contemporary Nārāyaṇapāla reigned at least seventeen years. Accordingly their accession may be dated about 1006. The highest known regnal number of Vigrahapāla is 13; he may have succeeded in A.D. 991. The highest known regnal number of Devapāla is 33; he may have succeeded in A.D. 956. The highest known regnal number of Dharmapāla is 26; his date of accession will be A.D. 926. The highest known number of Gopāla is 7, but all tradition agrees in giving him a very long reign of 45 or 55 years; a limit of 20 years, therefore, will be safe, and to him A.D. 906 may be given. Altogether this

---

10 id. Vol. III. p. 120.
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gives 120 years to five generations, which is certainly not too much. But there is a curious piece of evidence, which tends to confirm the date thus assigned to Devapāla, viz. A.D. 956-91. In the he-goat Gwalior inscription noticed by Mr. Fitz-Edward Hall, a king Devapāla is mentioned, with the date Sārvat 1025, corresponding to A.D. 983. This exactly agrees with the date assigned to the Bengal Devapāla; and as he is recorded to have made wide conquests towards the west, his mention in the Gwalior inscription would be accounted for. His warlike expeditions towards the west would bring him into contact with the Haihayas rulers of Chedi, and thus explain the statement in the Bhagalpur grant of the alliance of his son, Vigrāhāpāla, with a Haihaya princess. Moreover, they would also explain the fact of the coins of Vigrāhapa inimitating the Sassanian type. As to Mahāpāla, he is reported in Tārānāth’s History to have reigned 52 years—a statement which is borne out by two inscriptions found by Mr. J. E. Lenecke at Imadpur (in the Muzaffarpur district) and dated in the 48th year of his reign. Accordingly Mahāpāla’s reign may be put down as having extended from A.D. 1006 to 1058.

The history of the Pāla empire about the turning of the 10th and 11th centuries, I imagine to have been thus:—The empire included Bengal, Bhār and Audh (Gazir, Paṭana, and Benares), and the Pāla rulers were Buddhists. Towards the end of the 10th century a great disruption took place:—Bengal under Nārâyana pāla became Bhārānic; while Bhār and Audh under Mahāpāla remained Buddhistic. In the beginning of the 11th century another disruption took place:—Bhār under Mahāpāla’s successors remained Buddhistic; while Audh under Chandra Devar, a son of Mahāpāla, who made Kana bi his capital, became Brāhmaṇac. Bhār remained Buddhistic till the Muhammadan conquest destroyed the remnant of the ancient Pāla kingdom. Nārâyana was probably assisted, in the separation which he effected, by the Bengal governors sprung from the Sena family, who were in charge of the province of Paṇḍra Vardhana. The Sena family was intensely Brāhmaṇac, and two of the earliest members of it, Sāmanta and Hemanta, synchronise with Nārâyana’s date (A.D. 1006-1026). It was probably the successor of the latter, who was supplanted in the Bengal kingdom by Vijaya Sena (or Sukha Sena), the first Bengal king (though the fourth in descent) of the Sena family, whose date is about A.D. 1030. In the Baqirganj grant he is stated, in so many words, to have “rooted out those of the race of Bhāpāla.” Bhāpāla is a well-known synonym of Gopāla, the founder of the Pāla dynasty. This is confirmed by the Bhagalpur inscription, which says that Vijaya Sena overthrew the king of Gauda. It may be added that the tradition of Adisāra, who appears to be the same as Vijaya Sena, the first of the Bengal kings, having imported Kana bi Brāhmaṇa, about the turning of the 10th and 11th centuries, coincides with the first disruption of the Pāla kingdom and may be intimately connected with it.

which the above calculated dates of the Pāla reigns may require adjustment.

As Mahāpāla’s reign was much longer than Nārâyana’s, he may have temporarily regained possession of the whole of the ancient empire after Nārâyana’s death. Verse 6; see Jour. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. VIII. p. 435. Prinsep’s Pratapit translated “rooting out the family of the inimical royal lines.” Bu viyā Bhāpāla-mūrdhita means simply “the inimical descendants of Bhāpāla.” Bhāpāla is here a proper name, not an appellative. If Mahāpāla, as suggested in the preceding footnote, regained possession of Bengal after Nārâyana’s death, he may be referred to in that notice. Bhāpāla and Mahāpāla are synonyms.


* * *

The identification of Adisāra with Vijaya Sena is supported by the genealogical tables, for which the Nārâyana’s date of “three generations a century” is too low. At the rate of four generations Adisāra’s date would be A.D. 1025, which is too low, as it would tend to identify him with Bullā Sena. An medium rate will suit best; it will make Adisāra identical with Vijaya Sena. As to the names, Sūrā and Vijaya Sena are nearly synonymous; dīśa indicates Vijaya Sena as the first king of the family. However, even if he be the same as Vira Sena, it does not materially affect the argument in the text.
I append my reading of the Áṃgikôhî plate, imperfect as it is. None, I believe, has ever been published, and though imperfect, my reading may prove helpful to others in fully deciphering the grant. I do not despair of the possibility of doing this, though I had too little leisure to do it myself. 24

TEXT.

First side.

[20] Svasti ||
Maitrî-kûrûya-putrâ-râma-pramadita-hridâyaḥ| preyasînî sandadhånaḥ
[23] nîkåh | jivå yaḥ kâma-kárî-prabhave| abhîbhavaḥ áhâvat[ý]
[25] Gopâladevaḥ ||
Lakshmi-janna-niketanaã samakaro||| Râma-| bhava||
masyaeva grijhita-satyam tapasas tasyānurūpa guṇaîh Saumitrer udayādi- |
[27] tulyâya
[28] mahimå Vâkîla-nâma-äññuḥ| yaḥ śrîman naya-vikrama-va-svasti[ê] bhrâtuḥ stitha-|
| tasa śaṃsa śrâvanâ śrâtu-pâtâkinñhîr akarod ekâtapatraśa disaḥ ||| Tasmåd u-
[29] pûndra-charitai jagatih punânaḥ putro babhûva vijayal Jayapâla-nâma| dharm-
| dvişhâmaḥ samayiñâ yuddhi Devapâle yaḥ pâ[r]yavo bhuvana-râjya-sukhâny-
avaishîn || Śrîmå-
[30] n Vîgrahapâlas tat-sûnur Ajâtaśatrubh iva jataḥ| śrâvanî vâsanâ-prasâdhana-vi-lopi-
| vimala-jaladhâraḥ || Dikpâla[ê] kshiti-pâlanâya dadhatuṁ dehe vibha-|
[31] kî̄̄h śriyâḥ śriṃmantâ janayám-babhuva tanaýaḥ Nârâyanaḥ sa prabhuṁ| yaḥ|
| kshaunâ-patihîbhih śiromaṇi-rucchaiśiḥ-ānghî-pîthopala[ê] nîyâ-opâtam a[l]-mî-
| chakrâ charitaḥ
| cha kula-bhûva[ê] tulya-kakshaih| vîkhyāya-kîrîr abhavat taasyaḥ cha tasya|
| śrî- Râjyapala i-
[33] ti (nûtana)-lokâpalah || Tasmât pûrva-kshitihdran nîdhir iva mahâsa[ê] Râshtrakûtâsuvayendos
[34] n (about one third of the line omitted) bharya . maîka-ratna-ducî-kuhchita-chatu\-
| sindhu-chirâmsukâyâh ||

24 Doubtful portions are enclosed within round brackets. Restorations are within straight brackets. Syllables omitted are indicated by the number of dots placed in their stead.

25 I have carefully re-examined the original plate of the Bhâgalpur grant, which is in the Society’s collection, for the purpose of the following notes — Verse 1. The latter half of this verse in the Bhâgalpur grant agrees with the Áṃgikôhî grant, and reads as I have given it. The meaning is: “who having overcome the over-powering strength of desire has (now) obtained everlasting peace, may he, Gopâladeva, be prosperous, being another (i.e. like) Daśabala (Buddha), the Lord of the world.”

26 Both grants read distinctly niśtamåså samakaro; not uniform altered as given in the Bhâgalpur transcript; the meaning is: “well able to sustain the weight of the earth, making it (the earth) to be like the native-place of Lakshmi, he became the only asylum of the princes who approached him (for protection) as if they were afraid that their wings might be elipt.” — I may note here, that in the Áṃgikôhî plate, the anusûtras and superscribed replics are often wanting, whether from the engraver’s carelessness or perhaps from the ravages of time, it is impossible to say. On the Bhâgalpur plate they are always present. The replic, when it does appear on the Áṃgikôhî plate, is often a minute stroke attached to the upper part of the left side of the letter.

27 This verse is, in the Bhâgalpur grant, preceded by another, which is omitted in the Áṃgikôhî grant.

28 The Áṃgikôhî grant reads distinctly pērojô (nom. sing.). If this should be correct, it would reverse the mutual relation of Jayapâla and Devapâla, making the former the elder brother of the latter. The context, however, certainly seems to confirm the reading of the Bhâgalpur grant, which has equally distinctly pîrojô. See Verse 3.

29 The Áṃgikôhî plate has asaśâkti, while the Bhâgalpur plate has asaśâkti, both equally distinctly. Both readings convey the same sense.

30 Another verse of the Bhâgalpur grant is omitted here.

31 Here, again, a verse of the Bhâgalpur grant is omitted.

32 The Bhâgalpur grant has śriyâḥ, not dhîyâḥ as given in the transcript.

33 The latter part of the first half of this verse is different in the Bhâgalpur grant, which reads Śrî-Nârâyânapâlindena acyaj cakopa śaṃyo-ottaram.

34 Here commences the portion which is peculiar to the Áṃgikôhî grant.

35 Bhûvara is apparently a synonym of bûdhara; compare varshâvara and varshedhâka, ’sunûkha.’

36 Mahâsa is clearly a mistake for mahâsa.
THE PALAS OF BENGAL.

[14] (about one fourth omitted) prabhū-sakti-lakṣmīḥ pūrṇāhīṃ sapatnīm iva śīlapatra || Tasmād bahuḥ sauvīryavarchhī | kālena chandra iva Vighrhapāladeva[h] ||

[14] ... paṇa vimala kalā(tapadena) || (āyāhitaena panito bhuivamasya tāpah || Bhava-sakala-vilakṣhaḥ saṅgare vā pradrāpād anadhiśkrita-vilagnāṁ rājyaṁ āsādyā purīyam [ ] ||

[14] ...... vasadhārāḥ ... vanipālaḥ ṝṣī-Mahīplā-devaḥ || Tyajaj toshā-sāgāraḥ śìraḥ(sti) krītāpaḍah kahiḥ-bhāṭavivrāṅge sarvavāśāḥ prabha-bhuva ||

[14] ...... riva raviḥ [ ] bhava . naḥ snigdaḥ prakīrī naurāgo . vaisātī sma vā dhanyaḥ prakhyayair ajani Nayapālo narapatiiḥ || Pitaḥ saṅgaṃale (vanaih) amara-riphoḥ pūjā-||

[14] ...... viśrāmā ... dhikāra-bhavanah ka . krīte vidvishāḥ mantavyāṁ dva-yam āśrayah śivapasa ... peṅgaga ... ndavan ( ) śrīmad-Vighrhapālā-deva-nripatiiḥ kriyāsāndrika-ra(pajalukh) tātyākṣara-||

[14] (about one half omitted) sa khalu " Bhāgirathī-patha-pravarttānamā-nādvidha-nau-vatāka[ ]-samīpātita-setubandha-virāgra-||


[14] ma (about one third omitted) (petana dhanā ha) lakalita || Kākini ṛpdhikopamā-||

[14] sa ... (pomana) droṣṭa-dravya-sameta || sah(t)ālaya-pramāṇa-ta(lu-ma) saṃsva-aṃsva-ta Vighrampurośām samupagatīse[ ]


[14] dān̄̄cādhaśadhanaika[ ] | mahādandaṇiyakā | mahākumārnāmyata | rājasthānaparika** | dāsāparaṇāika | chandrodhārāika | dāṇḍika | dāṇḍapisika | sau-

[14] ikīka | (gau|mika) | kahetapa | prāntapala** | kōshīpāla | sūviraśaka | tadāyukta** | vinīyuktaka | hastyaśvośtrānuvalayāpyāṭi | kīsora-vadavā-gomahīshajāyā-||

[14] vi(kālayakaḥ | drutapeneša)ṇika | gamāgamika | abhitvaramāṇa** | viṣhayapā | grāmapatī | tarika | goda | mālava | khaṣa | hūṣa | kuṇika | kulaṭa | lāṭa | chāta |

[14] (bhaṣa | sevakādīn | anyāṁ-chā) kriṭiṭān | rājapādopājīvaṁ[ ]** | pratīvāsino brb-||

37 In the middle of this line, with sa khalu, the identical portion of the two grantees recommends.
38 The Bhāgulpur plate has ṛṣīya for ṛṣīja. The name of the capital should be Śrī-Mudgagiri.
39 Though the number of the letters on the plate agrees with that name, their tracés, which are only very faintly visible, hardly seem to do so.
40 The letters on the plate are only mahādārāṭrā, the syllable āḥ being omitted by mistake.
41 From this line down to the end of line 26, the version of the Amgūkhī grant is new. It mentions the donor, Vighrnapalā, the province Pūṇḍarīkadhana, and apparently a town, Kṛtiyārsha.
42 At the end of this line the two grantees again coincide. There is a mention here of a place Vīṣhampura.
43 The office of mahākriṣṭa is omitted in the Ámghūkhī grant. — To the title of dān̄̄cādhaśadhanaika the Bhāgulpur grant prefixe mālam. Dūkṣi in the transcript of the latter grant is a misprint for dūkṣi as the original plate has it.
44 The Bhāgulpur grant has rājasthānaparika for rājasthānaparika; also, dāsāparaṇāika, dāṇḍapisika and saṃśa, with the palatal š, while the Amgūkhī grant spells with the dental š.
45 Prāntapala is clearly an error for prāntapala.
46 It also has kūṣaḥdāraka instead of sūviraśaka.
47 The Bhāgulpur plate has abhītotamāna (not abhītotamāna, as in the transcript), clearly an error for abhītotamāna.
48 It has also viśhampura for viṣhampura; also hūṣa instead of ṛṣīya in the transcript.
49 The Bhāgulpur plate has rājapādopājīvaṃ; and it omits the imperfectly legible word ša. ma or ke, ma.

*Second side.*
[6] yasvabhuviddhey | bhagavananta vridha-bhataram udhisya | masanikri |
[7] tya sagramatra | Sandilyam(masha) | daiva | ra |
[8] harisa-brahmacharine | Sanaavedine |
[9] ne | Mimaamsa-nyakara(sic)-tarkakavyadido | Kauhamal-sakhadhyayi |
[10] yachchahati | ubhau tau punyakanniyan niyata svargagaminah | Gom ekam svara-pannam ekah cha bhuhm apan ekam apan apana | hanan narakam ayati | yavad ah-bhuta-sampavah | Warshti-varsha |
[13] kamala-dalambu-vindu-lola[n] | ariyam anuchintya manushiya-jivitah cha | saka- |
[14] vikashami | nidi braham | dhanadhanyo |
[15] hasa-ra(ja)maka | (n)i nam iha sasane bhuta | Posalgrama-niryata-Mahdhara |

---

49 The Bhasalpur grant has motam instead of vi-
50 sam. —After bhasal, it inserts two and a half lines containing particulars about Nairiyapadha, which are omitted in the Angdehli grant.
51 After sagartoshara, the Bhasalpur grant inserts apornkarah.
52 Pragyakata is the correct reading in both grants, not pragyakata, as given in the Bhasalpur transcript.
53 The Bhasalpur grant inserts avat after samak-
54 lam.
55 From the middle of this line to the middle of the 40th line, the Angdehli text is now.
56 The name of the donor is khokhita-deva.
57 The Bhasalpur grant omits sahbdhah; and has tato for aic.
58 Both grants have bhuhm, not bhramoair, as the Bhasalpur transcript gives.
59 The Bhasalpur plate has only apraharanue.
60 This line in the Angdehli plate is very carelessly written; anuvadana is twice repeated, and the last words should evidently be anuvapananyak pratigokshibhah.
61 The Bhasalpur plate has samudhata for samudita. —
62 It inserts saras before pratigokshah, and omits it at the end of the line. —Bhota in the Angdehli plate is clearly an error for bhoga.
63 Both grants have dattah, not bhutah, as given in the Bhasalpur transcript. —The Bhasalpur plate omits the second and third verses.
64 Tanes is an error for tanveva; and vihridayah for vihthidal.
65 Aparnamsetur is an error for ayan drhamasetur, the syllable raha being omitted.
CHINGHIZ KHAN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

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

(Continued from p. 152.)

XXX.—(continued).

We saw how a quarrel arose at the siege of Khurārizm, between Jachi and Chagatai, and how Ogotai was sent to supersede his two elder brothers there. According to the Yuan-ch’ao-pi-shi Chinghiz, after the siege, summoned his sons to him, and rebuked them so severely that they perspired freely with fright. Thereupon the archers Khuankhai, Khuantakhar, and Sormakhan remarked, "The three boys are like young falcons in training for the first time. This is their first campaign. Such strict rebukes may cause their courage to fail, while everywhere from east to west there are enemies. Send us forward like bloodhounds. If heaven favour us and we are successful we will return to you. Yonder in the west is King Khalībo, ruler of Bakhtat, i.e., the Khalīfa, order us to march against him." Chinghiz thereupon relented towards his sons. He told Khuankhai and Khuantakhar to remain, but sent Sormakhan against the Khalībo. This story seems to contain an anachronism, for Sormakhan is assuredly Charmaghān, whose expedition into the west did not take place till the reign of Ogotai. The Yuan-ch’ao-pi-shi also speaks of a campaign against the people of Alū (? Iran) &c., between the land of the Hindus and Bakhtat, led by Dorbodokhshin, about which I can find nothing elsewhere.52 Other authorities tell us that after the feud at Khurārizm Jūchi took offence, and instead of taking part in the operations south and west of the Oxus retired to the appanage which his father had assigned him in the steppes of the Kankaliz and Kipčahks, north of the sea of Aral, where he devoted himself to subduing those turbulent ancestors of the modern Kirghiz, Kazakhs, and Nogais.

While Chinghiz was at Samarkand he sent word to his eldest son that he proposed holding a great hunt in the spring and told him to distribute his troops north of the mountains, and to drive in a large quantity of game for the battle. The great conqueror himself passed the winter of 1223-4 at Samarkand. Meanwhile Chagatai and Ogotai planted themselves in the neighbourhood of Bukhara, and as we have seen from Ch’eng-Ch’un’s itinerary, put down some turbulent robbers, and repaired the bridges over the river. They also devoted themselves to hunting hūkūs and karakuls, i.e., wild swans and black-tails or steppe antelopes, and sent their father 50 camel-loads of game weekly.53

Sherifū’d-dīn, in his History of Timur, has a curious reference to this very hunt, and tells us Timur went to hunt on the same place, which he calls Ghulserketi, and says it was near Bukhara. There were some beautiful lakes there, he tells us, on which were a vast number of birds, especially swans. Timur camped on the banks of these lakes, while his officers made rafts on which they trusted themselves, and amidst shouting, drum-beating, etc. frightened the birds, which caused them to fly, when the falconers let fly at them the famous hunting falcons called tughrāl, which our author says were the strongest and most adroit among birds of prey, and thus secured a vast quantity of game. He then cites the Jīhan Kushāi as an authority for the fact that Chinghiz Khān’s men were similarly successful at the same place, and adds that the game which they captured was sent to be distributed in the camp which was then outside Samarkand, and that this distribution was called shiwiqa by the Tartars.54

In the spring of 1222 Chinghiz Khān again set out, and we are told that, while the army defiled past Turkhan, Khutan, the mother of Muhammad Khurārizm Shāh, with her widows and relatives, stood by the roadside, and in a loud voice with great lamentations bade their last adieus to the Khurārizmian empire.55

The result of Chinghiz Khān’s campaigns in the west was assuredly deplorable. It is the fashion now to somewhat discredit the statements about the terrible slaughter which he caused in Khorasan and elsewhere, as mere examples of Eastern hyperbole, but I confess that the evidence is too strong and unanimous to allow of such conclusions. Khorasan had hitherto

---

been the most prosperous and thriving district in Asia. By dint of irrigation and continuous labour the land had been made exceedingly fertile, while its towns were the great marts of the Eastern world. Never again has the district reached the degree of prosperity it had in the days of the Seljuk rulers, and the Mongol heel effectually crushed out of it its most vigorous life. We must remember that of its many flourishing cities none really remained intact, while its four capitals, Balkh, Herat, Merv, and Nishapur, were laid waste. It was a terrible moving back of the sun's shadow of progress on the dial, a terrible sweeping away of the results of centuries of culture, and a terrible penalty to be paid for insulting a Chief who a few years before was a mere leader of shepherds. In the countries laid waste by Chinghiz Khan, says Juveni, there did not remain a thousandth part of their former people. Where there were formerly 100,000 people there barely remained 100. "If nothing occurs to arrest the growth of population in Khorasan and Irak again from now to the day of resurrection," says the same author, "it will not reach one-tenth part of what it was before the Mongol invasion." Ibn Batuta quotes Ibn Jozai as reporting how Nur-ud-din, the son of Azzejaj, one of the learned men of Irak, went to Makka with his nephew, where, in conversation he said, "There perished in the catastrophe caused by the Tartars in Irak 24,000 learned men, and this man alone survive of the class." Von Hammer has extracted two pathetic passages from two fortunate authors who escaped the general slaughter, namely, the celebrated mystic, Sheikh Najm-ud-din Darya, and the Geographer Yakut, which describe with all the poetic rhetoric and pathos of the Persian language the desert created by the Mongols.

When Chinghiz reached the Sihun on his way back to Mongolia he was joined by Ogotai and Chagatai, and he now summoned a Kuriltai, or general assembly. Erdmann and De la Croix say this was at Banakot, also called Tonkat on the Sihun. De la Croix describes this Kuriltai in terms which show it to be a description of Kuriltai in general rather than of this specific one. The one definite thing that we read was done at the Kuriltai was the execution of a number of Uighur Chiefs. Thence Chinghiz went on to a place called Kulan-tashi, which Dr. Bretschneider would identify with Tashkend, but it was more probably somewhere in the steppes north of the Alexandrofski range. There he hunted wild asses and was no doubt attended by all the Mongol grandees who were within reach. In regard to one of them, namely Juichi, Chinghiz Khan's eldest son, the accounts are contradictory. Abulghazi says that when he received his father's orders about the great hunt he advanced at the head of his army, driving the game before him. Inter alia he took his father's present of 100,000 horses, of which 20,000 were grey, 20,000 dappled grey, 20,000 bay, 20,000 black, and 20,000 piebald. Chinghiz showed him great consideration, and he was very affable to his younger brothers. After hunting with his sons Chinghiz returned home again. He gave Juichi some counsel as to governing the country, and then sent him back to the Desht Kipchak. This story, told by a descendant of Juichi, as Erdmann says, is not otherwise confirmed, and is very improbable. Other accounts say that Juichi did not attend in person, but sent his father a present of 20,000 grey horses, and ordered a vast quantity of wild asses to be driven to a place whose name is read Muka by Erdmann, and Akabar, Akabir, Akair or Uka by Raverty. There the great circle converged, and Chinghiz and his people hunted to their hearts' content. The army, it would seem, remained encamped at Kulan Tashi for some months, and it was there that Subutai and Chepe rejoined their master after their wonderful campaign, to which I must now devote a few paragraphs.

I carried down the story of their campaign to the capture of Kazvin. They apparently passed the winter in the neighbourhood of Rai. De la Croix says at Senoravend (?) in Irak. They sent to Khorasan for reinforcements. These troops were attacked, we are told, by a Khmizhian named Tekin, who commanded 3,000 or 4,000 horse, and who had some time before killed the governor of Bokhara. Tekin was beaten, and had to escape to Jurjan in Tabaris-

---

tan, where he was joined by Inan Khán. The two allies were again attacked by the Mongols between Jorjjan and Asterabad. Tekin was killed and Inan Khán fled to Ghas-u’d-din, brother of Jalal-u’d-din, the Khâûrizm Shâh, where he died. These events are otherwise reported by other authorities, where we read that while Chepe and Subutai were in winter quarters in the district of Rai, Begtikin, leader of the Khâûrizm Shâh’s troops in Irak, set out from Mughan, where he had his winter quarters, to attack the Mongols in Irak-Ajam, in company with Jamal-u’d-din Ineh (i.e. Inan), called Jamal-u’d-din Abiah by Raverty, raised a revolt against the Mongols, killed the Mongol Commissary whom Chepe had placed in charge of Hamadan, carried off Majn-u’d-din Alau’d-daulat its governor, and imprisoned him in the fortress of Krit, called Kurbat or Gurbat by Raverty. Chepe speedily marched to the rescue, drove away Jamal-u’d-din Ineh and reconquered the district. Zaajan, north-west of Kazvin, was also attacked and all the Jews there killed.

The Mongols now proceeded to invade Azerbaijan, whence the recent attack had come. Azerbaijan and Arran, from which it was separated by the river Kur, were subject to a Turkish chief named Uzbek, son of Jihan Pahlivan, whose grandfather Ildegis had been brought from Kipchak as a slave and sold to the Seljuk Sultan of Irak. Eventually emancipated and raised to various dignities Ildegis was in 1146 given the appanage of Azerbaijan and Arran and the style of the Atabeg, which was retained by his family after the destruction of the Seljuk dominion in Irak. Uzbek had been Atabeg of the two provinces since 1197.

The Mongols first attacked Azerbaijan. Uzbek bought the goodwill of the invaders by paying them a large sum of money, and sacrificing a quantity of cattle and goods. They thereupon withdrew from the neighbourhood of Tebriz on account of the cold, the winter having been very severe, and went to spend the winter in the rich pastures of Mughan, bounded by the Caspian, the Kur, and the Aras.

Thence they made an attack upon Georgia. Varitan, the Armenian historian, tells us how their arrival was portended by the fall of the splendid church of Meshgavan in the province of Udi, which was shattered by an earthquake; three priests who were celebrating the sacrament being killed, while a comet shaped like a lance appeared in the heavens. They penetrated the country, he says, by the valleys of the land to Kukark from the side of the Aghuans to the number of 20,000 men. They massacred everything living they met with, and then rapidly retired. Lasha* followed them with his troops, overtook them near the river Guesdman, but was defeated and had to flee with Ivanb. The latter’s horse had been damaged, so that he was dismounted. Meanwhile a grandee of the country, called Vahram, who was a prince of Khachêr, unaware of this defeat attacked another body of Mongols, and pursued them to the fortress of Kartman. Guiragos says the invaders advanced rapidly upon Tiflis and then withdrew towards the town of Shamkor, and adds it was falsely reported that they professed Magism, and were also Christians, and that they were sent to revenge the wrongs which the Christians had suffered at the hands of the nomads; that they had a church in the form of a tent and a miraculous cross; that they were accustomed to take a measure of oats and scatter it in front of the cross, after which the whole army brought their horses to feed upon it, but it did not diminish in quantity, and that it was the same as human food. The people were put off their guard by these reports, and our annalist reports how a priest who went with his flock cross in hand to meet them was killed with the rest. In regard to the fight above described Guiragos says: “They devastated a wide district and deposited their spoils in the strong Fortress of Bighamej, situated in the marshy country between Barda and Bailekan.” He adds they killed all living things they met, men and even dogs, nor did they attach any value to rich garments. &c., but only to horses.

The Georgians now sent to propose an alliance
with Uzbeg, the prince of Azerbaijan, with whom they had been at feud, and who agreed to help them after the winter was over, as did Ashraf prince of Khelat and Jesiret, but the Mongols allowed them no respite. They were joined by a Turkish slave of Uzbeg's named Akhush, who had collected a force of Turkomans, Kurds, &c. His men cozened naturally, we are told, to the Tartars, from their common origin; another piece of evidence shewing how numerous the Turks must have been in the Mongol armies. They now formed the advance-guard of the Mongols, with whom they advanced to the neighbourhood of Tissis. The Georgians came out to meet them. They gained some advantages over Akhush with his advance-guard, but the Tartars afterwards coming up, they suffered a severe defeat. This battle was fought in January 1221.

The Georgian Chronicle gives more details of these events. We read there that the Tartars having reached the frontiers of Georgia, proceeded to ravage the district of Gag. Vahram Gagel and the Atabeg Ivanhe therefore sent to inform the Georgian king, George Lasha, of the arrival of a strange people, speaking an unknown tongue, who were devastating the borders of Armenia. The king thereupon called together his soldiers, his Imers and Arners, to the number of 90,000 horsemen, who marched against the Tartars. They were joined by the Atabeg Ivanhe, by his nephew Shahin Shah, son of Zakaria, the generalissimo, and by Vahram Gagel, the chief of the maschhuri. They met the enemy on the Berduj (now called Sagam); Guiragos says in the plains of Khunaa and Vardan, on the river of Codman (Gardman?). A fierce fight ensued: one-half of the Tartars fled, no doubt in furtherance of their usual tactics, while the other lay in ambush and attacked the Georgians from the rear. The latter with their king fled, leaving many dead behind. Ivanhe, the grand Atabeg, barely escaped with his life, and fled to the fortress of Kagh or Kagh. Beka, son of Kuarkouragh, chief of the armourers, fell when fighting bravely. The Chronicle deprecates the defeat, the first which the Georgian arms had sustained for a long time, and adds from this time down to our own day the fortune of the Georgians has been constantly the same; namely, to be constantly beaten by the Tartars.

Ibn al-Atthir also moralizes on these events. He says: "These Tartars have done things unparalleled in ancient or modern times. Starting from the borders of China they have penetrated in less than a year to the borders of Armenia and of Irak. Those who come after will hardly credit these things. God should find Islam and the Musalmans a defender, for since the birth of the Prophet never have they suffered such misfortunes as in these days. On one side the devastations of the Tartars in Mawar Nahr, Khorasan, Irak and Azerbaijan: on another a second enemy, the Franks, coming from their country in the north-west beyond the Roman empire, have entered Egypt and captured Damietta, and the Musalmans cannot drive them out." The same author attributes the misfortunes of his co-religionists to the disappearance of the Sultan Muhammad.

After their victory over the Georgians, the Mongols, in the spring of 1221, again approached Tebriz, when the Governor Shams u'd-din Tughrail paid them another heavy blackmail. They then went on to Meragh, about 17 leagues from Tebriz, which, according to De la Croix, had sent help to the Georgians. Its ruler was a princess, who resided in the fortress of Rauder, called Ra-in-dujs by Raverty, situated three leagues from Meragh. They compelled their Muslam captives to lead the assault. The place was captured on the 30th of March. The inhabitants were slaughtered, and what could not be carried away was burned. In order to tempt any victims who had hidden away to come out they made their prisoners announce that they had retired, and then fell on them and killed them. Ibn-al-Atthir reports as a proof of the terrible prestige the invaders had acquired, that a Mongol woman entered a house at Meragh and proceeded to kill its occupants, who mistook her for a man. When she laid down her weapons they saw she was a woman, and one of the Muslman prisoners killed her. We have heard it said, he continues, that a Tartar having entered a street there were a hundred
people, killed them all one after another, without anyone attempting to defend himself.  

From Mirahagh the Mongols set off again towards Irbil, but the defiles on the route, which do not permit two horsemen to ride abreast, induced them to turn aside towards Irak Arab, which was part of the dominions of the Khalifa. He demanded help from Mazaffar’s-din Kukkeri, prince of Irbil, Badru’d-din La-lu, prince of Mosul, and the Malik Ashraf, prince of Mesopotamia. Ashraf excused himself on the ground that he was assisting Kamil, the ruler of Egypt, against the Crusaders, who had taken Damietta, and he at once set out hastily for Egypt. The other two princes collected their troops and marched them towards Dakuca. Mazaffar’s-din commanded the army, and was joined at Dakuca by 800 men supplied by the Khalifa. He naturally complained of this miserable contingent, but offered, if supplied with 10,000 men, to clear Persia of the invaders.

The Mongols were apparently misled as to his real strength, and deeming it prudent not to attack him, once more approached Hamadan, where they demanded a fresh contribution through the commissary or bakhsh they had left there. The principal citizens repaired to the Rais of the town, who had negociated the former pact with the Mongols, complained of this new exaction, and accused him of pusillanimity. He warned them that being weak they had no resource save to buy safety. They retorted that he was harder towards them than the infidels, &c. At length, goaded by their reproaches, he said he was ready to do their bidding. They thereupon killed the Mongol Commissary; but a speedy vengeance soon overtook them. The town was beleaguered. During the first two days the citizens made brave sorties, led by the Fakih. When he was so weak that he could not mount his horse they went to ask the Rais to lead them on, but he was faint-hearted and had withdrawn himself and his family by a subterranean passage. This disconcerted them, and they ceased making sorties. The Mongols, who had suffered severely and were about to withdraw, made another effort, stormed the town and committed a terrible slaughter, which lasted several days, only those escaping who found refuge under ground. The town was then burnt.  

The Mongols now returned northwards, sacked Irbil, made a third visit to the neighbourhood of Tebriz, whence Uzbeq had fled to Nakhchivan, while the commander he left behind showed such a bold front, that they withdrew again on the payment of black mail. They then captured Sarab, where everybody was slaughtered. De la Croix says they first took Selams and Khoi in the extreme west of Azerbaijan, and then entering Arran they apparently levied a contribution on Nakhchivan and approached Barlekan. There a Mongol officer sent into the town at the request of the citizens to make an arrangement was murdered. They thereupon pressed the siege. There being no stones about they pulled down great plane trees, and threw their trunks with their catapults. They stormed the place and destroyed its population with every cruelty; tore children from the womb, and having ravished the women, killed them. They then approached Ganja, or Kantzag, the capital of Arran. Ibn-al-Athir says distinctly that afraid of the prowess of its citizens, who were experienced warriors, from their constant struggles with the Georgians, the Mongols did not attack the town, but contented themselves with levying a contribution of money and stuffs. De la Croix says they entered the town peaceably and Erdmann that they destroyed it.

Having conquered one portion of the Musalmans of Azerbaijan and Arran, and made peace with the rest, the Mongols now turned once more upon Georgia, whose king, George IV. Lasha, had recently died, probably, as Saint-Martin concludes, in 1221, and been succeeded by his sister Rusudan. What followed is not quite clear. From one account it would appear that the Georgians, having marched to meet the invaders, Chepe planted himself with 5,000 men in ambush, while Subutai advanced against the enemy with the main army. At a given signal he retired with his men and drew on the unsuspecting Georgians, who were meanwhile attacked from behind by Chepe’s division. Thirty thousand Georgians!!! are said to have perished. Ibn-al-Athir adds that the Tartars
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were so undauntable that it was impossible to check them; they never fled nor would they surrender. On one occasion one of them having been captured, dismounted and broke his head against a stone. Guiragos also speaks of this second defeat, where he says the Georgians were more numerous than before, and that the enemy captured their wives, children and booty, and determined to return home by way of Derbend. Vartan mentions a struggle in which Vahram, a grandee of the country, fought valiantly against the enemy and slaughtered many of them as far as Gardman.

These struggles are referred to in two very interesting documents, which contained the first news of the invasion of the Mongols that reached Europe. These are two letters written to Pope Honorius the Third, one by Rusudan and the other by her Constable Ivaneth. In her letter the queen styles herself Rusutana, queen of Anegnua or Avgnua (probably a corruption: being, as Saint-Martin suggests, a translation of the Georgian sentence, Rusudan mepe Abkhazetia, Rusudan ruler of the Abkhaz, which was the usual style of the Georgian kings at this time). After some preliminary phrases she informs the Pope that her brother was recently dead, that his message inviting him through his Legate who was at Damietta to go to the help of the Christians had duly arrived and he was preparing to set out, when, as he might have heard, those evil men the Tartars entered her country and caused much damage to her people, and killed six thousand of them. "We did not fear them, since we thought they were Christians, but we afterwards learnt they were not good Christians, and we thereupon collected our people and slew twenty-five thousand of them and captured many of them and the rest we drove out of our land; and this is why we have not come at the summons of your Legate." She then goes on to express her pleasure at hearing that the Emperor was en route to invade the Holy Land, and promised to send her Constable Ivaneth to share in the enterprise. In his letter Ivaneth styles himself Constable of all Bratia and Armenia, i.e., of Georgia (the Georgians being called Vrata) and Armenia. He also reports the death of his sovereign and the election of his successor, and goes on to say that the Pope's message had reached him, and that as they were preparing arms and horses, victuals and men, there came the Tartars bearing the cross before them to the assistance of the Christians and to the relief of the Holy Land. "They entered our country, and under pretence of being Christians deceived us and killed six thousand of us." He concludes by saying he was ready to start to relieve the Holy Land with 40,000 warriors when the Pope should require it. He also begged the Pope's blessing for his Nephew Sandana (i.e. Shahin Shah) the lord of 15 towns. The Pope's answer, which was dated in 1224 mentions that the Emperor had set out for the Holy Land, and promises a year's indulgence to those who would aid in the work. The victory which Rusudan claims to have won is not confirmed by other accounts. It seems most problematical. No doubt the Mongols now left Georgia, but it was doubtless in obedience to the express orders of Chinghiz Khâa that they should return in three years.

Before we trace further the doings of Subutai and Chepe, it will be well to complete the tale of Mongol ravage in Persia. It was about this time that Ruknu'd-din, the second son of Muhammad Khwârizm Shah, came by his end. When his father fled from Kazvin to the Caspian, as we saw, Ruknu'd-din went to Kerman; where, reinforced by the troops of Zuzan who governed that province, he entered the capital of Kerman, and seized the treasure there, which he divided among his men. After a stay of seven months in Kerman he returned to Irak, and was about to attack Jamalu'd-din Muhammad, a grandee of that district, who intended appropriating it, when he heard, near Rai, of the approach of a Mongol force under Taimas and Taimal. He accordingly sought refuge in the strong fortress of Satan Avend, near Rai, which was deemed to be impregnable. It was now invested by the Mongols, who in six months captured it, and Ruknu'd-din having refused to stoop and do homage, was put to death with his people. Zakaria of Kazvin relations with Ruben, Prince of Cilicia, who was at Damietta, and who would probably put him in communication with the Georgians. Brosset. \textit{Hist. de la Géorgie}, add. et ex., p. 203, note.
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CHINGHIZ KHAN AND HIS ANCESTORS.

says that Raknu'd-din Gerssazi shut himself up in the fortress of Demavend in 618 H. i.e. 1221. Rashid says it was at Peruzkoh. Jamal-
un-din, having heard of the death of the prince, offered his submission to the Mongols, hoping thus to retain the district of Hamadan. The Mongol generals sent him a robe of honour, and invited him to their camp, when they killed him with his suite.22

While Chinghiz Khan was wintering at Samarkand, about 1224, a body of three thousand Mongols went from Khurasan, and appeared suddenly before Rai and surprised a body of 6000 Khwarizmians there. They routed them, and entered Rai, which had been again occupied. They pillaged and devastated it. Saveh, Kum and Kashino suffered the same fate. The two latter towns had escaped the previous Mongol raid. Hamadan was fired and ravaged for a second time, and then the invaders entered Azerbaijan, where the Khwarizmian troops beaten at Rai had sought refuge. They were again attacked and again defeated. The remnants fled to Tabriz where many of them, at the demand of the Mongols, were put to death by Uzbeg, who ruled there, as we have seen. Having received the heads of the victims and been conciliated by some presents, they once more withdrew to Khurasan.23 The most famous victim of the Mongol invasion says Von Hammer, was the great mystic poet, Faridu'd-din Attar, who at the time of the invasion lived at Shadyak, and was a very old man. A Mongol was about to cut him down when another said to him, "Do not kill this old man. I will give you 1000 silver pieces for him." "Hold," said the Attar, "you will meet with a better bargain." A few steps further on he met another man who offered a sack of straw for him. "Take it," said the Attar, "I am worth no more." Whereupon the Mongol slew him in two. This story is preserved in Danlai Shah's History of Rhetoric.24

To return to Subutai and Chepe. On withdrawing from Georgia they marched upon Shirvan, whose capital was Shamakhi. According to one report the Mongols piled up a great heap of camels, cattle, sheep and men's corpses, their own as well as those of the enemy, and thus built up a mound from which they dominated the walls. The citizens resisted with the greatest bravery, but in vain. The place was taken, and a terrible carnage ensued.25 They then captured the town of Derbend, but not the citadel, where the Shirvan Shah Rashid had taken refuge. The latter was constrained however to furnish them ten guides, one of whom they killed as a warning to the rest, who directed their march through the difficult defiles of Daghestan. There they killed many of the Lezghs, some of whom we are told were Musalmans and some infidels.26

Fifteen days after leaving Derbend the invaders found themselves confronted by a combined army of Alans, i.e. Ossetes and Kipchaks, in the dangerous defiles of the Eastern Caucasus. They had recourse to their fox-like instincts, and we are told Subutai sent an envoy with rich presents to the Kipchaks to assure them the Mongols were their brothers, while the Alans were foreigners (proving what a large contingent of Turks there was in the Mongol armies), and urged them to detach themselves from the Alans and made common cause with them, and they would give them gold and garments as much as they could wish. The Kipchaks, taken in by these advances, accordingly separated themselves, and the Mongols soon made short work of the Alans, who were pursued as far as Tarku, which was captured.27 The Alans having been crushed, the Mongols next turned upon their newly made friends the Kipchaks, dispersed them and recovered the presents they had recently given them. The remainder of these Turkish nomads fled towards Russia.28

In the biography of Subutai in the Yuan-shih, the chiefs of the Kipchaks are called Yu-li-gi (i.e. Yuri or George), and Tà-tà-ha-y, who gathered their forces together at the river Bu-dsu (?). The son of Yu-li-gi was wounded by an arrow and fled into the forest where he was betrayed by his servant, who instead of being rewarded, was afterwards put to death for his treachery by order of Chinghiz.29 Karamzin says that both Yuri (who is called
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Yuri Konchakovitch by the Russians and Daniel Kobiakovitch, perhaps Kotiakovitch), were killed during their flight."

The Mongols now spread over the country north of the Caucasus. We are told they captured Terek, the capital of the Circassians, and advanced as far as the Sea of Azof and the "Rampart of the Polouci" (i.e. to the dyke forming the frontier between the Kipchaks and Russians) and subdued the Yasses, i.e. the Ossetes or Alans, the Abkhazians and Circassians, and became the masters of seven tribes near the Sea of Azof." Ibn-al-Atbir says the Tartars captured the cantonments (i.e. the winter quarters) of the Kipchaks. It is a country, he says, affording good pasture both in summer and winter, and it contains places where the temperature is cool in the hot season, and others where it is mild in winter. The shores of the sea are bordered by forests. The Tartars advanced as far as the town of Sudak, i.e. Soldais, which belonged to the Kipchaks, who got their grain from it. It was a seaport, and the Kipchaks, we are told, went there to buy stuffs, bartering in exchange slaves of both sexes, and fox-skins (burtasses) and those of the beaver, &c. &c.

The Tartars occupied Sudak, whose inhabitants fled with their families, some to the mountains, while others embarked for Rum." Ten thousand families of these fugitives crossed the Danube into the borders of the Roman Empire, and the Emperor John Ducas took them into his service. A portion of these latter were cantoned in Thrace and Macedonia, where they committed great ravages. Others were transported into Asia Minor." The greater number fled to Russia, which at this time did not extend eastwards beyond the Oka, and did not comprise the Ukraine. It was divided among a number of petty princes, owing little more than nominal allegiance to the Grand Duke of Novgorod, and continually at strife with each other and with the Kipchaks, whom they called Polouci, as the Byzantine authors called them Comans. One of the chiefs of the latter, who now sought refuge in Russia, is called Kotia by Nikon, Kotian by Karamzin, and Kothan or Kuthen by the Hungarians. His daughter had married Mitislaf, Prince of Gallicia. Kotia reported at Kief the advance of the terrible enemy, presented the Russian princes with camels, horses, buffaloes, and beautiful slaves, and told them the Mongols had taken his land, and that that of the Russians would suffer the same fate. The astonished princes asked who these strangers, hitherto unknown, were. Some called them Taurmains, others Petchenege, others again Tartars. The more superstitious recounted how the barbarians, defeated by Gideon 1,200 years before Christ, were to reappear at the end of the world from their deserts, and to conquer the whole earth. Mitislaf assembled the Russian princes at Kief, and there met there beside himself, Mitislaf Romanovitch of Kief, Mitislaf of Chernigof, Daniel Romanovitch of Volynia, Michael) son of Vsevolod the Red, and Vsevolod Mitislavich of Novgorod, and it was determined unanimously to march against the invaders, much to the joy of the Polouci, one of whose princes named Basti," embraced Christianity. They assembled their forces at Zarub and the isle of the Varangians (places whose exact sites are unknown), on the Dnieper." There they received ten ambassadors from the Mongols, who spoke thus: "We understand that, seduced by the statements of the Polouci, you are marching against us. But we have done nothing against the Russians, we have not taken your towns or villages, and our sole intention is to punish the Polouci, our slaves. For a long time they have been enemies of the Russians. Side with us, therefore, and take a signal vengeance upon these barbarians, and seize their wealth." "This message was accepted," says Karamzin, "as a sign of weakness, or as a ruse." Doubtless as the latter, for the recent treachery of the Mongols in the Caucasus must have been known. At all events, the ambassadors were barbarously murdered. Others were sent which met the Russian army at Oleschia who said: "You have preferred the counsel of the Polouci, you have killed our envoys, well; as you wish for war, you shall have it. We have done you no harm. God is impartial, He will decide our quarrel."


"Erdmann and von Hammer call him Rata.
"Von Hammer says near Zarub.
The Russians assembled their forces in large numbers from Kief, Smolensk, Putivl Kursk, and Trubchevsk. The Volhynians and Gallicians came in a thousand boats, on which they sailed down the Dnieper to the sea, and then up the Dnieper to the island Khortiza, called the Isle of St. George by Constantine Porphyrogenitus. There also came some bodies of Polouetsi. The Russians numbered some 82,000 men, and were joined by other auxiliaries whom the chronicles call Bautii, Gangali, Uigoltzi and Gallicians. The young prince, Daniel, with a few companions rode out to reconnoitre a party of Tartars which had been seen on the other side of the river. Some reported that the enemy was contemptible but the voievode Yuri of Gallicia gave a different account, and said they were experienced soldiers. Mitislaif, with an advance guard of 10,000, impatient to meet the enemy, went on ahead, overtook a body of Mongols under Hamabek and defeated them. Their leader was found hidden in a ditch or hole among the kurgans or mounds on the steppe, and was beheaded with the consent of Mitislaif, who by this attack secured a large number of cattle. The main body of the Russians now crossed the Dnieper, and after a nine days' march (Ablughazi says ten and Rashiduddin twelve) arrived at the river Kalka, the modern Kaleza, near Mariupol, in the government of Ekaterinoslav. Mitislaif, who was probably wishful of monopolizing the glory of the campaign, ventured to attack the main body of the Mongols with only one division. He planted his men on the left bank of the river and ordered Yaruu, the chief of the Polouetsi, and Daniel, to advance with the Russian Guard. Daniel with Oleg of Karsk performed prodigies of valour and continued fighting although the former was badly wounded in the chest. Mitislaif, the mighty brother of Ingvar of Lutak, went to their rescue and fought desperately. Meanwhile the Polouetsi, unable to withstand the Mongol attack, turned their backs to the enemy and threw the Russian reserves under the princes of Kief and Chernigof into confusion; the precipitance of Mitislaif's attack having left them little time

for preparation. This caused their men to retire also. The Mongols pursued them mercilessly. Six princes, namely Sviateasl of Yanovisk, Iiaslaif Ingvarovitch, Sviateasl of Shumsk, Mitislaif of Chernigof with his sons, and Yuri of Nausigov, together with a celebrated paladin named Alexander Popovitch, and seventy nobles perished. Of the contingent from Kief alone, 10,000, says Karamzin, were left on the field of battle, while the faithless Polousi used the occasion for plundering their unfortunate allies. Mitislaif, to whom reverse was something new, seemed beside himself. Having crossed the Dnieper himself, he caused the boats to be destroyed in order to prevent pursuit. In the general route one leader held his ground. This was Mitislaif Romanovitch, Prince of Kief, who had entrenched himself on the Kalka, and resisted for three days the assault of the Mongols. They at length proposed to allow him to escape on paying a ransom, and Ploskinis, voievode of Brodnik, or light troops, who was in their service, swore on their behalf to faithfully observe the convention; but he betrayed the Russians, bound Mitislaif and two of his relatives with cords, and handed them over to the Mongols. Irritated by the prolonged resistance of Mitislaif, and furious at the slaughter of their envoys, they put to death all the Russians they met with, and smothered Mitislaif and his sons-in-law, Andrew and Alexander Dabrowetzky, under planks, and held a feast over their bodies. The pursuit was again renewed. In vain the inhabitants of the towns and villages submitted, humbly going to their camp with their crosses, but no pity was shown. Their grim maxim, surely the most cynical of all ferocious war-creeds, was that “the vanquished can never be the friends of the victors, the death of the former is necessary therefore for the safety of the latter.”

Ibn-al-Athir speaks in inguibus terms of the devastation they committed in Russia, killing, burning, pillaging and ruining what they met with. The chief merchants and wealthier people emigrated with their property and went beyond the sea. According to the Yuan-shi, the Russian prince Mitislaif was sent by Chepe under the escort of Ho-sze-mai-la, i.e. Ismael, to Juchi, the...
eldesi son of Chinghiz, who had him put to death. The Mongols now, in January 1224, marched upon great Bulgaria on the Volga. The passage of Ibn-al-Athir describing this last event has been differently translated by D'Ohsso and Quatremère. One makes the Mongols and the other the Bulgars to be successful. Quatremère says the Bulgars planted themselves in various ambushes and the Tartars being attacked before and behind the greater part of them were killed, only 4,000 escaping. D'Ohsso says it was the Bulgars who thus suffered. The invaders now seem to have marched down the Volga to Saksin. Saksin, according to the geographer Baunji, was a large town in the country of the Khazars, whose inhabitants were divided into 40 tribes, most of them Muslims. It was a famous mart and frequented by a large concourse of merchants. It was traversed by a great river, abounding in fish, one of which produced a large quantity of oil. Saksin, he adds, is at present submerged, but close by is the Senai of Bereke, the residence of the ruler of this country. From this description it would seem that it was situated on the Akhtuba. De la Croix says the invaders also captured Astrakhian, but this is not mentioned by the older authorities, Ibn-al-Athir, Juveni, and Rashidu'd-din, and I am disposed to think that he has mistaken Saksin for that town, which only became famous at a later day. On the other hand, we read in the biography of Ho-sze-ma-li-la, i.e. Ismael, in the Yuan-sh, that the Mongols defeated the Kaukals (who lived east of the Volga) and their Khan Ho-to-sze (? Kutuz) and captured their town Bo-ize-baligu (perhaps Seraiukon on the Jaik.) Subutai now formed a special corps of Merkits, Naimans and Kipchaks, with which he returned home. Ibn-al-Athir tells us how this raid upon Bulgaria and the neighbouring districts, which were the fur countries of that day, interrupted the trade in furs, and how it was renewed again on the Mongol withdrawal.

Subutai and Chepe after their wonderful march rejoined Chinghiz Khan at Kulai Taishi, where, as we have seen, he held a great Kuriltai or Assembly, and a hunt. He then set out for his home. The biography of Subutai in the Yuan-sh tells us that general returned home by way of Imi (i.e. the Choughach of our day) and Hoji, by which some neighbouring town is doubtless meant, and the Yuan-ch ao-pi-shi tells us that Chinghiz returned home by way of the Irtish, where he passed the summer of 1225. We are elsewhere told that two of his grandsons, who afterwards became very famous, namely Khubilai and Khulagu, went to meet him at Anmarhu near Itel Kujin, west of the river Il. The former was a mere boy, and had on the way killed a hare, while the latter who was only nine had captured a deer, and as it was the Mongol custom to rub the middle finger of the hand with the flesh and fat the first time that boys went hunting, Chinghiz performed this ceremony in person for the two boys. Further on, at a place called Buka Su-hiku, he erected a great Golden Ordu, i.e. a tent, and held a grand feast. The camp, we are told, was planted on yielding and uncertain ground which was much broken. He ordered each one to place stones round the margin of his ordu. All did this except his brother Uchi, i.e. Ochigen, who, instead of stone, used wood. For some days after he devoted himself to healing. Uchi of all his people did not go, but stayed at home. For this, his disobedience, he was denied access to the ordu for a week, but on his making due apologies, he was forgiven. Chinghiz reached his home which was at this time on the river Tula in the spring of the New year Zafar 622 H., 1225 A.D. The Yuan-ch ao-pi-shi tells us that he returned to his chief camp "Karastun which is translated in the Chinese text by Heilin, and which answers to the Karam Kabjal, i.e. the defile of the Black forest on the river Tula where he and his people once more met their families.

What a wonderful gathering that must have been. We are much impressed in reading the history of the Middle Ages with the effect of the Crusades, which brought the parochial-minded chivalry of Western Europe into contact with the land of so much gorgeous romance as the East, and gave an impetus to
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thought and action, and an enlargement of view that had more than aught else to do perhaps with the social and mental revolution of the revival of learning. But what were the Crusades as an experience to the journey of Chinghiz and his troops? Born and accustomed only to the dreary steppeland of the Gobi desert, and its girdle of pine-covered mountains, their triumphant march led them through the very garden of Asia, among its most refined and cultured inhabitants, and through its most prosperous cities. Every step must have been a new chapter of romance, such as boys in England find in the Arabian Nights, and the vast caravans of treasure that they carried back with them must have been objects of intense wonder to the wives and daughters of the returning warriors, as the tales they told of their adventures must have seemed like the romances of ballad makers, rather than the truthful experiences of ingenious soldiers. Nor were the crowds of captives, chiefly artisans, a less important, if a somewhat less picturesque, element in the cavalcade. With them there went to the farthest East all the knowledge and craft possessed by the Muhammadans, and if we find the period of Mongol supremacy in China was one of revival in art and manufacture, a period of great literary energy, we must not forget what a number of names in the administration of that period are Persian and Turkish; and how the rubbing together of two widely different civilisations, which have crystallised apart, such as those of China and Persia, necessarily leads to a vigorous outburst of fresh ideas and discoveries, a most potent example of the law condensd for us in the venerable proverb that “iron sharpeneth iron.”

**MISCELLANEA.**

**THE COINS OF THE IMPERIAL GUPTA DYNASTY.**

The appearance, in the March number of this Journal, of Mr. Fleet’s interesting paper on the legends of the Gupta silver coins, and of a friendly review of my essay on the gold coins, is a welcome proof that the publication of my Catalogue has produced its desired effect, in stimulating the study of one of the most attractive branches of Indian numismatics. The review is in itself a most valuable contribution to numismatic science, and adds much to our knowledge of the Gupta coins.

As regards the bird-standard on the gold coins, I am still not satisfied that it represents Garuda; but am now rather inclined to view it as being an imitation of the Roman eagle. When examining the Gupta copper coins in the British Museum, neither Professor Gardner nor myself noticed the human arms between the wings and legs of the bird on these coins; nor are they mentioned in any of the descriptions of the copper coinage hitherto published. I cannot therefore feel quite certain that the lines between the bird’s legs and wings on some of the coins, are really intended for human arms.

The Rājim seal undoubtedly supplies a delineation of the Vaishnavā monster Garuda; but I do not think that this seal can be fairly quoted as evidence of the meaning of the bird-standard on the Gupta gold coins. Rājim is in the Central Provinces, on the Mahānadi River, and may very probably never have been included in the Gupta dominions; and the inscription to which the seal is attached was engraved at a time considerably later than that of the Gupta coins. Moreover, on the seal the figure of Garuda is associated with the remaining emblems of Viṣṇu—the lotus, shell, and discus; whereas, the bird-standard on the Gupta coins is not associated with any such emblems, and there is no reason to think that Samudra Gupta and his successors were specially addicted to the worship of Viṣṇu.

The bird on the standard may have been intended for Garuda, but I do not think it is proved that it was so intended.

Professor Percy Gardner suggested to me that the bird on the copper coins may be a copy of the owl of Athens (ἈΘΗΝΑΣ ΝΙΧΗΠΟΠΟΥ), as seen on the coins of Pergamos. The suggestion seems a plausible one, and is supported by the other examples of imitation of Greek and Roman designs adduced in my essay.

I accept the correction of the name of Nara in lieu of Nārā, and admit that there is no authority for adding the name Gupta to the legend Nara-Bālditiya. I also accept the reading grē for the character between the king’s feet on Nara-Bālditiya’s coins.

The letter ṣ which is found between the king’s feet on Viṣṇu-Chandrāditya’s coin, appears to be the same character as that which occurs below the horse on Praśāditiya’s coins. Possibly these detached letters may be mint-marks.

The reviewer’s reference to Makoba, Kālining and Khajuraho, is due to a misunderstanding of what I wrote.
THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

The question as to whether the founder of the dynasty was named Gupta or Śrīgupta, appears to me to be still an open one.

I must confess to having followed earlier authorities too implicitly with regard to Ghatotkacha. My critic has proved that the coins hitherto referred to this prince cannot be his; and I agree with him in thinking it probable that Ghatotkacha did not coin in gold. I believe that, as suggested in the review, these coins belong to the time of Samudra Gupta.

The goddess on the reverse strikingly resembles the standing goddess on the Aśvamedha-pieces.

As to these latter, I admit that it is not demonstrated that they were issued by Samudra Gupta; but it appears most probable that they were.

Professor Tawney informs me that the name Ghatotkacha is familiar to him in Hindī legend as the son of Bhima by Hijumbā, and that the name occurs in the Mahābhārata as quoted in the St. Petersburg Lexicon, thus:—

वोर हरमिक्ष्बक हात दहा भजनानाय।
अबविषय नामात्रः परित्रक्तः इति स्वः

The reference is to Mahābhārata I. 197, in the Calcutta four-volume edition, which, however, Professor Tawney was unable to consult in order to verify the quotation.1

Basti, 15th March 1885.

V. A. Smith.

BOOK NOTICE.


To the already numerous Lives of Buddha that have appeared within the last twenty-six years, since the first edition of Bishop Bigandet's was published, Mr. Rockhill has added still another. Being a translation from the Tibetan, however, this volume has a special interest, and will be welcomed by scholars. The Tibetan Dalva or Vinaya-piṭaka, which is probably the oldest and most trustworthy portion of the Bhok-hyur, contains many historical or legendary texts, together with Jātikhas (several of which are not found in the Pāli versions), Avadanas, Vajkravanas or Prophecies, Sūtras, and Udānas; and the first part of this volume presents us with a full and connected analysis, and frequently literal translations, of most of the former, and the more interesting of the latter. Especially important are the accounts of the Councils of Rājagriha and Vaiśali, and of the spread of Buddhism in Kaśmir (pp. 148–180), taken from the eleventh volume of the Dalva, and which differ materially from the accounts previously translated from the Pāli and Chinese.

Vassilieff, in his unfinished work on Buddhism, has translated the Samayavacchāsūkha chaṭṭha of Vasumitra, and has added the schismatic schools; and Mr. Rockhill has here added the Kayabhedro viśhōjya of Bhavya, which immediately follows it in the Bstan-hyur, and treats of the same subject; and with the information contained in it, he has combined further particulars from the Samayabhādoparaschāna chaṭṭha of Vinitadēva, which is a compilation from that of Vasumitra, and from the Bhikṣu-naravagrapriyaka, and has thus elucidated some obscurities in Vassilieff's translation of Vasumitra's work, from which that of Bhavya materially differs.

Two chapters are devoted to the early histories of Bod-yul (Tibet), and Li-yul (Khoten), which are especially interesting; and, in an appendix, are given extracts from Bhagavatī, X., on the intercourse between Mahāvīra (i.e. Nāgaṇṭha Nāṭaputra) and Gosāla Manikhaihiputta—translated by Dr. Ernst Leumann, and on the doctrines of the Six Heretical Teachers, according to two Chinese versions of the Samana-phala Sutra, by Bunyu Nanjo.

In his notes, Mr. Rockhill has given everywhere references to the parallel passages in other works on Buddhism and the life of its founder, which will be of great use to the reader. The Index of names is full, and the special index of Tibetan words with their Sanskrit equivalents will be of use to those who may wish to study the original Tibetan works.

Throughout the book, however, we note a want of uniformity in the transliteration of Sanskrit names and words: the long vowels are marked, but not always, and not unfrequently wrongly, and the same word is spelt in more ways than one: thus we have the names of Buddha's three wives as 'Yaḍāḍhārā' and 'Yaḍāḍhāra,' 'Gāyā,' and 'Mrgadā' or 'Keisa Gautami,' and we find 'Adjatasatru,' 'yavara,' 'Jeta,' 'tehitya' and 'chaitya,' 'Kacchere,' 'Gāyā,' &c., ' symbol being represented by g, c, s, and x;ב by dj and j; and י by sh, ch, and teh, &c. This ought not to have been: uniformity at least, if not conformity to some of the systems in vogue among English scholars, should have been preserved.

[See also Fitz-Edward Hall's edition of Wilson's Translation of the Vīshnu-Purāṇa, Vol. IV, p. 152.—Ed.]
A MODERN ORNAMENTAL KUFIC ALPHABET FROM KABUL.

BY CAPT. R. C. TEMPLE.

DURING the Kabul War of 1873-80 a slip of paper, of which a full-sized facsimile is given below, was picked up in the Amir's rooms on the 12th October, 1879, and afterwards found its way into the possession of the Rev. J. Hinton Knowles, of Siraagar, Kasmir, who handed it over to me for disposal. It shows the alphabet of an ornamental modern variant of the Kufic variety of the Arabic character, and is accompanied by a description in high-flown Persian, describing by whom and why it was written.

The transcription is as follows:—

1. A and B (in the) Kufi character, to the end, written according to the order of
2. The great Mustaf' al-Mamalik Sahib (Chancellor of the Exchequer), may Almighty God ever preserve his honour and his prosperity!
3. Derived from him the slave, the sinner, the pilgrim (to Makkah), the suppliant for the mercy of God, Yahya, the public preacher: (dated) the month of Jumada I's-awwal, 1293 (June 1876).

The next two lines transcribe the heavy black characters of the facsimile. These clearly represent a modernized form of the Kufic alphabet, written in an ornamental style. The derivation of the letters from the medieval Kufic is obvious, and their form is interesting for the following reasons:—It will be observed that the modern order of the Arabic alphabet, which is by no means the probable Kufic order, has been strictly followed, and a close inspection will show that every letter of the original has been carefully differentiated from its fellows.

The last letter I take to be the sukun or sound-stop in Arabic. Now the modern Arabic letters غ خ ذ ض غ are not found in the medieval Kufic at all, and of the rest one symbol did duty for the following pairs of letters, viz. غ خ ذ ض غ.

The medieval Kufic in fact had but 17 symbols, with which all the sounds of the Arabic language had to be expressed. The forms of these are as under, and from a comparison the descent of the letters in the facsimile will be clearly seen.
VIDYAPATI AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES.

BY G. A. GRIERSON, B.C.S.

So little is known about Vidyāpati, the most famous of the old Master-singers of Bihār, that no excuse is needed for offering the following very free translation of an excellent Bāngālī preface to an edition of the Bāngālī recension of his works. I have endeavoured to give rather the spirit of the original than a literal translation, and have not scrupled to make excisions where it appeared necessary. As translator I do not consider myself responsible for every statement made in the article. At the same time, I have carefully checked and accept the responsibility for all that directly bears upon Vidyāpati and Mithilā. Except where they are followed by my initials, the footnotes are portions of the original articles.

Owing to the influence of Chaitanya, Vidyāpati’s poems obtained an immense popularity in Bengal, and were speedily compiled into written manuals of devotion, an honour to which they did not attain in their native country of Bihār. In Bengal too, numerous imitators sprang up, some using Vidyāpati’s language and name, and others writing under their own name in Bāngālī. The result was a great mass of Vaishnava poems by various authors, which were finally collected, and arranged according to subjects in a series of Litanyes or Sankītānas, called the Vaishnavav-sa-Vāda-Kalpatar. This has been printed at various times, the edition referred to in these pages being of Bāgīl Mādhava Dé and Co., Śaka 1788 (A.D. 1866).

From this collection various redactions have been made at different times, in which the hymns have been arranged according to their authors or supposed authors. The best known of these is the Pradhanā-Kavya-Saṅgīr, published at Chalchhuri (Chinna) by Akhaya Kumāra Sarkār, in the Bāngālī year 1285 (A.D. 1878-79). The volume attributed to Vidyāpati in this collection is of a very mixed character. While containing a number of hymns undoubtedly written by Vidyāpati, it also contains a great number certainly not written by him, and the bulk is of very doubtful authenticity. It should be added that even the genuine hymns are in a Bāngālī recension; i.e. they are written down as they were recited by the Bāngālī Chaitanya and his followers, who, not being acquainted with the Mutthīl dialect altered the verbal inflections and nominal declensions to suit the exigencies of Bāngālī grammar. It is rarely, however, difficult to correct the genuine ones, so as to get an approximately pure text, as Vidyāpati’s metre is a guide which seldom fails. The Bāngālī recension is very incorrect when judged by the rules of Mutthīl metre.

An independent collection of Vidyāpati’s poems, collected by me in Mutthīl itself, has been given in my Māthil Chrestomathy, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal. These have been printed exactly as they were recited by the various singers, who retain a traditional memory of the songs of their famous countryman.

For further information regarding Vidyāpati and his times, the student is referred to an article in the Bāngālī Magazine called the “Bāngālī-Dauṣhāna,” for 1882 (B. S.). Vol. IV. p. 75; Mr. Beames’ article in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. IV. p. 299ff., also contains all that is important, and gives a résumé of the contents of the article in the Bāngālī-Dauṣhāna, with his own valuable criticisms thereon. In another article in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. II. p. 37ff., Mr. Beames also gives an interesting account of the Bāngālī recension of our poet. The introduction to the songs of Vidyāpati Thākur in the Māthil Chrestomathy may also be referred to.

The Vidyāpati-Padāvali, the introduction to which is now translated, is an excellent expurgated reprint of the Bāngālī recension with explanatory notes.

TRANSLATION.

The history of ancient India is enveloped in deep obscurity; none of its details can be distinctly seen; hence it is improbable that any clear account can ever be given of the birth and childhood of the Bāngālī language.

Bhāttachāryya, Printer and Publisher.
The Baigal line of Sena's kings was not compelled to devote itself to marshalling armies for the repulsion of conquering Pajans; its efforts were rather directed to collecting "troops of poems." At a time when the kings of Dehli, Ajmer, Mewar, and others were summoning up all their forces for a death struggle with the conquering flood of Musalmân invasion,—when Mahmud of Ghazni was engaged in breaking the images of the gods in a Western India soaked in the blood of Hindus,—the Sena kings of Bihar and Eastern Bengal, surrounded by the gems of their court, were tranquilly engaged day and night in the enjoyment of the pleasures of poetry. On one side of India the day of destruction of Hindu religion and Hindul rule had arrived, and bearded ghouls in the form of men were plundering hearth and home; while on the other side of India the Sena kings were peacefully listening to the homed accents of Jayadeva, soft and sweet as the clove-laden breeze of Malaya. They were great encouragers of learning, and their profound knowledge of Sanskrit is celebrated to the present day.

All invaders of the golden lands of India had launched their attack from across the Indus, and had been compelled to content themselves with engaging with the western provinces. Alexander was obliged to return without crossing the Sutadra; the Khilifâl Wâli conquered Rajputâna and Gujarât and was satisfied; Mâmûn turned his back on Aryan land, after suffering several defeats in Rajputâna; and Mahmud of Ghazni was obliged to be content with conquering Kanyakubja. In short,—up to the year 1203, no invader had ever penetrated to Bengal; and hence the Sena kings had no necessity for laying plans for the protection of their country. The country of Mithilâ fell within their territories, and to the present day it is called Darbhanga, or the western door of the dominions of the Sena kings. In the height of Bengal's power, the flame of its poetry burnt brilliantly. Up to then no news of the approach of foes had reached the land, and in the midst of the timid Baigalis, who lay, as it were, enveloped in a profound sleep, arose, like the voice of a midnight lute, that song of the sweet poet Jayadeva,* called the Gita-Govinda.

* The Sena kings reigned in Bengal in the eleventh and twelfth centuries after Christ, their dynasty ceasing in A.D. 1203. They were extremely powerful, and, according to the Anuadhâni-Samhita, Lakshmana Sena reigned for twelve years as far as Dehli. Adîsîra was the first king of the race. It is uncertain in what year he reigned. The kings of the Pala kings from the land of the Pala kings. [See, however, Dr. Bajendra Lâla Mîkra's paper in the Pala and Sena Dynasties, in the Jour. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. XLVII. 1878, Part I, p. 384.—G. A. G.]

There is plenty of evidence that Mithilâ formed part of the kingdom of the Sena. At the present day, in the Mahali Bihâr, the Baigal alphabet, not strictly accurate, but sufficiently so for the purposes of the argument.—G. A. G.]—and the era of Lakshmana Sena. The era of Lakshmana Sena is not current in Bengal, although it is so in Mithilâ. Darbhanga is a corruption of Dabara-banga, and Ayudhya Prasad, the historian of the Darbhanga Raj, has pointed out that Darbhanga is the western door of Bengal. [This is the popular explanation, but I cannot believe it to be true. It is opposed to the rules of philology. I know of no instance in the modern languages of India, in which a b situated like the b of Baigal, has become ba. It is a standard saying in Mithilâ that the derivation of the names of places cannot be sought for, as they cannot be found. —G. A. G.]

There is considerable difference of opinion as to the date of Jayadeva. He was born in the village of Kendulîvîla, on the north bank of the river Ajaya. The modern name of this village is Kedal, and here a yearly festival takes place in memory of the poet. Mr. Etchison states that Jayadeva lived in the 14th century, and people alike Bihâr Bajaj and Xantô Gupta, the author of a life of the poet, states that it may be admitted that he was born in the latter half of the 13th or former half of the 14th century. Professor Lassen maintains that his birth falls between the years 1100 and 1150. Professor Wilson calls him a follower of Râmânuja, and fixed Râmânuja's date as falling in the latter half of the 14th century or the former half of the 15th; and

in that case the Gita-Govinda must have been written in the 15th century. In our opinion Jayadeva was one of the gems of Lakshmana Sena's court, which is supported by Professor Lassen's opinion. In the doorway of Lakshmana Sena's palace, a slab has been found inscribed as follows:—

| गीतागृहाऔ समाधि स्वपनि स्त्रयाद्रमणम् |
| कन्याकुबजां चार्त्रि मिथिला च चरणम् |

"In the court of Lakshmana Sena, there were five gems, viz., Gôvarîdana, Sarana, Jayadeva, Umşpati, and Kâvîrâja." The opening lines of Jayadeva's poem contain some of the names of these gems, as follows:

| नववन्दनो नववन्दनो नववन्दनो नववन्दनो |
| कुमारी समस्यामात्रि कुमारी समस्यामात्रि कुमारी समस्यामात्रि कुमारी समस्यामात्रि |

[Not translated in the original. The translation is here given:—

Umşpati is prolific in his language, and Jayadeva alone knows how to give a regular coherence to his words, while Sarana is worthy to be praised for the ease with which he composes difficult verses. The master Gôvarîdana is famous for his compositions excellently describing the most perfect lover, and the poet Dabral, lord of the earth, is famous and without a rival." According to Maitkul tradition there were two Jayadevas, viz. (1) the famous author of the Gita-Govinda; and (2) a less known poet, who with Vidypatî and Umşpati adorned the court of king Śiva-Siśîha; see J. A. S. B. p. 76, sub. number, Part I. 1834, Twenty-one Vaisnavta Hymns, edited and translated by G. A. Greathouse.—G. A. G.]

A comparison of these two passages makes it certain that Jayadeva was a member of the court of Lakshma Sena. His songs quickly spread throughout India. The celebrated poet of Śiva-Siśîha, Chand, in a catalogue of
When we notice that this poem was written in Sanskrit, it must be considered that up to this time Baigâli was held in little esteem; and in fact this was the case; the learned men of the country despised the local dialect, and were averse to using it. Lãkṣmînâra Sêna ruled in the twelfth century after Christ, at a time when Eastern India was blessed with peace. His kingdom had no need for preparations for battle, nor was it necessary to excite his subjects by the stirring strains of war-songs in the homely Doric of the people. He who sought for knowledge had leisure to study the abstruse technicalities of Sanskrit; nor was his mind distracted by the necessity of protecting his independence, his religion, or his land.

From the time of Lãkṣmînâra the garden of Baigâli song commenced to wither, and in the reign of his grandson the two sisters, Prosperity and Poetry disappeared from the land. The same bigoted barbarians who set fire to the library of Alexandria, became masters of India; and with India’s freedom, disappeared her Sanskrit civilization, and her collections of Sanskrit works. The thirst after knowledge which had existed in Bengal, the undying glory of Central India, the devotion paid to Sanskrit literature at the court of king Bhôja, disappeared like a flash of lightning.

Nearly all the polished works of the Pandits of the courts of Lãkṣmînâra Sêna and king Bhôja have been devoured by the fires lighted by the Musulmans. Only here and there a famous book, which had spread abroad in many copies, was preserved from their hands, but the garden, which had been planted and tended for many thousand years, was devastated root and branch.

It is probable that not very long after this catastrophe, the Sanskrit-founded vernaculars of Northern India became a general means of communication, and hence we may fix their rise into importance as occurring in the thirteenth century after Christ. Similarly we see everywhere that the destruction of a nation causes the uprisal of a new national language. The Vandals, Franks, and other barbarian races conquered Rome, and then, and not till then, do we find the Latin language abandoned, and its place taken by Italian and other modern languages. The Muhammedans conquered Persia, and since then the modern Persian has taken the place of Zend: and since the fall of ancient Turkey and Constantinople, we have only the modern Greek or Romaine language. So also in the place of our sacred tongue, Baigâli,
mission would be, if he preached in difficult Sanskrit, understood only by the upper classes. But before A.D. 1203 we can find no trace of any new religion being preached in that part of India governed by the Sénas. It is uncertain when the Bhágavata Puráña, and the Brahma-Naïvara Puráña became well-known: even the date of the Saṅkaravijñaya cannot be fixed with certainty. And neither the author of the Bhágavata, nor of the Brahma-Naïvara, nor the illustrious Saṅkara ever tried to shake any person’s faith in his own religion. Ráma uja and Madhavacharya, it is true, had spread the Vaishnavism religion throughout Southern India; and they and their disciples had become powerful in the 11th and 12th centuries, but there is no proof of the seed of their faith ever having been planted in Bengal. They wereVaishnavas, it is true, but they inculcated the worship of Ráma, and we have never heard of any worship whatever of Ráma existing in Bengal. There can be no doubt but that in the tenth and eleventh centuries the Bhágavata and other similar books were much honoured by Saṅkritic scholars, and in that case the narrative of the sports of Krishna would necessarily have been deeply engraved in their hearts; but before the manifestation of Chaitanya no one arose in Bengal filled with the desire of converting the mass of the people to his way of thinking. Hence, on a consideration of all these circumstances, we can assume that, prior to the conquest of Bengal by the Muhammadans, no sufficient reason had arisen for changing the standard language of the country into that of the language commonly known as Bengali, and that no written evidence has floated down to us along the stream of time to prove that before that opinion, viz. that he was born in the latter half of the 11th century, and did not become famous till the 12th. Madhvlacharya is the celebrated author of the Saṅkaravijñaya. He also wrote many other works. He was a disciple of Rámanuja.

Wilson calls Jayadéva a follower of Rámsañana; and according to him Tulasidása and Jayadéva were of one faith. In our opinion, this is by no means the case. A reference to the Gośa-Gvánda will show that Jayadéva in no way adored Visnú in his incarnation of Rámsañana. The eleventh—twelfth century works of the Bhágavata is the origin of the poem of Jayadéva, and he adored Visnú under the form of Krishna. It is true that in the Chaitayana-Chowrtiśehita and other books of that sort, Rámsañana is spoken of as an old master, but, simply on this account, it must not be surmised that his form of religion ever became prominent in Bengal.

10 [Bengali is certainly the offspring of Mágadhi Prákrit. Bhárí, on the contrary, is descended from Arútha-Mágadhi.—G. A. G.]

11 Some say that the Bhágavata is the work of Vígudára, the author of the Mágadhi-language. Wilson and Colebrooks inclined to this opinion, and consider that it was written in the 13th century; but we can find no sufficient reason for such a theory. It is improbable that this, the best of all the Puráñas, should have been written after the Muhammadan conquest.

12 According to Wilson this Puráña was written in the 14th century. From internal evidence it appears to be a modern work.

13 M. Nih (I) and Wilson place Saṅkara-chárya in the 8th or 9th century.

14 The author of the Pravditi-Kila-Turuṣa fixes Rámsañana’s date as 1127 A.D. Wilson is of a similar
occurrence, Baṅgāḷi was the standard language of the country.\(^{16}\)

There are some who maintain that the Baṅgāḷi language dates from the time of the Pāḷa\(^{17}\) kings.

The Pāḷa kings were Buddhists, and Mahaḷā was the most powerful of the line. Owing to their power, and the oppression displayed by them, the Brāhmaṇs of Bengal were compelled to desert the country. It is not improbable that under such a race of kings the sacred tongue should have been held in small esteem, and that in their time the Baṅgāḷi language took its present form.

But, be that as it may, we have proved this, that in Bengal for many centuries the Sanskrit language was held in especial honour, that up to the end of the twelfth century learned men used Sanskrit as the ordinary means of communication, in the ordinary affairs of common life; and that if any old master had a book to write he wrote it in that language. Before the 12th century no master ever, had recourse to the dialect of the vulgar in composing a work dedicated either to amusement or to instruction. On the other hand, the Prākrit used by the common people in ordinary conversation became gradually altered in the ninth and tenth centuries, and under the rule of the Buddhist Pāḷa kings took a new form not essentially different from modern Baṅgāḷi. Subsequently, under the Sanskrit influence of the Śena kings, this dialect received small encouragement, and Sanskrit, regaining its lost ascendancy under the favouring influence of the dynasty, acted as a powerful drag upon its development. But when once the field of Bengal was touched by the hand of the Muhammandans, Sanskrit civilization closed itself up like a modest creeper, and the dialect, which up to this time had been only a vehicle of common talk, two hundred years subsequently took a new form, and commenced to trickle forth like honey in the writings of a new line of poets.

Bengal, it is true, was ruled by the Muhammandans, but the Muhammandan language, and the Muhammandan faith never succeeded in entering the homes of the Baṅgāḷis. The timid Baṅgāḷi attended the funeral pyre of his freedom without a pang, but no persecution could induce him to be a traitor to his Hindū religion and his Hindū customs. The North-Western provinces were directly under the feet of the emperor of Dehli, and there the speech of the people speedily became more or less adulterated with Arabic and Persian words, but our ancestors adopted but few Persian forms, and hence their dialect became little modified by the invasion. Baṅgāḷi had departed little from its Sanskrit original, and gradually it became a well-known and harmonious language; and at length, in the court of king Śiva-Simha, Vidyaśāti took the strains of the Gītā-Gīvādha, sung so many years before the Muhammandan conquest, by the side of the waters of Ajayān, as they purred past Kenduvīlva, and created a new and wondrous kind of lay.\(^{13}\)

The Afgāns and Paṭhāns had conquered Bengal and Bihār; but while good fighters they were wanting in intellect, and were compelled to allow the burden of government of their subjects to remain in the hands of the Hindūs. These Hindū kings, as long as they acknowledged their submission to the Mughals, by the payment of an annual tribute, were practically independent. In some places the paller to import Brāhmaṇs from Kanayakbīj into Bengal. From the various inscriptions on copperplates found relating to them, it appears that Divē Pala, and Kājī Pala [or rather Kājī Pāla.—G. A. G.] were very great kings. The name of Mahī Pāla is even more widely celebrated. In the year A.D. 1026 he established the Buddhist religion in Benares itself. In Dīnēpur there is a tank, which is still called that of Mahīpāla, and to the present day there is a proverb current; Bhanaṇaṇṭa śrīvāvā tāna—The song of Mahīpāla at peddy husking, i.e. trying to do two things at once. [The principal town of the neighbouring district of Baṅgāḷ is also called Mahīgāḷ.—G. A. G.]

\(^{16}\) The author here discusses the question of the alphabet of the Brāhmaṇs of Mithilā, which is practically the same as that of Bengal. He assumes that the Mithilā Brāhmaṇs borrowed it from Bengal; and on this supposition he founds arguments to prove that this borrowing must have taken place before the Muhammandan conquest. As, however, the basis of the argument is an assumption, and as the Mithilā Brāhmaṇs contend that the Baṅgāḷs borrowed the alphabet from them, it has not been thought necessary to translate this portion of the original, more especially as the subject is of small importance, and hardly comes within the scope of the present article. [G. A. G.]

\(^{17}\) It is impossible to say exactly when the Pāḷa kings reigned. It is known that they were Buddhists, and there are traditions that they were in the habit of divesting Brāhmaṇs of the sacred thread, on account of which Bengal became deserted by them. It is said that for this reason Aḍīdrā was subsequently com
Nawâbs continued the old Hindû kings on their former thrones, and in others they appointed new Hindûs to be kings, but, in either case, once that was done, they never interfered as long as the tribute was paid. All these princes were warm encouragers of learning, and desiring to emulate the fame of Vikramâditya, Lakshmana Sêna, and Bhûja Rája, showed no niggard hand in encouraging preeminence in the knowledge of the Sástras. Their courts were the asylums of Sanskrit belles lettres and philosophy, and about this time many works, celebrated to the present day, were composed. They also gradually began to turn their attention to Baîgâll, and in a very short time poems in that language began to be composed. These vernacular poets were specially honoured by the princes, and the names of several of the most famous have come down to us. Vîdyâpati, Kavi Kañkâna, Ráya Guñâkaka, all these wrote their songs for the delight of these petty courts. The Emperor of Dehli's Viceroys at Gânda, Dhûkâ, and Munshidâbâd, surrounded by wanton dancing girls, and now and then taking a glance at the state of their treasury, lived like animals, engrossed in the enjoyment of sensual pleasures. They encouraged no kind of learning, either Persian, Sanskrit or Baîgâll, while the subordinate Hindû princes were giving free grants of land to learned Brâhmanas, were promoting their religion by erecting new temples and new images of their gods, and were living in the enjoyment of a pure happiness, immersed in the study of their sacred books and poems. Through their efforts and generosity, in two hundred years, the Baîgâll language made astonishing progress.

In this way Mîthilâ (or Darbhanga), while nominally under the sway of the Muhammadans, was really governed by a race of Hindû kings. They were in every way similar to the feudatory kings of the present day. They acknowledged their subordination to the Emperor of Dehli, and paid him a yearly tribute, but in every other respect they were independent of him. From the year A.D. 1348 to 1549 Mîthilâ was under a race of Brâhman kings, and the third [or rather sixth].—G.A.G.] of this race was king Śîva Sûmâha, who came to the throne in A.D. 1446, and reigned for three years and nine months.

According to the Pâîyâ, Dêva Sûmâha was his father, and Lakshinâ and Vişvâsadêvî his two wives. He was extremely celebrated, not only from the fact that Vîdyâpati mentions him in his poems, for his name is famous to the present day, and the people of Mîthilâ have nowadays a proverb that he alone was entitled to be called a king. Vîdyâpati attended the court of this famous king, and therefore we may consider that his poems appeared in the former half of the 16th century.

Vîdyâpati's father was Gânapati, the son of Jaya Datta, the son of Dhîrôvâra, the existence. It is composed of an immense number of palm-leaf MSS. containing an entry for the birth and marriage of every pure Brâhman in Mîthilâ; they go back for many hundred years, the Pâîyâs say for more than a thousand. These Pâîyâs, or hereditary genealogists, go on regular annual tours, entering the names of the Brâhmanas born in each village during the past year, as they go along. The names are all entered, as no Brâhman can marry any woman who has not been entered in the pâîyâ and vice versa. At certain conjunctions of the heavenly bodies large marriage fairs are held at Sûrîth, Mahâdi and other places, which are attended by the parents of marriageable children, and these Pâîyâs, after ascertaining from the pâîyâ that the parties are not within the forbidden bounds of consanguinity, and that there is no other legal impediment, the marriage contract takes place.—G.A.G.}

"The tank at Rajôkhari is indeed a tank, all others are mere ponds: king Śîva-Sûmâha was indeed a king, all others are mere princes."—(The translation given in the original is incorrect. I have accordingly corrected it. Rajôkhari is the name of a village where there is a very large tank, said to have been dug by Śîva-Sûmâha.—G.A.G.)
son of Dēvāditya, the son of Karmāditya. In the year A.D. 1400 he was presented with the village of Bisapli, and to the present day this village is in possession of his descendants.

Vidyāpati died an old man, and was the author of many works, amongst them the Purusha-Parīkṣā. This work was translated into Bengali for the use of the students at Fort William College in Calcutta. The Durghādhak-Ṭaraṅgaṇī, the Dānavaṅkaṅkara, the Vīvāda-Sāra, the Gayā-Pattana, and other works are said to have been composed by him. The Purusha-Parīkṣā was written during the reign of Śiva-Sīmha, i.e. between A.D. 1446 and 1450. The Durghādhak-Ṭaraṅgaṇī was written during the reign of Nara Śīmha Dēva, that is to say after A.D. 1472.

In the commencement of the Durghādhak-Ṭaraṅgaṇī it is stated that Vidyāpati wrote the work during the reign of Nara Śīmha Dēva, at the request of the prince Rūpa Nārāyaṇa. Nara Śīmha came to the throne in A.D. 1470 and as the grant of Bisapli was made in the year A.D. 1400, this work must have been written in the poet's old age.

The celebrated Vāchaspati-Miśra was writing at this time in Mithilā the Tattvā

Concluded in this manner, the work was made during the lifetime of, and at the request of, Śiva Sīmha.—[I give the opening and concluding lines with a translation in Appendix No. II. p. 191.—G. A. G.]

Vidyāpati in the commencement and conclusion of this work, states that it was made during the lifetime of, and at the request of, Śiva Sīmha.—[I give the opening and concluding lines with a translation in Appendix No. II. p. 191.—G. A. G.]

Vidyāpati also says that he and Śiva-Sīmha were not the same person; although Vidyāpati in many of the Bhasītās of his songs gives Śiva-Sīmha the title of Rūpa Nārāyaṇa. That the word Rūpa Nārāyaṇa was used as a title can be no doubt, and there is not a single song of Vidyāpati's from which it can be gathered that they were two different persons. In one place the poet gives some extracts from poems in the Vaishānava-Pada-Kalpataru. The whole of the poems, with a translation, are given in Appendix, p. 1036—G. A. G.]

[The original gives Bhrāmaṇā, according to which the Pāṭā is incorrect. Karmāditya's father was Harā- 

āditya, the son of Vīshnuśarma, who is called the founder of the family, and who lived in the village called Bisapli, modern Bispati.—G. A. G.]

King Śiva Sīmha gave him this village at a time when he was heir appanant to the throne. The original here gives some untranslatable extracts from the deed of endowment. I give the whole, with a translation in Appendix No. I. p. 190.—G. A. G.]

[Rūpa Nārāyaṇa and Vidyāpati, both 12th in descent from Vidyāpati. The latter of these two 

has lately died.—G. A. G.]

Vidyāpati in the commencement and conclusion of this work, states that it was made during the lifetime of, and at the request of, Śiva Sīmha.—[I give the opening and concluding lines with a translation in Appendix No. II. p. 191.—G. A. G.]

[Not the fact. It was written during the reign of Dēva Sīmha.—G. A. G.]

[Adhikara Déva Nāraṇya] (Drātya Nāraṇya.)—G. A. G.]

[Mr. Beam's doubts if Vidyāpati could have lived to such an age; and I myself am not by any means certain that these dates, which, with the exception of the date of the grant, which is certain, depend entirely on the authority of Ayābhyā Pratikā, are correct. I may point out, however, that one of the best Pandits in Mithilā is over 80, and is now translating the Hitopadesa into Mārtillā for me. I give the opening lines of the Durghādhak-Ṭaraṅgaṇī in Appendix No. III. p. 192.—G. A. G.]

It is quite certain that Chauḍi Dāsa dwelt in Bīrāhā. The village of Nandūr is shown as his abode, where an image and temple of his patron goddess Rāmānī Thākurdā is still shown, and where there are many legends attached to him. There are several poems concerning the interview of the two poets. —[The original

Koumuḍi, the Vīvāda-Chintāmaṇī, and other works. He was therefore a contemporary of Vidyāpati, and an attendant at the court of Śiva-Sīmha.

We have already stated that Chauḍi Dāsa was a contemporary of Vidyāpati, and had also made his name famous by writing songs describing the sport of Krishna. Each hearing of the other's fame, they had an interview which has been celebrated in several poems. The legend runs that the interview took place on the banks of the Bhāgirathī. Chauḍi Dāsa lived in the village of Nandūr in Bīrāhām; which gave rise to the tradition that Vidyāpati was also born either in Bīrāhām or Bāmūrām.

The collection of Vaishānava songs called the Pada-Kalpataru contains several songs by one Rūpa Nārāyaṇa, and it is most likely likely that he and Śiva-Sīmha were not the same person; although Vidyāpati in many of the Bhasītās of his songs gives Śiva-Sīmha the title of Rūpa Nārāyaṇa. That the word Rūpa Nārāyaṇa was used as a title there can be no doubt, and there is not a single song of Vidyāpati's from which it can be gathered that they were two different persons. In one place the poet

here gives some extracts from poems in the Vaishānava-Pada-Kalpataru. The whole of the poems, with a translation, are given in Appendix, p. 1036—G. A. G.]

[But this is only found in the Bengali version of Vidyāpati, and is not known in Mithilā. I have collected most of the songs of Vidyāpati current in Mithilā, and they have been published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal in my Maithili Chrestomathy. In the following are the Bhasītās in which Vidyāpati's patron's names are mentioned:—]

[1] (Vid. 6, 14, and 41.)

Rāja śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Rāja śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Vidyāpati sings in the presence of king Śiva Sīmha, Rūpa Nārāyaṇa, and his queen Lakṣāmī.

[2. (Vid. 24, and 32.)

Rāma śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Rāma śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Vidyāpati the poet sings a song of love, and king Śiva Sīmha understands it.

[3. (Vid. 30, and 78.)

Rāma śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Rāma śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Vidyāpati says king Śiva Sīmha, and Lakṣāmī his queen, know this love.

[4. (Vid. 28, and 78.)

Rāma śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Rāma śrīvī śrī śrī rāma

Vidyāpati says king Śiva Sīmha, and Lakṣāmī his queen, know this love.

[The original
Vidyāpati and His Contemporaries.

189

calls Śiva Simha, the Pañcha-Gauḍēvāra, or lord of the five Gauḍas. From this it may be imagined that Śiva Simha was a Baṅgaḷī monarch; but it is impossible to imagine that, under the Muhammadan rule, any Hindū king could conquer the whole of Bengal; hence the epithet must not be taken literally, but only as signifying the extreme power and excellence of this king over other kings.

Nothing more is certainly known about Vidyāpati; there are some legends about him, but they are hardly deserving of confidence. To satisfy the curiosity of our readers we give two of them.

(1.) "The emperor of Dehī carried off king Śiva Simha to his capital in order to punish him for some offence. Vidyāpati hearing this hastened to Dehī to release him, and entering into the presence of the emperor declared his ability to see things hidden from him, as well as if they were before his eyes. Hearing this, and in order to test him, the emperor ordered him to be tightly fastened up in a wooden box. In the meantime he made a number of women of the town bathe in the river and afterwards go home, and then sending for the poet told him to describe what had happened on the banks of the Yamunā.

Vidyāpati by the favour of the lotus feet of his guardian deity, although he had not seen what had occurred, described it exactly as if he had seen it."

The legend goes on to say, that the emperor, seeing Vidyāpati's superhuman power released king Śiva Simha, and gave the poet the village called Bisapt. But king Śiva Simha himself gave this village to the poet, and the deed of endowment has already been quoted.

(2.) "Vidyāpati, feeling that his end was near, determined to visit the Ganges. On the way he began to consider that the holy Bhāgirathī is the child of the faithful, and that there was no reason why it should not come to him, instead of his going to it. As he thus thought, he there and then sat down, and immediately the Bhāgirathī, dividing itself into three streams, spread out its waves up to the very spot where the poet was sitting. Joyfully gasing on the sacred waters, Vidyāpati laid himself down and died. A Śiva-Liṅga sprang up where his funeral pyre had been. That Liṅga and the marks of the river are seen to this day; and for all these reasons the place has become famous. It is in the northern part of the town of Bāṅāpurī, on the north side of the river Bhāgirathī (Ganges) about five kās from the town of Bāṅāpurī."

That Vidyāpati was a devout follower of the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa there can be no doubt. In the year of Lakṣaṁapī Śena 349 (=A.D. 1456) he copied out the whole of this work with his own hand, and this copy is still in possession of his descendants. In fact, in the 12th and 13th centuries after Christ, the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, the Brahma-Vaiṣṇava-Purāṇa, the Bhagavat-Gītā, and Bhāgavata-Purāṇa had greatly altered the Hindī religion. In Bengal the Śīkta and Tāṇtrik forms of worship had been powerful, but on the publication of these few books the number of their followers began to decline. Men who lived in the reign of Lakṣaṁapī Śena, had probably begun to worship Viṣṇu under the form of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, and their chief guides were the works of the Jayadēva and Mūrārī. Shortly afterwards Bīrbhūm and Mithilā produced Chapāḍī Dāsa, and Vidyāpati, and they, being devoted to the praise of the sports of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, had recourse to the common vernaculars, and thereby relieved the pent up aspirations of their souls. Not long afterwards, the moon of Nāvāḍīpa, the

O Friend, king Śiva Siṁha, the beloved of queen Mōḍavati pays attention.

(7.) (Vid. 76.)

मोदवती पति राजासः सिंह गति
कावी बिधयपति गाहे

Vidyāpati sings, "Rāghava Siṁha, the lord of Mōḍavati, is my refuge."—O. A. G.

[By reciting a song descriptive of a woman returning from her bath, in the Maithili dialect, which is extant to this day. It is the first in my edition of his songs.—O. A. G.]

King Śiva Siṁha Bāpa Nārāyaṇa, and Prāvatī his necklace.

(5.) (Vid. 61.)

मोदवती राजासः सिंह गति
कावी बिधयपति गाहे

Vidyāpati says, "Hear, and take it for granted, king Rāghava understands young love.

(6.) (Vid. 75.)

राजा राजास विध नन्द राय क्रमसी
मोदवती देह गाहे
lord Chaitanya himself appeared, intoxicated with the sweetness of their strains in prose and verse.

In the time of Vidyāpāti, Bengal and Mithilā were not distinct as they are now. Then the customs and language of both countries were nearly the same, and the learned men of each were on mutual terms of good feeling. From the writings of the 14th and 15th centuries, whether in Bāṅgāḷ or Sanskrit, it is evident that the Bāṅgāḷ Pāḍītas did not look upon the Maithili Pāḍītas as forming a distinct caste. The Eastern Bāṅgāḷīs adopted Vidyāpāti's songs almost as soon as they were written, and amongst men of taste the foreign Vidyāpāti was preferred even to the Bāṅgāḷī Charṇī Dāsa. We ceased to call him a Maithili poet, but, calling him a Bāṅgāḷī, gave him unhesitatingly a niche in the temple of our hearts. The language of the songs of Vidyāpāti which are found in the Pada-Kalpaṭaru, differ somewhat from the language of those songs of his which are current in Mithilā; but, whether knowingly or unknowingly, all we who meditate on the sports of Kṛṣṇa, whether poets or worshippers, have placed him on the throne as prince of poets, and claimed him as our own, although he belonged to another land. In imitation of him Gōvinda Dāsa, Kṛṣṇa Dāsa, Nārātāma Dāsa, Jānaka Dāsa, Śri Nīvās, Nārāhārī Dāsa, and other Vaishnava poets, have sung their lays, and made their names famous thereby, and he will be long honoured at the head of the roll of Bāṅgāḷī poets. Even when the sun of the Hindū religion has set, when belief in faith in Kṛṣṇa, and in that medicine for the "disease of existence," the hymns of Kṛṣṇa's love, is extinct, still the love borne of the songs of Vidyāpāti in which he tells of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, will never be diminished.

TRANSLATOR'S APPENDICES.

No. I. Note 24, p. 188.

The following is the deed of endowment granting Bisāpi to Vidyāpāti. It happened

---

33 He was born in 1461 Śaka = A.D., 1484 as the old rhyme says,

Gaurāvetā Satāt Sade Šakā Providence
Kālāvetā Pratā Taśa Śakā Providence
Bhāgavatam Śākā Mahātat Śakā Providence

34 [This is not the fact as regards the language. The Bāṅgāḷ of Charṇī Dāsa is quite a different language from the Maithili of Vidyāpāti, and they were contemporaries.—G. A. G.]

35 [Only four or five of the songs in the Pada-Kalpaṭaru are known in Maithili.—G. A. G.]
tens of millions of rivers of the blood of the armies of kings who were his enemies; and
who thus gained a glory in the universe, brilliant as a mass of whiteness, and able to
clothe the tresses of all the (female)-quarters of the earth.

(6.) His father was a giver of elephants and chariots, and a wishing-tree of golden gifts;
and through him he gave out of his own wealth, a wondrous gift equal to his (father's)
weight in gold. By him, high-minded ruler of the earth, happiness was created, and the
recipient of his first friendship was the eastern and western sea (for no one else was worthy
of it).

(7.) Honoured amidst the race of kings, skilled in the science of archery, knowing the
chief end of man, pleasing with his gifts the crowd of applicants for his favours, pure in
habit, such is he, Siva Sihna, the son of Dēvā Sīhna, as, like a lion, he overcomes the
elephants of his enemies.

(8.) If any Hindū or Musalman king ever annex this village, may he eat, together with
his own flesh, that of cows and pigs according to his religion; while as for those who protect
this jewel of a village from the royal tax, may the song of their good fame be sung by crowds
of poets for ages in every land.

No. II. Notes 26, p. 188.

The opening and concluding lines of the Purusha-Pariksād are as follows:—They have never, I believe, been printed before. They are
taken from a correct copy in the possession of Bābū Baināl-Dhari Sīhna, of Rāgbhapur, in the
Darbhanga District.

OPENING LINES.

The original of this line is very obscure and is probably incorrectly written in my copy.
Concluding Lines.

"(6.) He whose pure grandfather (on the banks) of the Vāgrāti, king Bhava Simha Dēva, adorned with two wives, left his body in the presence of Siva, and went to heaven, after having enjoyed the blessings of his kingdom, and after having conquered the universe, and slain his enemies in battle, offering oblations to fire according to the rules of sacrifice, and supporting suppliants by his wealth.

"(7.) Whose father, Dēva Simha, a conqueror in battle, in whom all worthy qualities were collected, is now alive (अनन्त), who dug the tank of Saṅkūrīpura, and was skilled in granting gifts of gold, elephants, and chariots.

"(8.) He who, after gaining glory in a terrible battle with the king of Gauḍa and with (hinī of) Gajjana, is conducting it to its home in the white kunda-flower in the ringlets of all the ladies of the quarters.

"(10.) At the order of this Śrī Śiva Simha Dēva the king, the friend of the learned Vidyāpati compiled this . . . . . treatise on morals."

Opening Lines.

(1.) That primeval Sakti which Brahman even, praised by the other gods, praises, which Śiva, worshipped by them, worships, and which Vīṣṇu, meditated upon by them, meditates upon, I salute.

"(2.) May Śrī Śiva Simha Dēva, the son of Dēva Śrī Dēva Simha, honoured amongst heroes, excelling among the learned, worthy to be written first amidst the wise, live long.

"(3.) For the accomplishment of the moral instruction of children of unripe understanding, and for the delectation of city women devoted to the enjoyment of love, at the command of Śiva Simha the king, Vidyāpati the poet fearlessly at once commenced the compilation of these tales.

"(4.) Will not also the Pāṇḍit, whose intellect has been made clear by his intelligence, bear my work, either for the sake of the advantages to be gained by an acquaintance with morals, or from a curiosity regarding the elegance of the stories.

"(5.) Men are recognised by the touchstone of inference (from these stories), and therefore the "Touchstone of Men" will be "pleasing to every person,"

Note that Dēva Simha was alive when this was written.
who has completed the study of the scriptures and the performance of sacrifices, in battle destroying the kings of his foes, as it were Nārāyaṇa in visible form destroying Kaṇsa, for the benefit of the three worlds, this excellent monarch gave the order to Vidyāpati, and compiled (through him) a manual on the festival of Duṅgā, according to the maxims found in other works.

No. IV. Note 30, p. 188.

The following four hymns occur on p. 270 of the Vaishnava-Pada-Kalpataru. They treat of the meeting of Chaṇḍi Dāsa and Vidyāpati. The first two may possibly be by Vidyāpati, at least they are written in Maithilli, and have only been slightly altered into Bāṅgālī. I have not hesitated to restore the text into the original language, which was not a matter of any difficulty. The last two are probably by some Bāṅgālī imitator of Vidyāpati, and could never have been written by our poet. They are in Bāṅgālī, with a few pseudo-Maithilli forms inserted, to give a foreign air to the language. I have, therefore, given them as they are printed in the Pada-Kalpataru. A few alterations have been rendered necessary, owing to the change of alphabets; for the Bāṅgālī system of spelling certain sounds is different from that which is customary in the Dēvānāgari alphabet. I am responsible for the translation. In the last two hymns the meaning is sometimes very doubtful.

चिद दास विनिष्ठात्त दौँई जन गायत्रि प्रेम सुप्रति मय प्रियति।
अ काल दौँई जन तीर्थनु गुन बरन निति निति नय नय भक्ति।
दौँई गुन सुनिति विति दौँई उत्तकृत दौँई दरसन लागि।
दौँई रतिक्रयान सुनि सुनिं दौँई जन दौँई बिय दौँई रथ बाङळ।
निम निम गीती निम रति भैल ताहि भक्ति धारति मे भेज।
राजा नाहुक पूंग रस कीरुक ताहि मगन मै गेल।
निम निम सहचर रसिक भाल भर ता हैंग करत बिचार।

*The writer in the Bāṅgālī Darāma, mistaking the meaning of the text, says that Rūpa Nārāyaṇa conquered a king called Kaṇsa.*
नाही निति नवीन परन मुख पार्यात
गायन मेम चाहार ||
रूप नरायण विवाह नरायण
'वेदानाथ लिव मुरली' ||
मीलन भाष मध्ये कक वरनान
तपु पद कमल भिििन ||

२
चांदिन दास सुने विवाहात गुन
दरसन मेल भुनुराग ||
विवाहात तत्तु चांदिन दास गुन
dरसन मेल भुनुराग ||
ढँढं उत्तरी तेल ||
अजुनान रूप नरायण केवल
deवाहित चांदि गेट ||
चांदिन दास तर हर्ग न परार
deलिनाहि '(र चल्लिनाहि) दरसन लागित ||
पयाहि ढँढं जय दुर्ग गाभोिल
deढँढं लिव ढँढं रुघ जाघिी ||
ढँढं दौहि ढँढं दौहि दरसन पांशक
dिनारे न परार कोडः ||
ढँढं ढँढं नाम खििन ताहि खानी
dरूप नरायण गोिी ||

३
मम हवन याम दिन माहभि
वद लने सुधुंची तीर ||
चांदिन दास वद रसने मिलन
dुर्ग लम्बे गीर ||
ढँढं जय दौहसार ना पार ||
अजुनान रूप नरायण केवल
deढँढं चांदि पतिकार ||
प्रेम रघु ढँढं मित्र ढँढं
पुष्क्र मधुर रस कि ||
रामक हस्ती खड़े रस उपायात
de रस हस्ते रामक कह ||
रामक हस्ते रामक हक दाइक
dे रामक हस्ते रामक ||
रामक हस्ते मेम मेम हस्ते रामक
de खिये कह मानव अभिका ||
पुष्क्र चांदिन दास काह रामक

मुनीवहि रूप नरायण
dह विवाहात इह रस कारन
deलिमशा पद कह धारण ||

४
रसेन कारन मस्का रामक
de कायापि घतने रस ||
रामक कारन मस्का होयत
de भािि मेम विलास ||
स्थल दुहूँके काम सुधक महि
de स्थल दुहूँके महि ||
दुहूँके घतने वे रस होयत
de दुहूँके गाभोिल ||
दुहूँके बोटन विनाहि कलन
de दुहूँके दुहूँके ||
महि पुखवे वे कहु हायत
de रात देव परार ||
पुरात भवास: महि सतवा
de अधिक रस वे विषे ||
रात सुझ कािि अधिक सुखहि
de ता माफ़ पुखवे पाये ||
दुहूँके नयने किकसते वाण
de वाण वे कामे हय ||
रात के वाण मपिकार कलन
de कैिे किकसतय ||
काम दामान रात के शीताक
de शंशी प्राकाय पात ||
ढेि काम दौहे मेम दे बािेि
de पचने बिरिमा माथ ||
पचने पचने नाय उपािया
de देव दौहे ||
सैँड करु वंदे मेम दे उपिे
de माफ़ का रस के बय ||
भगवी विवाहात चांदिन दास तवि
de रूप नरायण घड़े ||
ढँढं चालीकान करन तित
de भासल मेम तरारे ||

Translation.

The mutual love of Chanḍī-Dasa and Vidyāpati is the presentation of love itself in all its

and is full of Bāgāl expressions, e.g. हस्ते as the sign of the ablative; Vidyāpati could never have written this.
किये is the Bāgāl way of writing the Maithili किये.
beauty, for both ever told the tale of Kṛṣṇa's sports in ever-varying methods.

Each hearing of the virtues of the other became anxious for an interview; each hearing of the other's power in love, the heart of each woke up.

Each wrote songs and sent them to the other, and thereby increased his pangs; yet, as the songs of each dwelt on the loves of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, each was plunged into a sea of joy.

Each discussed the matter with his companions who were full of faith and love, and thereby each continually obtained a new happiness; nay, unlimited joy and love.

Rūpa-Nārāyaṇa, Vijaya-Nārāyaṇa, Vaidya-Nātha, Śiva-Sūṅda, the bees which haunted their lotus-feet, described the prospects of their meeting.

2.

Chandā-Dāsa heard of Vidyāpati's virtues, and desired to see him. So also Vidyāpati heard of Chandā-Dāsa's virtues and desired to see him.

Each became anxious for an interview, and then, accompanied by Rūpa-Nārāyaṇa only, Vidyāpati set out upon his journey.

Then Chandā-Dāsa could no longer abide at home, and himself started for the interview. On the way each sang of the other's virtues, and the heart of each woke up.

By chance they met, and the interview took place, nor was anyone able to gaze upon it (so affecting was it). Rūpa-Nārāyaṇa says that each heard privately with his own ears the name of the other.

3.

It was spring time, at about midday, at the foot of a fig-tree on the banks of the Ganges, that the two met.

Chandā-Dāsa met the Kavi-Rājana (Vidyāpati) and the body and voice of each thrilled with joy.

Neither could check his emotions. With them was Rūpa-Nārāyaṇa, and he was the only remedy for their helplessness.

Each checked his emotions, and began to converse secretly, asking each other, 'What is sweet love?'

'Doth it originate in the one who loveth, or doth he who loveth become so from the influence of love?'

'Is it the love of the woman which causeth the man to love her, or is it the love of the man which causeth her to love him?'

'Doth love spring from intercourse, or intercourse from love? In these two, which is more visible in the human being?'

Chandā-Dāsa asked these questions of the Kavi-Rājana, and Rūpa-Nārāyaṇa heard them. Vidyāpati meditated on the feet of Lakṣmī, and said,—'This is the cause of love.'

4.

'The man and the woman become filled with love through love itself. Love is not born by close contact of the two.

'It is through the man that the woman becometh the subject of love, in which are the delights of affection.

'In the dull-souled desire scarcely entereth, and the essence of love is itself dull.

'When two such souls unite, their love hath no motion.'

'By their union no happiness is produced, either in the man or woman.'

'But in the natural (i.e. wise) man, love is produced in this way.'

'The man himself is powerless, and his nature full of power; and therefore is not the love which fillet him great?'

'And at the time of union, great are the delights which fill (his soul).'

'From the eyes of both issue forth the arrows of male love.'

'But woman's love (rati) hath no arrow. How then can they issue forth from (the woman's) eyes?'

'Man's love is like a raging fire, and woman's like ice, and the mutual attachment is the vessel for holding water.'

'Rank is the wood and straw-fuel, and affection is the receptacle in which love is cooked.'

'By continually cooking desire is produced, and when the ice (i.e. woman's love) is melted down,

but here and elsewhere I give the traditional interpretation.

Vidyāpati's reply is given in No. 4.

These are unusual meanings of चन्द्र, and नरेश.
The melted substance so produced is what is called pure love.

Vidyāpati sang this to Chaṇḍī-Ḍāsa, who heard it from Rūp-Nārāyaṇa.

Then each embraced the other, and floated away upon the ocean of love.

Genealogical Table of the Family of Rāja Śiva-Siṃha, from its Foundation to its Extinction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adhirāpa Thākūr.</th>
<th>Viśvarāpa Thākūr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gōvinda Thākūr.</td>
<td>Lakshūma Thākūr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāja Pratiṣṭa Kāṇēśvara Thākūr. (First king).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhīgēvāra Thākūr (2nd king).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Mahādeva. Vīvāha.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṭīya Siṃha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No issue).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4) Mahādeva. Lakshmi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari Nārāyaṇa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No issue).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raṭīya Siṃha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No issue).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A Copper-Plate Grant of the Gujarāt Raṣṭrakūta King Dhruva II., Dated Saka 757.¹

By E. Hultzsch, Ph. D.; Vienna.

I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. A. Fuhrer, of Lucknow, for a rubbing and an ink-impression² of the present inscription, which was found at Baroda. It is a grant issued in the year 757 of the Śaka era (A.D. 835-36)

¹ A German version of this paper appeared in the Journal of the German Oriental Society. The English translation of the grant differs from the German one in a few details, the correct explanation of which I owe to Paḍāṭī Bhāgavatākhārya of Benares.

² The accompanying lithograph does not always agree with the materials supplied to me. Thus it reads by Dhruva rāja II. also called Dhāravaccha, who belonged to the Raṣṭrakūtaas of Gujarāt, a collateral, but not independent, branch of the Raṣṭrakūtas (Raṭīyas) of Mānīkheta (Mālkheda).

नरेण्य for नरेण्य (line 2-3), शिरस्व for शिरस्व (line 49), and नरेण्य for नरेण्य (line 40). On the other hand, the lithograph enabled me to make out the name of the granted village, Paṇḍḍīḍi, which is indistinct in the materials supplied to me, and which I had therefore misread in my original paper.
Of this grant, only the last two plates are now extant, each measuring about 11½" by 7½". The edges of them are fashioned somewhat thicker, so as to serve as rims to protect the writing, and the inscription is in a state of excellent preservation almost throughout. The grant originally consisted of four plates. This is shown—by the size of the two extant plates, which is such that the earlier part of the genealogy would cover three sides, not only one; and 2, by a point noticed by Mr. Fleet, when he had the original plates under examination; viz., that the last plate has four notches, and the last but one has three, on its lower edge. The rings and seal of the grant are not forthcoming.

The third plate begins with the second half of a stanza treating of Śriva. The loss of the two first plates is of little moment; as those stanzas of the Vāsāvali, which must have been on the missing plates, are already sufficiently well known. The Vāsāvali of this new inscription comprises the following kings' names:

A. Direct Line.

[Śriva I.]

Govindaśriva II., Dhruvasriva I.
also called Vallabh.

B. Gaurḍ Branch.

Govindaśriva III., Indrāśriva III.

Mahārāja Śriva.
also called Amoghavaraṇa.

Kartasriva II.
Dhruvasriva II.,
also called Nirupama,
and Dharavasriva.

The contents of the last two stanzas of the Vāsāvali (13, 14), which are the only fresh ones, are of an entirely general character. Nevertheless, we gain from this new inscription a number of important historical facts.

The second Karka's younger brother, Govinda IV., who issued the Kārṇ grant of Śaka 749 (Professor Bühler's Bāthor grant No. I.), is lost out; as is also the case in the Bagumrā inscription of Dhruva III. dated Śaka 789 (Rāthor grant No. III.), and in the Bagumrā inscription of Śriva II. dated Śaka 810 (Rāthor grant No. IV.). The fact, that this omission occurs in a grant originating with the second Karka's own son, brings almost to a certainty Professor Bühler's conjecture, that Govinda IV. was a usurper, and therefore was ignored by the direct descendants of Karka II.

In the prose portion of the inscription (line 23-29) the expression is, that the Brahma Yoga, in whose favour the grant was made, had received the title of (court) astrologer, after (his father's death), from the illustrious Govindaśriva. Hereby, of course, the king Govinda III., belonging to the direct line (Śaka 726-35), might be understood. But, even if the usurper Govinda IV. was meant—which is much more likely,—yet this involuntary mention of the name, that is wanting in the Vāsāvali, would rather confirm than discredit Professor Bühler's view.

According to the undoubtedly correct reading of this new inscription (and of the inscription No. IV.) Amoghavaraṇa, in stanza 10, must not be taken as a secondary name of Karka II., but must be understood as referring to his cousin and feudal lord Śriva-Amoghavaraṇa (Śaka 736-99), who belonged to the direct line of the Rāthakūtas. Karka II. supported the latter successfully in war against the tributary Rāthakūtas, who, after they had voluntarily promised obedience, dared to rebel with a powerful army. It is, I take it, beyond doubt, that, by the rebellions Rāthakūtas, we must understand Govinda IV. and his followers; and that Karka II., in conjunction with Śriva, succeeded in overthrowing the usurper Govinda IV., and in ruling a second time over Gaurḍ as the vassal of Śriva, just as we know he did formerly as the vassal of Govinda III.

So far I have tacitly assumed that Karka II. was the father of Dhruva II. According to the inscription No. III., Indra III. was followed by his son Karka II. (stanza 26), and the latter by his son Karka III. (stanzas 27 to 29), who was again succeeded by his son Dhruva II. (stanza 30). In the inscription No. I., we find

* ante Vol. XII. p. 128.
at the beginning of the second Karka's reign the same stanza (31) as in No. III. (26). This new inscription (stanzas 9, 10), and No. IV. (17, 18) omit Karka II., and include the first and last of the three stanzas of No. III., which treat of Karka III. Now, it is inconceivable that the official who drafted the grant of Dhruma II. should have been unaquainted with the name of that king's grandfather. Accordingly, it must be assumed that the writer of No. III. selected stanza 26 and stanzas 27 to 29 from two different forms, preserved at the secretariats, both of which related to Karka II. The first form, which is given in full in No. I., was composed during the rule of the usurper Govinda IV., and was compiled from different stanzas of the Vaasidvali treating of earlier kings. The second form, the first and last stanzas of which are found in this new inscription and in No. IV., cannot have been composed before the overthrow of Govinda IV. The Baroda inscription \(^{11}\) of Karka II., dated Saka 734, contains a third form different from both and dating from the first period of the reign of Karka II. The name of Karka III. must, for the above reasons, be struck out from the list of the Rāstrapātis of Gujarāt.

Dhruma II., like his grandson Dhruma III., bore the surname Dhīravarsha (lines 21, 24). When he issued the present document, he was staying at Sarvamangalalātā near Śrī-Khetaka (line 26-27). By Khetaka, in all probability, we must understand here,—as is also the case in the Valabhi inscriptions,\(^ {12}\)—the modern Khejdi (Kaima) at the confluence of the Vātrak and Sheri rivers, the capital of the Collectorate called after it. According to this, the province of Lāta, ruled over by the Rāstrapātis of Gujarāt,—which Govinda III. took away from the Gurjaras,\(^ {13}\) and gave in fee to his younger brother Indra III.,\(^ {14}\)—appears to have reached in a northerly direction as far as the Sheri; while, on the south, it extended to the further bank of the Tapti.\(^ {15}\) My books of reference do not enable me to identify the remaining localities mentioned in this grant (lines 27 and 29 to 31).

From a palaeographical point of view, the following observations have to be made on this new inscription. For the most part, र has the form without the loop; and न the form with the loop. But in a few cases the form without the loop is used for र; see मान l. 1; स्नान l. 9; तव्र्मन मन l. 23; मायद्वयन l. 28; and ग्राम l. 51. And in a few cases the form with the loop is used for र; see भोज l. 1; and नमि l. 15. With one exception, भ्रु (l. 8), final र has the peculiar but now well-known form that appears in स्नान l. 21. We have three forms of र; see स्नान l. 1, ग्राम l. 41, and ग्राम l. 49. For र, standing single, two forms are used; see यथा l. 26, and प्राप्ये l. 47. And three other forms of the same letter occur in compounds; see यथा l. 2, नि प्राप्ये l. 39, and नि पार्थे: l. 15. The अवर्ग्रहा occurs once; in वा निंदेदित l. 43. The जिहवालिया occurs three times; e.g. in याज्ञवलिया l. 43.

The engraver of the inscription has copied the original document without understanding it. This is best shown by the fact, that he spells the name of the king who issued the grant पारिवर्क्तीबुद्धीकृत instead of पारिवर्क्तीबुद्धिकृत (l. 24-25).

He often confounds similar letters. Thus he writes क for भ, in यद्वक for यद्वक (l. 48) and यद्वक for यद्वक (l. 15); क for य, in क नेत्र for य नेत्र (l. 40) and कार for कार (l. 154); न for क, in नीति for नीति (l. 22); म for म, in मैत्रे for मैत्रे (l. 4) and कर्म for कर्म (l. 85); च for , in चिन्त च प्राप्त (l. 14). Other mistakes are pointed out in the foot-notes.

The grant contains in its last two lines the king's sign-manual, which is very remarkable, as its current-hand characters resemble the South-Indian alphabets, and completely differ from the archaic alphabet used throughout the remainder of the inscription. After the colophon, there occurs twice the peculiar flourish XI l. 76(l.). This would be about seventy years before Govinda III.\(^ {16}\)

\(^{11}\) ante Vol. XII. p. 156. \(^{12}\) ante Vol. X. p. 278. \(^{13}\) By this we have probably to understand the Gurjara dynasty, whose last date, 640, of an unspecified era, corresponds to A.D. 736 according to the ingenious supposition of Pāṇḍit Bhagwānīlāl Indrājīl (ante Vol. XII. p. 181).
which is also found on the other inscriptions of the Rāṣṭrakūtas of Gujarāt; and which is evidently intended for an actual representation of the sign-manual.

Text.

(First two plates not forthcoming.)

Third plate; first side.

[1] दाता १६ मन्मुद्धम् गुणवत्ता यस्ती, सिंही वस्त्रो, भृगुं सर्मणवत्तान् भृताप- [2] सा स्थाने नागाधार न || [१] येन शालध्वनम्भावित्रक, बलतारभेदाय || [३] ले वने नातीरुपक्रियावालतादित्वारतः वहभावः सतसी[१] श्रीमद्रामिलराजयो [४] विषिवादवदिनीविनायकायश्च: (१) तत्त्त्वासर्वेशु || करंजादित्वातिसादिदेशुभुमिः || (२) [५] तस्मानुष || श्रीमद्रामिलराजयो महानमविसेवनम् || प्राणव: || प्रसादसादकाविदत्तरकाहेः || [६] क्रमेण वालकवृत्तयुज्यो || [७] रक्षते येन निष्केषे चुरुवेशविषयिनये || राज्ये धर्मो लो- [८] याम मुखा हस्ते परा हस्ते || [९] दज्जम्बाण श्रीमद्रामिलराजयो श्रीविहारावराजारामवर: महान - [१०] संपुर्णे || लक्ष्मीपत्ताना चक्खर विनाशस्मार्गार्थिनी संदर्भतुलविनायकाधिकरणे || सुध्रीयो निष्केषे नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || महाराजारायोऽक्षित: ध्यातिवारा || [११] महत्ववेद्यो || नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || महाराजारायोऽक्षित: ध्यातिवारा || समाप्तवेद्यो || नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || महाराजारायोऽक्षित: ध्यातिवारा || [१२] तुष्टेन्द्रे श्रीमद्रामिलराजयो श्रीविहारावराजारामवर: || संविधानः निष्केषे नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || राज्ये धर्मो लो- [१३] राज्ये धर्मो लो- [१४] राज्ये धर्मो लो- [१५] राज्ये धर्मो लो- [१६] राज्ये धर्मो लो- [१७] येन निष्केषे नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || महाराजारायोऽक्षित: ध्यातिवारा || [१८] तुष्टेन्द्रे श्रीमद्रामिलराजयो श्रीविहारावराजारामवर: || संविधानः निष्केषे नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || राज्ये धर्मो लो- [१९] तुष्टेन्द्रे श्रीमद्रामिलराजयो श्रीविहारावराजारामवर: || संविधानः निष्केषे नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || राज्ये धर्मो लो- [२०] तुष्टेन्द्रे श्रीमद्रामिलराजयो श्रीविहारावराजारामवर: || संविधानः निष्केषे नामाकसमिरिक्तरये || राज्ये धर्मो लो- ...
Fourth plate; first side.

Sarvprabha mukha maspaśeṣṭē.

Fourth plate; second side.

L. 27, read 'विनो' and 'ब्राह्म' L. 29, read 'नारे'. L. 31, read त्राण. L. 33, read 'नायक'. L. 35, read 'भारत'. L. 37, read 'कांतिक'. L. 39, read 'भारत'. L. 40, read न for क. L. 41, the answer of सामाय is indistinct. L. 42, read 'कन्तर' and 'सदन'. L. 43, read 'अयोध्य'. L. 44, read
GUJARAT RASHTRAKUTA GRANT OF DHIRUYA II. OR DHARVARSHA II — SAKA 757.
Translation.

This favourite of fortune (Krishṇarāja), who was liberal, proud, and the first among the virtuous, went to the highest abode, in order to enjoy the heavenly rewards (which he had gained) by his great austerities.

2. One of his sons was the illustrious Govindarāja, surnamed Vallabha. His head being whitened by the dust of the vanguard, he ever walked in battle with sportive gait, as the heat of the sun's rays was warded off by his white parasol. He conquered the world, knew how to make widows of the wives of his enemies, and split open the temples of the most elephants of his foes in battles which to him were feasts.

3. He was succeeded by his younger brother, the illustrious Dhrūvarāja, who conquered all kings and resembled the morning sun (by) his great majesty and his irresistible prowess (or heat).

4. While he righteously ruled his whole kingdom together with the four oceans, he filled the hearts of men with the highest joy.

5. His son was the liberal and brave Govindarāja, the favourite of mankind and the ornament of his race. He, whose great fame was spread over the world by the virtuous, distressed his enemies by his notorious valour.

6. In a great battle, he alone caught all these and many other kings, who were distressed by the blows of his unsheathed sword, and acted so that even the goddess of fortune left off her inconstancy, wore his glittering precious chauri, and could be enjoyed by all suffering people on earth, by his Gurus, by Brahmans, by the virtuous, and by his friends and relations.

7. When he, who made his enemies tremble,
13. Who is not satisfied, when Dhārā-varsha (i.e. "the torrent of rain"), whose body shines like the lightning, pours forth wealth and removes distress on earth,—as when a cloud, whose body shines with the lightning, pours forth rain and removes the heat of the earth.40

14. The fame of Dhruvarāja was highly displeased with the Creator, thinking:—"Why did not of old Brahman create this world according to my measure?"41

15. Seeing that this worthless life is as unstable as the wind or the lightning, he effected this pious gift, which is most meritorious, as it consists of a grant of land.

(L. 24)—And he, the illustrious Dhruva-rājadeva, (eunamed) Dhūravarsha, the lord of great vessels, who has obtained all the great sounds,42 inform all those whom (this order) concerns, lords of provinces, lords of districts, heads of villages, officials and functionaries, magistrates, great men, &c.:

(L. 26).—"Be it known to you that, in order to increase my parents' and my own spiritual merit and glory in this world and the next, I, residing at Sarvamangalastā outside Sri-Kheṭakā, have given to Yōga,—who is the son of Bhūta Mahēśvara; lives at Vādaraśiddhi; belongs to the Chātuvedins of that (place), to the gotra of the Livānas (f.), and to the school of the Vājī-Mādhyaśāstikās,43 and has received the title of (court-)astrologer, after (the death of his father), from the illustrious Govindarājadeva,—the village of Pāsīlavīllī, which is situated in the country of Kāśaharā and the boundaries of which are:—on the east, the river called Vēhučchasa and the village of Vohtravka; on the south, the village of Chatuḥsa; on the west, (the village of) Tāralavāli; on the north, the village of Vīnchaya—all this village, thus defined by its four boundaries, together with the udāna, together with the parikara,44 together with (the right to) punishment and (the right to fix those who commit) the ten offences, together with the bhādhaprayatnāvyaya, together with (the right to) eventual forced labour, together with the income in grain and in gold, not to be entered by regular or irregular soldiers, not to be meddled with by any royal officers, to last as long as the moon, the sun, the ocean, the earth, the rivers, and the mountains shall endure, to be successively enjoyed by his sons, grandsons, and (further) descendants, with the exception of grants previously made to temples and to Brahmanas,—with heartfelt devotion,—when seven hundred and fifty-seven years of the era of the Śaka king had elapsed, on the fifteenth day of the light half of Karttikeya, (which was) the great day when the full-moon stood in Kṛttikā, after having bathed, to-day, with a libation of water,—in order to (enable the donee to) perform the five great sacrificial rites, (viz.) the bali, charu, vaiśvadeva, agnikotra, and hospitality.45

(L. 39).—"Wherefore, nobody shall cause obstruction to him, if he enjoys (this village), (or) causes it to be enjoyed, (or) cultivates it, (or) causes it to be cultivated, or assigns it (to others) according to the usual rule relating different musical instruments, which are enumerated in a note of Mr. Growse (ante Vol. VII. p. 354) and in a paper of Mr. Puthak (ante Vol. XII. p. 86). According to Sir Walter Elliot (ante Vol. VII. p. 253) it implies, that the band played five times a day, as stated by Firishta.46 Professor Kiehorn has translated the expression pashfahābha by "the five titles commencing with great" (ante Vol. XIII. p. 134). There can be no doubt now that the expression properly, and usually, denotes the sounds of five musical instruments, as explained above and in the references quoted there. But, that it may sometimes have been also used in the sense given to it by Professor Kiehorn, appears probable from the way in which five titles commencing with mañā, great, viz. Mahāśānta, Mahāpratītha, Mahābhāṣyā, Mahābhāṣyā, Mahābhāṣyakī, and Mahābhāṣyā—are given collectively to Dhruvaśma I. of Valabhi in the grant published ante, Vol. IV. p. 1049.—Etc.)

47 i.e. the Mādhyaśāstikās, a subdivision of the Vājins or Vīśānāryas.

48 For svarīkāra, which is also the reading of No. III., No. IV., and the Baroda grant of Karha II., other inscriptions have somekāra.

49 A different enumeration of the five great sacrifices is found in the Sātvathā-Bhūmāna, XI. 8, 6, 1, and in the Bhūmān-Dharmāstra, XII. 6, 11, 1 to 6.
to gifts to Brähmaṇa. And future kings of
our lineage, or others, shall assign to this our
gifts, considering it as equal to their own gifts,
and shall preserve it, recognising that the
reward of a grant of land is common (to all
kings), and reflecting that the inconstant royal
dignity is as transient as the lightning, and
that life is as unstable as a drop of water
hanging on the tip of a blade of grass. And
if one, whose mind is covered by the thick
darkness of ignorance, shall confiscate (this
grant) or assent to its confiscation,—he shall
incur (the guilt of) the five great sins and the
minor sins."

(L. 44).—And the holy Vyāsa, the arranger
of the Vedas, has said:—"He who gives land,
dwells for sixty thousand years in heaven; he
who confiscates it or assigns to (its confiscation),
shall dwell as long in hell! Those who
confiscate a grant of land, are reborn as black
snakes, which dwell in dry holes of trees in
the waterless forests of the Vindhyā (mountains).
Gold is the first offspring of fire;* the
earth belongs to Viṣṇu; and cows are the
dughters of the sun; the three worlds will
be given by him who gives gold, a cow, and
land! Many kings have enjoyed the earth,
commencing with Sāgara; as long as
(a king) possesses the earth, so long the reward
(of grants) belongs to him! Those gifts, producive of spiritual merit, wealth, and glory,
which have been formerly made here (on earth)
by kings, are like offerings to a deity or
vomited food; what good man would take them
back again? O prince, best of the rulers of
the earth, assiduously preserve the land, given
by thyself or given by others; to preserve
(land) is more meritorious than to give it!
Therefore men of pure minds and possessed of
self-restraint, shall not destroy the fame of
others,—reflecting that royal dignity and
human life are as unstable as a drop of water
on a lotus-leaf!"

(L. 53).—The messenger for this (grant) is
Śrī-Devarāja. And it is written by the
minister of war and peace, Śrī-Nārāyaṇa,
the son of Śrī-Durgābhaṭa.

(L. 54.)—What is written above, is the
pleasure of me, Śrī-Dhruravarakṣaḍeṣa, the
son of Śrī-Karakarājaḍeṣa.

NOTE ON THE FAMILY AND DATE OF THE
GREAT RAJENDRA-CHOLA OF TANJORE.

The two inscriptions, Nos. CLII. and CLIV.,
contributed by Mr. Fleet on pp. 48 to 59 of the
February number of this volume, contain matter
of so much value and interest from their bearing
on the supersession of the Eastern Chalukya
dynasty by the Cholas of Tanjore, and especially
with reference to the history of Rājendrā, entitled
Kulottuva-Čoḷa, Kopparikesari Varman, &c.,
that I am desirous of drawing attention to some
difficulties in which his exact date and parentage
appear to be involved.

I have had occasion, more than once, to refer
to these points, and particularly in a contribution
I made to the International Numismata Orientalia
in November last. Some of the information I
possessed was founded on another copper śāstra,
which I hope Mr. Fleet will be good enough to
publish in continuation of the two just referred to.
This I have frequently quoted under the name of
the Cheltr grant, from the place where it was
found—a village in the Kōkanāda Tālukā, 18 or 20
miles south-east of Rājamahendri, on the way
from that place to Koringa.

The oldest of these three grants, which I have
marked A, after detailing the genealogy of the
Eastern Chalukya dynasty as far as Vimalāditya,
states that his queen was the daughter of a Rājā-
raja, of the solar race, and the father of Rājendra-
Chola, brother of the queen. The son of Vimalā-
ditya and the Choja princess is then said to have
been Rājārāja II., who ascended the throne in
Sāka 943 = A.D. 1022-23. He appears to have given
the village of Korumeli, situated about 40 miles
south of the Godāvari, to a Brähmaṇa.

The second, which I have called the Cheltr
grant B, was copied by Mr. Fleet; a copy of it
is included in my MS. Collection, and the
original is now in the British Museum. It is a
remarkably fine śāstra, with a large handsome
seal, which as well as that of the following (C)
is represented in the Madras Journal, N.S., Vol. IV.
plate ii. figs. 2, 3, and at p. 94. To this I can
only refer from my own notes, and an abstract
translation made for Colonel McKenzie which
I have lately discovered. It calls Rājārāja-
Narendra the son of Vimalāditya, and states
that he married Ammaṇa, the daughter of a
certain Rājendra-Chola of the solar race, and

* According to the Naiśpyākas, gold consists of fire (tājas).
The son was called Rājendra-Chola. He married Madhurāntari, the daughter of another Rājarājendra-Deva, the ornament of the solar race. They had several sons. Among them was one named Rājarāja. "The earth-lord (or sovereign), seeing his many good qualities, thus addressed him:—Be myself desirous of ruling over Chola, I appointed my uncle Vijayāditya to rule the country of Vengi, which he did for 15 years. Now, in consequence of his death, that duty is imposed on you. Hearing this, the son, though reluctant to part with his father, assumed the dignity and administered the affairs of Vengi for one year, when, thinking that happiness consisted in sitting at his father's feet, which could not be placed in competition with the possession of power, he returned to his parents. The Chakravarthi (or sovereign) then bestowed the government on his younger brother, the valiant young prince Vira-Chola, and blessed him, saying that his feet should be placed on the heads of kings. Accordingly he took leave of his mother, father, and elder brother, and accompanied by a younger brother repaired to Vengi. He was installed in his office in Śāka 1001 (A.D. 1079-80)."

One of his first acts was to confer a mark of distinction on a favoured dependant named Mełamārya, the son of Potana of the Mūdgalā gōtra, by giving him a village named Kaleru for the endowment of two chattrakes, one at Drakshārum, the other at Pithāpur, and for the maintenance of a tank and temple in the agra-hīram of Chelār in Śāka 1001 (= A.D. 1079-80).

Mr. Fleet's second grant C is the latest, and is said to have been transmitted by a Mr. Smith, who obtained it from the Kāram of Chittār. This I take to be a mistake for Chelār, as my notes state both this and the last to have been procured by Mr. George Anthony Smith, the Collector of Rājamahehandri, from Dantia Veikatāpati Rāj the Kāram of Chelār. They were forwarded to me by that gentleman about the year 1843 or 1844. It gives the same genealogy as A down to Vimalāditya. His son Rājarāja II. reigned 41 years, and was succeeded by his son kulottunga-Chola-Deva I. who ruled 49 years. Next comes Vikrama-Chola, his son, for 15 years, and his son Kulottunga-Chola-Deva II. He bestowed the village of Ponduva on Kolami-Kātama-nāyaka, who resided at Saraspuri in a lake-district of which he was the governor. With the sanction of his superior he transferred the village just conferred on him to certain Brāhmans as an agra-hīram in Śāka 1056 = A.D. 1034-35. The lake in question is evidently the Koḷār lake, lying between the Godāvari and Krishna, and the village of Panduva is shown in Arrowsmith's map No. 94 on its eastern border about 50 miles south of the Godāvari or more nearly 22 miles west of the Vasisthī branch.

I am unable to reconcile the discrepancies found in these three documents, which are probably due in a great measure to the incorrect version of B. above referred to; but, that Vira-Chola was a son of Rājarāja, and governed the Vengi-country for many years, appears to be certain from the great number of inscriptions in his name included in my MS. Collection. A difficulty however occurs in identifying the great Rājarāja with the names mentioned in the grants. In the J. N. O. I have made what I believe to be his exact date as A.D. 1064-1113. With this Vira-Deva-Chola's vice-royalty would agree tolerably well, the date of the Chelār inscription in his first year being A.D. 1079, or 15 years subsequent to his father's accession, tallying nearly with the administration of Vijayāditya which is stated to have been 15 years, or, including Rājarāja's one year, 16 years. Of this youthful Rājarāja we hear no more; but he was probably the Vikrama who succeeded his father in A.D. 1113, and whose other name of Rājarāja has been perpetuated on the numerous coins of that period.

The views I took in the paper communicated to the Madras Journal in 1855 accord nearly, as far as they go, with those above stated.

Vijayāditya was a family designation in the Eastern Chalukya line, as well as Vishnuvardhana; and it was from the latter that Vira-Deva took the title of septtama or 'seventh' Vishnuvardhana, as well as that of Kulottunga-Chola. Rājarāja calls the Vijayāditya here referred to his uncle, but the loose description of the genealogy does not enable us to see how this could be. Perhaps he was the son of Vimalāditya and Rājarāja's sister, and by a mistake in the translation has been called "my" instead of "your" uncle.

Similar views were stated in the J. N. O. at pp. 88, 120, 121, 131, where I have also referred to Dr. Burnell's conclusions, and a résumé of the Chelār inscription, when found, was added a p. 150.

The importance of the points at issue makes it desirable to have that portion of the Chelār inscription containing the genealogy printed from the original plates for insertion in this Journal, with a critical translation by the able palaeographist, whose aid I have already invoked.

Walter Elliot.

Wolves, 18th March 1885.

THE GENEALOGY OF THE CHOLAS.

The latter portion of the genealogy of the larger Chola grant at Leiden, of which Dr. Burgess
has published a notice in the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XIII. p. 311, corresponds with the pedigree of the Cholas in the Kongu Chronicle.—Vira-Chola of the Chronicle receiving in the grant the eponym of Parantaka I.


Stripped of collateral names, the two pedigrees stand as follows:—

**Kongu Chronicle.**

Vijayādī.

| Āditya Varman. |
| Vira-Chola |
| Harinjaya. |
| or Arinjaya. |
| Parantaka. |

[Diagrams of pedigrees]

**Divi Rāya, Arivai Dēva, alias Arititu. alias Rājarāja.**

**Leiden Grant.**

Vijajālaya. |

| Āditya I. |
| Parantaka I. |
| Arinjaya. |
| Parantaka II. |

| Āditya II. Rājarāja. alias Karikāla. |

The early portion of the genealogy of the Leiden Grant agrees with the grant of Vira-Chola, and with popular tradition, in ante Vol. IX. p. 47ff., and Salem Manual, Vol. II. p. 36ff., asserting the descent of the Cholas from the Solar Race through Ikshvakū and Manu. The Vira-Chola grant traces their pedigree still higher than this, boldly carrying them up to the four-faced Brahmā himself.

The Leiden Grant and the Kongu Chronicle thus render mutual support to each other for six generations of the Cholas: and it is something to have obtained this amount of confirmed foothold in the midst of the great confusion in which the history of this dynasty is involved.

The Leiden Grant states that Rājarāja-Chola conquered Satyāśasya: and there is scarcely room for doubt that the reference is to one of the Western Chālukya kings, five at least of whom bore this eponym. If the name in the grant is to be regarded as a dynastic title, applicable to all the Western Chālukyas, the event referred to may well be the great victory obtained by the Cholas over Śōmēśvara-Āhavamalla. This identification may possibly suggest the date of this grant, and at the same time afford a corrective for some of the difficulties which now surround the chronology of the Cholas. But it would be unsafe to press it at present, any further than as a tentative suggestion.

Considering the small quantity of original materials hitherto published for the history of this dynasty, and the important part which these kings once played in the annals of the Peninsula, it would be a great service to those who are working on the very intricate problems of Chola history if some one would publish the Sanskrit portion of the Leiden grant in the *Indian Antiquary*.

**THOS. FOULKES.**

**Coimbatore, 12th January 1885.**

**THE LEIDEN COPPER-PLATE GRANTS—A CORRECTION.**

At p. 59 of Vol. XIII., tentative readings have been given of the legends on the seals of the two Chola grants in the University Museum at Leiden. An excellent cast of the seal of the larger grant, for which I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Kern, and a more careful examination of the photograph of the other than I was able to give to it in January 1884, enables me to give revised readings of the inscriptions.

That on the smaller and later grant runs,—

Śrī-Kulottunga-Chōjaśya, Rājakaśvari-varmanah, puyang kahōntwara-sabha chōlādratnayā differently:—

"Śrī-Kulottunga-Chōja Rājakēśvarīvarman’s auspicious edict to the crest-jewel of the assembly of earth-rulers."

The mistake in the first reading was mainly, if not entirely, due to the very peculiar form of the īa in Chōla, which being mistaken for īgā, the syllables written below were taken in at the wrong place. These are—ōgāya, Rājakaśvari-varmanah, inserted below ॐīgā-Chō and puyang kehōntwara.

Dr. Kern has kindly pointed out this reading, and helped me with some of the letters in both inscriptions, about which I had doubts.
The legend on the larger and older grant is in an earlier and more difficult character: it reads—

"Ii Rājendrā-Chōlāya Parakasiravmanarād
rajā-rajaṇya-makula-kṛṣṇi-ratnāku dhanaṃ—
"This is Rājendra-Chola Parakasiravman's edict to the jewels of the range of diadems of kings and princes."

The character used here for the first syllable of Rājendra and in the third of rājāraṇya is quite different from that employed to represent ra in all other cases in the inscription, and is more like what we might expect to find for dra or pra.

JAMES BURGESS.

CURiosITIES OF INDIAN LITERATURE.

ANOTHER MACABRous Verse of gumārI KAVI.

Under the pretext of purifying his ancestors, king Bhrindrathra brought down the Ganges (to us on earth). He thus became a supreme friend of the world; for—"A good man benefits every one, (even when he is working out his own purposes)."

With this may be compared the following Sanskrit lines, by an unknown author, also popular in Tirhut:

एको ग्रन्थि: कुश्कुशापल्लवतः
आवश्य चूर्ते सरसों वशति
आवास रिसः: विनिर्खल हरः
एका विलया ब्रह्मकीर्ति पलिता

A single saint, with a pitcher and a brush of kusa-grass in his right hand, pours water on the root of a mango-tree. By this the mangoes are irrigated, and his ancestors satisfied; (so that) one act is declared to have a twofold accomplishment.

G. A. GRIESEN.

THE PROVERBS OF ALI ELN ABI TALEBI.
Translated by K. T. Best, M.A., M.R.A.S.
Principal, Gujarat College.
Continued from p. 124.

224. A man's companion resembles himself.
226. Acid food is better than acid speech.
227. Fear God and you will be safe.
228. The fear of God brightens the heart.
229. A mind free from care is better than a full purse.
230. The best riches are those which are laid out in pious uses.
231. To acquiesce in the decrees of God is the medicine of the heart.
232. The religion of a man is known by his words and deeds.
233. Treat him kindly who has injured you, that he may be ashamed.
234. Leave the perversity in his perversity.
235. What princes give to taste burns the lips.
236. The most despised creatures is precious in the sight of God.
237. The remembrance of death cheers the heart.
238. Honour your father and your son will honour you.
239. Visit a man according to his attentions to you.
240. The ornament of the mind is better than that of the body.
241. He is allured by vain hope who rejoices in worldly things.
242. The safety of man lies in controlling his tongue.
243. Priests rule a people.
244. The disgrace of learning is boasting.
245. A little wisdom is better than many works.
246. A rich miser is poorer than a liberal pauper.
247. Prayer at night brightens the day.
248. The silence of a fool is his protection.
249. His labour is lost who trusts in any one but God.
250. The blow of a friend is the sharpest.
251. To enjoy lawful things enlightens the mind.
252. He who is stingy has a narrow mind.
253. The desire of learning is better than the desire of gold.
254. The injustice of a man overthrows him.
255. The tyranny of kings is better than the rule of the people.
256. The thirst for wealth is greater than the thirst for water.
257. Live contented and you will be a king.
258. The fault of a discourse is its length.
259. A wise enemy is better than a foolish friend.

BOOK NOTICES.


These little volumes, four only of which have as yet appeared, show the immense progress that has been made in the study of Indian dialects since I published my article on the Bhujpuri dialect, seventeen years ago, in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (Vol. III. 1868). In the first place, it is now clearly recognized that the term Hindi,
as used by Europeans, is merely a vague expression for so many of the Aryan dialects as have not been distinguished by territorial names. I had partially grasped this fact, though not fully, when I wrote the remarks on p. 31 et seq. of Vol. I. of my Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India in 1872. All round the outer edge of Aryan India is a circle of kingdoms or provinces; Bengal, Ossasa, Mahārāshtra, Gujarāt, Sindh, Pañjāb, Nejál; and the “Indian,” or as the Muhammadans called it the Hindi, spoken in each of these places came by degrees to be called Bangālī, Orya, Marāthī, and so on.

But in the centre there remained a vast area for which no special name was found, it was merely Hind, and its language or languages were all merely Hindi. It has long been known that under this general term were included forms of speech differing very widely from each other, and it only remained for some scholar to enquire into the subject and classify these various forms, referring them to their proper relationships. Mr. Grierson has done this for the Eastern part of the hitherto undefined area, and he has therefore a perfect right to give a name to the form of speech whose independence he has successfully established. Indeed, it is highly probable that the province of Bihār, like the neighbouring province of Bengal, maintained itself in independence of the crown of Delhi for any length of time, its language would have been called Bihārī many centuries ago.

In the second place, the researches of Dr. Hoernle into the obscure subject of the Prākrit dialects, have placed it beyond a doubt that these forms of speech fall into two groups, called respectively Māgadhī and Sauraseni, the former being the elder of the two and at one time probably the only language of Northern India, the latter and younger having gradually extended from the west eastwards and pushed the older language before it, till the domain of Māgadhī lay entirely to the east of a line drawn north and south through Benares, though its influence on the Sauraseni resulted in the growth of a mixed dialect called Ardha-Māgadhī, which seems to have extended far to the west. At a later period Māgadhī pushed to the south-west through the Marāṭhā country, but in the valley of the Ganges it never seems to have got much further west than the longitude of Benares. From this it follows that the dialects spoken in Bihār have very much less connexion with those spoken in the western parts of the loosely defined and misleadingly designated “Hindi” area than they have with the other speech forms of Māgadhī origin, such as Bangālī and Oriya.

While, however, I fully agree with Mr. Grierson in separating Bihārī from the so-called Hindi, I feel a little difficulty in following him when he divides his newly discovered language into so many as seven dialects. Indeed, he himself seems rather doubtful on this point, for he admits on p. 15 of the Introduction that there are in reality only three dialects, Bhojpuri, Maithill and Māgadhī, and his seven grammars are, or are to be, made up by giving in addition to these three, four mixed forms, such as Maithill affected by Māgadhī, Maithill-Bangālī, and so on. All this extremely fine classification and subdivision, though it entitles Mr. Grierson to high rank among scientific philologists, is rather out of place in hand-books intended to teach officials the patois of their districts.

When one comes to look even at the three leading dialects, one finds them so very much alike that a grammar of any one of them would almost be a sufficient guide to the whole group. Take for instance the pronouns. That of the first person may be summarised as follows:—

**Nominaive.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>form</td>
<td>form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singlar. “I” meh ham mera hamra

Plural. “we” hamari hamari

The only deviations from this scheme are that meh is not used in Māgadhī or South Maithill; that North Maithill uses mord as well as mord; that Bhojpuri adds ki to hamari, and all the dialects use also ham sabk and hamda sabk for the nom. and obl. plural respectively. The same close similarity runs through all the parts of speech. Apart from this defect of over-refining and over-classifying, which is a defect only in so far as it tends to embarrass the practical student, these little grammars are as complete and perfect as can be desired. The arrangement is admirable, being both scientific and simple. The rules are clear, and not too numerous, and the examples well chosen and carefully worked out. As none of these languages possesses any literature (with the exception of Maithill, which has a little poetry), there is no recognized standard of speech for any of them, and it is therefore inevitable that there should be many varying forms for every person of every tense. Mr. Grierson’s trained musical ear has enabled him to detect a very large number of these variations, very many more in fact than are apparent to the ordinary observer; and all of these are very fully given. It would have been well if some effort had been made to select for each person or tense one form, to be considered as the standard form, from
which the others should be held to be deriations.
By this means the vagaries of rustic pronunciation might by degrees be reduced into manageable limits.

Specially noteworthy is the attempt to indicate several fine distinctions in vowel sounds by signs borrowed from the Gurmukh character, a measure in which Dr. Hoernle took the lead, and which, it may be hoped, will become general.

John Beames.


This short quarto of some 90 pages is divided into three distinct portions. Part I. describes the District of Bulandshahr, Part II. gives an account of its history from ancient times to the Mutiny, and Part III. an account of the rebuilding of its towns under the auspices of the artistic author.

Mr. Growse's qualifications for the first two divisions of his subject are so well known and have been so well illustrated in his model district memoir on Mathurâ that it is almost superfluous to say that both are treated with consummate skill and scholarship, and are safe guides for those who may have to study the locality.

The main interest in the book lies in the third part, which describes how he set to work to improve the towns over which chance had given him control; a duty to which he evidently gave his whole heart and performed with all the enthusiasm of the artist. The key to the spirit which animated him throughout is to be found in the quotation on the title-page:—“Our western civilization is perhaps not absolutely the glorious thing we like to imagine it.” Accordingly we do not find him improving the city of Bulandshahr by the erection of European buildings on European models for purposes considered desirable by Europeans, but by taking the city and the people as he finds them and inducing the latter to satisfy their wants, as they feel them, by buildings after their own hearts: Indian listlessness having been hitherto content with mere mud and untidiness.

This method of proceeding brought him into more or less direct collision with the powers that be, especially in the Public Works Department, and accordingly with all the courage of his opinions that has distinguished the author in other publications he runs full tilt at the Department without any mincing of words or beating about the bush: unmindful of the native proverb with which no doubt he is acquainted, ‘pañch pañch mil khyâd, harâ harâ na dek laj: when a company does business no one is blamed if it succeed or fail,’ and which so aptly expresses the hopelessness of trying to fasten blame on a corporate body. However, it must be as gratifying to him as it is to us, to see that his repeated hammering at the folly of holding up ourselves to the Indian public as official approvers of all that is ugly and tasteless, is at last bearing useful fruit, and that the Pâñjab Government has lately officially disapproved of plans submitted by the Lahore Municipality, merely on the ground that they are ugly. It was admitted that the plans proposed had been largely adopted elsewhere, but the Government in effect hoped that the Municipality would be able to prepare plans of a more ornamental kind without materially adding to the cost of the buildings.

If we have read Mr. Growse’s pages aright, it would seem that he is of opinion that the Natives are likely to largely copy the warehouse style of architecture adopted by the Public Works Department in our public buildings. Here we think that his enthusiasm has carried him too far. Here and there an ‘advanced’ Native of the ‘noble’ class may do so, but it is our opinion, after careful examination of many a building, that as architecture in India is still a living art, there is no servile copying to be found in the majority of buildings; and that even in British Cantonment towns, where British influence is strongest and the very builders are nearly all trained in the Public Works Department, British influence in native buildings is mainly to be seen in adaptations of European ideas and materials to native architectural requirements in reasonable subordination.


In noticing the first volume of this work (ante, Vol. XI. p. 304), we have pointed out its importance to the student of Islam, and sketched its plan.

This volume contains chapters III. to XIII. inclusive, or about one-third of the total contents of the Qurâân, so that two more volumes will be required to complete the work. We could wish that, in what still remains, and in the promised index to the text, Sale’s Discourse, and notes, the author would, as far as possible, rectify his transcriptions of Arabic and Persian names and words—which is not scholarly, and is the worst, if not the only fault we have to find with the book.
THE SONG OF ALHA'S MARRIAGE;
A BHOJPURI EPIC.
EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY G. A. GRIESSON, B.C.S.

ROUND the history of the famous Bundel-khand heroes Alhā and Rudā, an enormous cycle of folk-epics has collected. Probably these were originally written in the Bundel-khand dialect of the Bihāri language; but, so popular did the narrative of their exploits become, that the poems are now found in almost every dialect current in Hindustān. The different versions can, however, be roughly divided into two classes, the Hindi (or Western) and the Bihāri (or Eastern) recension. The most noteworthy example of the Hindi recension is one usually, though probably erroneously, attributed to Chand Bardālī. Another version, in modern Hindi, has been lately edited by Chandraśīr Ghātī Rām of Bāntpurā.1 In this version, as in other Western versions, the heroes are named Alhā and Udāl. A third version of the same recension exists in Kanaujī, and has been translated by Mr. Waterfield in Vols. LXI., LXII., and LXIII. of the Calcutta Review, under the name of "The Nine-lakh Chain, or the Mārā Fend." The translation is in English ballad metre.

The Eastern version only exists in the mouths of itinerant singers, and is nearly always couched in the Bhojpūrī dialect of Bihār,—sometimes, however, mixed with Bāis'wāri, when the audience is supposed to be of an educated character. The following Bhojpūrī text was obtained with considerable difficulty from the mouth of one of these men, and has been carefully revised with the help of competent Bhojpūrī scholars.

Although broken up into lines, the poem is hardly in metre, being adapted for singing to music, and not for rhythmic recitation.

I have adhered to the system of spelling usually adopted in printing Bihārī, viz. to spell every word rigidly as pronounced. As in the case of other Gaujīan languages, a final ā is not pronounced; and words ending with this letter are treated as practically ending in consonants; thus daṅkā, 'I shall see,' is pronounced dék'kā, and not dékhaba. Occasionally, however, (particularly in the case of monosyllables and the 2nd persons plural of verbs) a final a is pronounced, and this is shown by the sign ə, thus dékhab (or in prose dék'kha) 'you will see.' I have used the signs ə, ō, ū, and ū, for the short diphthongs e, ā, o, ù, peculiar to Eastern Gaujīan languages. Their non-initial forms are ə, ā, ə, ō and ù respectively. These vernacular signs are those used by the Bengal Asiatic Society, the Royal Asiatic Society, and the Government of Bengal, for the purpose. Natives, in writing, make no distinction between long and short vowels or diphthongs. When non-initial, ə is always written long, whether really long or short; and short when initial. So also a is always written short.

The following is a brief account of the tradition concerning the origin of the two heroes of the story:

Rajā Par'māl or Par'mār, the Chandēlā, conquered the whole of India. The first city he conquered was Mahōbā, of which Bās'dēo was the prince. This man had three daughters. The eldest, Malān'ē Nār (also Mal'ānā, and Mal'ānavatī), Par'māl took in marriage. The other two were named Dīwālā and Tīl'kā. One day the king was out hunting in the forest of Kajrī, and found therein two infant boys deserted by their parents. He took them up on to his elephant and returned to his palace at Mahōbā. At the request of his wife he adopted them. One of the boys was named Daś'ṛāj (also Jassārāj, and much beloved by his subjects. On his death, a peculiar kind of song, called Kajrī, was invented in his memory. It received this name for two reasons: first, that the Kajrī forest was situated within his dominions; and second, that the third of the month on which this song is most sung is known in the Parvēnas as the Kajjīl Hī. According to tradition, Alnā finally disappeared into this forest, and is now lying there gerdū awaiting his opportunity for issuing from it again. [The Kajjīl Hī is a stock locality in modern legends. See Legends of the Palmūa, Vol I. p. 259. The popular notion in the Palmūa is that it is on the banks of the Ganges in Gaj'wālī.—Ed.]

1 Printed by Paulit Hanālē Sahā, Gyanī Sāgār, Mērāth (Meerut).
2 i.e. Paramārdī Déva (circa A.D. 1163 to 1209) of Mahōbā (called in the text Mahābā or Mahōhā) in Bundel-khand. He was the most famous of the Chandēl dynasty of that province, and was finally defeated, and Mahōhā captured by Pithāmph in A.D. 1182. See V. A. Smith, History of Bundel-khand, Journ. Beng. As. Soc. Vol. I Part I. 1881, p. 1 ff. 6 A very famous forest. According to Harischandra, the author of Bindu Bhākhā, there was once in Central India a Kajrī prince named Dīvā Rāy, in whom were no Musalās dared touch the Ganges. He was
Jásar); and him the king married to his sister-in-law Diwálá. The other was named Bác’há r’áj, and was married to Til’ká. When they grew up, Par’mál divided his kingdom and his army between them. Each of them had children. Jásar’s son by Diwálá was called Ál há or Álhá. He had also another son by a maid-servant, whom he named Dá’há. A son, subsequently born to him by his legitimate wife, was named Rú’dál or Údal. The former is the Bihárá; and the latter the Hindi version of his name.

Ál há was a suitor for the hand of Son’vát, the sister of Rájá Índar’man of Nainágárh. Índar’man was opposed to his sister marrying any one, and had captured and imprisoned several would-be suitors. The present poem deals with Rú’dál’s many battles with Índar’man on behalf of his brother Ál há. Finally Índar’man is conquered and slain, and Ál há marries Son’vát.

TRANSLATION.

When Ál há’s court was held, his palace was attended by great noblemen. The courts of the Ujains and Bisains were also held there. Nine hundred Nágis of Nág’púr, armed with Nag’phéni swords were there, and Kákan of Díllí was seated there, with three thousand Loh’tamiyás. There were also there Mar’h’war, Tirantá, Karam’war and Kumb Chandá. So also were seated there, Jarhá, Újháníya, Gu’y’haníyá, and the Lord Gádaháyáwá. Dancing is going on and Mur’ldhar is playing on the flute. ‘Mur’m’ur mu’r’mur’ sound the fiddles, and ‘run’run’ sound the guitars. The drums roll, the flutes express love, and the mukh’chandá studded with jewels give forth music. (10) Girls from Ceylon and boys from Goáliyáre are dancing. So also are dancing girls of Báiqalí, verily a dance of fairies is going on in the bungalow. The kúndí weighs seven mois, and its pestle ten. Eighteen pitchers of sáhí have been prepared, and nine balls of opium for each guest. Ál há himself is chewing fourteen batís of poisons, and (in his intoxication) (15) the pupils of his eyes are inverted, and his eyes themselves shot with blood. Fierce shone the features of the kings, brave as lions in battle. The son of Jásar is immortal. At that moment Rú’dál, at whose step the earth used to shake, and at whose shout the trees would wither, entered the palace. (20) As Ál há looked upon him he became grieved in heart, saying, ‘I see your body dimmed and your face sad. What distress has befallen you? Tell me, sir, in what difficulty you are, Tell me the secrets of your heart, for how else shall my soul be comforted.’ Rú’dál said respectfully. ‘O brother, hear the real fact. (25) I am much distressed in body, let my elder brother agree to do a certain thing. In the East I took Pat’ná city, on the day when I conquered the seven divisions of Nepál. In the West I conquered Badam and Láhaur, and in the South the mountain of Birin. I have searched the four quarters of the earth, but nowhere have I found a maiden fit to be your wife. A bride has been born in Nainágárh, in the palace of king Índar’man (her brother). (30) She is the daughter of Sam Dévé, and is grown up, and her father demands a tiger-fighting bridegroom. Great is the desire in my heart to celebrate the marriage of my brother, and I would wed him to Son’vát.’

This much heard Ál há and he began to grieve in his mind. Folding his hands he said respectfully, ‘O Rú’dál, pay heed unto my words. (35) Go not to Nainágárh, for its prince destroys castles just as if they were but wild beasts’ holes. Powerful is the king of Nainágárh, and very mighty in arms. He has thrown into prison fifty-two (would-be) bridegrooms, and seven hundred and fifty thousand happens in these songs. [See Preface to Vol. I. Legends of the Panjáb, p. x.—Ed.]

1. Ráj’pút tribe.
2. Said to be the name of a Ráj’pút tribe.
3. These are all said to represent Ráj’pút tribes. It is a common saying that there are as many kinds of Ráj-púts as there are kinds of rice.
4. Káran for ván ván or ván ván.
5. A kind of wind instrument.
6. A stone vessel for grinding khâng.
7. A quarter of a ton.
8. An intoxicating drink made from khâng.
9. Batí is the lump of opium eaten at one time.
10. The latter half of the line appears to have no meaning. It is recorded exactly as it was sung, but the singer was unable to interpret it. This often
attendants of their marriage processions. The fathers of the bridegrooms he has shut up in dungeons, and the match-makers have been clothed in fetters. The very bards and musicians have all been reduced to mud under the marriage canopy. Three thousand men of the tribes of Ek'hā, Dhek'hā, Dhel pur'wā, and Mut'ghānch'wā (has he slain). You will be killed in Naināgāṛh. O Rūdāl, pay heed to what I say. There is no hero in the world who dare marry Son'vait. Go not to Naināgāṛh! So much heard Rūdāl, and in a rage he blazed up like burning coals. Reversely said he, 'Brother, hearken to me. O cowardly brother, you are frightened and have lost your wits. Shame upon your life! Has your sword sunk in the world?' O Ambā, on the day on which I go to Naināgāṛh will my sword be wielded furiously. Look not at my thin body, nor on my slender limbs, for on the day on which I go to Naināgāṛh will my sword be wielded night and day.' When Ālā heard these words he was thrown into great perplexity, and said politely, 'Lord Rūdāl, hear me. How often have I remonstrated with you, Bagh Rūdāl, and you never paid heed to me? If you had been a child I could have prevented you by force, but how can a hero like you be stayed, if he pays no heed to words?' So whatever is your pleasure, that do.' When Rūdāl heard this, he rejoiced greatly, and after crying shame on cowardice, he said, 'Hear, O Brother, cherisher of the poor! It would have been better, elder brother mine, that you had drowned yourself, for it is disgraceful for you to live. Had you been born in the house of a leather-worker, you (might have stayed at home and) dressed leather every morning. But we are Raj'pūta by caste, and we have but a few days in which we can live in this world. There are but three or four days of life, and then comes the dark night. Even if fate is displeased with us, God can but take away our life. What else can he do?

Whatever he has written in the book of fate that cannot be erased. If I die the earth is but smaller by a single yard. Let me have one struggle (lit. bow) with destinies. Then shall I be worthy to be called the Lord Rūdāl, the son of Jāsār.'

Rūdāl departed thence, and went to the fort of Piari, to where Débā was holding court. Débā spread a golden bed for him, and made ready a golden stool. He sate him down on the top of seven carpets. Rūdāl folded his hands, and said, 'My blessing be upon Débā, the Brāhma. War has been declared with Naināgāṛh. Débā, accompany me.' When Débā heard this he was thrown into perplexity, but with folded hands said, 'Lord Rūdāl, hear my words. Wherever Rūdāl's sweat will fall, there will my blood fall too.' Débā, Débā,' cried out Rūdāl, 'Débā, pay heed unto me. The horse is tied up in my stable, go and bring it to me this day.' Débā went off from Piari to Rūdāl's stable. Fifty-two horses of Kōṭāl were tied there, and in the midst was the horse Beṇālia; 'twas then that Débā approached it. With folded hands Débā said, 'O horse, hear my words! You are summoned by Bagh Rūdāl. War has been declared with Naināgāṛh. O horse, accompany me!' So much heard the horse, and in a rage he blazed up like burning coals. Said he, 'My blessing be upon the Lord Débā.' Has a thunderbolt fallen upon Ālā (that he fights no more)? May torrents of anger fall upon him too. Ever since I have come from Indra's heaven, have I been put to this sad plight. Worms have bred in my hoofs. Spiders have spun webs on the shields, and rust has formed upon the swords. Has the sword sunk in the world? Ālā has never seen a fight (since then), and we have but a few days to live in the world.' Débā was delighted at hearing these words; and unfastened the horse's front, heel, and neckrope. He put on him the golden saddle and bridle. As he unfastened the bridle he patted

---

18 This was a common custom in those days. When a Raj'pūta gave his daughter in marriage, it was a rule of honour only to give her at the point of the sword.
19 This is a corruption of the English 'guard.'
20 A name of Dévī.
21 Tiger Rūdāl. Wiw has become shortened to Wi as it is in the before the penultimate of a compound tadhāna word.
22 i.e., taken up by my grave. This song is sung principally by nauts and joyts, who bury their dead.
23 i.e., is there no one else left to fight with?
24 i.e., is there no one left to conquer?
the horse's body, saying, 'My steed, may you always be happy.' Débâ saddled the horse and started, (95) and in two and a half ghâris reached Rûdâl. When Rûdâl saw the looks of the horse he was delighted. As he smoothed down its body he smiled and said reverently, 'O horse, hear my words!' Then shouted he, 'My blessing be upon Débâ, the minister, (100) make ready the horse Benuliya and carry out my orders.' Débâ the Brâhmañ saddled the horse and tied on it a silken saddle-cloth. He plaited the hair of its mane with gold, pinned on with silver pins. Its tail (O gentlemen, hear what I say!), he plaited with pearls, and a necklace worth seven lââks he put round its neck. (105) So much was the array of the horse. Now hear about Rûdâl.

He fastened on a loin-cloth fifty-two yards long, and drawers of khurâd cloth. At his side hung a shield weighing eighty mana and in his hand he carried a spear weighing thirty mana. He put on a curved leather belt, which reached down to his side, and below its flap hung his sword. (110) At his waist swing fifty-six knives and nine javelins. Shoes of cloth shine on his feet, and at the echo (of their movement) his moustaches quiver. A necklace of fifty-two gold mohars he put round his wrist. On his arm above the elbow shines a golden spangle. The awe-inspiring hero Rûdâl leaped upon his horse and bestride it. (115) Bagh Rûdâl rode the horse Benuliya, and Débâ the horse Hansâ, and each on his own horse started for Naimâgârth. They whirled their horses, and these no longer set foot upon earth. They flew up and went in the sky at even pace. 'Rim'jhim rim'jhim' danced the horses, as peacocks of the forest dance; (120) and going right and day they arrived at Naimâgârth.

When Rûdâl saw the garden of Sûvâti he was delighted, and shouted, 'Débâ, Débâ, hear my words! Rest here in this garden, and let us take a short sleep.' Great was the beauty of the garden, and there they took their rest. (125) As Rûdâl wandered round it he was filled with delight, and especially when he saw Indar’man's wrestling arena. (Said he), 'My body has become stiff from the journey, let me perform a few exercises.' He tightened up his fifty-two yards of loin-cloth and put on tight athlete's drawers. He rubbed his body with the dust of fifty-two granaries, placed the palms of his hands on the ground and performed nine hundred thousand exercises. He whirled Indian clubs weighing twenty-two mana and dîls weighing seventy and a half mana. The nêjams weighed thirty mana. All these did Rûdâl break, as he cleared the ground around him. As he clapped his right hand (O gentlemen, hear my words!), all the flowers in the garden fell down, the trees of the grove were rooted up, the fish were driven out of the water. By his mere shout people became deaf. Siva mounted his bull and ran away, while Dêvi wept tears of pearls, saying, 'Who is this powerful king that has desolated the garden under my charge? If King Indar’man come to hear of it, he will strip my skin from my body. Dêvi, with her seven sisters departed from Indra's paradise, (140) and in two and a half ghâris arrived at the garden.

Rûdâl was sleeping in the garden, and thither Dêvi went, and when she saw his form she was filled with perplexity. (Said she) 'This youth is of great beauty, and his eyes burn brilliantly. If he come in front of Indar’man he will cut him off.' (145) By this time Rûdâl awoke from his sleep, and gazed around. Then folding his hands he said, 'O Dêvi, heed my words. I will sacrifice fifty-two goats to you, and full fifty bull-buffaloes. I will even offer a human sacrifice to you, if you will grant my petition.' So much heard Dêvi, and in a rage she blazed up like burning coals. (150)

32 About 3 tons.
33 A dÎr or nâm is an instrument used by athletes. It is a heavy wooden block with a handle for lifting.
34 Over two and a half tons.
35 The nêjams are a kind of bow, with iron chains instead of a string, used by athletes, for lifting as a test of strength.
36 Over a ton.
37 i.e. on to the elbow of his left arm.
38 Dêvi is said to have seven sisters, or rather incarnations. Seven altars are usually erected to her at one place.
39 A ghâr is about half an hour.
Then spake she with her mouth, 'O Lord Rúdal, listen to me. Many and many a time have I warned you, but, my boy, you did not heed my words. Mighty is the king of Nainágarh, whose name is Indarman. Fifty-two minarets has his fortress, and fifty-three thousand markets. There are fifty-two police-stations in Nainágarh, which extends from heaven to hell. (155) The wedding crowns of fifty-two suitors has he cast away to float upon the river at Guraiyá Ghâti. Lord Rúdal, you will be killed. For nothing will you lose your life. You will not be left to offer pindás for your ancestors, and your whole family will be uprooted.' So much heard Rúdal, and from the soles of his feet blazed up fire through his body. He seized Dévi by her top-knot and cast her to the ground. (160) (The baleful star) Sanchar was in his eye; O gentlemen, his eyes were dread as death itself! Twice or thrice did he slap and thump Dévi, as he pressed her down under his knee. She screamed 'Râm, Râm,' and weeping cried, 'O Rúdal, spare my life! I will bring you and Sonváti together.' (165) Rúdal heard this much and was delighted. He spared Dévi's life and she ran away in terror to Indra's paradise. The five Pâdavas were there, and their eyes fell upon her. (170) Wept they, 'O Dévi, hear our words! You are the mistress of the three worlds, why do you weep so bitterly?' Then shouted Dévi, 'O Pâdavas, hear my words! The son of Jásar, by name Rúdal, has come, and wishes to marry Sonváti by force. (175) Even I, Dévi, could not save my life from his hands. Do you protect me, O Pâdavas.' The Pâdavas heard this much and wept tears of pearls. They all began to tremble, 'O Dévi, hear our words! Powerful is king Bagh Rúdal, and mighty is he in arms.'

Dévi fled from Indra's paradise congratulating herself that she had not lost her life (180) and went to Nainágarh. Inside fifty-two doors was Sonváti sleeping. The bed was of silver and the side planks of gold. Four nurses sat round her, and in their midst Sonváti slept. The betel-dresser was preparing betel, and other (nurses) were standing by in reverent attitude. (185) Some nurses were opening the plaits of her hair, and others stood by with water in their hands. At that time Dévi arrived and showed Sonváti a dream, saying, 'O Sonváti, hear my words! King Bagh Rúdal has come and is camping in the garden. He wishes to marry Sonváti by force. (190) If he does not succeed he will assuredly take my life, so, Sonváti save me from death.' When Sonváti heard Rúdal's name she was delighted, and called out, 'Nurse, nurse, nurse Maugíyá, consent to do something for me. Last night I saw in a dream that I went to worship in Siva's temple. Bring me my casket of jewels and my clothes. (195) Bring it hither.' The box of clothes was opened and a heap of apparel taken out. She put on a petticoat of western cloth, embroidered with a hem of velvet. She put on a bodice of musvút, which was fastened with fifty-two ribbons. On every joint of her fingers she put rings, and the tinkling of her bangles became audible. (200) A naginá stone adorned her little finger, and her teeth shone like diamonds. The splendour on her forehead was worth seven saíkas. Her plaited hair was loosened and meandered down her back like black snakes. She took out her mirror, and looked at herself, and became perplexed in mind. 'May my brother Indarman die the death, for he keeps his sister a maiden in his house. (205) My youth has passed away. And I am still a maiden in Nainágarh. Cursed be this beauty of mine, for I dwell a maiden in Nainágarh.' The litter of Sonváti issued forth (from the castle), and she set out to worship Siva: and the eyes of Indarman fell upon it, and he called his guards. 'Ho, there! Of what country is this king so mighty, who has mounted a litter?' (210) Cut off his head and cast it into the field.' King Indarman grasped his naked sword, and leaped fifty-two cubits in the air. Sonváti's eyes fell upon him, and the soul of her inner heart took fire. 'No longer will I keep up the

---

40 The five Pâdavas (Yudishthira and his brothers) continually appear in folktales of this character as a species of demi-gods.
41 A mixed stuff of silk and cotton. A corruption of the Arabic مزيلة.
42 A হচ্ছ স্থান is a field in which crops are not growing, but not necessarily a barren one. It may be ploughed and otherwise prepared, as long as it is not sown. I have not met the word হচ্ছ in any other connection. Natives connect the word with হিঁচঃ, a virgin, hence, a field which has not been sown. Is there any connection with Kurukshêtra, in the way of a field too sacred by association to be used for ordinary purposes?—No.)
43 I have only met the word হৃদ in the phrase হৃদ কীর্তি, which is not uncommon. The phrase means the 'innest heart.'
tie of brother with this man.' She took off all her jewels, and laid them in the litter. (213) She fastened round herself a loin-cloth fifty-two yards long, and leaped forty-two cubits in the air. Then began the fight between the brother and sister; O gentlemen, terrible was the fight! The scimitars shrieked 'tar' tar' and the swords 'khatar khatar.' 'San' san san' hissed the bullets, as the combatants hardly set foot to earth. (220) For seven days and eighty-seven nights (sic) the battle lasted. Even when seven cubits of earth had been hollowed out by their feet, still Sons'vati did not retreat. Then king Indarman drew his scimitar and called upon the name of All, and as he struck at Sons'vati, she warded off the blow with her plaited hair; a second blow he aimed at her which she warded off with her bracelet, and a third which she warded off with the border of her garment. (225) Then the lady leaped fifty-two cubits high, caught Indarman by the wrist and threw him to the ground. She then pressed him down under her knee, till he screamed out 'Rām, Rām.' Sam Dévā saw this and began to weep bitterly. Crying 'Alas, alas!' he caught hold of her, and said, 'Daughter Son'vati, agree to this. (230) First cut off your father's head, and then your brother's.' Sons'vati heard this much and became much perplexed. She, however, spared Indarman, and answered her father, 'How often have I warned this brother, but he heeded not my words. Last night I had a dream from Śiva.' (235) So much heard Indarman, and in a rage he blazed up like burning coals. Cried he, 'I will have a canal dug from the Ganges to this place, and will fetch here Śiva's discus itself. Flowers will I supply from the garden, so that you may do your worship at home.' No one knows the arts of women. She turned the subject, and began to speak disparagingly of Bagh Rūdal. (240) 'He! Oh, he is the man that was turned out of Soīrhi. The king Jhingrā turned him out. He is the slave of a foreign master. How could he aspire to marry Sons'vati?'

Then Indarman sent with Sons'vati her five sisters-in-law, and called out to nurse Munīgyā, 'O Nurse, hear my words! Whatever you see occur in Śiva's temple you must send word to me about it at once.'

(245) The litter of Sons'vati started, and she entered the temple. The temple had fifty-two gates, and inside them all went Sons'vati. When she saw the image of Śiva she began to grieve in her heart. 'Nurse, nurse,' she called, 'My blessing be upon nurse Munīgyā! The flowers in my basket have run short. Go and fetch some from the garden.' (250) So much heard the nurse, and she was delighted in her heart. She took a golden flower-basket in her hands, and went to the garden.

Dēvā, the Brāhmaṇ, was seated there when the nurse arrived. Rudely said she, 'Sir, hear my words! Of what country is the king who has come and encamped in the garden? (255) You will have to pay tribute for the garden. Give me my tribute.' Then called out Dēvā, 'My blessing be upon nurse Munīgyā! I am Duniyā Śiṅgh, king of Loh'gāti. I am come at the invitation of Sam Dévā. I am come to comply with his invitation.' So much heard the nurse, and in a rage she blazed up like burning coals. (260) She began to speak disparagingly of Bagh Rūdal. 'The slave of a foreign master, Rūdal earns his bread from a stranger. How can that Rūdal be so audacious as to aspire to Sons'vati's hand?' (When Rūdal heard these words) his heart burned within him, and from the soles of his feet he blazed up like burning coal, as he cried, 'She is only a nurse, and dares to reply thus. Then what audacity is this of mine (compared with hers).'

(265) He leaped towards the nurse, seized her by the wrist and threw her to the ground. He tore off the border of her garment and the precious strings of her bodice, and dishonoured her as she screamed, 'Rām, Rām.'

Sons'vati's nurse fled from the garden (270) begin. Usually the villain of the combat strikes three intellectual blows at the hero, who then goes in and wins.

**Kṛṣṇa** is connected with **kṛṣṇa** unripe, hence 'hard,' hence the word means the sound produced in beating a hard substance. Thus they say कचरे गार वद, I will give you a beating which will make a great sound.

**For 'All, the son-in-law of Muhammad and the patron of the Shi'a Musalmāns.**

**In all these battles, it seems to have been etiquette not to strike the first blow. There is generally a contest of politeness between the combatants as to who is to**
August, 1885.] The Song of Alha's Marriage. 215

to where her mistress was sitting in Siva's temple. Said she to the nurse, 'O Nurse, my blessing be upon you! With whom had you an assignation that you stayed so long away?' Then screamed out the nurse, 'My blessing be upon Son'vatì! Your husband's younger brother, Bagh Rúdal, has come to the garden. (275) Your nurse's life has not been saved from him. O Son'vatì, protect me!' When she heard the name of Rudélà, Son'vatì was delighted. 'The very boon which I asked for in the temple of Siva has come to me.' So much is the narrative about Son'vatì, now hear about Rúdal.

Bagh Rúdal mounted his horse Benuliyà, and Débà his horse Hansà, (280) and the former made his horse to fly and arrived at Siva's temple. He tied his horse at the gate, and entered. The eyes of Son'vatì fell upon him, and she ran away to the inner window. She caused a golden bed to be spread, and a golden stool to be laid, (285) and on seven carpets she made Bagh Rúdal sit. Reverently said Son'vatì, 'My blessing be upon Lord Rúdal! Where is that girl born for whom you are ready to fight?' Bagh Rúdal replied, 'My blessing be upon my sister-in-law Son'vatì. Twelve years have passed and my brother is still a bachelor. (290) I shall pull down the fort of Nainágâr and marry him to Son'vatì.' So much heard Princess Son'vatì, and she was filled with delight. 'My husband's younger brother is a hungry warrior. Let me give him food to eat.' She sent for cows' milk and made khéla** mixed with lumps of sugar. 'Eat, eat, Lord Rúdal, the only hope of my life is in you.' (295) But Rúdal answered roughly and said, 'O sister-in-law, pay heed to my request! I have taken an oath in Moh'bà fort that I will neither eat nor drink (till I have accomplished my purpose). To me water is as unlawful as if it were wine, and food as if it were beef.' Then called out Son'vatì, 'O Muṅgiyà, my blessing be upon you. Play the sports of the Hûlî with my brother-in-law.' (300) So they mix abâ in Siva's temple. Some of them chuck him under the chin,** and others pat his checks.** They empty pitchers full of mud upon his body. His silken loin-cloth, and his brown wrapper are wet through. His sheet studded with small pearls is besmeared with mud. (305) Then said Rúdal, 'O Lord Débà, hear my words. I am not the slave of women, that I should forget myself amongst these females. I am the slave of weapons, happen what Sílâ and Râm may ordain.' He sent for a roll of betel which he filled** with lea[n]d (bullets). Then uttering a charm he struck the nurse with it, and the spangle on her forehead was thereby smashed to pieces. (310) The nurse ran away to save her life.

The court of Indar'mà, full of great lords, was assembled in the palace, and at that time the nurse arrived in his presence. She rolled** on the ground under the bed and cried, 'O king Indar'mà, hear my request. King Bagh Rúdal has come and surrounded the litter of Son'vatì. (315) He wishes to marry by force. Is there any strength in your thighs? Then go and rescue her.' In his heart king Indar'mà was sorrowful, and in his heart he grieved. 'Time on time have I warned Son'vatì, but she would not heed my words.'

He set a roll** of betel on the carpet. Nine hundred thousand rolls were put. (320) 'If any king would fight with Rúdal, let him chew one of these rolls.' The jaws of the warriors trembled, the very thirty-two teeth in their mouths shook. They replied, 'Let him whose life is a burden to him go and be killed by Rúdal.' But Lah'râ Singh took up a roll and put it into his mouth.** Then he caused the war-drum to be beaten, and the drum-sticks to sound 'jújham jújham.' (325) One by one the army collected till there were fifty-two and ninety thousands. The old men and those who had children were not counted in it, when

---

**lit. you have tightened your loin-cloth.
** Milk boiled down till it is thick.
** The red powder thrown about at the Hûlî festival. It is also mixed with water and squirited from syringes.
** Khand is a chuck under the chin. Sometimes the meaning is extended to a dig in the ribs.
** A wès means to rub between the finger and thumb.
** Sâhí means 'silken,' but the meaning is doubtful.

---

** See section here means 'fill.'
** abâ is metri grättà for khâ and, more properly, abâ, lit. she eats (the act of rolling).
** This is the regular ceremony for calling for volunteers for any hazardous enterprise. It is frequently referred to in this class of songs. Of Chand, Revāta, 16. [Also Legende of the Paujâb, passim.—Ed.]
** lit. under his jaw.
the armies were not numbered.\(^{49}\) The king brought out fifty-two male elephants with short tusks, and sixteen hundred tuskers. There was altogether a circle of ninety hundred elephants, while above them hovered war-balloons.\(^{48}\) The mountaineers came down from the mountains, and the Lakáš\(^{48}\) started armed with swords. (330) Bāgāl\(ī\)s mighty in arms came from Bāgāl and Māra\(h\)ṭā\(s\) (Māra\(h\)ṭā\(s\)), whose (cannons) took) balls weighing full nine mans,\(^{48}\) came from the South. Nine hundred cannons belonging to the king came, besides thirteen thousand which he borrowed. Fifty-two carts were loaded with flints, fifty-three with gunpowder, and thirty-two with lead. Naked swords were also loaded (on carts). (335) Against one Rūḍal and one Dēbā, ninety hundred thousand horsemen started. For fifty-two kos\(^{47}\) around he caused beat of drum to be made inviting men to come in and take advances of a hundred rupees on their monthly pay; but that if any one ran away at the time of battle, he would be loaded with nine mans of fetters.

The bugle\(^{49}\) sounded in the battalion,\(^{49}\) (340) and the army of Lāh\(rā\) started, O gentlemen! like torrents of rain from a cloud. The horsemen who fought with gunpowder\(^{10}\) were seven hundred and fifty thousand in number, so the army of Lāh\(rā\) started, and came within sight of the temple of Śiva. He caused guns to be set at all the fifty-two doors of the temple; so Rūḍal, Rūḍal, was surrounded\(^{72}\) in the temple of Śiva. (345) His heart was in a flame, and he leaped upon his horse. Then he slapped his left elbow with his right hand, and at the sound the fifty-two temples fell down. Then said king Lāh\(rā\) Siṅgh, 'O Rūḍal, pay heed to my words! Depart from hence and you will be saved from your fate.' But Bagh Rūḍal paid no heed, and cried saying, 'Hear the word of virtue.'\(^{35}\) From words they came to quarrelling, and then to wrangling. Who could stop the wordy warfare? Fiercely they began to ply their scimitars. 'Tār\(t\)ār, tār\(t\)ār' hissed the scimitars, and 'khiṭār khaṭār' the swords, 'sān san sān san' whizzed the bullets, so that on neither side could the ears (of the warriors) bear to hear the terrible noise. A hundred and sixty horsemen, who fought with gunpowder fell, (355) for just as a carpenter cuts down the trees of the forest, so did Rūḍal leap and hack. A stream, half Ganges water and half blood, flowed. Foot-soldiers fell on foot-soldiers, and horsemen on horsemen. In the stream the shields floated resembling tortoises, and the swords like alligators. Knives and daggers floated like sīdhrī fish and ate up the soldiers. (360) In the battalion of ninety thousand men only ten escaped. Then Lāh\(rā\) Siṅgh bound Rūḍal with an oath to spare his life, saying, 'Always will I be thankful to Bagh Rūḍal.' So much heard Rūḍal and he was delighted, and turned back (from the attack). Then Lāh\(rā\) Siṅgh attacked him a second time with greater violence\(^{13}\) (365) and calling upon the name of All,\(^{13}\) drew his scimitar. As he struck at Rūḍal, Dēbā immediately warded off the blow. Then Rūḍal's heart burst into flame, and he leaped fifty-two cubits into the air, and so struck he Lāh\(rā\) that his corpse rolled upon the earth. Away then fled the army of Lāh\(rā\) to Naināgārāh.
(370) to where Indar’man was sitting in court. They cried to Indar’man to save their lives. When Indar’man saw them he grieved in his soul, and he himself took up one of the rolls of betel, which he had deposited as a challenge. He called for his elephant Bhauñ-rānand, and had it fed with nine manas of bhang,19 (375) and taking only ten soldiers with him, as a quiet battalion, started. In a moment’s walk he arrived at Śiva’s temple. Rūdal’s horse, which was tied there, saw the battalion, and lamenting, called upon Dēvī to save his life. Dēvī came in the form of Banas’pātī (the goddess) of the forest, (380) and unyed it. The horse flew into the sky, to where Rūdal was sleeping in the temple, and wakened him with the trampling20 of its hoofs, telling him that Indar’man’s battalion had come. Rūdal leaped upon his steed and arrived in the midst of the battalion (385) and without considering whether it was a propitious time or not, he immediately21 began to use his sword.

Then began the fight between Indar’man and Rūdal in Śiva’s temple. Such a fight was it that no one had time to recognize friend from foe. The discus-headed arrows hissed ‘gan’gan gan’gan,’ and the camels cried ‘bal’bal,’ ‘San’san San’san’ whizzed the bullets, so that on neither side could the ears (of the warriors) bear to hear the terrible noise. (390) Rūdal cut down all the ten soldiers of Indar’man, and made a clear space. Then Indar’man became greatly enraged and drew his sword, but when he struck at him Rūdal received the blow on his shield which weighed eighty manas. But the shield was cut through by the stroke, and only the inside pad remained in the hand of the man behind it. The arm and rib of Rūdal was broken by the blow; (395) his horse’s shoe was broken, and the horse’s rider fell to the ground screaming ‘Rām, Rām!’ When Dēvī saw Rūdal in this parlous state, she came from Indra’s paradise to him, and dropped ambrosia2 into his throat. (400) As soon as his palate tasted it, Rūdal rose in amazement, and finding his life saved by Dēvī, fled to save it himself. Fleeing, fleeing, he arrived at Moh’bā. So much for Rūdal, now hear the account of Ālha.

Quoth he, ‘how often did I warn Bagh Rūdal, but the boy paid no heed to my words.’ (405) For fifty-two leagues in all directions did Bagh Rūdal have the drum beaten, and he wrote a letter and sent it to Tit’rī. The oilmen and shopmen of Tit’rī, terrible in arms as a black tempest, sent a letter to Nar’bar’gār, to the audience hall of king Med’ni Singh, who (on its receipt) set out for and arrived at Moh’bā. (410) So also came the kings of Mak’rannāgagh and the Moraṅgh22 and Bhūwan Singh the king of Si’l’hat, Sur’jan Singh the king of Dillī came, and the old Saiyad of Banhras,23 with his nine sons and eighteen grandsons. He could stop lowering24 clouds. Very terrible was he in the fight25 (415) Miyān Meh’dī of Kābul came, who ate his food in his hand.26 He will fly in the air as he fights, and the corpses of those killed by him will be eaten by fairies. Came King Lākhan Singh with lākhs on lākhs of horsemen. Naunamīṇi came whose sword27 weighed nine manas28 and whose grindstone weighed a hundred and twenty-five manas.29 He was a leader amongst a hundred heroes. How can I describe his entrenchments? (420) Bhūwan Singh, the king of Si’l’hat came.30 Rūdal quickly summoned every king who could fight. All who could fight, and who owned a lāk and a quarter of cavalry he summoned. So much is the account of the kings, now hear about Rūdal.

He threw down the rolls of betel30 and took one up himself. (425) He caused war-kettle-

---

19 It has the property of infuriating elephants.
20 चाँड is for चाँडों oblique of चाँड or चाँड, present participle of चाँड ‘go,’ immediately on going.
21 पुष्प is the soft pad of cotton on which scents (such as agar of roses) are dropped, as on a sponge. It is also used to mean the bed of cleaned cotton on which a person is laid when suffering severely from eruptive diseases. Thus they say ‘पुष्पोलाका निकस्सित, कि कुंवर के पास पर शुद्धी में गाई’ ‘So badly has the small-pox come out on him that I have put him to lie on a cotton pad.’ पुष्प or चाँड is the inner throat.
22 The Moraṅgh is the Eastern end of the Nepāl Tarā. 
23 He was Tālā, a great friend and ally of the Banāphala. See Summary of the Aīk Khand, post. Compare Mr. Waterfield’s translation of the Kanaṇjī version of that poem, Cal. Rev. Vol. LXXI., p. 360. — And Mirā Tālān the Saiyid in Banhras then abode;
And by his banner nine stout sons
And eighteen grandsons rode.
24 चांड means, ‘hanging as if about to rain’. I have only noted its use in connection with clouds.
25 lit. in arms.
26 As he rode to the meeting, so hastened he.
27 lit. iron.
28 About six cuf.
29 About four and a half tons.
30 This line is repeated twice. ** See note to line 319.
drums to be sounded, and the drumsticks sounded 'kaṟim kaṟim.' Quickly he sent for Álhā, 'O brother, come with me! I will celebrate your marriage with Sen'vat, night and day will the swords be plied.'

Gaṅgan, the washerman of Dar'gauli, had fifty-two asses tied at his door. On these he loaded his maces; terrible as a black tempest was he in the fight. (430) Dānī the Koiri of the Baburl forest, who had a lākh of cavalry mounted on Siāghin horses, came. So the battle of Bagh Rūdal started, with its three hundred thousand cavalry. After a journey of a night and a day they arrived at their destination, and in Dar'gauli did they pitch their tents. Folding his hands Rūdal asked his brother to attend to his instructions. (435) Then leaving a guard of nine hundred soldiers over Álhā he went to Indar'man's paradise. He went, having bought vermillion of the immortals. So much is the account of Rūdal, now hear the tale of Naināghār.

The bard of Naināghār was a tale-bearer, and so he went into the audience chamber of Indar'man (saying), 'Rūdal's brother is Alī 'gaṛjar, and he is encamped at Dar'gauli.' (440) There is an army of three hundred thousand men with Álhā!' Folding his hands respectfully he said, 'My blessing be upon the lord Indar'man. If you give me the order, I will call him here.' At hearing so much, king Indar'man was delighted and exclaimed, 'The day on which you bring Álhā here, on that day will I give you half the kingdom of Nainā.' (445) The bard went forth from Naināghār and arrived at Dar'gauli: folding his hands he said, 'Lord Álhā, king of kings, hear me. The sword will not be plied in Naināghār, and the marriage will take place peaceably.' Álhā folded his hands and replied, 'O Bard, hear the truth! I will not go to Naināghār; (if I did), I would fall into calamity.' (450) But the bard took an oath, 'O lord Álhā, hear my words! Let him who deceives a king be washed away by the Ganges.' So Álhā's palanquin started in great pomp, and in two and a half ghārs arrived at Naināghār, accompanied by nine hundred bearers. (455) They entered into the fort where Indar'man was seated. Indar'man leaped upon Álhā, and seizing him by the wrist cast him to the earth. With fifty-two rows of string he tied his hands behind his back, and packed him up in a sack. Then he put him upon a barge and cried, 'Brother Chhōtāk, my blessing be upon you. (460) Take Álhā away and drown him in the Ganges.' Chhōtāk made ready a battalion of a hundred and twenty-five thousand men, and arrived at the Ganges' bank. There they sank him in the Ganges. They sank Álhā in the water, but he being the immortal son of Jāsā was not drowned.

In the meantime Rūdal came back to camp from Indar'man's paradise. (465) The palaquin-bearers are weeping in Dar'gauli, 'O lord Rūdal, take some measures. They have drowned Álhā: they have drowned him in the Ganges.' Rūdal leaped upon his horse and arrived at the Ganges' bank.

The fight with Chhōtāk commenced. 'Tar-tar tar-tar' shrieked the seimitas, and 'khaṭar khaṭar' the swords. (470) As a wolf falls upon goats, so fell Rūdal upon the battalion. Those whom he caught by the leg and flung to the ground were torn to pieces. He cut off the heads of the elephants, and they floated in the water like little boats. He smote the camels a slap, and they fell down with their legs in the air. The hundred and twenty-five thousand men-at-arms of Chhōtāk were cut to pieces. (475) Then he smote Chhōtāk, and left his head in two. Away fled Chhōtāk's soldiers to king Indar'man's audience hall. 'A hard warrior,' say they, 'is Bagh Rūdal, he has cut us all to pieces, and cleared the field.' So much is the tale of Indar'man, now hear about Rūdal.

He took Álhā out of the barge and laid him on the ground. (480) Then when he opened the sack and saw his brother, Rūdal smote his chest with his mighty hand. He put him into the palaquin, and escorted him to Dar'gauli. So much is the tale of Álhā, now hear about Indar'man.

He threw down the rolls of betel and took up one himself. He made the war-music play and the instruments sounded 'jujhām, 

---

30 lit. swinging: cf. note to line 110.
31 This is the forest where An'rā Gurd, the spiritual preceptor of the Bāṅphals, lived.
32 বন, from বন, 'run,' means the goal which run-
33 This line is quite unintelligible. The singer himself did not know its meaning.
34 i.e., through or by means of (ৰ্থ) virtue.
(455) One by one an army assembled; an army of fifty-two and ninety thousands. Fifty male elephants with small tusks, and three thousand single tuskers. Nine hundred of his own canons he took, and three thousand he borrowed and yoked. He borrowed twelve-barrelled cannons, and loaded them with balls. He borrowed eight-barrelled cannons and loaded them with knives. (490) Then the kings all swore, 'Shame upon our lives; let us go and cut them off, and clear the field.' Indar'man's army started, and came to Siva's temple. There he fired a cannon as a salute, and caused war-music to be played. The news of this was taken to Rüdāl. Cried he, 'Brother Álā, hear my words! (495) Make ready the army, and let us haste to Siva's temple.' So the army went forth to Siva's temple. Then said King Indar'man, 'Lord Rüdāl, hear my words! Depart from hence and you will be saved from your fate.' But called out Bagh Rüdāl, 'My blessing be upon King Indar'man! (500) Perform Son'vati's nuptial ceremonies. Why do you prolong the conflict?' Then the fight began, and fiercely were the swords plied. Foot-soldier fell on foot-soldier, and horseman upon horseman. The earth did not attack the foot soldiers, nor did horses their riders. (Rüdāl) split into two parts the heads of all the elephant-drivers. (505) The fight lasted for six months, but still king Indar'man did not retreat. Then Bagh Rüdāl went to Son'vati, and folding his hands said, 'Sister-in-law, my blessing be upon you. He cannot be killed by anyone. Only you can cut him down, and when you will cut your brother down, then your marriage will take place.' (510) So much heard Son'vati and she was delighted in her heart. She took her magic scimitar in her hand, and disguising herself as a man, hastened out followed by Rüdāl. When Indar'man and Son'vati saw each other, the former cried out, 'Blessed be God! (515) My enemy, my sister, has at length come.' He drew his scimitar and attacked her, but she received the blow on her shield, and then she struck Indar'man, and left his head in two. The blood of Indar'man flowed from his body, and Son'vati fled away to save her life. (520) Then called out Bagh Rüdāl, 'O Brother, follow my advice.' And his whole battalion went to the Ganges' bank and there bathed, and then started for and arrived at Nainágār. There Rüdāl addressed Sam Dévā. (525) 'My Lord, my blessing be upon you!' Perform now Son'vati's nuptial ceremonies, why should you prolong the conflict?' So much heard Sam Dévā and he was filled with delight, and cried he, 'Do you now perform the nuptial ceremonies. Why should you prolong the conflict.' Rüdāl heard this and was filled with delight. Now hear about Sam Dévā.

He got filled a fresh mahād tree, (530) and six green bamboos. With scimitars he thached it, and he sent for nine hundred learned men and made them sit within it. Golden pitchers placed he under the canopy. The stools he has placed therein were made of the backs, (535) and the ploughshare out of their thighs, and the (four-wick) lamps out of their skulls. All in the midst of the canopy.

Rüdāl's battalion came and entered beneath the canopy, and there they found seated the old man Madan Siṅgā, Son'vati's grandfather. (540) He roared under the canopy, so that its ten doors shook. Said the old man Madan Siṅgā, 'You caitiff Rüdāl, hear my words! How great is the audacity of Bagh Rüdāl that he would marry my daughter?' So battle ensued under the canopy: a severe fight it was. Nine mams of snuff were scattered in the air, as they fought with logs of wood. Bricks rained in showers under the canopy, and Rüdāl began to grieve in his heart. Half his battalion was cut to pieces and in the
marriage canopy the golden pitchers sunk.118 Invoking the aid of Mother Devi he drew his sword and smote old Madan Singh, so as to sever his head from his body.

(550) With folded hands Sam Deva said, 'My blessing be on lord Rudal. Celebrate now Sonvati's nuptials.' So they called nine hundred learned men, and at midnight they summoned the bridegroom. There they sat Sonvati down and celebrated her marriage with Allah. So was it done: by force was the marriage celebrated.

(555) Nine hundred prisoners were confined in the canopy and he cut all their fetters as they cried, 'May you live for ever, lord Rudal, and may your sword be ever famous.'119

So the litter of Sonvati started and came within sight of Mohab, and by travelling night and day it arrived there.

Text.

|| 1. Bhag Gita Bhagavad 

| 1.1 | लागल कहरी वव भाला के गैला वड़े वड़े बुनालान कहरी उदवन के विसनन के दरसार नौ सी मामा नामूर के नामती की चंद्र तरार बैठल बाकन दिक्की के लोहा यात्री तीन हरार मधुरा निरहा रमण कर्मदार है विन के बैठल कुंभ चंद्रान

| 5 | भाँड़ु उमकन्या मुखमहिमा हे बाहु बैठल महिमाचाल नाथ करवे बैलाम में सुमिरार वन बाल युगुरु सुरुमुर सज्जा सार्जी जिने के रूबरु रवे नज़र

| 9 | तलाय चार नन बनने के मुखदर निताना नाथ नवं पृथिविया सिल्ल टीप के जोड़ा नाथ गोपालखर चरान

| 10 | तोका नाथ बैलामा के बैलाम होय परी के नाथ सात मन का खुशी दत दन का नगर नाम चाँदाह सबबी वन गेल ने मे मोकल चमतक बैठह बती बहरे के शाहा बती बहराव राय पुर्णता फिर गेल चौधर के चिरिया मैतेन के धर

| 15 | बोहरा कब्र के राष्ट्राका के लड़कीया शर बच नाम जबर बटा है बासर के यथा करने तीन बोहरा किन्ने के चलने गरी ही पटे गाँव भुगरार बौहिं स्नात फूल बुड़ान बैलामा में पहुंच चल बाप देवल गुर्जर फूल के भाला मने के गरे गुनान

| 20 | देखिया देखी नीर धूलिम मुहम्न देखी उदास

---

118 In the stream of blood.
119 'may it be famous'; lit. 'may it sound.'
बाद जनमत नू हु चमरा पर बुझा नित उठ कुटाव
चाम

बाद हमार रचनाम के वाग भी जीवन है दिन चार

चार दिन के निम्नगामी सिर चौथी रात

बाद हमारा रचनाम के वाग में जीवन है दिन चार।

चार दिन के निम्नगामी सिर चौथी रात

धैव शीमा ही दिन लीजा चाम का करिहे भवानव

धैव शीमा ही दिन लीजा चाम का करिहे भवानव

मे किसा निम्नगामी सिर चार के निम्नगामी सिर नहीं चाहे।

मे किसा निम्नगामी सिर चार के निम्नगामी सिर नहीं चाहे।

बल में फुलान चाचा चाह दिन लीजा चाम का करिहे भवानव।

चाम चार दिन के निम्नगामी सिर चार के निम्नगामी सिर नहीं चाहे।

रचना चाम का करिहे भवानव।

चाम चार दिन के निम्नगामी सिर चार के निम्नगामी सिर नहीं चाहे।

रचना चाम का करिहे भवानव।
| जन के मछरी बहरी होय गैल डैट्ट कान बहर होय जाय 135 |
| बसला चढ़ेत सिव बी मगल देवी रोज अमित के लोग कहाँ है राजा प्रतिव बिहारी मॉर पुलवारी कैल उदार सुनें पीछे राह सदनरम हमारे चमड़े की दिमाग कार्य सही विचार देवी इन्द्रानन्द से चलना बनाय पढ़ी पढ़ाई का अन्तर में डूबन पत्ती जाय 140 |
| बदल सुने लुढ़कर में बहरी देवी दुमली बनाय देशल सुरत बदल के देवी मन करे गुणान बढ़ा पुराने के ई लारिसा है जिन्हें के नैन के से जो पाँई में समन इन्द्रानन्द का कट करी मैदान 144 |
| नीचे दूं गैल बन बदल के बदल बन लीज चारी शरीर हाय बाँड़ के बदल बदल देवी सुनि गुणि बाज हमार बायन बाज के भोग देव मैदा दूर रवाल भोग बदल बदल के देवी शरीर मान हमार प्रत्येक नीचे दूं गैल देह के देवी बाज के संतोष गाज़ी तब मूँ देवी देह कुदा महारानी बदल महाराज 150 |

| बिब ना बाजल मौर देवी के पकड़ नाना बाज सरकार 175 |
| प्रत्येक बौली पकड़े सुने गैल पकड़े रोज में के लोग धर था कौन कुली पकड़े देवी सुनी बाज हमार बाज राजा बन बदल बदल में बड़ बदल पार भागल देवी इन्द्रानन्द यह ना छुटना पान हमार भागल देवी इन्द्रानन्द से में गैल बनाय 180 |
| बाबन के गाजा का बदल में बेड में सोने भूरी बनाय |

| लग याजार चारी के सोने पूरी तार लग चारी जो भी के सोने भूरी बनाय पान खबराया पान लगाने केल हाथ जोड़ मैल ठाल केल तो लौटी जूता केल केल पानी लेनें लाय 185 |
| बाहर समन देवी पदुल लीजी को बन बाज के लग बाजा ले बाहर राजा बन बदल बदल में उड़ा मिलने लाय गोली विभ्राण के बाहर राजा के नीचे भूरी बाज हमार |

| नाम बदल के युवा के सोने बड़ महान होय बाज लौटी रैनी के लगकर देह के सोने बाज मन बाज बाल मन हानी में सिव बाबा के सिव पूरा चलन बाज आधा भी देवी मौर बायन के लांग उड़ा यून सीता है गहना के बड़ा के ले पाह उड़ा 190 |
| सुलह बदल हारा के किह में राजा देव लमारे स्लैम पिन्च के महाराज के मीट बाज की बाज बीलिया प्रेम मुहर के बेड में बायन नद लगाय परे पी बैनी पड़ गोल गाज़ी चुरिया के कहलकर सोमें नागिया कुन्दुरिया में जिन्हें के बाजर चमके देव 195 |

| सात वाज के मैंत देव के पूरा ढंग है लिना में सोने बाज बड़ा नूद गैल पवार पर बैट नये बाजर नाम काँड दरनी मूढ़ देवी सोने मनं करे गुणान मर जा शेर राजा इन्द्रानन्द परे बाहर राजा के सीता बाज राजा बाज सरकार |
| निकल देवी चारी के सोने के सिव बाज नूद बाज कहाँ के राजा पूरा बाज की बाजर ना डूंगर राजा के कूर खेत भी बाजर | 200 |

| लाज़े बेड मौर इन्द्रानन्द बाबू कूरल बाजर बाज | 205 |
हारिया है सोनों के निन्द भरे बरी ब्राह्मण न्र राजाओ दृश्य प्रेम के
बैठने जा गुरु आ दृष्ट्य दो में दृष्टा धरार वान गुण के जोती बीसी सोनी दुध गौर बाली वाली
पूर्ण उत्तराण में आती के पुलवार में पूर्ण ले भा-
य तथा
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध के दृष्टी वह महान हो आय
सोनी निवाल में वराम मधूर बनाय
दृष्टन राजा दृष्टा ब्राह्मण वहाँ वेलै सोनी बनाय
कड़वा दुध ती दृष्टी दृष्टा नागर बाली दुध नागरी के मोर दृष्टी दृष्टा दृष्टा
तत्त्व नागर दृष्टा बाली उमािया दृष्टी के बली
अभी
हम के राजा लोग मारे के दृष्टी सिंह नाम हमार
नामे दृष्टी समरे के उसे के में वेलै पुराण में नाम
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध चुने ने दृष्टी बाज दृष्टी ने दृष्टी ने दृष्टी के भेल बाली दृष्टा
हृदय दृष्टा दृष्टा में दृष्टा दृष्टा के जो दृष्टा के के दृष्टांक
बिनाय
गठ करता है वरुल दृष्टा के तराये से रे चाँगा दृष्टी
हो के उत्तर दे दृष्टा के सोनी दृष्टा हमार
चुपक राजा है वरुल दृष्टा के दृष्टा हमारे आय
पकड़ पूछ ने दृष्टी के दृष्टा के दृष्टा के
दृष्टा दृष्टा दृष्टा के दृष्टा के
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध राजा दृष्टा के दृष्टा दृष्टा
के सी दृष्टा के दृष्टा के
प्रज्ञा वेलै सुध दृष्टा के दृष्टा के
के सी दृष्टा के
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध के दृष्टा के
के सी दृष्टा के
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध के दृष्टा के
के सी दृष्टा के
हम के राजा लोग मारे के दृष्टी सिंह नाम हमार
नामे दृष्टी समरे के उसे के में वेलै पुराण में
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध चुने ने दृष्टी बाज दृष्टी ने दृष्टी बाज
हृदय दृष्टा दृष्टा में दृष्टा दृष्टा के जो दृष्टा के
बिनाय
गठ करता है वरुल दृष्टा के तराये से रे चाँगा दृष्टी
हो के उत्तर दे दृष्टा के सोनी दृष्टा हमार
हम के राजा लोग मारे के दृष्टी सिंह नाम हमार
नामे दृष्टी समरे के उसे के में वेलै पुराण में
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध चुने ने दृष्टी बाज दृष्टी ने दृष्टी बाज
हृदय दृष्टा दृष्टा में दृष्टा दृष्टा के जो दृष्टा के
बिनाय
गठ करता है वरुल दृष्टा के तराये से रे चाँगा दृष्टी
हो के उत्तर दे दृष्टा के सोनी दृष्टा हमार
हम के राजा लोग मारे के दृष्टी सिंह नाम हमार
नामे दृष्टी समरे के उसे के में वेलै पुराण में
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध चुने ने दृष्टी बाज दृष्टी ने दृष्टी बाज
हृदय दृष्टा दृष्टा में दृष्टा दृष्टा के जो दृष्टा के
बिनाय
गठ करता है वरुल दृष्टा के तराये से रे चाँगा दृष्टी
हो के उत्तर दे दृष्टा के सोनी दृष्टा हमार
हम के राजा लोग मारे के दृष्टी सिंह नाम हमार
नामे दृष्टी समरे के उसे के में वेलै पुराण में
प्रज्ञा वेलै दुध चुने ने दृष्टी बाज दृष्टी ने दृष्टी बाज
हृदय दृष्टा दृष्टा में दृष्टा दृष्टा के जो दृष्टा के
बिनाय
गठ करता है वरुल दृष्टा के तराये से रे चाँगा दृष्टी
हो के उत्तर दे दृष्टा के सोनी दृष्टा हमार
भाईल सोंवी घरघर बिलकुल भांत बांधा। आज यौने बांधा बिलकुल दास, दास के मुमक में देखने देख देख देख 285
हाय जोड़े के सोंवी दोलन बुड़ा फुड़े के बले जायां जायां
कभी जैसे आयत जैसे पर भैलने पाली जैसे बांधे राजा बन जैसे दुर्ग के सोंवी के बले जायां
बार बार वर्तमान भव भव भव भव भव भव भव भव भव भव भव 295
उसने अंग आन्दोलन था, जो बोले बांधे रा बन दुर्ग भव के सोंवी के बले जायां।
नाम सोंवी नाम सोंवी सुन गैल गैल सोंवी बड़ महान होय बायां
भुज गारी जैसे मील देख हैं देख के में देखने देख देख देख देख देख 300
के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300
पार के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख के जैसे हैं देख 300

गनगन गनगन चकर बान बौले बिन्ह के बनवन बौले डूंगट
समज समज गौली वरसे दुर दल का छलन नाहि आया
दसी तिलका इंद्रमन के सुदंड का कैल मैदान 359
गोसा और भैल इंदरमन सीधे लेन तरार
रई तक माराल व दुल के भासी मन के शानन पर लेन वचाय
दलिया कट के व दुल के गंध रहल मर के पास दुल ले डूंगट के बाबु बुलांत पलाज के हाद नाल ले डूंगट के गिरन वहाँ तुगा से 395
dरघु पर गिरल राम राम विस्तिरण
पहल नबिरहा है दीवी दुल पर लड़ गैल दीवी
बाई दीवी इंद्रमन के सुदंड का पहुँच बाय
धर्मित सिद्धा दे दुल के ये पर ते मैं गैल मानान तक बांट दुल के रुखे उठे विस्तिरण 400
मान बचाई दीवी दुल के रुखे दुल के रुखे गैल पराय
भागल भागल गैल मोहा मैं गैल पराय
प्रती बाराला वा दुल के आला के सुविच वर्मन के तली मोही बाबु दुल के लोका कह कर मनु वैर
बाबुवन की को गिरदा मैं बाबु दुल दिगरी देल विद्वान
नवल पौती बबु दुल तिली मैं देल बड़वाय
तेली बर्मिया दुल तिली के लोहा मैं प्रसिद्ध कान पौती भेद धर कर गई राजा मेडी निक दे दुल वरार चलन जे राजा वा मेडी निक मोहा मैं पहुँच आय
बाबु राजा महर्षि वा दुल के आला पहुँच चलन जे राजा वा सिलहट के भूमि निक नम धराय
बाबु राजा दिखी के मुरझा निक
बुद्धि सैयद बगारस के तौर पर पर पर जेब राजा मेडी निक के दरार चलन जे राजा वा लालसिंह लिंक लाल सिंह खैर
भू मैं निक नीमिता के सता सी मन के साथ
उध के मुरझा प्रसे का बन्न की सी बीन के समार
बाबु राजा वा सिलहट के भूमि निक नम धराय
बेंता जे राजा वा लड़ाई दुल तुरत लेन बोधाय
भेंता ज़े वा लड़ीया बिने के सवा लाख च्छस्वार
क्रूँता बारा वा राजा के रूढ़िल के सुदीप हवाल बीड़ा पड़ गैल वाम रूढ़िल के बाल बीड़ा चला लौटयाम
माफ़ु उठा चक्कर ला में चुक राज चले तरसर गजन बेही दरगीली के बाल गदन ओले दुर्भाग युक्त लाल 428
dानी कोरी बच्ची वन के सिरहान लाख गोड़े च्छस्वारण
चलन के पल्टन वप रूढ़िल के बिने के तीन लाख च्छस्वारण
गाँव दिनाय का चलन भागा पर पुंज़ल बाय
उड़ा तिरारे दरगीली के हूँड़ा गेरो वन के विरोध बीड़ा म्यून के घरी पती मारी भाके वाला नी ली चिरारी के वर्षा चाल में देखौ देख वाल 438
रूढ़िल चलन दरगीले में वाम कमर खेड़ा चिन के गैल वाला
प्रति बारा वा रूढ़िल के नेना गढ़ के दुनी हवाल बेंचुना चौला वा नेना के राजा दरगीलन के गैल दरवार रूढ़िल के भाद बारत यम है दरगीली में उड़ा गेरो वन के नेना लाख पल्टन साथ में वा चाला के तैलारी बाय
हाथ ओड़े के चेहरा बीड़ा बाबू इंदरमन के बाल जानी है दुसूं के गाईरे इंदरमन के चाला के लेरी है बीड़ा प्रति बेंचुना मुल इंदरमन राजा बड़े मजन ही मैने हवाल
उस दिन नासे चाला के तेरे दिन नासा राज नेना के देख बनाए
चलन के भेंटा वा नेना गढ़ के दरगीली में पड़ौन बाय
हाथ ओड़े के भेंटा बीड़ा बाबू इंदरमन के बाल जानी है दुसूं के गाईरे इंदरमन के चाला के लेरी है बीड़ा प्रति बेंचुना मुल इंदरमन राजा बड़े मजन ही मैने हवाल
हाथ ओड़े के भेंटा बीडियां बाबू इंदरमन के बाल जानी है दुसूं के गाईरे इंदरमन के चाला के लेरी है बीडियां प्रति बेंचुना मुल इंदरमन राजा बड़े मजन ही मैने हवाल
हाथ ओड़े के भेंटा बीडियां बाबू इंदरमन के बाल जानी है दुसूं के गाईरे इंदरमन के चाला के लेरी है बीडियां प्रति बेंचुना मुल इंदरमन राजा बड़े मजन ही मैने हवाल
हाथ ओड़े के भेंटा बीडियां बाबू इंदरमन के बाल जानी है दुसूं के गाईरे इंदरमन के चाला के लेरी है बीडियां प्रति बेंचुना मुल इंदरमन राजा बड़े मजन ही मैने हवाल
THE SONG OF ALHA'S MARRIAGE.

अगस्त, १८८५ []

लोउँ ले पलटन उदरमण के सिव मंदिर पर पहुँचनार आये
रीप समाजी दगवाल मारु उठा देत वनानाय
खहर पहुँचन वा हळुं सन क भीमा खाँड़ा गुणीं मोर
वाह
कर तैयार पलटन के सिव मंदिर पर चली नवय
विलास पलटन सलन के सिव मंदिर पर पहुँचन वाय
बीलन राजा उदरमण बाबू हतुल सुधीं मोर वाह
देगा फेर द नजी से तोहर महा काल क आय
तन ललकारे हळुं बीलन राजा उदरमण के बाल एवं बालियों
कर द विप्रहवा सोनारी के काहे बाँड़ राय
पड़न लड़क हे पलटन मे भर चले लागल तरार
ऐद के चारे में गोर गैल धाग चारे उपर बसावार
मुखीपी वेदन के न मारे नारी गोर धागार
व्रती महानत हाथी पर सम के सिर जान दुर्गार
छोटे महीने लड़े बीलन शान न हो हठे उदरमण बीर
चलन के राजा वा हळुः सोनारी क़े गोर बनना
हां योग के हळुं बीलन मैती सोनारी के बाल
बालियों
केवल के मारल से नाम मुढ़ें वधान कर्तन बीर करार
अभी काठे बूं भेंका के तव सोनारी के होती
बियाह
प्रणाम अंशी सोनारी सुन के राती धड़ मजन होय आय
प्रणार नंगा सोनारी के के लें गोर गैल भर के भेंस
आये भागो सोनारी पांडे हळुं चलन वायन
पड़न नवारिया सोनारी के उदरमण के आई गैल रीढ़
बीलन उदरमण वाहों गोर भजन के बाल एवं
मुढ़ें बाहनी में हळुं चलन वाय
वच क्षण तना उदरमण सोनारी पर देल चलनाय
शरीफ तना उदरमण सोनारी पर दील चलनाय
शरीफ़ तना उदरमण सोनारी पर दलन पर लेल बचाय
शरीफ तना उदरमण के रिश्वा दर खड़खड़ होय वाय
लोकन मिरर उदरमण के सोनारी शरीफ लगे गैल पराय
कर लालकह धड़ मजन भेंका मैं मजन होय
कर लालकह धड़ मजन भेंका मैं मजन होय
dुके मार वात भी वे अपनी कर मजन होय
सलन के पलटन कर औजनी से भेंका गड़ पहुँचन वाय
हां बेज़े के हळुं बीलन बाल समेद्धा के बाल बालियों
A NOTE ON A SECOND OLD SANSKRIT PALMLEAF MANUSCRIPT FROM JAPAN.

BY DR. G. BUHRER, C.I.E.

Through the kindness of Professor Max Müller I am enabled to describe a very interesting find lately made in Japan. The search for ancient Sanskrit MSS. which Mr. Bunjiro Nanjo institutes there, has brought to light a second fragment, consisting of a single leaf, which possesses a high importance for Indian palaeography. According to the eye-copy before me, which appears to have been made with great care, the leaf measures 32½ centimetres by 3½. Each page contains six lines with 58-77 aksharas. Each line is broken up, according to the usage observable also in other ancient palmleaf MSS., into three parts, blank spaces of the breadth of two aksharas being left near the holes for passing the strings. The leaf appears to be well preserved, as only about a dozen aksharas have been destroyed. The writing is less carefully done than that of the Horinani Palmleaf, which is a model piece of calligraphy. There are also a number of bad clerical mistakes and some corrections. The second side, or śīna-pravṛtta, bears on the left margin the number 129, expressed by the ancient signs of the akṣarapālī, 100 + 20 + 9, which are placed vertically in the order indicated, one below the other. The sign for 100 is a variety of śū, and holds the middle between the second Gupta form in 400 (Dr. Bhagwânâla’s Table (Ind. Ant. VI. 45), and the seemingślof the Eastern copper-plates (idem) and of the Cambridge MS. No. 1702 (Bendall, Catalogue, Table of Letter-numerals). The sign for 20, tha, is a little more ancient than that used in the just-mentioned Cambridge MS. And that for 9, ९, resembles the sign of the Valabhi plates (Ind. Ant. loc. cit.). The characters of the new document are closely related to those of the Horinani Palmleaf (Anecdota Oxon. I. 3. Table VI). But they show a considerable number of older forms which connect them with the Gupta alphabet of Kuhân (Anecd. Oxon. loc. cit.), and with the oldest Nepalese inscriptions (Ind. Ant. IX. 164). Among these archaic forms the following are the most remarkable:—1, the tops of the letters kha, ɣa, and sa, are invariably round;—2, the prolongation of the vertical strokes on the left of the letters ɣha, ɣha, pa, ma, etc., is frequently wanting;—3, the small vertical stroke at the lower end of da is mostly wanting;—4, ya shows twice or thrice the trirpate form of the Gupta inscriptions, which is found also in the Nep. Insers. 1-12; more frequently the transitional form with a loop, found in the Cambridge MS. No. 1702 (Bendall, Catalogue, Table of letters); and rarely the form of H.P.;—5, ra consists occasionally of a simple vertical stroke with the serif, just as in Gu. KU. (An. Ox. III. 1, Table VI. col. IVa); more frequent is the form of Ne. Insers. No. 15 (loc. cit. col. VI.); and rarer that of H.P.;—6, a is always made triangular, the bottom-line sloping to the right;—7, a shows occasionally the form of Gu. KU. with a loop, and more frequently that of Gu. Ind. (loc. cit. cols. IVa and IVb);—8, the medial ə-stroke turns upwards not only after ja, but also after pa, and rises in the latter case from the left-hand vertical stroke; it shows besides the wedge-shape of H.P., also other varieties, found hitherto only in inscriptions;—9, medial ə has once the form of Gu. KU., in all other cases those of H.P.;—10, the division of the sentences and periods is invariably marked, as on the ancient copper-plates, by one or two very short horizontal strokes; where two strokes are used it is difficult to distinguish them from the visarga. In two points, the form of the initial a and of na, the MS. frequently agrees with the Jāhārāpāthā inscription (loc. cit. col. V.). Most peculiar is the notation of ु in ra. The latter sign looks like rã-u, because one of the u-strokes is attached to the top of the ra, while the other stands in the usual place. A similar separation of the two elements of the ु is known to me only from the inscription on the Jagayapēta Stūpa (Ind. Ant. XI. 257). All these various points indicate, it seems to me, that the new MS. is much older than the Horinani Palmleaf and Old-Kanarese Inscriptions, No. CLXIII. lines 77-78 (ante, p. 53); aui(ou)raasæ, id. l. 92; and ind-u(ou)parisæ, id. l. 108.—Ep.]
leaf, and I should not be surprised if it went back to the beginning of the fourth century of our era.

The contents of the MS. are Buddhist, and probably belong to one of the larger Sūtras. They treat of the definitions of rūpa, cēdanā, saññā, saññakāra, and viññāna, and of their origin. Short as the piece is, it furnishes several new words, hitherto not found in the Sanskrit dictionaries; vijñā, a sub-division of sanidāraṇa-rūpa (compare the verb vijñā and Pāli anāñca); saññakāra, a term which Childers supposed to be the original of the Pāli nākkhaṇa; and manāṇa, 'agreeable' (found in Pāli). The first line of the text runs as follows:—kathviśvānim
rūpaṁ, kathviśvidhā, cēdenā, saññā, saññakāra, and viññāna, and of their origin. Short as the piece is, it furnishes several new words, hitherto not found in the Sanskrit dictionaries; vijñā, a sub-division of sanidāraṇa-rūpa (compare the verb vijñā and Pāli anāñca); saññakāra, a term which Childers supposed to be the original of the Pāli nākkhaṇa; and manāṇa, 'agreeable' (found in Pāli). The first line of the text runs as follows:—kathviśvānim
rūpaṁ, kathviśvidhā, cēdenā, saññā, saññakāra, and viññāna, and of their origin. Short as the piece is, it furnishes several new words, hitherto not found in the Sanskrit dictionaries; vijñā, a sub-division of sanidāraṇa-rūpa (compare the verb vijñā and Pāli anāñca); saññakāra, a term which Childers supposed to be the original of the Pāli nākkhaṇa; and manāṇa, 'agreeable' (found in Pāli). The first line of the text runs as follows:—kathviśvānim
rūpaṁ, kathviśvidhā, cēdenā, saññā, saññakāra, and viññāna, and of their origin. Short as the piece is, it furnishes several new words, hitherto not found in the Sanskrit dictionaries; vijñā, a sub-division of sanidāraṇa-rūpa (compare the verb vijñā and Pāli anāñca);

**SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.**

**BY J. F. FLEET, Bo. C.S., M.B.A.S., C.I.E.**

(Continued from p. 142).

No. CLVII.
**BRITISH MUSEUM PLATES OF EREGANGA.**

I have already published one spurious grant of the Western Gauḍa dynasty. I now publish another spurious grant of the same dynasty, from the original plates, which belonged to Sir Walter Elliot, K.C.S.I., and have been presented by him to the British Museum. I have no information as to where they were found.

The plates are seven in number, each about 8½" long by 21¼" broad at the ends and somewhat less in the middle. The edges are slightly raised into rims, to protect the writing; and, except for a few rust-holes in the seventh plate, the plates and the inscription are in a state of perfect preservation almost throughout. The ring, on which the plates are strung, is about 3½" thick and 3½" in diameter; it had been cut when the grant came under my notice. The seal on the ring is of irregular shape, neither circular, oval, nor rectangular, and measures about 1½" by 1½"; it has, in high relief on the surface of the seal itself, and not, as is usually the case, on a countersunk surface, an elephant, standing to the proper right. The first plate has, on the outer side of it, in characters of much about the same period as those of the body of the inscription,—Vinammanā maṇaṇa-Durviṃmaṇa maṇaṇa-Dike.

---

3 See notes 12, 13, 19, 20, 31, and 32, below.
4 Conf. ante Vol. XIII. p. 275. —The name Gaṅghavas, or 'lineage of the Gaṅga,' occurs in line 34 of the Nāga-māṇa grants.

---

8 Mr. Rice translates the Nāga-māṇa grants, Mālohaḷi (ante Vol. V. p. 159ff.), and Hecār (Māveera Inscriptions, p. 234ff.) grants, in such a way as to make Avinīta another name of the next person, Kośaṇñanṛtiṇda I., called Durvīnīta. But this is not justified by the construction.
His son was the Rājā Kōṅgaṇī-śrīdha I. (l. 12), also called Durvinita, who was victorious in battle at Andarī; Ālattūr, Poruḷāre, Pelnagar, and other places not specified. His son was the Rājā Kōṅgaṇī-śrīdha II. (l. 14), also called Mokkarā. His son was the Rājā Kōṅgaṇī-śrīdha III. (l. 25), who also had the renowned name of Vikrama or Śrīvikrama, and whose mother was a daughter of Śindhurāj or the king of Śindu. His son was the Mahādhīrāj Kōṅgaṇī II. (l. 32), who also had the name of Bhūvikrama, who conquered the leader of the Pallavas (l. 35), in battle at Vīḷand, and acquired the name of Śrīvallabha, and made the whole of the Pallava dominions subject to himself (l. 37). His younger brother was Navakāma (l. 40), who seems also to have been called Dēvarāja (l. 43).

The inscription then mentions a certain Eregāṅga (l. 49),—with nothing to indicate whether this is another name of Navakāma, or one of his feudatories,—who was governing the Torenāḍu Five-hundred, the Koṅgalāḍu Two-thousand, and the Male Thousand. The rest of the inscription records a grant made by Eregāṅga of a site or village which seems to be named Pānekkōḍupāḍi (ll. 51, 54, and 64). The inscription is not dated; but the fabrication of it may be allotted to about the ninth century A.D.

Text.*

First plate.

[1] Svasti! Jitāṁ bhagavataṁ10 gata-[ghana*]—gagan-ābhēna Patma(dma) nābhēna [||*]
Śrīmat Jānnavē.

[1] ya1-kul-āmla-bhyō(vyō)m-āvabhāsana-bhāskaraḥ sva-khā(kha)dyg-aika-prah[a*]ra-khaṇḍita-
mah[a*]jīllā.

[1] stambha-lakṣha-vā(ba)la-parākramaṁ dāruṇ-ārī-gaṇa-viḍārṇa-ran(n)ai(ō)paladbha-vraṇa-vi-
[1] bhūṣhna-vibhūṣhitaṁ K[a*]vēyana-saṅgohet kṣūṁ-Jōg[a*]gavē[rah]*]mma-dha[rah*]-
mmamah[a*]dhirāja[hm*] [||*]

[1] Taṣya putraḥ pitur-总理gata-guna-yuktō vidy[a*]-vinaya-vihe[rah*]ta-vṛtaṁ samya[k*]-
pra.

Second plate; first side.

[1] jā-pālana-mātṛ[a*]dhigāṭa-rājaṣa prayaṇāṇo vidvat-kavi-kāḥ chhaṇa-nikāṣṭhōpala.11 [rah*]mma

[1] mahādhiṣṭ przecyā priya-bhāginīśyō viṣṇimbhūma-saṅkā-traya-se[m*]bhrām-āvansama-

[1] samāṭa(sta)-sāmanta-maṇḍolā vidyā-vinay-āṭiṣṭaya-paripāṭ-āntarṣīm[a*] nirvagra-

[1] ha-pradhāna-śaurya[hm*] vidvatṣa prata(tha) ma-gaṇya[hm*] śrīmat-Koṅgaṇi-mādhiṣṭa

Āvīna-tavī12 [||*]

[1] Tat-putra Andarī. Ālattū[r*]-Pporuḷāre-Pelnagar-ādy-ā(n)ēka-samara-mukha-mu(ma)khī-

āhu.

Second plate; second side.


Du[r*]yēni.

[1] ta-nāmādhīrāyā śrīmat Koṅgaṇīrvidha-rāja13 [||*] Taṣya putra[hm*] [cha*]durdaṁ-vinārda-vimbhi(mṛ)i-dita-vi-

* In the Nāγamāṅgala and Hōsr grants, this name is written 'Mushka.'

1 Mr. Rice translates the Nāgamāṅgala and Hōsr grants in such a way as to make Vīḷand, another name of Koṅgaṇi-Śrīvikrama. A reference to the text in lines 25-26 of the Nāgamāṅgala grant (that of the Hōsr grant has not been published), as well as in line 36 of the present inscription, will show that this is quite wrong. Nor can there be any justification in the Hōsr grant for the translation by which he makes the battle occur at the village of Bhūmēvākrama. This is due solely to a misunderstanding of the words samvārda-bhāva saṅgrōḍha; see lines 34-35 of the present inscription, and line 25 of the Nāgamāṅgala grant.

2 The original has svasti. There are but few instances in these plates in which the proper form of i, with the circle closed down on the letter, is used. In most places, i, with the circle not closed down on the consonant, is used indifferently for i or t. I draw attention to it here, in preference to enumerating the text with a number of corrections on this point alone.

3 Read bhagavātā. 4 Read śrīnāy-Śrīnāya.

5 The proper context is bhāṣa dēka., in line 14, down to Kṛiṣṭasūra, in line 23.
6 The passage commencing here should probably some after Kṛiṣṭasūra, in line 23.

7 Read mahādhiṣṭa-Vinīta-nāmd.

8 Read śrīmat-Koṅgaṇirvidhārājā.
Third plate; first side.


[12] Tat-pu [[]|[]].


[14] Vīñgūpa[m]*-mahā[ḥ]* dhirajāṁ [[]|[]]. Tat-patra[ḥ]* T[r]* yambaka-charaṇ-āmbōrha [[]|[]].


[16] tami[ṃ]* [ja[ḥ]*] sva-bhuja-vavala[]-parakrama-kra[ve(yi)] krita-rājan [[] kshut kshanō [[]|[]|] ah-piṣit [[]|[]]].

Third plate; second side.


[18] sannadhah[ḥ]* śrīmat(n)-Mādhava-māhadhirajāḥ [[]|[]|].


[20] lana Kri[Kri]*shpava [[] dhēy[ō]*].


[22] nātara-maṭi[ḥ]* [] Tad-ātmaja udita-ōdita-salāganti-pradhi[ti][ta]-Sindhu-rāja-duhitri-[ja].


Fourth plate; first side.


[25] kṛṣi-prayōṭṭṛi[kṛi]-kuśālō ripu-timira-nir[r]* karaṇ-ōdaya-bhāskarāḥ pravara-vidagdha-mugdha-

[26] lalan[ā*]-jan-aika-rāti-panic[ah]* [[]|[]].

[27] Tasya putrah anēka-samara-sampāti-va[ṃ].


Fourth plate; second side.


[31] pratidina.

[32] m-abhivardham[ā*] na-prabhivah[va]* śrīmat-Koganiṇī-mahā[ḥ*] dhirajāḥ svani-bhāskarō

[33] Bhuśvīkra-

[34] ma-dvītiya-nāmadhēya-bhārāḥ [[]|[]|].

Nānā [[]|[]|] hēti-pruh[ā*] pra-vighoti[ti][ta]-bhathi[ti].

18 Read mati.
19 Read prasrja.
20 Read śrīmat-Koganiṇīvṛddha.
21 The proper context is dhrēyā naya &c., in line 23.
22 The passage commencing here, down to Kṛishnaḷa, in line 23, should properly come after nikesāpala, in line 6.
23 Read Mādhava-māhadhirajāḥ.
24 Read śrīmad-Dharivarman-māhadhirajāḥ.
25 Read viṣhad-Viṣṇugūpa.
26 Read kṣaṭṭhi-kshamā.
27 Read piṣṭā.
A JAINA-VAISHNAVAPROJECT.

BY LEWIS RICE, C.I.E., M.R.A.S.

Among the inscriptions at the Jaina town of Sravanga-Belgola is one known as Ramanujacharya’s kisana, engraved on a stone standing to the east of the entrance to the Bhandara baati. According to general belief its object was to declare that no difference existed between the Jains and the Vaishnavas, meaning thereby no difference on doctrinal points. The following transcript and translation will show that although there are certain terms used, which, if taken by themselves, might bear out the statement, yet that, when read with the context, it is clear they were not intended to convey any such meaning. The expression referred to is the declaration, in the emphatic form, Vaishnava-darshana yati Jaina-darshana yena bheda-nil-ana. “there is no difference whatever between the Vaishnava darshana and this Jaina darshana.” Now it is true that darshana has the meaning of doctrine or religious system; but that in this inscription it is not so used, is evident from what follows, whereby it is declared that the use of the five big drums and the kalasa forms part of the Jaina darshana. From this, and from the whole tenor of the inscription, it is clear that the matter in dispute was not darshana in the sense of ‘doctrine,’ but darshana referring to religious processions for the purpose of visiting the god. This to the present day is a fruitful cause of street fights among religious sects, and so it was five hundred years ago in the days of Bakkara Ray a of Vijayanagar.

The inscription is in Haile-Kannada characters and in the Kannada language. At the top appears the Vaishnava symbol of the trisna, with the sankha on one side and the chakra on the other. It is dated in the Saka year 1290 (A.D. 1368) ; and Ramanujacharya could not therefore have had anything to do with it, as he lived more than two centuries before. But his followers, the bhaktas, or faithful, had been hindering the religious processions of the saints (bhava-jana) or Jains, and objecting to their using the five big drums, &c., the music (!) which is always mixed up as such an important element in these disputes. Bakkara Ray a seems to have been successful in effecting a reconciliation between the parties, and proceeded to ratify it in a very interesting and significant manner.

Some of the Srivaishnava terms, I have not been able to get altogether satisfactory information about. If not rightly interpreted, it is hoped that contributors who understand them will come forward to explain them better.

Text.


Read bhakke.

Read brahma.
neya Kilaaka-samvatsara sاعdha 1 Brijvajniyara Swasti śrīman-mahāmāndalē-
śvāraḥ | ari-rāraya-vibhāda | bāhūngē-tappu-
va-rāya-gaṅgaḥ | śrī-Vīra-Bukka-Rāyanu pṛth-
ī-vājya mādva kālādūla Janarrigū bhak-
tarigū samvājīv-adāla śrīvaddi Hosaṭapā ṇa
Penagondi Kallhada-paṭṭana vaḷagaḍa samas-
ta-naḍa-bhavya-jaṇaṅgala ॥ à Bukka-Rāyaṅge
bhaktaru mādva anāyaṅgalaṁ anmahaṁ māḍ-
dalāga Kīvīl Tirumale Perumāl-kōvīl Tiru-
naḍarāyanapuram Mukhavāda saka-āchāryaru
saka-samayaṅgaḷu saka-sātvikara mōshīkara
ṭaṇuṇgamñi-aṅgau pāṭhīvī-kālaṅgala kal-
śavā sattuvudu | Janara-darśanakke pāṛv-
maṅgāyayallu pāṭhīa-māhā-viḍyāṅgala kal-
śavā sattuvudu | Janara-darśanakke bhaṅka-
ḍaśeṣyindā hāni vṛddhiyādāra Vaṃśaṅava-hāni
vṛddhiyāṅi pāṭiśuvaṅ | vā māṅgāyayallu
yēlā rājya-dolā uḷaṅa bastigāḷī śrīvaṃśaṅa-
vāra āsāṅvā-netu pāṭiśuvaṅ | chandrārka-
sthāyīyī śrīvaṃśa-samayaṅgala Janara-darś-
āla vaṅkokaṅgaṇḍa bahuvādu | śrīvaṃśaṅgala
Jainara vanda bhādaṅga kāṅgalagudā | śrī-
Tirumaleya-tātaṅgala samasta-rājyada bhavya-
janāṅgala anuvāmatindā Beḷgaṛla-thṛthadallī
dēvāṅ dēvāṅ-ṛaṅg-ṛaṅgā dēvāṅ samasta-rājya-
dolā uḷaṅtaḥa Jānara bāṅgu-dātaṅgāyī mā-
ane-māṅgaṅa vāṣhaṅke 1 vandu haṅa koṭṭu ā
yātīda honiṅge dēvāṅ dēvāṅ-ṛaṅg-ṛaṅgā yippat-
śiā māṅgaṅa viṅha tinī-ḥonīṅge jirīṅa-jinā-
layaṅgāṅe sōḍhe-āṇiṅkāyī ā māṅgāyayallu

1 Seringam near Trichinopoly. The king is the idol Śrī Raṅgaṅātha in the great temple there.

2 Bhakata—a term used throughout the inscription to represent the Vaṃśaṅgala.

3 Bhavya-jaṇaṅgala.—Similarly used throughout the inscription to represent the Jains.

4 Anegondi, more commonly Anegundū, is on the Tānaṅgaṅaṅ, on the opposite side of the river to the former city of Vījaṅgaṅa; Penagondi, more commonly Penugondi, a well-known hill the south-east of Bellary district, and a royal city after the fall of Vījaṅgaṅa: the other two places I do not know.

5 Kāḻīpālī: From this it would appear that a written agreement was taken from them.

6 A term used in other inscriptions with reference to the Śrīvaṃśaṅgala.

7 Kōvīl is Śrīrāngas or Seringam; Tirumale is Tripati in Kadappa district; Perumāl-kōvīl is Kāṇchi or Co直通车;

8 The samayaṅs were dēvāṅ or Vaṃśaṅga religious mendicants, invested with authority as censors of morals. No religious ceremony or marriage could be undertaken without gaining permission by payment of fees, &c. Under the former native Rājas the office was farmed out

chandrrākār uḍḍanaṁ tappaliyade varsha-
varshakke koṭṭa kṛitiyāṇe pāṇyaṅgana upār-
jiṣikomādu ॥ yē māḍīd āsaṅgāyāṇē āvaṁ
obhan mūrdaṅavān rāja-drōhi saṅgha-samudā-
yaṅke drōhi ॥ tapasvīyāṅgala śrīsāṅgāyāṅgala yē
dharrmāva kṛṣaṅgāyāṇē Gaṅgēya tādiyāṅ.

Translation.

Be it well!—Possessed of every honour, the great fire of the mare-faced to the ocean of hereditics, the original slave to the lotus-feet of the king of Śrīrāṅga,1 donor of a path to the jewelled temple of the world of holy Viṣṇu, Rī ṁa-

nuja triumphs, the king of royal yattī.—In the Śaka year 1290, the year Kilaaka, the 1st of the bright fortnight of Bhadrapsa, Thursday, at the time when—Be it well!—the auspicious Mahāmāndalēvara, the victor over hostile kings, the punisher of kings who break their word, the auspicious Viṛa-Bukka-Rāya was conducting the government of the world, mutual strife having arisen between the Jainas and the faithful2 (i.e. the Viṣṇuvas), the blessed people3 (i.e. the Jainas) of all the districts included within Anegondi, Hosaṭapāṇa, Penagondi, and Kallhada-paṭṭana, having made petition to that Bukka-Rāya of the injustice done by the faithful, the Mahārāya, under the hand of the Śrī-Vaṃśaṅgala of the eighteen districts,4 especially of Kōvīl, Tirumale, Perumāl-kōvīl, and Tirunāḍarāyanapuram,5 including all the dēvāṅs, all the samayaṅs, all the respectable men, those living on alms,6 the (temple) servants

in all the large towns and credited in the public accounts as samayāṅdēvāṅa. An important part of the profits arose either from the sale of females accused of incontinency, or from fines imposed on them for the same reason. The unfortunate women thus put up for sale were popularly known as Nāēṅkī wives. "The rules of the system," says Wilks, "varied according to the caste of the accused. Among Brāhmans and Kāṇṭīs females were not sold but expelled from their caste and branded on the arm as prostitutes; they then paid to the sāṅdāk (or contractor) an annual sum as long as they lived, and when they died all their property became his. Females of other Hindu castes were sold without any compunction by the sāṅdāk, unless some relative stepped forward to satisfy his demand. These sales were not, as might be supposed, conducted by stealth, nor confined to places remote from general observation; for in the large town of Bangalore itself, under the very eyes of the European inhabitants, a large building was appropriated to the accommodation of these unfortunate women; and as late as the month of July 1866 a distinct proclaimed of the Commissioners was necessary to enforce the abolition of this detestable traffic."
of the holy trident-mark, of the holy feet and the drawers of water, the four (thrones) and the eight tātas, the instructors of the true faith, the Tirukula and Jāmabhakula—declaring that between the Vaishnava dārana and this Jaina dārana there was no difference whatever, the king, taking the hand of the Jain and placing it in the hand of the Vaishnava (decreed as follows):—In this Jaina dārana, according to former custom, the five big drums and the kalaṅga (or vase) will (continue to) be used. If to the Jaina dārana injury on the part of the faithful should arise, it will be protected (in the same manner) as all injury to the Vaishnavas had arisen. In (the matter of) this custom, the Śrīvaishnavas will set up the decrees in all the bosstis throughout the kingdom. As long as sun and moon endure, the Vaishnava samāya will continue to protect the Jaina dārana. The Vaishnava cannot be allowed to look upon the Jainas as in a single respect different.

The tātas, by consent of the blessed people of the whole kingdom,—the Jainas throughout the whole kingdom having given according to their doors house by house one janam a year (to provide) for the personal protection of the god of the śrīthaka of Belugula—will with the gold so raised appoint month by month twenty servants for the personal protection of the god, and with the remainder of the gold will cleanse and purify the ruined jinālaya: and as long as sun and moon endure, allowing no failure in this custom, and giving (the money) year by year, will acquire fame and merit.

This rule now made whoso transgresses is a traitor to the king, a traitor to the assembly and the congregation. Be he devotee, or be he village headman, that destroys this work of merit, they incur the guilt of killing a cow or a Brāhmaṇa on the bank of Ganges. Whoso takes away land given by himself or by another is born a worm in ordure for sixty thousand years.

ANOTHER BHAUMAYANTRA.1

With reference to the Bhaumayantra obtained in Mālāvā, and published by Dr. Hultsch in this Journal, ande Vol. XI. p. 186, I give here an account of another,—obtained by my father, about forty years ago, from a gentleman who got it in Benares,—which has recently come into my possession. The plate is nearly 7½ inches square, inscribed with an equilateral triangle, which, again, is subdivided into twenty-one equilateral triangles, each containing, in good Nāgarī characters, the mystic syllable Īrī, a name of the planet Mars in the dative singular, the noun nāma of adoration, and, lastly, a numeral. At the

1 The nāma or triandma, the symbol of the Vanjana.
2 Tiruvan is for tiranuvi.
3 The word following nel or 'four' is not very clear, but it seems to refer to the occupants of four thrones or maṅgaṇa-adhipati appointed by Rāmānuja, namely, Tiruvaṅka, Kanduki, Bhatākā, and Nālākāvarā.
4 Tita, literally grandfather. Certain Vaishnava teachers of the priestly order are called fūkākā, and are representatives of eight principal ones appointed by Rāmānuja, who were called the ashaka-sīhā-ja.
5 This term is not clear, and one copy makes samandamakāri (p). It probably refers to an inferior class of religious teachers under the tātaṅga.
6 The Tirukula and Jāmabhakula are two tribes of Hollayas or outcastes, still called. They are credited with having assisted Rāmānuja, in discovering the image of Krishnā, called Shoolvo-pulle Rāya, at Melkote, from Dehli (t) whether it had been carried off by the Muhammadans. Hence they have the privilege of entering the temple once a year to pay their devotions.

edges of the plate are the words for eight weapons in the accusative singular. The contents of the twenty-one triangles are as follows:


See the story from Buchan in my Mysore and Coorg, Vol. II. p. 239.

This term I have remarked in the introduction.

1 The pāyaka-mahādāna commonly included among attributes of great chieftains.

4 A vessel in the form of a vase or urn containing water, which plays an important part in religious ceremonies.

5 Jainas temples.

6 This must be the colossal Jain statue of Gomateśvara, 60 feet high, on the summit of the Indra-giri at Shrivara Begol. There is a story generally current that Rāmānuja had the Vaishnava symbol of the trident cut into the middle of its back. But I have been up myself to see, and also taken Śrīvaishnavas up to satisfy themselves that nothing of the kind was ever done.

7 Sinjha and samadāya; both terms of the same signification; they seem to refer, the former to the Jainas and the latter to the Vaishnavas.

This last verse is not very a poor.

1 From the Academy, April 4, 1885, p. 248.
2 [The reading given by Dr. Hultsch is Sīhrānāya. —Ed.]
The wise courageous Pāṇḍava wandered distressed in the forest for many days, while the evil-minded Duryōdhana reigned as a king. Of a truth—"Everything depends on seizing the opportunity (and not on individual merit)."

G. A. GRIESEN.

THE PROVERBS OF ALL EBN ABI TALEBI.

Translated by K. T. Best, M.A., M.R.A.S.,
Principal Gujarati College.
Continued from p. 266.

260. A wise youth is better than an old fool.
261. It is better to boast of virtue than of pedigree.
262. The speech of a man plainly shows what is in his heart.
263. A generous infidel may hope for Paradise more than an avaricious Muhammadan.
264. To be ungrateful to a benefactor destroys the benefit.
265. Gentleness of speech is the bond of hearts.
266. There is no rest for the envious.
267. If a man could see the end of his life and how quickly it is reached, he would hate riches and worldly goods.
268. Great are the anxieties of a man who plans great things.
269. He who is silent does not repent.
270. It is better to be alone than to converse with a bad man.
271. He is your friend who does not oppose you.
272. A future life harasses the fortunate man, but this world in which he lives, worries the miserable.

BOOK NOTICE.


This is in several ways a remarkable book. It professes to be the first chapter of the first section of an immense work that the author has on hand, entitled Studies in Islam. This first chapter is in itself a book of pp. 322 and xix, including index, of long primer type, 5vo. The fact of its being treated as only a chapter of a larger work has forced the author into its chief defect, as it has obliged him to carry on a long-sustained argument consisting of many parts without a break. The result is that it is difficult to find one's way about it. As the work of a Baptist Missionary it is naturally controversial, and is in fact an attack on the cardinal Muhammadan doctrine that Ishmael and not Isaac was the "Child of Promise." It is therefore a fitting commencement of a general attack along the whole line of Muhammadan dogma. It is not our intention here to enter into the merits of this old controversy, but we gladly point to this learned work as containing the gist of all that has been said up to date on both sides; and as the arguments of necessity embrace important points in the history, ethnology and etymology, as well as in the religion of the Arabs, and as the author gives chapter and verse for every statement, the work is a mine of accurate information on most matters, which Orientalists hold to be of value. It is to be hoped that the author will be encouraged by its reception to rapidly proceed with the remainder of his "Studies." He is, of course, well known for his Hindi Dictionary, and now we find him equally familiar with Arabic and the Muhammadan side of an Indian Missionary's labours.
WHETHER these old brass images found
tour way to Bombay by water or by land
is not known, and their possessor, who kindly
allowed me to make copies of them, could only
inform me that he had purchased them from
various persons, strangers in Bombay, such as
Armenians, &c. I have represented the actual
size of these icons, because a reduction to a
smaller scale would have considerably interfered
with the distinctness of the figures, religious
symbols, and inscriptions represented by them.

The ground of two pieces, No. I. and No. III.,
is enamelled in blue as shown in the drawings,
all the rest retain the natural yellow
of the brass. Some of the pieces have been
used as amulets, and were, no doubt, worn
suspended from the neck, as appears from the
hinges and loops through which strings for that
purpose were passed.

I.

This piece opens like a book, and to give a
clear idea of it I have represented it in three
figures; namely the outside, then opened, and
lastly the thickness.

The outside contains an oval surrounded by
ornaments. The cross in the oval is flanked
by a spear and a reed, the one with which the
side of Jesus was pierced, and the other
showing the sponge in which vinegar was given him
to drink (Matt. xxvii. 48). The separate
letters scattered over the ground are initials,
and also the words, such as Jesus Christ, Son
of God (Yisua Cristos, seen Bojith⁴), are given
in an abridged form as indicated by the curved
lines above them; thus the monograms ΙΟ and
ΧΟ which stand for Yisus and Christos occur
also on other pieces.

The left side of the opened piece displays the
interior of a building with three arches; the
central one, which is also the largest, surmounted
by a head with wings attached, being occupied
by the Madonna with her infant, and the lateral ones by the heads of persons entering
the edifice. Under the Madonna, who is flanked
by winged guardian angels holding wands,
there is a corpse in a horizontal position, but
with the head slightly raised. At each side of
the Madonna, and just under the angels there
are two bearded men, in the act of reading
from a book which each holds with his two
hands. Just under the right hand of the Ma-
donna there is a globe surmounted by a cross
(the symbol of dominion) held out on a rod
to the corpse by a bearded man, near whom
also others are standing, but the full stature of
the foremost only is shown. Near the head of
the corpse a man is standing with a censer
suspended by chains, for the purpose of being
swung about in ceremonies of fumigation; the
person in his rear is a woman, apparently
weeping. The two small figures under the
bier represent an angel and a demon, the for-
mer attacking the latter with an uplifted sword
in his right hand, whilst that in his left is held
downwards. The demon, apparently desiring
to ward off the attack, touches the coffin whilst
doing so, but is unarmed. It will be observed
that each of the prominent persons has a halo
of sanctity round the head, except the demon
in the foreground.

The right side of the opened piece has in
the centre an oval occupied by the full stature
of the Saviour, emitting rays of light in all
directions. On the top of the oval are the mono-
grams ΙΟ and ΧΟ in a small quadrangle.
In the foreground on the left side a man in
a kneeling position appears, whose hand is
grasped by Jesus; on the right there are two
women, likewise kneeling, and above them two
persons, one of whom appears to be a king and
the other a warrior, with a spiked helmet. A
sea of the tops of human heads above, closes
the picture, as in the preceding piece. On the
frame above, the inscription has now the follow-
ing form BOCKPCCHIC XTBO which must
be read Voskresenîe Christovo, meaning “Res-
urrection of Christ.”

Of the thickness no other description is ne-
necessary except to mention that the drawing
shows how the two tablets, of which the piece
is composed, are held together by the hinges.
One of the holes on the top through which a
string for suspension may be passed is also
shown, as well as a piece of iron-wire which

⁴ The ĭ in the last word is pronounced like s in pleasure.
passes through the hinges and holds them together, but sticks out above.

II.

Those who are familiar with the symbolism of the Eastern and Roman Catholic Churches, will easily understand what the small head of the old bearded man represents and the dove beneath it, flanked by two angels with their heads down and feet upwards. The body on the crucifix appears to be dressed in a coat, but the arms and legs are left bare. Near it are the spear and the reed, as seen also on the outside view of No. I. Of the inscription round the cross I was able to make out with certainty only the word Raspyaté, which means "Crucifixion." On the back of this piece vestiges of several lines of writing occur, which, not having been engraved deep enough, are nearly effaced.

III.

On the top of this piece, which is a little damaged, a person in a standing position with covered head appears to be reading from a book on the pulpit in front; both the lower compartments however contain Christ as the central figure. In the upper one he is represented as taking a person by the hand in the same way as in the position of No. I, superscribed Resurrection; this person, as well as the one on the right side, is a female. Christ stands under an arch surmounted by a small ring. In the lower compartment he is represented in the act of addressing the surrounding people with both his hands stretched out, and above his head is a small oval containing the bust of a man with an angel on each side. The few words occurring over each of these two scenes I was unable to make out satisfactorily.

IV.

The small quadrangle above, contains a head with rich locks, probably intended to represent hair on both sides of the beard; the two usual monograms IC and XE occur on the frame above, and also a halo of sanctity around the head. On the back there is a small ring—not seen in the drawing—for suspending this icon from the neck. The big figure below bears on the frame the superscription Svyati Nikolias meaning "St. Nicholas." Having been a bishop he is represented with the two forefingers of the right hand prominent, which are thus separated from the others, and gently striking the cheek of a person receiving the Sacrament of Confirmation; and in the left he holds a short Byzantine cross. His robe of gold brocade is richly adorned with flowery devices, and over it he wears two stoles, with crosses embroidered upon them. Above the heads of the two small figures, supported by clouds, at the sides the monograms IC XC and MP which stand for YIRUS CHRISTOS and Maria, may be observed. A small hole is broken out of this icon on the right side above.

V.

This icon, the smallest of the set, likewise represents St. Nicholas, flanked by two little busts resting on clouds. To judge from the two hinges, this may have been the door of a book-like piece similar to No. I, but inferior in size and execution. The ring above indicates that it may also have been worn as an amulet suspended from the neck.

This is the only piece the reverse of which is ornamented; accordingly two views of it are given, namely the front and the rear, the ornaments of which also display but poor workmanship.

VI.

This figure is apparently the oldest, and seems neither to be of Russian design nor of sacred import, unless we indulge by a stretch of imagination in the supposition that this young lady with almond eyes had attained sanctity by subduing the two besetting sins of her sex, loquacity and vanity, keeping them firmly under control as she grasps in her fists their symbols, the parrot and the peacock. Her only unintelligible ornament is on the centre of her bust; the necklace and bracelets are distinct enough. The head-dress appears not to be a cap, but the Arab kerchief, over which a fillet of camel hair is thrown, according to the fashion of the country. Just over the fillet there is a ring in the centre. It would be natural to expect an inscription under this bust, but even a magnifying glass could reveal nothing more than the few paltry curves of foliage or of serpents shown in the drawing.
THE PRINCE THAT WAS THREE TIMES SHIPWRECKED.

BY THE REV. J. HINTON KNOWLES, F.R.G.S., M.B.A.S., ETC., (C.M.S., SRINAGAR, KASHMIR.)

A KASIMRI TALE.¹

There was a very wise and clever king, who had four sons, and each of these sons was equally as wise and clever as his father.² One day the king, wishing to test the wisdom and talents of these sons, called them all to him, and among other questions asked them each one, singly and privately, by whose good fortune it was that he possessed such a large and powerful kingdom, and was enabled to govern it so wisely and so well. Said he, "Is it through my own good fortune, or your mother's, or yours, or your brothers'?" The eldest son replied: "It is by your own good fortune, O king, our father, that you have this kingdom and this power." Likewise replied the second and the third sons. But when the fourth and youngest son was thus inquired of, he answered, that this might and power and glory were obtained through his own good fortune and not another's.³

The king was as much enraged at the bold and decided reply of his youngest son as he had been pleased with the fawning and truckling answers of the other three sons. In a wrathful tone, he said, "Was not I a wise and powerful king before thou wast conceived in the womb? This kingdom and power did not come with thy birth, O proud and stupid boy! Away! away!" and then calling the door-keeper he bade him remove the lad far from his presence.

The boy, however, did not require any pressing to go. Being of a most determined and independent disposition he hastened away, packed up a few necessaries, and left the palace. Soon afterwards, the king's anger having in the meantime relented, when it was known throughout the royal city that the youngest prince had really departed, messengers from the throne were despatched in all directions to find him and bring him back. He was overtaken on a certain way, but it was in vain that the messengers re-counted to him the king's anguish and how his Majesty would load him with honours and presents if he would only return. The young prince persisted in going on.

Great was the sorrow in the Court that day. A veil of mourning and lamentation shrouded the city and people. But none could tell the anguish of the exiled prince's wife, and none could comfort her. She tore her beautiful hair, she beat her milk-white breasts, she cast aside her jewels and ornaments, and was as one mad and about to die. Finally, she decided to follow her beloved, and resisting her mother-in-law's and other relations' entreaties, she dressed herself like a female fagir and went forth penniless and unattended in search of her husband.

It was not long before she succeeded in reaching him, for love had made her feet swift, and her search keen. The prince was overjoyed at seeing her, and lavished upon her all the affection which she deserved. With her he felt rich and happy, and cared not to occupy himself again with the business and excitement of the court. "What is thy thought, O my beloved, the light of my eyes?" said he. "Shall we not abide here in the woods, and live upon what this bow and sling shall bring us?" She consented, and for some time the days and weeks passed pleasantly, until one day the bow and the sling lost their charm, and no prey came to hand. This state of affairs continued, so that at last, feeling very hungry, they were obliged to leave their jungle-home and beg by the wayside, and in the far-scat tered villages around. In the course of their wanderings they reached the sea. Great was their surprise on seeing the boundless expanse of waters; and as they watched the tides, now rushing forward and then receding, they thought that they were living waters, and that they were trying to swallow them up and all the country behind them. Nevertheless they did not dread the sea, but the rather wished to live upon it, and tried hard to get the sailors of some of the ships which now and again touched at the port of that place to let them sail with them. But the sailors

¹ Told by a Brahman named Mukund B�, who resides at Suthú, Srinagar. He heard it from a Musal- màn, hence the constant occurrence of the word 'God' in the story.

² Literally "who were one cleverer than the other." Yum ďāi ak ďāi āndik āndik ītāl ītāl.

³ The story of "The Fair Prince" in Indian Fairy Tales begins something like this; cf. p. 193.
always refused, because the prince and his wife were so poor and had nothing to give them. At length, however, one day, a trader, kind and wealthy, heard of their desire, and perceiving that they were gentle-mannered people and of a good countenance, he had compassion upon them, and engaged for them a berth on board one of the vessels then about to start on some distant voyage. Before they left the trader inquired who they were, and whence they came, and what was their intention. "For surely," he said, "Ye both are of a princely mien and countenance, and by some foul trickery have become thus poor and helpless." "True, true," replied the young prince weeping; and he related to him all his history.

"I am a prince," said he,
Of splendid destiny.
Through me alone the king doth rule and power obtain.

"But on an evil day
Did my fond father say,
Whose fortune is it—mine or thine, by which I rule?"

'I told him, 'Mine, O King,'
Said he, 'What, thine! What thing
Is this? Away, O proud and foolish child, far hence!'

'And so my home I left,
Of father's love bereft,
And wandered far and lone into the desert wilds.

'Then came my wife to me,
And we lived happily,
Till bow and string refused me help to strike my prey.

'Next hunger drove us forth
East, West, and South, and North,
To seek for bread and shelter with a beggar's cry.

'And then God brought us here
To give us such good cheer
As thy kind sympathy and help providest us.

'O friend, to thee long life
And happiness without strife,
And after death to dwell in richest joys above.'

The trader was so much moved by the prince's touching tale that he could scarcely keep from weeping. "I know that what you have said is correct," he said, "because as soon as you left your father's kingdom, my agent, who lives there, sent me word that a foreign force had entered the city, slain many of the inhabitants, and taken the king and his brothers, together with their wives and families, prisoners." When the prince heard this he wept bitterly, and mourned his poverty and helplessness to afford succour to his father and brethren and people, whom he so loved. It was useless for his wife and the trader to try and cheer him by saying how thankful he should be to have left the city before these sad events occurred. The prince was of far too noble a character to attend to such words—nay, he rather reproached himself the more, knowing that if he had but tarried at home, these things would not have happened.

After a long time had elapsed they were sailing with a boisterous wind not far from the country where they hoped to disembark; but the wind became fiercer and the waves rolled mountains high, threatening every moment to overwhelm the ship. All hands were at work and everything was done that could be done for the safety of the crew. For hours and hours they thus lingered between life and death, until at last one great wave, swifter and larger than the rest, broke upon the ship, so that it divided into two pieces and everyone and everything were swept into the waters. Only two were saved, and these two were the prince and his wife, who had caught hold of a spar and a plank from the wreck and were thus carried to the shore. The prince, however, was carried to one part of the country, whilst the princess floated to another part, perhaps, of another country far distant. The place where the princess landed was near a large garden, which had evidently been laid out with great care, but was flowerless and leafless. As soon, however, as the princess approached its walls the trees and shrubs began to freshen and here and there a tiny bud appeared. Great was the surprise of the head-gardener when, on going his customary round of inspection the following morning, he noticed these things. He had come as usual to give orders concerning the withered trees, that they might be uprooted and taken away for fuel or other purposes, but lo! there was life
in them, and he told the under-gardeners to go for that day, as there was no work for them. The gardener then hastened to inform his master, who was the king of that country, concerning the good news. The king was exceedingly glad to hear it, and thought that at last God would cause the trees to bring forth fruit and the flowers to blossom in the garden, over which he had expended so large a sum of money. Then the gardener returned once more to feast his eyes upon the new sight and saw a woman squatting by the gate. He inquired who she was, whence she came, and what she had come for; but never a word escaped the princess's lips; and so he left her.

The place where the prince arrived, turned out to be close to the walls of a large and magnificent city. In the course of his peregrinations through this city he came upon a most beautiful garden, one blaze of colours, and redolent with perfumes. He looked within the entrance gate, but dared not venture right in, as seeing no person there, he thought that people were prohibited from entering and therefore stopped. He was still there, looking at this wonderful sight, when the royal gardener came. Seeing a man at the gate gazing with such longing eyes upon the flowers he suspected that he had trespassed inside the garden and stolen some of them, and for the moment he was filled with fear and trembling, not knowing what the king would do to him if such were the case. But when he discovered that no harm had been done he felt rather pleased with the stranger, and perceiving that he was clever and gentle, he asked who he was and what business he had there. "I am a beggar come from a far country," was the reply. "Then follow me," said the gardener. "I will make some arrangement for your food and clothes." Of course the beggar-prince was only too delighted, and followed the gardener to his house. There it was told how that he was a poor man wandering upon the face of the earth for a bit of bread; and food was set before him, and clothes provided, and he was invited to draw near to the fire and warm his shivering limbs. During conversation the stranger-guest asked why the gardener had plucked the flowers. The gardener replied that it was the order of the king that fresh flowers should be provided every day for the pleasure of the royal household. Hence his extreme care over the garden that no flowers be stolen, lest there should not be sufficient daily for the palace. "I wish," said the prince, "that you would allow me to arrange these flowers into bouquets. They would look so much more beautiful, and his Majesty the king would be so much better pleased with them." The gardener consented, and presently there were several bouquets of flowers tastefully arranged, ready to be taken to the palace.

The king and all the royal family, when they saw the beautiful bouquets, were greatly pleased, and giving many presents to the gardener ordered him thus to prepare the flowers every day.* The gardener made his obeisance and departed.

On reaching his house he told his wife of the pleasure of the king, and of the many presents which had been given to him; and then went and honestly told the prince that all this honour was through his skill, and that he must abide in their house and arrange the flowers every day, because if he now left them the king would not have his wish, and perhaps would imprison him (the gardener) or take away his life. The prince thinking that nothing better would offer itself, at all events for a long time, readily complied. And so matters continued. Every day the king and the royal household were delighted with the most delicious bouquets of flowers, and every day the gardener returned with rich rewards.

Becoming more and more wealthy, and loving money the more as it increased to him, the gardener and his wife were sometimes filled with terrible fears lest their guest, the prince, should suddenly depart and leave them as they were before. Accordingly they hit upon a plan to marry him to their only daughter, that he might be certain not to leave them; for said they, "though he came to us in great distress, yet how do we know that he is not some great man reduced by trickery and falsehood to this state. At all events he is wise and skilful, and of a noble countenance, and by his means we have attained to this great wealth." And so it was arranged to ask the prince to marry the gardener's daughter. The prince at first demurred, but

* Cf. Wide-awake Stories, pp. 150, 151.
afterwards consented, on condition that he should be allowed to depart when and whither he wished. The gardener readily complied, making sure in his own mind that if the stranger were once settled and comfortable in his own house, he would not care to leave it.*

The marriage took place, and there was much money spent and great rejoicings. All things went smoothly for a while and everybody seemed as happy as could be, until one day the gardener could not go to the palace, and so was obliged to ask his son-in-law to go instead of him and take the bouquets of flowers. He did so, but on returning the king’s daughter met him, and seeing that he was clever, gentle, and handsome, she at once fell in love with him, and ordered one of her female attendants to follow him and see where he lived. She saw him enter the gardener’s house, and came and told her mistress so. On the following morning the princess sent to the gardener, telling him on no account to let this young man go, but to give him food, and supply him with everything that he might require. The gardener was astonished at this strange order, and went immediately to tell his wife and son-in-law. “What is it that thou hast done?” he said to the latter, “to provoke this request? Hast thou seen the princess, spoken to her, or looked upon her with eyes of love? Tell me the reason of this strange order.” The prince acknowledged that he had seen the king’s daughter, when returning from the palace; but that he had scarcely noticed her—much less spoken to her. Great was the suspense until the reason was known.

Meanwhile the princess lost her appetite and became very pale and weak. When her mother noticed that she was getting thin and sickly she begged her daughter to tell her if there was any pain or sorrow, and if so she should tell her that it might be remedied. Or, perhaps, she wanted something; if so let her make these wants known, and the king would satisfy them. Anything and everything rather than she should pine away like this and die. “O mother, dear mother!” replied the princess, “it is not that I am in pain, or that any one has grieved me; but God has guided hither the man whom I love, and whom I wish to marry.”

“Tell me,” said the queen, “who he is, and where he dwells, and I will inform the king that a message may be sent for him.”

“It is the young man,” answered the princess, “who resides with our chief gardener, that wise and handsome man, who brought the flowers here the other day for the gardener.”

The queen was astounded at her daughter’s request, and begged her to consider what she was asking for. “A gardener’s lackey!” said she. “With such would a princess fain unite herself? The idea is preposterous. Surely, my daughter must be mad!”

“I am not mad, dear mother,” answered the princess. “This man is not of mean birth, as you suppose. He is of a noble type of countenance and of educated manners, which bespeak high blood and gentle training. Send and inquire, I pray thee, and see if this is not so.”

The queen promised to do so. When the king heard the reason of his daughter’s indisposition, he, too, was very much astonished, but thinking that there might be some truth in the princess’s surmisings, he deferred speaking to her, until he had sent and ascertained who and whence this young man was.

The gardener told the king’s messengers all that he knew about his son-in-law:

“It was a beggar that I saw—
But now my handsome son-in-law—
A-gazing at the garden gate
In wretched guise and piteous state.

“I thought at first he had been within
The closely-guarded garden green,
But finding every flower entire
I quickly stayed my ill-roused ire,

“And tempted by his pleasant face
I asked him—did he want a place?
If so, then he could follow me
And kind of under-gardener be.

“And he consenting came to us
And stayed—as you may well suppose—
For such a clever gardener he,—
Without his aid I could not be.

I found some nine or ten instances of this. Cf. Indian
Fairy Tales, p. 277, n. 2.
"The king’s delight, those bouquets rare
Did his own skilful hands prepare;
And then in sweet unselfish wise
He bade me gladden the royal eyes.

"Thus through his skill we honours gained
And countless riches we obtained,
Until we feared he would depart
And leave us ignorant of his art.

"Hence was he married to our blood,
With gifts of coin and clothes and food:
We thought he now would surely rest,
Choosing such fortune as the best.

"And now to you I have frankly shown
All that of this strange man is known:
Go tell the king and beg that he
Will of his mercy pardon me.

"But who he is, or whence he came,
Or even of the stranger’s name
I cannot tell, for never he
Hath told his fortune unto me."

On hearing this strange tale from the
messenger, the king, desiring to know more
concerning this underling, summoned the head-
gardener. With much fear and trembling the
head-gardener entered the royal presence.

"Now tell me," said his Majesty, "Who is
this man? Whence came he? What is his
business here? How didst thou find him?
What does he in thy house? And tell me,
too, of his behaviour and attainments. What
is thy own opinion of this man?"

The gardener then again told all he knew
about his son-in-law—how he met with him,
had pity upon him, and married him to his only
daughter because he made bouquets which
delighted the king; how wise and skilful he was in
all manner of conversation and work; and how
gentle, good, and kind he was. Not one thing
did the head-gardener keep back of all that
he knew about his son-in-law. Then the king
dismissed him, bidding him not to fear, as no
harm, but rather good, would happen to him
as the result of these inquiries.

As soon as the head-gardener had departed
the king sent a special servant to see really
how this under-gardener behaved himself, and
to bring him word again. He bade him be
very careful in his observations, as it was his
(the king’s) intention, if possible, to marry this
man to his own daughter. The servant left
and thoroughly inquired into all matters.

"It was quite true," he said to the king,
"what the gardener told you. But may it
please your Majesty to call for the man and
see him."

The king was pleased to do so, and soon the
under-gardener stood before him. A little
conversation and observation served to convince
the king that this man was no ordinary
personage; and so he informed him of his
daughter’s wish, and added that he, too, was
of similar mind. "Will you agree and become
the king’s son-in-law?"

"I will," he replied, "but only on the con-
dition that you allow me to leave the country
whenever I wish."

The king promised, and at once gave orders
for a certain house adjoining the palace to be
prepared for him and for clothes and jewels
and the richest food to be provided for him, so
that in every way he might be as the king’s
son-in-law, and every cause for reproach re-
moved. It was so; and soon all the people,
even the wazirs, began to acknowledge him as
one great and wise in the land, and the ac-
cepted son-in-law of their king.

In course of time the marriage took place.
There were great rejoicings, such as had never
been known in the city before. The air was
filled with gladness, and everybody was arrayed
in his gayest and his best—the poor, also, were
well-clothed, well-fed, and loaded with pre-
sents. The praises of the king and the queen
and the bride and bridegroom were in the
mouths of everyone; and never did there appear
such a glad and happy city.

And so matters continued. The king had
no reason to regret the union, for his son-in-law
increased in knowledge, wisdom, and popular-
ity. He knew all languages, could solve the
most difficult questions, and was most holy
and good, giving alms to the people and
attending to the cries of the sick and the dis-
ressed. Only one thing seemed against him,
and that was his refusal to attend the darbār
(or hall of audience).

One day his wife asked him the reason of
his not doing so. "It is not meet," she added,
"that you, the king’s son-in-law, should always
be absent from the great assembly. You
should certainly go sometimes, and manifest,
at all events, a little interest in the government
of the country, whose king is your wife’s
father." The prince, for he was now a recognised prince, then told her that he was a prince by birth, and that his father was ruler over a larger and more powerful country than that in which he was now living. He told her also how he had arrived in her father’s country, and all that had happened to him, and added, that his heart-longed to visit once more his home and fatherland. However, he saw the wisdom of what she advised, and promised henceforth to attend the king’s court. Accordingly the prince was present in the darbar on the following morning, arrayed in his best and looking most noble and handsome. The king was exceedingly pleased to see his son-in-law, and gave him the seat of honour, and especially consulted him concerning the present pressing difficulties of the country. Thus matters continued. The prince went regularly to the court and in all affairs behaved himself so wisely and so well, that the king loved him more than any of his other sons, and especially so, when he heard from his daughter that her husband was a great prince in his own right, but that he had been obliged by unkindness to leave his country and beg for bread in a foreign land. The king’s love and attention knew no bounds, when he had ascertained for certain that his favourite son-in-law was of noble birth also. He told him all his private affairs and all the secret state difficulties; in all matters he sought his counsel, and at all times he wanted his society.

"Thou hast become an absolute necessity to me, O my son-in-law," he said to him one day. "Think not, I pray thee, of ever leaving me. Ask what thou wilt and thou shalt obtain it here."

Now when the other sons-in-law and sons of the king perceived the great affection of his Majesty for the new prince, and how that he seemed to be unable to move or stir without him, they were filled with jealousy, and plotted together how they might estrange him from the royal favour. They did not know that he was a born prince, and therefore a skilful archer, but supposed that he was only the gardener’s son, and consequently would be altogether ignorant of the use of the bow, and the habits of wild animals; and so they suggested to the king that they should go on a shooting expedition and that this prince should accompany them. The king consented, and expressed a wish to his favourite son-in-law that he also should go a-hunting. The prince said that he would obey his royal pleasure; but on leaving his father-in-law’s presence he appeared to be going to his own house. This furnished rather a good joke to the other princes, who immediately sent each other word, saying, "There goes that gardener’s son to his house. Of course he cannot shoot or ride. Aha! Aha! Whom have we for a relation, and confidant of the king? And so they mocked him, and afterwards went to the king, and said, "He whom thou orderest to go with us, thy favourite son-in-law in whom thou trustest, must surely be of low degree, for he shirks this expedition; and rightly so, perhaps, knowing that he cannot well take part in it." Thus did they endeavour to turn the king’s mind against his favourite son-in-law.

But besides the thought that their brother-in-law would not be successful in the sport, they had an idea also that he could not ride, and therefore had previously given full instructions to the grooms that if this prince went shooting with them, he was to be mounted on a certain mad mare which was kept separate in the royal stables, and which no man had yet been able to ride. However, their envied brother-in-law was a magnificent horseman as well. In short there was nothing he had not thoroughly mastered, and so when he had gone home and acquainted his wife with his intentions, and fully armed himself, he went to the royal stables, and on asking for a horse, was told that the mad mare was the only beast available. All the other animals belonged to different members of the royal family and would be presently required, as everybody was going with this expedition. However, the prince did not care what beast he rode as long as it was strong of limb and swift of foot, and so he mounted the mad mare without any hesitation. As will be imagined the mare only became more mad at the presumption of the prince. Never had she been mounted before, and she cared not to carry any person now. So she plunged and then rose up on her haunches, then backed, then shied, and finally, after other tricks, all of which were well known to the prince, she started off in the direction of the jungle at
such a pace that her feet seemed scarcely to touch the ground. Firm as a rock the prince retained his seat, and quickly reached that part of the jungle whither the wild beasts were said to resort. A keen sportsman, he soon discovered their favourite haunts, and shot a jackal, a bear, and a leopard. Not being able to take them away with him for want of help he cut off the jackal's tail, the bear's nose, and the leopard's ear and left the jungle.

Now the other princes, thinking that the favourite prince had gone to his house, did not start so early, and when they did go, they went by another road to the hunting ground. On reaching it they discovered the corpses of the three animals which the other prince had killed and left, and having been unsuccessful in shooting any animal themselves, they gave orders that these three dead beasts should be taken to the king and presented as having been shot by them. 8

On reaching home the favourite prince's wife asked him why he had returned so quickly. "Perhaps," she remarked, "thou hast not been shooting." But he drew from his pocket the tail of the jackal, the nose of the bear, and the ear of the leopard, and shewed them to her, saying that he had left the bodies of these three animals in the jungle, as he had no body to bring them away for him.

Late in the evening the rest of the royal party returned, carrying with them the corpses of the jackal, the bear, and the leopard. On the following morning, just before the business of the darbār commenced, the king inquired what sport they had on the previous day. The jealous princes quickly answered, "We shot a jackal, a bear, and a leopard, whose carcasses are outside in the yard, waiting your Majesty's inspection. More than these we do not think are in the jungle just now."

But the king had observed that his favourite son-in-law had not spoken, and in consequence of his brothers' maligning him the day before, he was especially anxious to know whether he had been shooting or not; and if so what success he had. So he turned to him, and said, "What news of thy sport?"

"Oh!" replied one of the other sons-in-law, "Ask him not, O king, as being unaccustomed to the sport, he went home. Increase not his shame by advertising the whole matter."

Now the favourite son-in-law's dignity was offended and his anger justly aroused by these lying words. However, he waited until the others had said their say and then looking at them with scornful eye, he said, "I also went to the sport, O king, but alone; and three animals came to my hand, a jackal, a bear, and a leopard." The other sons-in-law, when they heard this, were greatly surprised, and especially so as the three carcasses, which they had brought back with them and displayed before the king as the result of their shooting, were of these three animals. What were they to do now? How could they convince the king of the truth of their words? Only by telling more lies, and therefore they waxed vehement and swore that the prince had spoken falsely, because they had seen him enter his house directly after yesterday's Court, and knew from many and various proofs that he had not stirred forth therefrom until this morning.

Calmly the prince waited again till they had finished their answer, when he begged his Majesty to allow him to send one of his servants to his house and bring thence a little parcel, the contents of which would prove the truth of his speech. As will be imagined there was greater surprise than ever at these words. A little parcel to be brought forward as a witness to this matter! The king himself now began to doubt the sanity of his favourite son-in-law. Much learning, thought he, has turned his brain. However, beyond general conversation, everyone forebore passing any remarks until the servant had returned, which he did presently; for the prince's house was very near the royal Court. Within the little parcel were the tail of the jackal, the nose of the bear, and the ear of the leopard; and when the king opened these out to view, the prince said, "Behold, O king, and my brethren, the tail of the jackal, the nose of the bear, and the ear of the leopard which I shot yesterday in the royal preserve, but the carcasses of which I left in the jungle, court; the princess rebukes him for staying at home instead of going out a-hunting with the other princes; at last he goes out alone; rides a horse called Kutar, who is very wicked and untameable; kills all the game, leaving nothing for his brothers-in-law, &c. &c.
because I was alone and could not bring them for your Majesty's and your Honours' inspection. And see ye farther that these things before you are none other than those belonging to the three carcasses which my brethren brought back with them yesterday evening, and which they are thought to have killed. Thou seest it is not so, O king, but that out of the envy and malice of their hearts have they done this thing, that my name might be degraded, and that the king's favour might pass from me. If your Majesty will but step forth into the court-yard and look at the three dead beasts lying there, your Majesty will find that my testimony is true, and that of my brethren false."

The king immediately rose and went into the court-yard as advised; and lo! the jackal was there but wanting a tail, the bear was there but without a nose, and the leopard was there, but having only one ear. Here, then, was undoubted proof of the veracity of the prince's words, and the king was so glad to find that he had not reposed his confidence in vain, that he almost forgot to reproce the other princes and members of the darbdr for their mean and false behaviour.

Henceforth the king's special affection was more than ever marked, and eventually it was settled that the favourite prince should succeed to the throne, while the other princes were promised only minor estates and offices. Not long after this final settlement of the succession the prince was filled with an intense longing to visit his father and country, and told the king so, promising that after he had fulfilled this wish he would return. The king was much grieved to hear this, and entreated the prince not to go, but to send messengers and inquire about his father and people, and the affairs of the kingdom. The prince, however, so urged his request, that at length the royal consent was given. On reaching home he told his wife of the proposed journey and bade her not to grieve or fear, as he should soon return; but she would not hear him or the entreaties of the king and queen—so great was her love.

"Whither thou goest I too will go," she cried, "I will never leave thee. Come trial or pleasure, I will be with thee. I live only because thou livest!"

And so it was arranged that this loving pair should both go.

Now the prince's country was far distant, and could not be reached except by crossing the sea. However, the royal couple did not hesitate on this account, though the prince had once been nearly drowned and lost his first wife in the shipwreck, and the princess had a horror of the sea. Passages were quickly engaged in a vessel soon to sail for the desired country, and they embarked full of plans and expectations.

It is not necessary to give another account of a shipwreck; for alas! the vessel had not proceeded far upon her journey, when the cruel waves engulfed her, and the prince and princess and all the rest of the passengers and crew were precipitated into the waters. It was a terrible time, though nothing was seen and not a sound was heard, because of the darkness of the night and the roar of the waves. Each one seemed to die, singly and unmourned. Afterwards, however, it was discovered that two out of all those on board had been saved, and these two were the prince and his beautiful wife. As was the case with the prince and his first wife, so now, they had each clung to different pieces of wood, parts of the wreck, and had drifted to different and far distant places.

The princess was carried by the waters to that place where her husband's first wife had been carried before her. She, too, entered the unfruitful and flowerless garden, and there sat down and wept bitterly. And lo! as soon as she entered the garden the flower-buds grew larger and increased in number, and the trees began to shoot out their branches. When the head-gardener visited the garden on the following morning to make his usual inspection he was surprised to find so many more buds, and the trees, too, giving some promise of eventually bearing fruit and affording shade. He gave the under-gardeners a holiday for that day, and went at once to inform the king of this glad matter. The king was delighted with this further sign of God's blessing upon the garden and richly rewarded the gardener. For very joy, the gardener went back to the garden to assure himself that his eyes had not deceived him; and on reaching it he saw another woman sitting in the garden, and
weeping and silent, in spite of kind and reiterated questionings. This is strange, he thought within himself. When the first woman came here the trees and the bushes budded; and now on the arrival of this second woman, the buds become larger and many, and the trees give out branches and increase in height and thickness. Perhaps these women are very holy women, and therefore blessing rests upon the garden. On this account also they will not speak with me." He visited the king a second time that day to tell him so. The king was pleased to hear this, and immediately ordered a holy person to go and commune with these women, if possible, and get to know all their circumstances. But this holy person could not make anything of them, and told the king that probably the gardener's surmising were correct, and therefore he advised that suitable food should be daily provided for them, lest God should be angry and cause the garden to wither as before. Accordingly food was sent every day from the palace, and in other ways special attention was manifested to these strange persons.

As has been mentioned the prince, his husband, reached some other place, which chanced to be a great and magnificent city. While walking in the bâsâr of this city, he observed a learned pandit reading aloud from the Śâstras in the shop of a certain merchant, and many people were assembled there to listen to the sacred words and wise interpretation of the same. He, too, joined the company and when the reading was over and people had dispersed, he remained behind by the merchant's shop. On closing up the place for the night the merchant, seeing the stranger still there, spoke to him and inquired who he was. He replied:

"A cruel fate forced me from home
Far in a foreign land to roam;
There I became most wise and great
And raised to second in the state.

"In time my heart began to yearn
Unto my kindred to return;"

1 Natives, but especially fujris, of both sects and sexes, sometimes give themselves up to such absolute contemplation of the Deity that they will not hold converse with any person for weeks and months and years in succession; and some, when they do speak, will only speak with those whom they recognise as holy as themselves. There is a panditâna at Bârkândâla who constantly sits for days without uttering a syllable. To see again my home and there
To tell them of my fortune fair.
"I bade my wife behind to stay
With patient heart, until the day
We met again, to part no more
Till one should enter at death's door.
"She hearkened not these words of mine,
But said, 'O love, my fate is thine!
Whither thou goest, there go I,
With thee I live; with thee I die.'

"Thus, though the king our absence waited,
The mighty bond of love prevailed;
And kept us happy by the way,
In loving longing for the day.

"When all the weary journey o'er,
We'd see the dear old home once more,—
The welcome sight of loved ones dear,—
The smile of love and best of cheer.

"The ways of God God only knows:
A mighty wind and waves arose,
And ship and all have passed away
Except this wail that pleads to-day."

And then he added in a most earnest tone:

"And must I plead, kind friend, in vain
For aid in this my life of pain?
Give me thy help and thou shalt see,
How helpful I shall prove to thee."

The merchant was much moved by this story, and gave him permission to sleep in the shop, saying that he would send him some food presently from his private house. Accordingly the prince arranged a little place in the shop for himself, and the merchant departed to his house and ordered his servants to prepare and take some food for the man in his shop. The next morning the prince was accepted as a servant by the merchant, and verified his promise in a most grateful and respectful demeanor and ready and efficient help. By-and-by the merchant discovered that his servant's services were indispensable, and told him so, adding, that such being the case, he had better make his abode there and marry into the family—would he care to marry the merchant's daughter? The merchant for some

There is a famous fujir residing at Lâr, who says nothing for weeks together. And at Srinagar, two years ago there died a Brahman, named Jâhar Sâhib, who is reported to have kept perfectly silent for over thirty years before his death. Châna Sâhib living at Renawâr, Srinagar, and Bajah Sâhib who resides at Kriyâr, an adjoining district, with many others, are also quoted as famous silent fujirs.
time had had long and difficult conversations with his wife touching this subject, for with a keen business-like foresight he had long seen the inevitable conclusion of matters. "In spite of his apparent destitution," said he, "I feel that the man's story is true, because he has such knowledge, understanding, and skill; and is of such gentle behaviour."

At length the wife agreed; hence the communication of the matter to the prince. But the latter did not at all consent. "It was not meet," he replied, "that such as the merchant's daughter should be allied to one of his present low estate, and who existed only through her father's kindness."

However, after much urging he agreed, but only on the condition that the merchant would not hinder his leaving the country whenever he wished. The merchant was satisfied, feeling sure that if this man was once settled in a comfortable home and with a beautiful wife and plenty of honour and money, he would not care to leave—not even for his home, and especially if a voyage intervened on the way thither. The marriage took place, and was celebrated with such great show that all the city was stirred at the sight. Fabulous sums were quoted as having been spent over it.

In a few years, in consequence of his son-in-law's great skill and wisdom, the merchant's business increased to such an extent, and he became so wealthy, that both his business and his wealth became a proverb in the country, and people said, "As rich and prosperous as So-and-So the merchant."

But alas! the merchant's son-in-law was not satisfied. He wished still to see his people and his fatherland, and told his father-in-law of this wish. The merchant was intensely grieved to hear it, and entreated him even with tears to relinquish his desire and stay with him. It was all in vain, however; his son-in-law would not listen. He then informed his wife of his intentions, and begged her to remain, promising to return soon; and then they would always live happily. His wife altogether refused, saying that she would never be parted from her husband. And so passages were engaged for both in a vessel about to leave for the prince's country, and they started. By God's will this vessel was also wrecked and all the passengers and crew perished in the waters except the prince and his wife who escaped, as the prince and his other wives had done, on pieces of the wreck. The wind and waves carried the prince in one direction, and his wife in another direction.

Marvelous to relate, the woman was borne by a piece of timber to which she clung, to the very spot where the other two wives of her husband had been carried, and were now sitting silent and sad, mourning their bereavement. The third wife, too, went within the garden enclosure and sat down by them; and lo! as soon as she entered, the buds bloomed and the branches of the trees put forth their leaves, changing the whole appearance of the garden, so that it now was pleasant to the sight and to the smell, and afforded a welcome shade. When the head-gardener visited the garden on the following morning he could scarcely believe his eyes. It seemed too good to be true, that God should thus bless this garden after such a long delay. Dismissing the under-gardeners and quîles (or day labourers) saying that they might have leave for the rest of that day, he went at once to tell the king the good news. His Majesty was delighted, and again gave the head-gardener some valuable presents. As before, the head-gardener returned to look once more upon the beautiful sight, when behold! he saw another woman sitting and weeping with the other two women. Hence, thought he within himself, the reason of this greater blessing. It is another of these holy women who has come, and whose goodness has attracted the especial notice of the Deity. So he went and informed the king, but the king ordered him not to trouble them with questions, but to give them food and raiment and all things necessary.

The prince, their husband, had landed on some island weird and uninhabited. After some rest and sleep he set forth to reconnoitre the place, and in a little while entered a large and intricate jungle, where he again rested mourning and lamenting his lot. "For what reason," cried he, "does God thus thwart me? Why does he thus make my life miserable and my heart to long for death? Is it that I have sinned in marrying, or how?"

Now in this jungle appeared not a living creature, neither man nor beast; and after a while life became intolerable. Indeed the
prince often laid himself down to die. But one day while wandering in the upper part of it he reached a cave, and by this cave he saw a woman sitting. This was passing strange. Surely, thought he, this can be no ordinary person, for such cannot exist here. This must be a goddess, or some especially holy woman. He went still nearer and when the woman saw him she began to weep, whereupon the prince asked her why she wept on seeing him. "I have come to comfort and not to trouble thee," he added, "and great and many have been the trials and dangers through which I have passed before I reached hither."

On hearing this the woman brushed away her tears, and smiling called him to sit beside her, and gave him rich food to eat, and pleasant drinks to assuage his thirst. And then she asked him how he had arrived there; for it was the chief residence of an ogre, who ate men and women as easily as the prince was eating the dinner before him; hence the reason of his not meeting with any living creature, man or beast, before coming to the cave. Alas! Alas! all had been slain and devoured by this ogre. "As for me," continued the woman, "I am the daughter of a king, and was brought hither by the ogre, who at first determined to eat me, but changed his mind when he saw that I should make a pleasant companion; and appointed me his mistress. It would have been better had he slain me. Now he is on some marauding expedition and doubtless will return at evening. Ah me! Ah me!" whereon she fell to weeping bitterly and it was with great difficulty that the prince persuaded her to lift her lovely face and hope for the best.

"But tell me of thyself," she said, "who art thou? Whence camest thou? How camest thou hither? — And tell me quickly that I may know thy state and hide thee safely before the ogre's return; for did he but get a glimpse of thee his appetite would be rekindled and he would devour thee. Think not of escape by any other means. Hadst thou the strength of many men and couldst thou travel as a bird, yet thou couldst not fly from this powerful monster, who passes over the way of a year in one day."

So the prince hastily recounted all that had happened to him.

"A cruel fate forced me from home,
Far in a foreign land to roam:
There I became most wise and great,
And raised to second in the state.

"In time my heart began to yearn
Unto my kindred to return;
To see again my home and there
To tell them of my fortune fair.

"But God had other will than I:
Three times have I been like to die;
Three times I escaped to different soil;
Sick and alone to mourn and toil.

"Yet God is gracious still to me,
That He hath brought me unto thee;
Here let me tarry thee beside;
Here let me evermore abide."

The woman consented, and immediately told him to follow her into the cave where she would hide him. She put him in a strong box that was kept in one of the innermost recesses of the cave and locked it up, with a prayer that God would protect him.

Towards evening the ogre arrived and being tired he at once stretched out his massive limbs upon the ground, while the woman with a large pointed piece of iron picked his teeth, which were crammed full of bits of flesh and bone, shampooped¹ his arms and legs and in other ways coaxed and wheedled him. As luck would have it the ogre was in a good temper that night. Thanks, a thousand thanks, the woman said to herself, the prince will escape for this night. But alas! she had scarcely encouraged this hope before the ogre's keen

¹ The woman's word here was vâdu = the Sanskrit vâdha, As far as he remembered the Musalmân who told him the story mentioned the word jinn. Following Captain Temple's reasons I have translated both of these words ogre, because the vâdha occupies in Indian stories an almost parallel position with that of the ogre in European tales; and the character ascribed to the jinn in genuine Indian Folktales, as in this story, has been borrowed from the vâdha. Cf. notes to Wide-Awake Stories; Join, p. 318, and ogle, p. 827.

² Muth dûna, to rub and percurse the whole surface of the body in order to mitigate pain or to restore tone and vigour. Quills in Kûmîr after a long march throw themselves upon the ground and get their fellows to trample, etc., upon them. (The word for rubbing, polishing, and thrashing or trampling corn by the feet of oxen, is the same as in Persian, mûlûh.)
sense of smell detected that there was a man in the cave." He said:—

"A man there is within this place,
Oh! let me quickly see his face."

To which the woman answered:—

"In vain, my lord, these words to me,
For here a man could never be."

But the ogre was decided and continued:—

"Woman, my nose is never wrong,
So see that thou delay not long."

Nothing daunted, however, the princess replied:—

"What power have I to make a man?
Find such yourself here if you can."

And added:—

"All the day long have I sat here
And seen no living creature near."

These answers made the ogre very angry; so he now with a terrible and flushed countenance and awful rolling eyes looked at her, and said:—

"A man there is within this place!
Unless I see him face to face,
Within two minutes more than thou diest.
As surely, wretch, as now thou liest."

Terrified by his frightful words and looks the poor woman pale and trembling asked him whether he had not met with sufficient prey, and therefore wanted a man for eating; whereupon the ogre answered that he was not hungry, but he was certain that there was a man within the cave, and rest he could not until this man was discovered. Then the princess, pale and trembling, so that she could scarcely speak, told him that perhaps it was true; at all events since the ogre was so decided she would have a good search in every hole and corner.

Finally after much rummaging and turning out, during which the ogre impatiently waited, now belching and then coughing, so that the very cave even seemed to shake with the noise, a man was pulled forth from a box at the end of the cave. "Ha! Ha! Yes, humpf! I thought so," said the ogre, as the prince approached him. The prince was ordered to sit down and explain himself, which he did with such a fearless grace, that the ogre was quite pleased with him. Encouraged by the ogre's good temper the princess confessed the whole truth of the matter—how that the prince had been shipwrecked and wandered thither, and how she had been moved with compassion and told him to reside in the cave; and then she begged the ogre to spare him and allow him to dwell there, as she felt so very sad and lonely at times; and besides the man was skilful and clever and would serve the ogre faithfully and well. The ogre agreed, and said that neither of them need be afraid, as he should never be tempted to eat such a skeleton of a fellow as the prince seemed to be. Hearing this the prince sat a little nearer the ogre and joined the woman in raubbing and pressing the monster's hands and feet; and the ogre got more pleased with him. And so the prince lived in the cave and became ever more and more fond of the princess, even as the princess became more and more fond of him, and the days passed very happily. Every morning the ogre went forth for his prey and left the prince and princess alone, and every evening he returned to be pampered and served by them.

Generally he brought back with him some rare fruit or precious jewel, or anything that the prince and princess asked of him, or expressed a wish for. However, there was always a lingering fear lest in a moment of rage or indisposition the ogre should devour them, and so they were always thinking of some plan to rid themselves of him. They soon discovered that might would not overcome him, and that if they would take him they must trick him into telling them the secret of his life, and in what his great strength lay, and therefore they determined if possible to find out this thing. One evening when they were cleaning the ogre's teeth and shampooing his limbs, the princess sat down beside him and suddenly began to weep.

"Why weepest thou, my darling?" said the ogre. "Tell me thy distress and I will relieve it to the utmost of my power." Saying this he drew her to him in tender embrace.

"I cannot tell thee all my thoughts," she replied, "but sometimes I fear lest thou be slain, and we be left alone here in this solitary cave, without a comforter or friend—for then starve we must, because who could bring us food? Moreover, thou hast been so good to us,

11 The words used were inshah runz mushk dya tamis, i.e., the smell of a man came to him. For a survey of the incidents concerning ogres in Indian folk-tales, cf. Wide-awake Stories, pp. 395-397.
filling our stores with the choicest provisions, and satisfying our every wish, that our hearts are one with thine. What could we do, and how could we live if thou were slain and lost to us?"

The ogre laughed heartily on hearing these words, and replied that he should never die. No power could oppose him; no years could age him; he should remain ever strong and ever young, for the thing wherein his life dwelt was most difficult to obtain, even if it could be known. This was just the reply, that the woman wanted, and so smiling most sweetly and affectionately she praised God for this assurance of the ogre's safety and then entertained him to inform her of this thing. The ogre, nothing suspecting, complied and said that there was a stool in the cave, and a honeycomb upon the tree yonder. He mentioned the stool because if anybody would sit upon it and say whether he or she wished to go or would at once transport them thither. He mentioned the honeycomb, because if any person could climb the tree and catch the queen-bee within it, then he, the ogre, must die, for his life was in that bee. But the bees within that honeycomb were many and fierce, and it was only at the greatest risk that any person dare to attempt this thing. "So you see," added the ogre, "thou weep'st without cause. I shall never die."

Then the woman smiled with joy and told the ogre how thankful she was, and how henceforth she should abide in peace, happy by day, and happier at night, when he returned; and how glad she was that he had told her of the stool and the honeycomb, for although there was not the slightest cause for fear concerning their safety, yet she should have pleasure in especially guarding them—remembering that his dear life was held in them. After some further conversation they all arranged themselves for sleep.

On the following morning the ogre went out as usual. Before midday the prince and princess concluded their arrangements for bringing about his death. The prince was to do the deed. He clothed himself from head to foot most carefully. Every part was well covered except his eyes. For these a narrow horizontal aperture was cut in the cloth which was wrapped about his face. Thus prepared he sat on the stool, and soon was seen floating away in the air in the direction of the tree. It was an exciting moment when he lifted the stick to strike the honeycomb. It seemed as if thousands of bees came out and attacked him; but he was thoroughly protected, and so cared only for his eyes. His purpose was to catch the queen-bee and to crush her, and thereby crush out the life of the ogre. He succeeded and no sooner had he dropped the lifeless bee than the ogre fell down stone-dead upon the ground with such force that all the air around trembled with the shock. The prince then returned to the cave on the stool and was welcomed by the princess with much rejoicing and congratulation. Still there was fear lest the shock, which they felt, should only have been an earthquake, and the ogre having told them a lie should return. But the evening arrived, and then the night, yet no ogre turned up, and so they felt sure that they were rid of their enemy; and gathering together the special treasures which were in the cave, they both sat together on the stool and were quickly carried away miles distant to the spot where the ogre's carcass lay stiff and cold, stretched out to a tremendous length upon the ground. Reassured by this sight the prince bade the stool to carry them to the place where his three wives were, living or dead. The stool obeyed and they were quickly landed close by the king's garden. The prince at once rose from the stool and telling the princess that he would presently return, he asked her to remain. He had not gone far before some poisonous insect alighted on him and stung him so that he then and there got the...
disease of leprosy. What was he to do now? For very shame he could not return to the stool. The princess waited until her patience was exhausted, and then speaking to the stool, she was borne within the garden and descended right by the very place where the other three wives of the prince sat silent and sorrowful. She, too, did not say anything, but wept aloud. Directly she entered the garden the flowers bloomed magnificently and gave forth the most delicious perfumes, while the trees were so richly laden with fruit that they could scarcely hold up.

When the head-gardener came round as usual the next morning, lo! he saw such a sight as he had never expected. At last the flowers were in the fullest bloom and the trees were covered with the most splendid fruit; and as he was leaving the garden to go and tell the king this good news, he beheld another woman sitting and weeping. He asked her who she was, and whence she came, but never a word came forth from her mouth. So he said to the king, "Behold, O king, a fourth woman has entered the royal garden, and now it is perfect. Your Majesty will, perhaps, come and see this great sight."

The king was exceedingly glad and rose up hastily to accompany the head-gardener to the garden. On reaching it he saw the four women and questioned all of them, but not one of them answered a word. Then the king, after inspecting the garden, returned to the palace and informed the queen of these strange visitors, and begged her to go and see them on the morrow,—perhaps they would converse with one of their own sex, and she the queen. On the morrow the queen went and spoke kindly to each of the women, but not one of them replied. The only notice they appeared to take of her Majesty's words was to weep the more. The queen was very disappointed, and knew not what to think of them. Undoubtedly they were very holy women, she said, or God would not have thus signally blessed their coming to the garden. Perhaps they had been betrayed by some foul monster or bereaved of one most dear. It could not be because of their sins that they thus wept. It might be, if the

king sent a certain very holy man to them, that they perceiving in him a kindred spirit would hold conversation with him. The king agreed and this very holy man was sent. But he returned also, and said that he could not get them to speak. Then the king issued a proclamation that great rewards and honours would be bestowed on the person who should succeed in making these women to speak.

Now the prince, who was suffering terribly from leprosy, and loathsome to behold, heard of this royal proclamation and inquired from a man who chanced to pass by that way: "Is this true?" Said he, "I will cause these women to converse with me."

This matter was reported to the king, who at once, attended by a large number of courtiers and servants came and wondered at the presumption of the wretched leprous man. However, as he did not know the mind of God, he told the man to go and speak with the women. The leprous man went and sat down before the first woman and begged her to listen to his tale:

"Once upon a time there was a certain great king who had four wise and clever sons. One day the king called these sons to him to ask them each separately by whose good fortune it was that he ruled and prospered. Three of the sons replied, 'By thy own good fortune, of a surety, O king, dost thou reign over so vast a kingdom and prosper in thy rule. But the fourth and youngest son gave answer, 'By my good fortune, O king, and not another's.' Exceedingly angry with this answer the king banished his youngest son, who with his wife and a few necessaries immediately left the palace. After some weeks' residence in the jungle and wandering by the way-side they arrived at the sea, and longing much to live upon the water, they told their affairs to a certain merchant, who had pity upon them and gave them free passage in one of his ships. Things went on most happily for a time, until one night the ship was wrecked and all were drowned, except the prince and princess. These were saved by clinging to the spars and rafters of the ship, but were carried in different direc-
tions, the prince to one country and the princess to another."

For the first time for many years this woman was seen to lift up her head; and when the leprous man inquired what reward she would give him if he brought the prince her husband there, she readily replied, "Ask what thou wilt and it shall be given to thee."

When the king and his company saw the woman speaking and looking quite happy, he was much surprised. At the same time, also, through God's mercy, the humour, which was escaping from the man's leprous wounds, stopped.

Then he went and sat down beside the second woman and asked her to listen to his tale:—

"In a certain country there lived a gardener—the royal gardener—in whose house a beggar prince from some distant country chanced to arrive. This prince became the gardener's servant, but making himself so thoroughly useful and being of a noble and gentle mien he soon became the gardener's son-in-law. One day the daughter of the king of that country saw the prince (though she knew not that he was a prince), and begged her mother to solicit the king to marry her to him. After full inquiries the king discovered that he was a great and clever man, and therefore assented to his daughter's request and made great preparation for the wedding. The wedding took place and there was great rejoicing, and the new prince prospered exceedingly and grew more and more popular both with the king and people. Only his brethren envied him. At last, tired of their envy and seized with an irrepressible longing to visit his home and country, he left with his wife in a ship then about to sail for the desired haven. Alas! the ship was wrecked, and only two persons were saved out of the whole ship's company, the prince and princess. These escaped on two pieces of board. One landed in one country and the other landed in another country."

For the first time for many years the second woman lifted her head, and when the man inquired what reward he should have if he could bring the prince before her she replied, "Ask what thou wilt and I will give it thee." When the king and his company saw the woman's happy face and that her lips moved they were much surprised. At the same time, also, the man's leprous wounds closed up and looked as if they would soon heal.

Then the man went and sat by the third woman and begged her to hear his story:—

"In a far distant city there resided a certain rich merchant, who had pity upon a poor traveller, whom he had noticed standing one day by his shop, and made him his servant, but afterwards finding that he was so wise and good, and that the business prospered by his means, he made him his son-in-law. In course of time the son-in-law wished to visit his home and country and so left with his wife, promising to return soon. But alas! alas! the vessel went down with all hands except the prince and his wife, who escaped upon planks and timber from the wreck, one reaching one country and the other arriving at another country." When the woman heard these things she lifted her head, and when she further heard that the prince was alive and near the place, she entreated the man to show him to her and she would give him a great reward.

When the king and his company saw the third woman's happy face and ready speech they exceedingly wondered. At the same time also the wounds of the leprous man thoroughly dried-up and were like to altogether disappear.

Then the man went and sat down beside the fourth woman and asked her to listen to his story:—

"In a certain jungle resided a great ogre who had captured a beautiful girl, a king's daughter, and kept her for his own service and amusement. By chance one day a man arrived at the entrance of the cave where this woman was sitting and lamenting her lot. He inquired why she wept and she told him all that had happened to her. Both being clever and beautiful they quickly entertained affection for one another and by the evening when the ogre usually returned from his excursions, finding that the man would not leave her she concealed him in a box. However, the ogre discovered him, but did not eat him, seeing that he was pale and thin, and kept him there as a servant. By-and-by the princess discovered the secret of the ogre's life and the prince accomplished his death, and then they both, the prince and the princess, sat on the ogre's enchanted stool and were transported to
within a short distance of this place. Then the prince left the princess and never returned, because a foul leprosy had attacked him, and so changed his whole appearance, that when the princess came and looked upon him a few hours afterwards she did not recognise her husband, but turned aside within this garden and wept. On hearing this story the woman stopped crying, looked up, and lo! she beheld her lost loved husband; for now every trace of leprosy had passed from him, and he was the same handsome, wise-looking, noble prince that he ever was. After much embracing they then both went together to the third wife, the merchant's daughter, and the prince was also recognised and embraced by her. Likewise, too, by the second and first wives. Oh what a time of rejoicing it was for the prince and all his wives, who had expected never to see one another again!

Now when the king and his attendants saw this they were more surprised than before. For here was not only the man who had made them speak, but the evident husband of them all. He seemed also a man of great learning and of noble birth.

"Who art thou?" inquired the king, now drawing near. "Tell me thy history, and all that has happened to thee."

Then the prince recounted to him his whole life—how he had left his home, how he had married with these four women, and how they had all been brought together there.  

The king was intensely interested by the account, and invited the prince and his four wives to come and stay at the palace. Everything that they wished for was provided for them, and the prince became so much in favour with the king that he was entreated to permanently take up his abode there and promise the kingdom after the king's death. To the great joy of the king the prince consented, and went daily to the darbār. Fresh plans were now attempted, new laws fixed and other great improvements made, so that the kingdom became exceedingly great and prosperous. Wishing to be more thoroughly allied with one so great and good as this prince, the king sought to marry him with his only daughter. The queen, the prince, and all the court accepted the king's wish and the marriage was eventually celebrated with great rejoicing. And thus affairs continued increasingly happy and increasingly prosperous.

The prince, however, was not satisfied. He desired to know of his country and his father's house. Accordingly messengers were sent to make inquiries, and after a long time they returned, saying that the king the prince's father's country had been conquered by strangers, and that the king and all the royal family had been taken prisoners. When he heard this the prince's heart was filled with remorse for not having sent before to ask concerning them. He now determined to make war against these foreign conquerors, and for this purpose he sought help from his royal father's-in-law. Money and troops were liberally granted him and at length he started with the prayers and good wishes of everyone in the kingdoms of all his father's-in-law. It was a long and difficult journey, but the prince and his army safely reached their destination and immediately commenced battle with the foreign king's army. They fought for days and there was much bloodshed on both sides, but at last the prince got the victory. He at once released his father and brethren, but they did not recognise him until he told them that he was the fourth son, and the banished prince. "The king, my father," said he, "banished me for saying that he held the kingdom by my good fortune. And was it not true—O king?" he added. "Directly I left the kingdom I heard that it was taken away from thee, and thou wast cast with thy family into prison, and now as soon as I return unto thee, behold thou art free again, and the monarch of a large and powerful kingdom."

"True, O son!" feebly replied the king. "We wronged thee. 'Twas not the pride and

---

18 Notice that the marriage with the gardener's daughter is not recognised, nor is she sent for when the prince arrives in his own country. On being asked the reason the narrator simply answered "It was so, othah." I see, however, that the same thing occurred in the story of "The boy with the moon and star" given in India. Fairy Tales, p. 135. Perhaps the other wives despised her because of her humble birth, and therefore she was deposed.

11 It will be remembered that the prince had heard this account before he started on his first voyage. I noticed this to the narrator and expressed my surprise that such a good and wise prince should have so long delayed avenging his father's and family's imprisonment and trials. "Perhaps the sea intervening prevented him," was the answer.
haughtiness of thy heart, but of our hearts, and God has sorely punished us for it," and then locked in each other's embrace they forgot all their past trials in present joys.

As the king was now very old and infirm it was arranged that the prince should henceforth occupy the throne, while minor estates and offices should be given to the other princes. All being in a good temper and most grateful to the prince for having delivered them, this was most readily agreed to. Accordingly the prince sent word to the different kings, his fathers-in-law, advising them not to expect him, but to send his wives, as he was now ruling over his own father's kingdom. Congratulations poured in from all sides; the wives safely arrived; and the prince, now a mighty king, and increasing in wisdom and power continually, passed the rest of his years in peace.

A SUMMARY OF THE ALHA KHAND.

BY G. A. GRIESON, B.S.C.

The following rapid résumé of the various sections of the Western recension of the Álha Khând, as published by Ghááí Rám, will give an idea of the extent and variety of the Álha cycle of folk-lore. The Kanaáji version of Chapters I.—III. of this recension as translated by Mr. Waterfield in the Calcutta Review (see ante, p. 209) is referred to where it differs materially from the Hindi version.

The following genealogical table will help the reader to understand the story better:—

Bás'déo, King of Mahubá.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mal'ná, d., m. Par'mál, the Chandel, who reigned at Mahubá.</th>
<th>Diválá, d., m. Jas'ríd, who lived at Jhíjhaül.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uday Chand., Suraj'vat, d. Álha, s., m. Udál, s., m. Dhadhá, s. of Jas'ríd by Bhalap, a slave-girl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmá, s., m. Bálá. (1) Macch'hávali. (2) Subháná.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Til'ká, d., m. Bach'h'ríd Jágin, s., Mahl'á, s., who lived at Jhíjhaül. lived with Jag'ñéri. Par'mál at Mahubá.

Mal'khá, s., Par'sá, s. of Bach'h'ríd by a slave-girl.

Mal'khá, s., Par'sá, s. of Bach'h'ríd by a slave-girl.

Chapter I.
The Birth and Lineage of Álha.

Par'mál the Chandel, the king of Chandéri, after conquering the whole of India, took an oath to fight no more. He married Mal'ná or Mal'n Dé, the daughter of Bás'déo, king of Mahubá. One day as he went out to hunt he found two beautiful boys playing alone in the forest, and taking them home, brought them up as his own children. When they became old enough to be married he married one of them, whom he named Jas'ríd, to his wife's sister Diválá or Divál Dé, and the other, whom he named Bach'h'ríd, to another sister of his wife named Til'ká. The two princes were also called collectively (as also their descendants) the Bánáphálz. When they had been duly instructed in every warlike art, he gave them the fort of Jhíjhaül as a residence. About the same time he gave to one of his wife's brothers, named Jágin, the fort of Jag'ñéri, and the other named Mahl'á he kept living with himself in Mahubá. In course of time Jas'ríd had a son

1 Mal'ná in the Kanaáji version.
2 The origin of Dá'sáj and Bach'h'ríd is quite different in the Kanaáji version. They had two brothers, Rahmal and Téjárár, and the four were called collectively Bánáphálz. They lived at Bagh'ñar (Buxa) between Bákára and Árá (Arrah). They quarrelled with Mírur Tálhan (Tála in the text) and started together for Kanaáj to have their dispute settled by Jáchánd, king of that city. On their way they stopped at Mahubá, and agreed to make Par'mál the arbiter. This was on the occasion of the fair mentioned in the next chapter. When Kanaáj attacked Par'mál the Bánáphálz and Mírur Tálhan turned out to defend the latter, whose salt they had eaten. Pleased at their conduct, Par'mál adopted the Bánáphálz as his sons.
3 In the Kanaáji version Dá'sáj.
4 In the Kanaáji version Dá'sáj, and in a set of Hamir-pur songs communicated to me by Mr. V. A. Smith, Dá'sáj Deví.
5 In the Kanaáji version Bórñáh or Brahmá.
6 In the Kanaáji version Álha is said to have been born in Dá'sájpur, or Dá'sájpur'va.
7 In the Kanaáji version he is called Jag'ñik or Jag'ñák.
8 In the Kanaáji version he is called Málí. He rides on the mard Lill, and his son's name is Abhai.
named Ā lhā, by his wife Divalā, and another son, Dẖẖā, by a maid-servant. So also Bachh'rāj had a son named Māl'kẖā by his wife Til'kā, and another son, Par'sā, by a maid-servant.

Chapter II.

Karaṅgā's battle with Jas'rāj and Bachh'rāj.

Once the Chandellā Par'māl went to a fair at the Ganges to bathe, and met there kings of the neighbouring country. Next his camp was pitched that of Tāḷā, king of Banāras with his army. Karaṅgā, son of Jambā and prince of Mārō came there also in the hopes of plunder, and to him came Mahā, youngest brother-in-law of Par'māl, and confided to him that his month's queen was possessed of a nau-lākẖā-hār, or nine-lākẖ necklace, with the suggestion that he could safely carry it away as booty, as she was quite unprotected. Karaṅgā agreed to this plan, and suddenly bursting into Par'māl's camp with an armed force rendered him helpless. While Karaṅgā was abusing Par'māl, the attention of Tāḷā of Banāras was called to the matter, and he came to Par'māl's assistance with an army of five hundred men, and drove Karaṅgā away for a distance of three leagues.

One day, as Mal'nā, Par'māl's wife, was taking the air on the balcony of her palace, Indrā saw her, and became enamoured of her. So every night he used to visit her, coming down from heaven on a flying horse, which he fastened up in the palace stables. This flying horse formed a connection with a peibald mare of Par'māl's, which was kept in the same stable, and as a result she gave birth to five winged colts. These colts Divalā (wife of Jas'rāj, and sister of Mal'nā) privately conveyed to her own palace, and reared them there.

Chapter III.

The plunder of the nine-lākẖ necklace.

About this time Karaṅgā-Mārō, king of Mārō, again advanced against the Chandellās, and bursting into the female apartments of Par'māl, carried off his valuables, including the nine-lākẖ necklace, the elephant named Par'sāwaṭ and the dancing girl named Lākh'hā Pāṭṭar. He also made Jas'rāj a prisoner and carried him off in bonds. Arrived at his own country he cut off Jas'rāj's head and stuck it up over his gate, while the trunk he put into an oil mill, and pressing the juice out of it sent it to Mahābū. About the same time the very same fate befell Bachh'rāj at the hands of Gāj, king of Guj'rat. The two queens, Divalā and Til'kā, remained mourning the death of their husbands.

At this time two sons were born to Par'māl by Mal'nā, whom he named Uḍay Chand and Brahmā, and to Divalā, the widow of Jas'rāj, a son named Uḍāl. This last mother was cast away into the jungle immediately after its birth, but Par'māl rescued it, and taking it home brought it up on the milk of a lioness. When Uḍāl and Uḍay Chand were five years old, when Par'sā was six, Mal'kẖā seven, Brahmā eight, Dẖẖā nine, and Ā lhā ten years old, an ascetic called A m'rā came there, to

9 In the Kanaunj version he is also called Nun Ā lhā. He rides the horse Karīlyā.
10 In the Kanaunj version he is called Mal'kẖā, Mal'kẖā or Mal'kẖāy, and he rides the mare Kān'bṛṭī.
11 These four descendants of Jas'rāj and Bachh'rāj, viz., Ā lhā, Dẖẖā, Mal'kẖā, and Par'sā, together with Uḍāl, who was subsequently born, are often called collectively the Banāphāls.
12 Called (only, p. 225, line 413) 'the Old Saiyād,' and in the Kanaunj version Mirā Tāṭhān, who rode a horse called the Lions (Gṛṇī). He is a prominent figure in all versions of the story, and always appears as the close friend of the Banāphāls,—first of Jas'rāj and Bachh'rāj, and subsequently of Ā lhā, Dẖẖā, and Mal'kẖā. He is the Kanaunj version of the Bīrān, as already mentioned, he cemented his friendship with the Banāphāls, with whom he had been previously at enmity, in protecting Par'māl in the attack described in this chapter. I do not mention him by name subsequently, but whenever the Banāphāls go he accompanies them, and acts as a sort of Nestor. Another ally of the Banāphāls whose name constantly recurs is Bāwan Sīdī. In another folksong (Gṛṇī Bījā Mollī), he is represented as being killed by Bīrān Mall, the son of Gorakh Singh, in revenge for the imprisonment of the latter. He lived in a mountain fortress called Bāwan Garh, said to have been situated near Mahābū.
13 The Kanaunj version makes his name Karīlyā or Karīnghā. It says that he promised his sister Bījāsi or Bījā to bring her a nine-lākẖ chain from the fair. He could not find one on the fair, and hence he yielded to Mārō's insatiation. Regarding Jambā's kingdom Mr. Waterfield says (Chit. Review, Vol. LXI, p. 307), 'Where Mārō (or Mīrān) was, I cannot say. It is certainly not Mārwar (Jodhpūr), as I, is believe, assumed by the bards. Nor is it Kīwā, the modern Baghel-khāed. Its neighbourhood to and dominion over Jhānsī I conceive to be a poetical embellishment, unless there is a second fort of that name. It was close to the Narmadā, and on the further side: this may perhaps furnish a clue for identification, for some one who is acquainted with that part of the country.' Bīrāh tradition identifies it with Mārwar, no doubt wrongly. A note of Mr. V. A. Smith, communicated to me since the above was written, states, 'Mrō is now called Bisāpur, south of Mirzāpur, and still has Jambā's ruined fort.'
14 Mal'kẖā is throughout the legend the villain of the piece.
15 The Kanaunj version adds Jas'rāj's horse Paphāl, and names the elephant Pach'sāwal.
16 In the Kanaunj version Uḍay Singh is an alias of Uḍāl.
whom the three queens (Mal'ña, Divalā and Til'kā) brought their children. The holy man adopted the boys as his god-children (chēlā), and gave them the blessing of having bodies invulnerable to weapons. He then departed saying that if ever they stood in need of him they would find him in the forest of Bāb'rī.

When the boys came to man's estate they became so mighty that none of them could mount a horse without breaking its back. Accordingly they went to their respective mothers, and asked for the horses that their fathers rode. The queens, however, produced the five-winged horses,17 and each one chose the one that pleased him best.

One day Udal rode on his horse to Mahāḷa's garden, and after devastating it began to insult the maids who were carrying water.18 When Mahāḷa heard of this he went and complained to Pār'māḷ, and then returned and taunted Udal with being brave enough to fight female water-carriers, but too great a coward to avenge his own father's death. The latter returned home in silence and anger, and approaching his mother, asked what had happened to his father. She shook her head in distress, and at first tried to put his questions off, but as he persisted, she finally told him the whole story of Jassājā.

On hearing the details of his death he hastened to Aǐhā, and the Banāphās immediately made ready an army to invade Māḍō. They set out and encamped on the frontier. They then, at the suggestion of Dēh vā and Tālā, disguised themselves as Jōgil dancers, in order to spy out the secrets of the fort, and danced so beautifully throughout the city and at the king's palace,19 that they enchanted the souls of all the men and women in the city. Especially

Pāh ha p,20 Kaṇāṅgā's sister, became enamoured of Udal. When the Banāphās had finished dancing they were presented with the nine-lākha necklace and returned to their camp, but were pursued by Kaṇāṅgā who had learnt who they were, and who, after attempting to catch them, had to retreat in fear.

Then the Banāphās set their army in battle array and a terrible battle took place in which Sur'ji, one of Jam'bā's sons, was killed. Then Kaṇāṅgā himself came out with an army, but was unable to stand before Udal. Then he sent out his own father, who also was defeated. Finally, with the help of a jōgil, or magician, he enchanted Udal, who fell from his horse. Jambā then took him up on his steed,21 carried him off and cast him into a dungeon.

On receiving this intelligence Ālḥā and his brothers sent word to the ascetic Am'rā, and by the help of magic taught by him, Mal'kha (Bachhrāj's son) released Udal from the dungeon.

Then they wrote a letter demanding that Kaṇāṅgā's father Jambā should send his daughter out to them to be married, but the king in rage again challenged them to fight, whereupon they bombarded his fort and blew it to pieces. Then they cut off Jambā's head, and mounting it over the city gate beside Jassājā's skull, pressed his body in an oil-press as he had done to Jassājā. They put Kaṇāṅgā in bonds and would have killed him had they not been compelled to spare him and let him go as one who had taken refuge with them. Then they carried off Pāh ha p as Udal's bride with the nine-lākha bracelet, the elephant Pach'sawat and the dancer Lakkhā Patar, and with great joy and triumph returned to Mahālā.22

17 Mahāḷa's horse is named Karilīva, and Udal's Benallīya, or Bās Bēndul, in the set of Hamirpur songs on the Alhā legend, communicated to me by Mr. V. A. Smith. Udal's horse is called Bēckhā.
18 It was a favourite method of insulting a person to lay waste his garden, and to insult his maidservants.
19 Mahāḷa, Udal's mother's brother, was, it must be remembered, an enemy of the family.
20 The long passage which describes the journey of the princely through the city, and how they fed their rage by visiting the scene of Jassājā's tragic fate, is a fine specimen of vigorous poetry.
21 In the Kānajī version she is called Bijjaisil or Bijjāīmā.
22 Jambā was Kaṇāṅgā's father and king of Māḥī.
23 The Kānajī version makes Kaṇāṅgā, who is riding on Pach'sawat, cause the elephant to treacherously seize and bind his quondam master Udal. The elephant subsequently repents its treachery, and allows Mal'kha to spring on its back and rescue Udal. Udal then attacks Kaṇāṅgā but is driven back, and finally Mal'kha comes up and smites off the latter's head. The head is sent in triumph to Mahālā.
24 The Kānajī conclusion is infinitely more dramatic. Udal brings out Bijjaisil or Bijjāīmā, to marry her, but Alhā says (I quote Mr. Waterfield's translation)—
"With the house of our foe, I bid thee know,
No marriage feast I keep; When she thinks of her father and brethren slain,
She will kill thee in thy sleep."
Udal entreats that she be spared, but in vain, and finally Mal'kha—
His shining sword he drew;
He smote so sore Bijjaisil's side, He left her shoulder through.
man, but no one could be found brave enough to attempt the conditions.

By chance they met Mal'khå, the son of Bassh'ráj, on the way, and he accepted the terms, made ready his army and invaded the king's territories, accompanied by the other Banáphals. Álhá then despatched his half-brother Dhádhá, who entered the king's audience chamber, and having quarrelled with him on the score of abusive language, returned to his comrades. Thereupon between both sides a terrible battle ensued, Jógá and Bhóngá were taken prisoners, and the victorious army entered the king's palace and occupied his audience chamber. Then Álhá mounted on horseback, and with one blow of his sword cut the fish on the top of the pillar in two, and Údal leaped into the boiling cauldron and issued from it alive. So the king, admitting himself defeated, gave Machhál'ávati in marriage to Álhá, which, being duly celebrated, the bridegroom and his party returned to Mahubá with great rejoicings.

Chapter V.

The battle with Prith’vì Rájá concerning Sares'má.

One day Mal'khå respectfully made representation to Par'mál, that all his brothers had been allotted separate forts and residences, but none had been given to him. He asked that the same consideration might be shown to him. The king replied that Prith’vì, Rájá of Dilli, had encroached on his territory, and that he had invited him and the neighbouring kings to meet him at Mahubá and settle the dispute. He was prepared to give Mal'khå what Prith’vì should return. The meeting took place, and Mal'khå charged Prith’vì with the encroachment, and demanded

"These are the orthodox negotiators of marriage treaties."
the territory back on pain of war. Prith'vī finally refused to give up the disputed land, and war ensued. Par'māl first laid siege to Sares'mā, and in the first battle defeated Pārāth. Then a larger army was sent from Dillī, but it also he defeated. Thus the king of Mahēbā got possession of Sares'mā, and giving it to Mal'khā returned to his capital.

CHAPTER VI.

The rape of Sura'j'vatī—Udāl's war with Mōti, and marriage with his sister.

Once Par'māl went to bathe on the occasion of a festival, and his daughter Sura'j'vatī, by dint of sulking, obtained permission on the third of Sāwan to go with Mahēbā into the Naulakkhā orchard, and there swing with her companions. Thereupon Māl'khā sent word to Mōti Rāo, king of Bāndo, of the fact, and suggested that he should come and forcibly carry her off, which Mōti Rāo, not considering the result of his conduct, did.

When Mahēbā had thus managed the abduction of his niece, he hurried to the seraglio, and told what had happened. The child's mother, Mal'khā told it to Udāl, who becoming filled with a violent rage attacked Bāndo unaided, and defeated several of its armies. Then Mōti Rāo acknowledged himself defeated, begged for mercy, and promised to give Udāl his sister Bha'nwar Kallī in marriage. But shortly afterwards, succeeding in making Udāl drunk, he made him prisoner, and confined him in a dungeon. When Sura'j'vatī heard this, she sent a letter to her cousin, Mal'khā, calling shame on him, for allowing Udāl to be captured, and summoning him to the rescue. When Mal'khā arrived he released Udāl from the dungeon with the help of a thief named Bannā Chōr and drew up his army in battle array. Mōti Rāo issued out against him, and after a terrible battle was defeated. Peace was then concluded, Mōti Rāo giving Bha'nwar Kalli in marriage to Udāl, and Udāl giving Sura'j'vatī in marriage to Mōti Rāo.

[This custom of swinging for luck in the rainy month of Sāwan is universal in Northern India, and has given rise to much pretty popular verse.—Ed.]

But in the seraglio, Udāl at first took him for an executioner come to kill him, but Mal'khā reassured him, and they all scaled the wall with the aid of the grappling-irons and escaped.

23 He is apparently the same as the Gaj who killed Bachī'rāj.
the news of this reached Gaj’na she wrote an account of the whole affair, and sent it to Allah. Allah disguised himself as a Brahman, and visited Gaj’s palace, where he recommended that Malik khu should be publicly executed. The proposal being accepted, he returned to his camp, and made his army ready for the attack. When Malik khu was led out to execution, Udal attacked the guards, and after rescuing him, joined in a battle in which the generals Babbar and Bundu were killed, Gaj’s two sons Moti and Laila taken prisoners, and his army defeated. Finally the Mahbaba army looted the capital and arrived at the king’s throne-room. Gaj made submission to them and explained that King Parna also desired to marry his daughter, and he did not know whether to give her to him or to Malik khu. At Allah’s suggestion a wrestling match was agreed upon between Malik khu and Parna; the prize being Gaj’na. In the end Parna was defeated, and contented himself with Gaj’s younger daughter, Bindu, while Malik khu carried his bride Gaj’na home with great rejoicings.

Chapter VIII.

The marriage with Prithvi’s cousin.

Prithvi’s uncle Kuba khan had a daughter named Bela. When she was ready for marriage the king made proclamation of the following conditions:—The successful suitor must be able to hit with his arrows three times in succession a goal which he could only hear, but not see. He must train in wrestling the two wrestlers, Har dan and Mar dan, and he must be able to dance upon weapons. The princes who took up the challenge were those of Mahababa, who collected an army and advanced upon the frontier. They sent a negotiator in the shape of a barber named Khub, who, arriving at the king’s gate, fought with the first comers for four ghars, saying that this fight was his neg or customary fee, as he was a soldier’s barber. Thereupon the Mahababa princes commenced a terrible battle in which they defeated Prithvi. They then performed all the various conditions of the challenge, and carried off Bela in triumph, and married her to Brahman, Parma’s son. 34

MISCELLANEA.

FOUR QUERIES CONCERNING THE FATEHPUR DISTRICT IN THE NORTH-WEST PROVINCES.

(1.) Fatehpur being a very common local name in Upper India, the capital of the Fatehpur District in the North-West Provinces is popularly known, by way of distinction, as Fatehpur Haaswa; the latter member of the compound being the name of a decayed town about 7 miles distant, which tradition represents as the oldest inhabited site in the neighbourhood. Its eponymous founder is said to have been a Raja Hans-dvaj, whose two brothers, Mordhvaj and Sankh-dvaj, are also locally commemorated by the names of two adjoining villages, Mordan and Sankhwan. The Raja’s second son Ran-bijay, having presumed to capture the horse that had been turned loose by the Pandavas, after their great sacrifice at Hastinspur, was attacked by them and slain, together with his elder brother Siva-dharma. Their sister Champavati then succeeded to the throne, but eventually died childless, after bequeathing the town to Brahmanas, whose descendants held it for many generations. I shall be glad of references to any passage in the

Mahbhadrata or other authority, which supports or corrects the above tradition.

(2.) After the defeat of Jay Chand of Kanauj and his brother Manik, at Karak (a town in the Allahabad district near the Fatehpur border) Quibu’d-din, with his sister’s two sons, Qasim and ‘Alau’d-din, advanced upon Haaswa. Its Raja, Hans-raja by name, came out to meet them, and joined in single combat with Alau’d-din at a village called Chakherti. The Raja was killed, and Alau’d-din also lost his head, but the headless trunk fought its way on to Haaswa, a distance of 12 miles, and there at last fell and was buried. His dargah is on the top of the old fort in the centre of the town and is still held in much veneration. Is this capture of Haaswa mentioned by any of the Muhammadan chronographers? 31

3. The town of Haaswa is almost surrounded by a broad shallow sheet of water, which, at one end has been deepened and brought into more regular shape as a tank. In its centre is an island, measuring 165 feet square, faced on all four sides with flights of masonry steps, and approached from the baad by a bridge 150 feet long, consist-

34 Since the above was written, Mr. V. A. Smith has most kindly placed at my disposal a number of valuable songs in the Hamirpur dialect, dealing with the Allah cycle. These I hope to publish on a future occasion.

31 [Compare this Legend with the numerous similar examples quoted in the Cal. Rec. No. CLXXXI. p. 158 ff. In the article Folk-tales of the Headless Horseman in Northern India.—Ed.]
The Faqhpur district is the original home of the great Goutam Clan, who claim the Rishi Gotama as their remote ancestor. Their descendant in the 6th degree married the daughter of Ajaypal, a Gahwarar Raju of Kanauj, and received as her dowry the whole extent of country from Prayag to Haridwar. From the date of this event the family came to be reckoned as Thakurs, instead of Brahmins as they first were, and the issue of the marriage took the title of Rajas of Argal, which is still borne by the head of the clan; Argal being a village situated in the ravines of the river Rind, in the Korah Pargana, about 30 miles west of the town of Fatehpur. Successive Rajas greatly reduced their territory by lavish grants of land, especially by a dowry, to a Bais chieftain, of 1,400 villages, lying to the north of the Ganges. This tract is now popularly known as Baiswar, and constitutes the district of Bais Buheli, in Oudh. About the same time, 62 other villages were conferred upon Parmal, the Chandel Raju of Mahoba, after his defeat by Firthi Raja in 1183. Ten years later the Raju of Argal, Ratan Sen, shared in the ruin that had overtaken his brother-in-law, Jay Chand, the Gahwarar (or Rathor) Raju of Kanauj. For the next four centuries the family was always in arms against the Muhammadan Emperors, but uniformly with ill success, till at last the Rajas's power was finally crushed, his forts razed, and all his possessions confiscated. The present holder of the empty title is reduced to the most extreme poverty, and his eldest son, with a pedigree of 75 degrees of descent, has been glad to accept a post in the subordinate ranks of the Police, with a salary of Rs. 10 a month.

The Fort at Argal is said to have been first called Mahakaya, from a temple of Mahadeva under that designation, and in evidence of its ancient celebrity the following sloka is quoted:—

Renuka, Sukaresh, Kati, Kati, Kala, Varakshar, Kalianjara, Mahakaya, Ukhala, narva muktidha.

Some of these places are unknown or uncertain, and I shall be glad of help to identify them. Renuka, I am told, is on the Narmada river near Jabalpur. Sukara, as I imagine, must be Soron, in the Etah district, where a great fair is held on the festival of the Varaha Avatar. Kasi requires no elucidation. Kali may be Calcutta. Batesar is in the Agra district is the scene of a great gathering on the full moon of Kartik. Kalianjar is the celebrated fort in Bundelkhand, and Mahakaya is Argal. But I cannot localize Kala, nor Ukhala, nor do I understand why Varakshar should appear in the dual number. It is also probable that considerable license has been allowed to local panegyrist and that other versions of the sloka are current, with variations in some of the names, which it would be interesting to compare.

F. S. Growse.

CURIOSITIES OF INDIAN LITERATURE.

MACABRONIC VERSES OF GUMAN KAVI.

वास्तविन: शास्त्रपाठी
नावातीह त्वस्तरी न
तान्त्रिके देखा गारी
क्से हैं मै यो हक्कल गारी||

[Mandodari says to Ravana after the carrying off of Sita].—Before Rama, bearing weapons, cometh here to fight thee, return thou his wife to him; for "The wetter a blanket gets, the heavier it is."

बिस्म लोकनायकवल न कुंडन दरसय
प्रयोगमनस्यवस्य क्या मससय।
ता देवर हस्त मंत्रिसिंह सा
नई राज गारी गई लाज सारी||

Even Mandodari, the beloved of Ravana, who was emperor of the universe and king of Lankâ,—she who was the mother of Mejghananda and the daughter of Maya,—even she intrigued with her husband's brother; for "Brother, when once a woman becomes a widow, her shame is gone."

G. A. GRIERSON.

THE PROVERBS OF ALI EBN ABI TALEBI.

Translated by K. T. Pest, M.A., M.R.A.S., Principal, Gujarat College.

Continued from p. 236.

273. He prepared the food, but did not eat of it.

274. A man is happy in the society of those who are happy.

275. Admiration of oneself is a sign of folly.

276. Anger is the fire of hearts.

277. A man who prays without working is like a bow without a string.

him by 35 generations. This supports the suggestion made by Dr. Houghton in his paper on the Gahwarars and Rathors: vide supra, page 85.
278. He is a sincere friend who tells you of your faults and prefers you to himself.
279. Beware of envy, for it will leave its marks on you and not on your enemy.
280. It is a distinguished virtue to forgive an injury when you can avenge yourself.
281. Justice is the crown of a king.
282. Acquire learning: for if you are rich it will adorn you; if you are poor it will support you.
283. There are three persons to whom a secret should not be told, viz., a woman, a malicious person, and a fool.
284. There are three things by which the dispositions of men are proved, viz., riches, power, and adversity.
285. There are three things which vex and overwhelm the mind, viz., separation of friends, poverty after riches, and contempt after being honoured.
286. Three things conciliate love, viz., religion, humility, and liberality.

287. The three chief points of a manly disposition are, to give without being asked, to keep one's word without a contract, and to be generous when poor.
288. Draw wisdom from him who brings it to you, and attend to what anyone says without reference to the speaker.
289. A slip of the tongue wounds more than a spear which goes straight to its mark.
290. A slip of the foot wounds, a slip of the tongue destroys.
291. To give more than you promised is noble, but to give less shows a mean mind.
292. Patience is the ornament of society by which one can put up with another's faults.
293. There are two things whose excellence is not recognised except when they are wanted, viz., youth and health.
294. Blessed is he whose heart is engaged in attentive contemplation, and his tongue in the praises of God.

SOCIETIES.


This number, though late to hand, contains some interesting communications on subjects connected with India and the East.

Dr. D. B. McCutie discourses on the origin of the Chinese and Korean writing, showing that, however close in external appearance the script of the Koreans may be to that of the Chinese, it differs radically from the latter inasmuch as it employs a real alphabet, which the Chinese has never done. On the same grounds it is argued that a Japanese origin for the Korean letters is highly improbable. The purely conventional character of these letters is most remarkable, as their elements are, "the square, its upper right-hand angle, lower left-hand angle, a rectangle with the right side gone, and with its sides prolonged upwards, the triangle, circle, and straight line"—showing a wide divergence from the principles on which the western alphabets have grown into existence.

Mr. Rockhill gives an account of and extracts from the Hundred Thousand Songs of Milaraspa, a Buddhist Missionary of the 11th century, from the Tibetan. Prof. D. G. Lyon calls attention to Part II., Vol. V. of the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, containing two important items, viz. a list of verb-forms in an alphabetical arrangement of radicals after the native Arabic plan, and a clay cylinder of Antiochias, in which he styles himself "An-ti-i-ku-us, the great king, the mighty king, son of Si-lu-uk-ku (Seleukos), the king Ma-ak-ka-du-na-a-a (the Makedonian)" and mentions his son Seleukos and his wife Asta-ar-ta-ni-ku (Stratonike).

Prof. W. D. Whitney has a paper on certain Aorist-forms in Sanskrit, in which he brings further information to bear on the matters discussed in his Sanskrit Grammar, §§ 834, 881, 883, and 884; and in another paper on the etymology of the Sanskrit erād, he inclines to the view that it must be referred to the tār with a leading sense of 'course of action or behaviour.' Prof. M. Bloomfield makes an attempt to define the position of the Vaiñosāstra in the literature of the Atharva-Veda; and Prof. C. K. Lanman addresses himself to the vexed question of Sanskrit transliteration with reference to typographical requirements. The question of transliteration is becoming a burning one, though Orientalists have not yet got beyond the stage in which every man doeth that which is right in his own eyes, and so every fresh solid addition to the literature of the subject is welcome. The writer advocates the employment of Professor Whitney's system as exhibited in his Sanskrit Grammar, and accordingly for ordinary Sanskrit he makes the following table of types:
BOOK NOTICES.


This is a curious pamphlet, and shows that the searcher after knowledge is no safer from attack—unjustifiable and otherwise—in the New World than in the Old. The Davenport Academy of Natural Sciences, entirely supported by voluntary subscriptions and work given to it from pure love of science by enthusiasts, who look for no pecuniary rewards, has been in existence some twenty years, and has published four volumes of Proceedings. Some members of the Academy, in 1877, discovered two 'elephant pipes' and three 'inscribed tablets' in what is known as 'mound No. 3' on the Cook farm adjoining the city of Davenport. Such things do not appear to have been discovered elsewhere, and accordingly the possession of these unique relics of antiquity by the Museum of the Davenport Academy gives it a 'deserved eminence,' since the importance of the find as testifying to the degree of civilization among the ancient American populations is obvious. In the Second Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology for 1880-81 and written then, though not published till last year, in a monograph entitled "Animal Carvings from Mounds in the Mississippi Valley," by H. W. Hemahaw, there appeared a most severe criticism of the work of the Davenport Academy, doubting the genuineness of the find and the good faith—a much more serious matter—of the finders. The pamphlet before us is issued with the object of

* At last the modified form of $\xi_1$ property used for $\xi_2$ is often thus printed.
establishing the bona fides of the Rev. Jacob Gass, the chief finder, in all he did. Without entering into the rights of the controversy one or two things strike us as most important in its future well-being of American research.

In the first place the Reports of the Bureau of Ethnology are issued under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institute and of the Government, and endorsed in fact by the Director of the Bureau; so that they are put before the world with all the authority, scientific and official, at the command of the United States. Now we notice that in the quotations from the Report, Mr. Henshaw—backed up, be it remembered, by the official authority of Major Powell, the Director—in addition to his attack on the personal character of Mr. Gass, practically tells him and his fellow-workers to cease from exploration. And we further notice that one object of the Bureau of Ethnology appears to be to centralize, and bring under its own direction all the research in the United States, and it seems to have taken steps to bring this about. Nothing could be more unsafe than this. Let a Government subsidize and encourage research as much as it finds itself able, and let it appoint official Directors of any branch of research that seems likely to be forwarded by such a step, but let it keep carefully clear of one thing—the official direction of all the research in the country. This means, of course, the centralization of research in the hands of one man or of a clique, and it might easily mean also the stifling of all independent labour.

The existence of the controversy under review points emphatically to the danger of such a system. Here we have an official employed in the direction of scientific research—backed up by his Director—warning certain outsiders against continuing in a certain line of exploration, and this official is criticizing arqueology, though his special training appears to be in ornithology. This kind of universal versatility—as we so well know in India—is more or less unavoidably to be expected of officials, but suppose such an official had it in his power to stop any particular line of research, what then? And if the Smithsonian Institute or the Bureau of Ethnology had all the direction of science in their hands in the United States, would not this sometimes happen? It seems to us a matter of the first importance to scientific men in America.

One more point. If Mr. Henshaw be rightly reported, his main reason for impugning Mr. Gass's good faith is that no one else has yet discovered similar important relics. The Indian Evidence Act lays down that no particular number of witnesses is required to establish a fact. One may be enough and one hundred insufficient. This seems to us to be common sense. The converse doctrine would render valueless many a paper in the Indian Antiquary on which it justly prides itself.


Dr. Ballantyne's translation of the Sāṅkhya Aphorisms, in three volumes, printed at Allahabad in the years 1852 to 1856, was for long well and favourably known in India, but has for some time past been very scarce. The abridgment, published in the Bibliotheca Indica (1862 and 1868), contains nothing of the Sanskrit text, and was therefore not so useful to students. In the volume now under notice, Messrs. Trübner and Co. have brought out, under the careful scholarly editorship of Dr. Ballantyne's old friend, Dr. Fitz-Edward Hall, a new and carefully revised reprint of the original work, which will doubtless be heartily welcomed. The corrections introduced in the readings of the aphorisms are very numerous, and all blemishes of idiom have been carefully removed from the translation, while the editor has evidently spared no pains in verifying references, and his numerous footnotes, supplying the variant readings of the commentators and other illustrative information, are most valuable. It is rarely one meets with a book of this kind, edited with such care and masterly acquaintance with the subject. It will be found to be of sterling value to the student.


This book is a very welcome addition to the literature of the well-known fables of Bidpai. The edition of Kalilah and Dimnah, by Prof. Wright, issued last year, being merely the Syriac text, was of no use to any but Semitic scholars. If the valuable introduction be omitted. The great value of this edition is that it translates Prof. Wright's text and so brings it before the student of general folklore. The introduction, too, which extends to lxxv pp., gives a good detailed account of all the chief recensions of these universal fables and a capital résumé of what has up to date been written as to their origin and migrations. It is to be observed that at p. lxix, the author notices that the 'Iṣṭ-i-Dināšik version, drawn up by Abd'al-Fazl for the decoration of Akbar in 1587 A.D., has never been edited, though Capt. Roeuck edited an Urdu version of it in 1815 as the Khird Afra. Here is a chance for Persian Scholars.
THE KANGAR OR KANGRI, THE KASMIリ PORTABLE BRAZIER.

[Editorial note: This page contains a detailed description of the Kangar or Kangri, a portable brazier used in Kashmir. The text explains its construction, usage, and cultural significance.]

1 I have noticed this distinction in pronunciation in scores of cases, e.g. Kasmiri lor, a house, Paishābī-Kasmiri lāri; Kasmiri kura, a chair, Panjābī-Kasmiri kurī.

2 Khoro or khōjā (Persian) means in Kasmiri a master, a gentleman, or man of some distinction.

3 This phāran is the chief garment worn by the Kasmirī, male or female. As already noticed its shape is not unlike a stout nightgown, but with sleeves very often half-a-yard wide and two to three yards long. The women's sleeves are generally larger than the men's. The phārans are made in all colours and in all kinds of cloth, according to the position and sex of the purchasers. The word phāran is manifestly derived from the Persian pdrāhan, a loose vest, shirt.

4 Many houses are destroyed by fire every year in Srinagar, the result of a careless use of the kangar; and scores of patients are treated at the Mission Hospital for epitheliosis, a kind of cancer generated from kangar burns.

5 "O Kangar, O Kangar, offerings for thee. Thou art a virgin of paradise, thou art a fairy."

6 "If there is not the heat of fire in the bosom, one's precious life will undoubtedly come out"—and many others.
got their own antidote for their winter cold. There is no necessity for me to go there."

It has been suggested that the Kâsmîrî learnt the use of the kângâr from the Italians in the retinue of the Mughal Emperors, who frequently visited the valley during the summer months 1587—1753 A.D. On this point nothing trustworthy has been procured as yet from the natives. Enquiry has been made from high and low, rich and poor, but no person can tell anything, fact or fiction, as to who originated, or whence was imported, this popular and necessary article.

The following extract from the Queen for March 1885 and the plate attached hereto will throw a good deal of light on the probable European origin of this now national utensil of the Kâsmîris. The first three figures are from the Queen, the fourth is a sketch of a Kâsmîrî kângâr drawn by Mr. J. Griffiths, from a specimen in the Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy School of Art at Bombay, and the fifth is half-size reproduction of an ordinary earthenware and wicker-work kângâr in the possession of one of the Editors of this Journal.

"In Italy, Spain, and in the East the brazier (brasero) as a heating apparatus was, and in many places is still, preferred to the fireplace. These charcoal-holders could be employed anywhere and carried from room to room. They were made in a great variety of shapes, and their surfaces received every kind of ornamentation; medallions with figures and complex bas-reliefs, embalzoned escutcheons, etc. The grounds were sometimes guilletoché with delicate foliage, borrowed by the Venetians from the chasings and inlayings of the Orientals. Braziers remained in use in France as late as the seventeenth century. They were frequently arranged on columnar tripods, with the fire-irons attached to them, or made portable and fitted with bars on the movable top, to rest the feet upon. Sometimes braziers and fire-dogs were combined. Combinations of this kind are still to be found in old Normandy farmhouses, where the top basin is used to keep dishes warm.

Directly connected with the braziers are the hand-warmers, which were already known to the Romans under the name of trulla, and long preceded the foot-warmers. These chausjournais were kept warm either by hot ashes or by a spirit lamp. First used in the Middle Ages by the clergy during their functions in church, ladies adopted them in the course of time as a counterpart to the pears made of agate, which served to cool the hands and to keep them dry. One of these agate pears is mentioned in an inventory of Gabrielle d'Estrée in 1599."

With regard to the derivation of the word there are two plausible conjectures:

(i) That the word kângâr comes from two Kâsmîrî words kâni (kânih and sometimes kauunjîh), which means a switch used for making baskets, and gar a maker or fastener. Hence the two words together kâni-gar would mean a binder or fastener of switches. But this combination might mean also switches bound together, because it often happens in Kâsmîrî that the thing made is called after the maker and vice verâ; and the kângâr is nothing but a basket with a little earthenware basin inside. From kângâr we easily get kângar. A shortening like this is very common in Kâsmîrî, e.g., rangi-gar is shortened into rangar, a dyer, and bungi-gar is shortened into bangar, a worker or trader in hemp.

(ii) Another, and perhaps a better, suggestion, is that the word comes direct from Sanskrit. Ku ñ (kud and kâ) as a prefix implies deterioration, depreciation, littleness, and aîgârā aîgârī means charcoal heated or not heated, while aîgârī aîgârī is a portable fire-place. Hence kâ-d+aîgârā or aîgârī kâd+aîgârī would mean a little heated charcoal, or a small portable fire-place. This, perhaps, could easily come to be pronounced kângâr or kângârī, according to the Sanskrit habit, e.g., kâ+d+agni makes kâdagni, a little fire, and kâ+d+aksha makes kâdaksha, to wink, etc. Sanskrit scholars may, perhaps, be able to throw more light upon this point.

Gasetter, I hear, has a short article on this subject. If this story is true then they would not have required the kângâr—for indeed, they would have found it extremely inconvenient, except as a charcoal-burner, as it is used in Italy, or as the chausjournais of Switzerland and other parts of the Continent of Europe.

* [If the Italians really introduced the kângâr into Kâsmîr they would be as likely as not to have introduced their own name for the article. This is a point worth observing in this connection.—Ed.]
PORTABLE BRAZIERS.

I.—HAND WARMER (OPEN), 18TH CENTURY.  II.—HAND WARMER (SHUT), 16TH CENTURY.

III.—PORTABLE BRAZIER.  IV.—KASMIRI KANGRI.
PORTABLE BRAZIERS

V.—COMMON KASMIRI KANGAR.
(Half size.)
XXXI.

When Chinghiz Khan retired from China he deputed his most trusted general Mu-khu-li to complete the conquest of the Kin Empire. "I have conquered," he said, "the Chinese provinces north of the Tai-hang Mountains. It is for you to subdue the country south of that chain." And he invested him with a golden patsak, or official tablet, which constituted him his vicegerent in China. Douglas says he gave him a chariot and a banner of nine pennons. He also commanded that the same honours were to be paid to him as to himself. Maps of China were ordered to be prepared by hing-shing, or surveyors, preparatory to the new campaign.

Mu-khu-li set out with 23,000 Mongols and Turks, viz., 10,000 Onguts, 1,000 Kushikulas (?), 4,000 Uruts,1 2,000 Inkirasses under Tutu Gurkan, 1,000 Mangkuts under Munkaka Kaljahan, 3,000 Kunkurats under Alji Noyan, and 2,000 Jelairs under Thalising the brother of Mu-khu-li, together with two divisions of Khitans and Churchis, commanded respectively by two generals belonging to the two nations, called Oyar and Taghan, who both received the title of leaders of tumans, i.e. of 10,000, which, in Chinese, is wun-shah.2

D'Ohs on says that after Chinghiz Khan's withdrawal most of the positions he had conquered had been reoccupied and fortified by the Kin troops, and the Mongols in fact only retained Chung-tu and the northern borders of Pe'chihli and Shan-si. Meanwhile the imprudent Kin Emperor Utubu quarrelled with his southern neighbour, the Sung Emperor, who ruled the countriesouth of the river Hoai in Ho-nan, with his capital at Hang-chau, the chief town of Che'king. The latter had seized the opportunity of the Mongol attack to refuse to pay the tribute, which had been hitherto exacted from him by the Kin ruler; and Utubu was now persuaded by his prime minister Chuku-kaoki to send an army to exact this tribute, and accordingly in 1217 a Kin army crossed the Hoai, captured several towns, and ravaged the country. Hearing that the Mongols were again in motion Utubu repeated this movement, and sent envoys to the Sung Emperor, to propose an alliance against the invaders. This the latter, who knew his enemy's embarrassment, naturally refused to entertain.3

Setting out from Yen-king, or Peking, in 1218 Mu-khu-li marched upon the towns of Sui-ching4 and Li-chau,5 The latter resisted bravely, and in consequence he would have slaughtered its inhabitants, but Chao-tien, one of his officers, who was born there, and whose family was inside, threw himself at his feet and in tears offered his own life to redeem the place. Mu-khu-li, touched by this, pardoned it. He then marched eastwards and successively captured the towns of Tsi-nan, Lin-tsi, Teng-chau, and Lai-chau.6 Douglas tells us that he conquered Ta-ming-fu, Tung-chau and Tung-chau in Chib-li and Eto-chau, Litsil-chau, Tang-chau and Lai-chau in Shan-tung, and also secured the cities of Mien-ching, Lu and Me. The losses among the Kin garrisons from death and desertion were numerous.

The most important event of the campaign was undoubtedly the capture of Ta-yuan-fu, the capital of Shan-si.7 This important capital was then governed on behalf of the Kin by Ukulun-t'eshing, and he defended it skilfully. The Mongols pressed their attack chiefly against the north-west bastion, which they at length forced. Still the place held out. Ukulun-te'shing then made a barricade with a number of carts bound together, behind which he sustained three assaults, but eventually the Mongols poured in such a shower of stones and arrows that the garrison was obliged to surrender. Its brave commander hanged himself.8

Ping-yang, which had a weak garrison, was

---

1 Erdmann says Uiruta.
2 De Mailla, Vol. IX. pp. 79 and 80; Gaubl., p. 82; Erdmann, p. 334; D'Ohs on, Vol. I. p. 162; Douglas, p. 84.
4 The modern Gan-echien.
5 i.e. Li-chien in the district of Pao-ting-fu in Pe'chihli.
6 De Mailla, Vol. IX. pp. 80 and 81.
7 Douglas, op. cit., pp. 84 and 85.
8 The Kung-hu tells us that Mu-khu-li, having conquered the towns of Tung, i.e. of the provinces of Chib-li and Shan-tung, marched towards Tai-ho-ling, south-east of Ma-li-hien of Tai-tong-fu, and having entered the district called Ho-tong he secured the towns of Tai-chau and Teih-chau, whence he proceeded to attack Tai-yuan.
easily captured. The troops wished to cut their way out, but its governor Li-kâ said he could not survive the loss of a place committed to his care by the Emperor. He accordingly killed himself. The governors of Fun-chan and Lu-chan also died sword in hand in defence of their towns.\textsuperscript{10} Douglas, in reporting these events, dates them a year later, and adds the towns of Hin-chan and Ho-chan to the above list of Mongol captures.\textsuperscript{11} Gaubil tells us that Mu-khu-li was accompanied in this campaign by his son Polu or Bora.\textsuperscript{12} The Kin empire had certainly fallen upon hard times, for while the Mongols pressed it hard on the north, it was carrying on a vigorous struggle with the Sung empire in the south, a good proof of its energy and vitality.

In the fifth month of 1218 we read how a Kin general named Miao-tao-yun was assassinated by an official at the court named Kia-yu. A colleague and friend of the former named Chang-yoou, who was a native of Ichin in Pe'chhiji, marched with a body of troops to avenge his death; but when he reached Tsi-king-kuan, the famous Judastree Pass in Pe'chhiji, he was met and defeated by a Mongol army under the general Mingan. His horse having fallen under him he was captured and taken before Mingan and ordered to bend the knee before him. He replied that he was, like Mingan himself, a general officer, and would die rather than disgrace himself in the way proposed. Mingan admired his soldierly courage and ordered him to be unbound. Presently, to save the lives of his father and mother, who had been captured and taken to Yen-king, he gave a feast and consented to enter the service of the Mongols, and eventually became one of their first generals.\textsuperscript{13}

He was speedily put in harness, for we are told that early the next year, i.e., 1219, he was sent at the head of a body of troops against Yong-chan, I-chan, Pao-gan-chan, Pao-chi, and some other southern towns. He began his campaign by an attack on a small place called Kong-shan-tai.\textsuperscript{14} It was commanded by his mortal enemy, Kia-yu, already named. Kia-yu resisted so obstinately that Chang-yoou had recourse to a little engineering feat, by which he diverted a stream that supplied the place with water, and it was thus compelled to surrender. He then tore out his enemy's heart and offered it to the manes of his dead friend Miao-tao-yun. He next pitched his camp at Muan-ching, a town situated north-west of Pao-ting-fu in Pe'chhiji.\textsuperscript{15} Here he was vigorously attacked by the Kin general Wu-sien. Too weak to risk a battle, Chang-yoou compelled every one inside to man the ramparts, even including the weak, the aged, and also women, while he was on the head of his most valiant soldiers he made a sortie and attacked the enemy in rear, capturing many prisoners. He then unfurled many standards on the neighbouring hills, and spread the report that the Mongols were approaching in strength. Frightened by these rumours and by the drums which were beaten on the hill and inside the town Wu-sien withdrew precipitately, and Chang-yoou put a large number of his men to the sword. He then captured Wanchan. The commanders of Ki-yaan and Ki-yaan, the modern Hien in Chih-li, submitted. He next attacked the town of Chong-shan-fu, situated in the modern department of Tung-cha in Chih-li, to whose relief Ko-tie-tsiang, a lieutenant of Wu-sien, marched. Chang-yoou met him at Sin-lo, where there was a sharp conflict, in which he was struck by an arrow in the mouth, losing two of his teeth. This made him furious, and he pressed the enemy and killed a great many of them, and also defeated Lieou-ching, who had marched against him. Then advancing southwars he exacted a submission from Ku-ching, Shin-chê, Ning-tai, and thirty other towns. The Mongols also captured U-chan west of Shu-chan in the district of Tai-tong, Ho-ho-hien and Tong-shing-chan. The Kin emperor, who was being hard pressed both on his northern and southern frontier, wreaked his vengeance on his chief minister, Chiu-chu-kao-k, whom he put to death.\textsuperscript{16}

Mu-khu-li himself during the latter part of this year captured the towns of Kohan, Ke and Hien, with other places in Shen-si, and killed their inhabitants.\textsuperscript{17} In the fourth month of 1220, the Mongols attacked Yu-chan

\textsuperscript{10} Id. p. 83.
\textsuperscript{12} Op. cit. p. 43.
\textsuperscript{13} De Mailly, Vol. IX. pp. 87 and 88; Gaubil, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{14} De Mailly, Vol. IX. pp. 88-90; Gaubil, pp. 44-45; Douglas, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{15} De Mailly, Vol. IX. pp. 88-90; Gaubil, pp. 44-45; Douglas, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{16} De Mailly, Vol. IX. pp. 88-90; Gaubil, pp. 44-45; Douglas, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{17} Douglas, p. 88.
(i.e., Ho-ku-yen in the district of Tai-yuen-fu in Shan-si) and Yen-chau (in the southern part of Shan-tung), and gained a victory in which the Kin general Uyen Weiku was killed. Two months later Mu-khu-li secured Lan-chau and Kiang-chau, but he failed to capture Ho-chong-fu, which resisted all his efforts.

Hitherto we are told the Mongols had waged war mercilessly, and their officers had permitted the greatest atrocities. Shi-tian-ni, a Chinese, who served among them, having gained considerable influence over Mu-khu-li, urged upon him that this method of waging war made the Mongol name to be detested, and made people dread to become their subjects. Mu-khu-li, having listened to this counsel, published everywhere a strong prohibition of pillage and slaughter, and also ordered all his prisoners to be released, so that they could return home and work in the fields. This clemency produced a good effect and caused wide-spread gratification.

In the eighth month of 1220 Mu-khu-li, who had gone towards Moan-ching, sent three thousand horsemen under a Mongol named Monku-puhu to capture Tao-ma-kuan, one of the mountain fortresses of Po'chihi. This general having defeated a body of Kin troops, Wu-sien, who commanded at Ching-ting-fu, and who had grown weary of resisting the invaders, made his peace with them and surrendered that important town. Wu-sien was now appointed deputy governor of the western division of Hope, with the Chinese general Shi-tian-ni, already named, as his colleague. Shi-tian-ni had joined the Mongol service on the occasion of the first invasion of China. His father, who was a native of Yung-tsing, having noticed that the invaders spared the districts where they were not resisted, went with a large number of people in 1213 and submitted to Mu-khu-li, who was then encamped near Choo-chau, a few leagues to the south-west of Peking. Mu-khu-li wished to make him commander of a firen, and on his refusal he gave the post to his son Shi-tian-ni.

The Kin Emperor Utuub now determined to again open negotiations for peace. He sent Ukalin Chong-tuan with an offer to recognize Chinghiz Khan as his elder brother and to behave towards him as a younger brother. Mu-khu-li replied that some time before the Mongols had asked him to cede to them the countries of Ho and Sa, promising on this condition to suspend hostilities. This offer had been rejected, "Now," he continued, "that we have conquered these countries and there only remain some towns of Kwang-si which are not ours, if you will surrender them we will recognize you as Prince of Ho-nan." This offer was rejected, and Mu-khu-li marched upon Shan-tung. Yan-shi, who commanded in Chang-te-fu and in seven other districts in the south of Po'chihi, in the portion of Ho-nan north of the Yellow River and the province of Shan-tung, submitted to him. De Mailla says he controlled 3 towns of the first order, and 6 of the second, with 300,000 families. Mu-khu-li duly confirmed him in his post. He then secured T'ai-nan-fu, the capital of Shan-tung.

The Kin Emperor had appointed a vigorous man named Su-ting as his chief minister in the place of the disgraced Kaoki. He speedily raised an immense army in Shan-tung, which prevented the Sung Emperor and the king of Hia from joining in an attack upon the province of Shen-si. The Kin army in Shan-tung was encamped at Hoang-ling-kang and its general detached 20,000 foot-soldiers to attack Mu-khu-li in the neighbourhood of T'ai-nan, who defeated his assailants, and then assailed in turn the main army of the Kin, which was ranged on the southern bank of the Yellow River in the district of Tsa-chau-fu. He dismounted his cavalry and attacked the enemy sword in hand, broke their ranks and drove many of them into the river, where a vast number of them were drowned. He then advanced upon Chou-koen, which he captured, and passing by Shen-chau laid siege to Tung-ping in Shan-tung (called Tong-chang-fu by Gaubil). This place offered a stubborn resistance, so after besieging it for a month he left a small force to blockade it

---

18 De Mailla, Vol. IX. pp. 92 and 93; Gaubil, p. 45.
19 i.e., of the country north of the river, by which the district north of the Yellow River is generally meant, but here apparently the northern part of Po'chihi is alone included in the term.
under the general Yan-shi, informing him that the place would not surrender until its people were pressed by famine. He ordered him to treat the people well, as also the inhabitants of the neighbouring districts. He nominated Solu-hutu as commandant of Tong-ping when it should surrender, Yan-shi as governor of the people (? dârâqha), and ordered Sarta, after the capture of the place to create two military governments, one of the north and the other of the south, and to entrust the one to Yan-shi and the other to Shi-kne.44 Mu-khu-li himself advanced upon Ming-chau (Kuang-ping-fu in Pe'chihli), dividing his army into small bodies, and thus overran the country north of the river. Douglas says he laid siege to Tsao and Ming, and adds that it was in this campaign the Kin general Wanian Weiko lost his life.45

Tong-ping did not surrender till the fifth month of 1221, when its commanders Monkukang and Wang-ting-ya, being hard pressed for food, abandoned it and tried to escape to Pei-chau. Solu-hutu pursued them and killed 7,000 of their men. Yan-shi entered the town and in accordance with Mu-khu-li's commands restored order there. Sarta, similarly obedient, divided the country into two departments, giving Yan-shi that of the north with the towns of Nghen-chau, Po-chau and others depending on them, while Shi-kne fixed his court at Tsao-chau, and took possession of the southern division.46

In November 1221 Mu-khu-li crossed the Yellow River at Tong-shing-chau, the modern Tokhto-khotpe, with the intention of attacking Kia-chau. He really wished to secure that part of Shan-si which belonged to the Kin Tartars in order thence to attack Ho-nan and Kai-fong-fu, the southern capital of the Kin dynasty. The king of Hia or Tangut was naturally alarmed at the invasion of his borders, and sent his general Taga to the district now occupied by the Mongol tribe of the Ordus to congratulate him. Mu-khu-li having asked for some troops the king further ordered his general Dake-ganpu to join him with 50,000 men. The Mongols speedily secured Kia-chau, and its commander Hang-kong-tso having fled, Mu-khu-li did not stay long there; but having entered the department of Sui-te-chau he captured two strong fortresses, Po-ma and Kâ-yeng. While there another Tangutan general named Mipu arrived with reinforcements. Before being presented he enquired what the ceremony would be. Mu-khu-li informed him he should expect him to behave as his master the king of Hia would conduct himself before Chinghiz Khan. This reply embarrassed Mipu, for he knew the Mongols treated the kingdom of Hia as tributary and subject, and that this meant some act which would be interpreted as homage of some kind. He replied that he had received no instructions from his master in regard to this matter, and he accordingly withdrew with his men; but he returned shortly after, as Mu-khu-li had attacked Yeng-gan, a town situated on the Yen-ho in Shen-si. Mi-pu went to him, held the reins of his horse, and made the salutation which Mu-khu-li prescribed.

Khada, the Kin Commander-in-Chief, and Nahomaichu had united for the defence of Yen-gan. The former was encamped with 30,000 men to the east of the town. Mongu-puhao, having reconnoitred his position with 3,000 men, reported to Mu-khu-li on his return, that the Kin troops despaired the Mongols, since they thought their army was a small one, and suggested the formation of an ambush that very night. Mu-khu-li approving of this, planted a portion of his force in a defile between two mountains, and the next day before sunrise Mongu-puhao attacked the Kin army with the advance-guard. He pretended not to be able to hold his ground and fled, abandoning his drums and standards. The Khins, who were deceived, pursued him quickly to the defile, where Mu-khu-li caused his concealed men to charge them amidst a tremendous beating of drums. Their surprise was naturally very great. Khada took to flight, and lost 7,000 men. He withdrew into the town, to which Mu-khu-li laid siege. As the place was strong, and promised to make a long resistance, he left a portion of his force there, and went southwards to attack Fu-chau and Fang-chau, situated in the modern Chung-pu-hien, and other neighbouring towns. At Fu-chau there fell several distinguished Kin

44 De Mailla, Vol. IX. pp. 94 and 95.
47 Called Takokanpu by De Mailla.
48 De Mailla calls him Hota.
officers, such as Wanian-lukin, Héséliei-ho-sheou, Pucha-leoushi, and a great number of soldiers. A few days afterwards Fang-chau was captured, while Sae-chau and Kichan were plundered. 29

De Mailla describes the pillage of Sse-chau. He tells us how the town was built on a scarped rock, and its governor, Yang-chin, finding himself hard pressed by Mu-khu-li threw his wife and children from the battlement, and himself jumped over after them. As this was an important place, Mu-khu-li left a garrison there with a body of light cavalry under Mongu-puhon, which was to overrun the surrounding district, and to secure the most important posts in the mountain and fords over the rivers. He himself with the main army captured Mong-chau, Tain-yang, Ho-i, and several other towns where the Kins had garrisons. 30

In the eleventh month of 1221, Chang-lin, the governor of Sung-gan, went over to the Mongols, and thus put them in possession of all the east coast of the capital, including the cities of Tsang and King in Chih-li, and Pin and Tai in Shan-tung. He was rewarded with the appointment of commandant of the eastern division of Shan-tung. 31

In the latter part of this year the Sung emperor sent Kao-mong-yu to make an alliance with the Mongols against the Kins. The Mongols duly sent back envoys to the Imperial court. 32

Douglas mentions the towns of Kien-king, and Pin in Shan-si, and Yuen in Kansuh, the modern Chin-yuen-kien, among Mu-khu-li’s captures. 33 He also says that Hutucuto desert ed the Kin cause, and gave up the Blue Dragon fort to the Mongols, after which Mu-khu-li took the Cow-heart stockade, when the prefect was killed by the fall of a house. He then summoned Shi-tian-ni and told him that Ho-chung was the most interesting place in Ho-tung (i.e., the country south of the Yellow River), and he would not entrust its protection to any one but himself. He thereupon gave him authority over all the troops in that district, and then went to Chang-nan, i.e., Si-ngan-fu, the capital of Shan-si, which he entrusted to the U-hu-nai and Tai-pu-hoa. 34 He gave Ganchi’s command of an army with which to blockade the famous fortress of Tong-kuan, and in the eleventh month of 1222 captured Tong-chau, in the defence of which Wanianoko, one of the best generals in the Kin service, lost his life. 35

In the first month of 1223, Mu-khu-li attacked Fong-tsiang-fu, a town of Shen-si. This he assailed night and day for forty days without effect, and was despairing of taking it and preparing to retire, when he heard that the Kin general, Siao-shu, had recaptured the town of Ho-chong-fu (Pu-chaa-fu), an important place near the eastern bank of the Yellow River, and had killed its governor, Shi-tian-ing, already named. It seems that having learnt that a Kin army was marching against him he had planted U-ta in ambush in a defile in the mountains by which it would have to pass. U-ta was brave, but addicted to wine, and notwithstanding his promise not to drink till his return, he had scarcely reached his post when he got drunk. The Kin passed by him quietly, and marched on to attack Ho-chong-fu, which had not been put into a state of defence. All those in the place who had submitted to the Mongols now abandoned them, joined the enemy, and introduced them into the town, which they proceeded to fire. The rising flames soon informed Shi-tian-ing that the enemy was in the place, and he put himself at the head of fifty or sixty of his men with the intention of driving them out. They wished him to cross the Yellow River and save himself, which he could well have done without compromising his reputation or bringing on himself the reproaches of Mu-khu-li. He said, however, that he should blush to appear before his friends, and must either drive the enemy out or perish. He accordingly marched against the Kin troops, and fought very bravely till mid-day, when he was overpowered and killed. The invaders having burnt the town, and put its inhabitants to the sword, retired by the same way they had gone. Antsaar, a Mongol general, pursued them; and, we are told, killed 30,000 of them. Mu-khu-li, to reward the services of

29 De Mailla, pp. 98—100; Ganbil, pp. 46 and 47; Douglas, p. 92; D’Ohsson, Vol. I. pp. 364 and 365.
30 De Mailla, p. 168. 31 Douglas, pp. 92 and 93.
32 De Mailla, Vol. IX. p. 100.
34 The Anki of D’Ohsson.
35 D’Ohsson says the general, Khunatai-Buka.
Shi-tian-ing gave his son, Shi-wa-ko, the same government and the same authority as his father had held. Mu-khu-li on hearing of the death of Shi-tian-ing raised the siege of Feng-siang, and repaired to Ho-chong, which had been abandoned, as I have mentioned. He put a new garrison there, and repaired the fortifications which had fallen into ruin. Setting out from Ho-chong, Mu-khu-li fell dangerously ill at Wen-li-hien or Wen-he-hien, in the department of Hai-chan in Shen-si. He summoned his younger brother, Tai-su, and said to him that he had for forty years fought for his master, and had never been defeated. His only regret was that he had not captured Nanking, a task he left for him to fulfill. Mu-khu-li died in April, 1223, at the age of 54 years. I have referred at some length to his earlier adventures in chapter XV. and elsewhere, and here I would merely say that he was Chinghiz Khan's most distinguished and trusted commander. Mu-khu-li's command and honours were made over to his son, Polu or Born.

In August, 1223, Monk-kang, governor of Pei-chau for the Khans, treated his soldiers with so much severity that they revolted. Naho-luko, one of his principal officers, feeling that the Mongols were riding the winning horse, put himself at the head of the malcontents, killed Monk-kang, and having arranged his plans with Li-tsui, a Mongol officer, they wrote a joint letter to the governor of Hai-chau, to inform him of their intention to submit to him. The letter was intercepted by an officer in the service of the Sung empire, who handed it to his commander, Li-tsui, who sent some troops under Wang-hi-ul to try and divert their intention, and to persuade them to join the imperial service. Li-tsui having gone to Pei-chau enticed Wang-hi-ul into the town under pretence of treating with him and, having closed the gates, arrested him. Li-tsui, piqued at this trick, marched to attack Pei-chau, which was surrounded by water on all sides, and was bravely defended. The garrison, however, made a sortie, when his troops were badly beaten and many of his men were killed, whereupon he retired to Taing-chau. Meanwhile the Khin general, Yanta, also marched upon Pei-chau, where he defeated and killed Naho-luko, and recovered it for his master. Two months later Utubu the Khin emperor died, and was succeeded by his third son, Ninkiasu, whose Chinese name was Sheou-siu. About the same time died Le-tean-hiu, the king of Hia, and was succeeded by his son Li-te-wang. Early the next year, i.e., 1224, Ninkiasu made peace with the Sung emperor, Ning-tsung. Ning-tsung died shortly after, probably from chagrin, and was succeeded by his adopted son, Li-tsung; so that the death of Mu-khu-li was followed in a few months by those of the three potentates dividing the Chinese empire between them, the emperors of the Sung and Khin dynasty, and the king of Hia.

Ping-hin, one of the Li-tsung's generals, having made himself master of the greater part of Shan-tung, allied himself with Wu-sien, whom Mu-khu-li had made deputy governor of Western Hopo (vide ante), and who having thus rebelled killed his collègue, Shi-tian-ni, and occupied Ching-tung-fu. Shi-tian-tsi, the brother of the murdered man, was nominated in the latter's place by the Mongol generalissimo Born. He attacked Wu-sien, defeated him, and took Ching-tung-fu. This was in 1225. Presently Wu-sien returned, recaptured Ching-tung-fu while Shi-tian-tsi withdrew beaten to Kau-ching in Pe-chihli. The next year Shi-tian-tsi again proceeded to Ching-tung-fu. Choosing a dark night for his attack he was completely successful. Wu-sien sought refuge in the mountains of the West, where he entrenched himself. Li-tui, who governed Chung-shau (Ting-chau in Pe-chihli) for the Mongols, had also joined the party of Ping-hin, who, being thus reinforced, proceeded to attack Tung-ping, where Yan-shi still commanded. After resisting for four months he was compelled by the want of provisions to surrender, and thereupon also joined the rebels. They marched together upon Ching-tung-fu, and were met near the Western Mountains by the Mongols under Belke.

53 Called Shi-tian-tsi by D'Ossau.
54 De Mailla, Vol. IX. pp. 103-104.
56 De Mailla, Vol. IX. p. 105.
58 D'Ossau says he died at Wen-hi, in the district of So-chau in Shen-si.
Thereupon Yanshi, who was aggrieved that Ping-i-bin had treated him haughtily, again changed sides and went over to the Mongols. Ping-i-bin was at the same time attacked in rear by Shi-tian-tai, and was captured. Bidden to do homage to the Mongol ruler, he replied proudly that he was a subject of the great Sung empire, and would not serve another ruler. They accordingly put him to death with torments. Yan-shi now secured the submission to the Mongols of that part of Shantung, east of the river Tsing, of which Ping-i-bin had taken possession. Meanwhile Li-tsiuan, who was master of the north of that province, having fought several times with the Mongols and been always defeated, "shut himself up in the town of Itu (Tsing-chau-fu in Ho-nan), where he was attacked by Mu-khu-lii's brother, Taisun. He held out for a whole year, notwithstanding that famine raged inside and that the besieged had to feed on human flesh, but surrendered in 1227. Taisun made over Shantung with the district of Khuai-nan in Kiang-su to him as a fief, for which he had to pay an annual tribute. Douglas says he was made Inspector of Shantung and Hwainan. Meanwhile Boru captured Chant-fu whose governor, Wahian Aishin, was killed during the siege, and also captured Lin-tao-fu, and killed its commander, Tomon-hushimen, and laid waste all the country between Fong-siang and King-chao. In the last month of 1227 the Mongols invaded the Sung empire by the three defiles of Ping-tesing (south-west of Sin-yang-chau in Ho-nan), U-yang (north-east of Jung-shan-hien of Te-gan-fu in Hu-kuang) and Kaoang-hien (south-west of Lo-shan-hien of Yu-nings-fu in Ho-nan), whereupon Ching-sun, believing they meant to attack Se-chuan, abandoned Mien-chau, and retired into the interior of the country.

The Kin Tartars had virtually lost to the Mongols Northern China, comprising Hopë of Shantung, and all the districts of Koan-chen, and now concentrated their endeavours upon the defence of Ho-nan, of which Tung-kuan was the key. Notwithstanding their recent losses they still retained command of the country stretching from Lo-yang, San-men, and Si-tain, eastwards as far as Yuen-tsiao-chin, extending over more than 2,000 li, and protected by 200,000 men; and to show the heroic materials of which the race was made, I would quote the siege of Si-ho-chau, which took place at this time. Its governor having defended it for a long time, saw that he must surrender, and told his wife, Tuhsi, that she had better see to her own safety, as the place was about to be lost. "Do you think," she replied in a firm voice, "that loaded with the favours of our princes I am going to sacrifice my duty to a weak love for life. No, I will not survive my misfortune. I had rather die than be wanting in fidelity." She thereupon took poison, and died a few hours later. Two of her sons drank what she had left, and died by her side, while her husband, Chin-yu, and several of his friends, ashamed of being beaten in courage by a woman committed suicide, and fell over the body of this heroine and her children. As many as twenty-eight of his friends preferred this end to surviving their defeat.

I have now brought down the account of the Mongol doings in China until Chinghis Khan's return home, when he again is found on its borders. Before describing his last campaign, we will bring up the story of one of the dependencies of his empire to this point. When he set out for the West, as we have seen, he left behind as his vicegerent in Mongolia his brother, Ochigin (called Uacht by Gaubil and DeMailla), who, we are told, ruled with considerable prudence. In the year 1220, he received at his court the princess Tiso-li (called Yao-li-si, in the Kang-mu), who went to announce to him the death of her husband, Yeliu-Liuko, the tributary king of Liau-tung, who had had to sustain some severe struggles in his young kingdom. Ochigin received the princess with great pomp, and giving her the official seal, sent her home with some troops to rule Liau-tung until Chinghis Khan's return. She ruled it, we are told, exemplarily. After Chinghis returned home, and when he was engaged in his campaign against Tangut, which I shall describe presently, and in 1227 was encamped at Yen-chuan near the Yellow River, the princess repaired...
to him, accompanied by her sons, Shan-ku, Tieku and Yong-ngan, by her adopted son, Tatar, and by her grandson, Siukuenuus. When Chinghiz Khan saw her, he said laughingly, "although the falcons which fly so swiftly have not yet arrived, yet you, a woman, are already here." He then presented her with a bowl of wine (doubtless darasun), and enlarged on his good-will towards her. The princess replied, "Liuko, my husband, lives no longer, and the people over whom you placed him are without a master. Hinesé (called Pita by Gaubil), the eldest of my sons, has been with your army for a long time, and is still in the West. I have brought my second son, Shanku, with me, to remain as a hostage with your majesty, and I beg you to send for Hinesé, so that he may succeed his father." "I regard," said Chinghiz, "Hinesé as one of my most faithful subjects. He followed me into the West, and when my son (Juchi), attacked the town of Hani (?), inhabited by the Mahamadans, Hinesé, at the head of a thousand men, distinguished himself more than any of my officers. At Sunsecan (i.e. Samarkand), he was wounded while fighting like a hero, and his great deeds have placed him among my best officers. He is useful to me, and I cannot part with him. Shan-ku, your second son, should succeed his father." "Hinesé," said the princess, "is not my son, but Liuko's son by an earlier marriage. Shanku, who is my son, is younger than he. If you give the latter his father's place will it not be said that regardless of justice I only consulted my maternal feelings. I beg you earnestly not to do a wrong which will tarnish my reputation, nor prefer the younger son to the elder." Chinghiz praised her wisdom, and he accorded her wish, nominating Yelii Hinesé as king of Lian-tung. When the princess took leave of Chinghiz he gave her 40 post horses, 9 prisoners whom he had captured in Ho-si, 9 horses, 9 ingots of silver, 9 pieces of silk, and 9 specimens of various kinds of precious stones. He retained Shan-ku, Tatar and Siukuenuus at his court, and only sent back Yong-ngan, her fourth son, with the princess."  

When Yelii-Hinesé arrived at Chinghiz Khan's camp, he said to him, "Yelii-Liuko, your father, put himself under my protection in order to get support against the Kin who ill-used him, and wished to undo him, and as a gauge of his sincerity he placed you as a hostage in my hands. Presently Yassêpu (?) and other malcontents revolved against him and against your family with the intention of exterminating it. Do you think the germs of disorder are extinct, and that you have no more enemies in your country? I have always treated your father like a younger brother, and I have loved you as a son. Command my troops conjointly with my brother, Belgutei, and live together in close union." When Hinesé bade him good-by, and desired to leave for his government he detained him for a while, so that he might share in the glory of capturing the capital of Hia.  

This reminds us that Chinghiz Khan was then engaged in his famous campaign in Hia or Tangut, the last of his great enterprizes, and to it we must now turn.

ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE ANIMALS AND PLANTS OF INDIA WHICH WERE KNOWN TO EARLY GREEK AUTHORS.

BY V. BALL, M.A., F.R.S.; DIRECTOR OF THE SCIENCE AND ART MUSEUM, DUBLIN.  

In a communication made by me in the year 1883 to the Royal Geological Society of Ireland, entitled A Geologist's Contribution to the History of India, 2 I endeavoured to identify many mineral productions which are mentioned by the writers of antiquity. Partly by the recorded characteristics of these minerals, and partly by such indications as are given of the localities whence they were derived, I was enabled, by a comparison with our present knowledge of the mode of occurrence and distribution of minerals in India, to arrive at a number of conclusions, the main tendency of which has been to show that many apparently extravagant and fictitious stories by these early writers rest on substantial bases of fact.

While engaged upon that inquiry with reference to minerals, I came upon numerous allusions to animals and plants, for some of which, in spite of their apparently mythical
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From the Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy,
character, I felt sure that equally substantial foundations could be found by subjecting them to the same sort of analytical comparisons with known facts. From time to time, as leisure has been found for the purpose, I have carried on this investigation, and have occasionally published some of the results.\(^3\)

Inquiries like these belong, if I may use the expression, to a border-land where the student of books and the student of nature may meet and afford one another mutual assistance.

I possess no special philological qualifications for this kind of work, and have only a slight acquaintance with a few of the languages of India; but, on the other hand, I think I may lay claim to the possession of some special knowledge of the animals and plants of India, the ideas about them which are current among the natives, and the uses they put them to. During my travels in the wildest regions of India I have ever taken an interest in the customs and beliefs of the so-called aboriginal tribes, and have had many opportunities for tracing out stories believed by them, and also sometimes by Europeans, to the sources from whence they had originated. This kind of experience enables me now to take up the tale of explanation where it has often been left by linguists and historians, and carry it forward to a perhaps more satisfactory conclusion.

A want of personal acquaintance with India, or when that was possessed, a want of such information as can only be acquired by a field naturalist, using the title in its widest sense, has caused many commentators, both among the early Greeks and Romans and the Continental and English literati of the present day, when at a loss to explain the so-called myths, to turn upon their authors and accuse them roundly of mendacity. Thus Strabo states succinctly that, "Generally speaking, the men who have hitherto written on the affairs of India were a set of liars." Again, Lassen has spoken of Ktésias, when referring to a particular statement of his, in much the same way, although I shall be able to demonstrate that the condemnation was in that particular case wholly undeserved.

The Euemeristic treatment of myths, according to which all that is possible may be accepted as historical, while the remainder is to be rejected as fiction, is all very well, provided that the person who conducts the analysis has become competent to do so by the nature and extent of his experience.

Elsewhere\(^4\) I have recorded numerous reported cases of children having been found living in wolves' dens in India; and these, to say the least, cannot be fairly disposed of in the off-hand manner which the follower of the Euemeristic doctrine would apply to the story of Romulus and Remus, and many others like it.

The well-known Arabian story, related by the author of Sindibad, Marco Polo, and Nicolo Conti, of the method of obtaining diamonds by hurling pieces of meat into a valley, had its origina, as I believe, in an Indian custom of sacrificing cattle on the occasion of opening up new mines, and leaving portions of the meat as an offering to the guardian deities, these naturally being speedily carried off by birds of prey. This custom is not yet extinct.

The so-called myth of the gold-digging ants was not cleared up till, by chance, information was received\(^5\) as to the customs and habits of the Tibetan gold miners of the present day. Then Sir H. Rawlinson, and, independently, Dr. Schiern, of Copenhagen, were enabled to come forward and state beyond a question of doubt that the *myrmekes* of Hérodotos and Megasthenes were Tibetan miners, and, it may be added, their dogs. The same dogs are now for the first time identified, as will be seen further on, with the *gryphos*. The full account of this discovery by the above-named authors would find its proper place in a paper on races of men, so that I pass from it now, save that I mention a contribution which I have made to it, namely, that the horn of the gold-digging ant, which we are told by Pliny was preserved in the temple of Hercules at Erythra, and which for centuries has been the subject of much speculation, was probably merely one of the gold-miners' pickaxes. I have been informed by an eye-witness, Mr. R.

---

\(^3\) The Academy, April 21, 1883, and April 19, 1884. Reprinted in Indian Antiquary, Vol. XII. p. 284ff.

\(^4\) Jungle Life in India, and Journal of the Anthropological Institute, 1880.

\(^5\) From the Reports of the Peshawar employed in Trans-Himalayan Exploration by the Indian Government.
Lydekker, late of the Geological Survey of India, that the picks in use by agriculturists and miners in Ladakh consist of horns of wild sheep mounted on handles. I believe it probable that Dr. Schiern would be willing to accept this in preference to his own suggestion, namely, that the horns were taken from the skins which are worn as garments by the Tibetans. Perhaps it is as well to add here further, for the benefit of those who may not be aware of the origin of the connexion between ants and gold, that independently that part of the myth was cleared up some years ago, first by Dr. Wilson, who pointed out that the Sanskrit name for the small fragments of alluvial gold (gold dust) was *pipāṭaka*, meaning “ant-gold,” in reference to the size and form; but the characteristics of the “ants” were always supposed, up to the year 1867, to have been wholly imaginative. Then, however, it was found, as related above, that these characteristics were in the most minute particulars identical with those of Tibetan miners. The whole is an example of what has occurred in reference to other subjects also, namely, the too literal acceptance by the Greeks of the signification of Oriental words, the merely symbolical meaning not having been understood as such. This is, for instance, notably the case with reference to the “Indian Reed”: as is printed out on a subsequent page.

It may be here noted that in the foot-notes of various editions of Ktesias, Megasthenes, Herodotos, Ellian, and Strabo, i.e., the authors who furnish the principal part of the statements with which this paper deals, commentators have not unfrequently suggested alterations in the accepted text to suit their preconceived notions of what is possible. With regard to several cases of this kind, I believe the explanations offered in the following pages will show that the text would lose the meanings intended were such changes adopted. Again, there are cases where commentators have suggested derivations for Greek words from Sanskrit or Persian names, which will, I think, be shown to be incorrect.

Many of the identifications of animals and plants suggested by commentators exhibit a sublime indifference on their part to the laws which govern and the facts observed with reference to the geographical distribution of animals. This practice is akin to the custom common enough among Englishmen in India of talking about animals by names strictly applicable to species not found in the Oriental region. Thus you will hear, at the present day, some sportsmen speaking of panthers, bison, elk, armadillos, alligators, toucans, canvas-back-ducks, and humming-birds, as being commonly shot by them in India, though as a matter of fact none of the animals to which these names are correctly applicable are ever found beyond the limits of the American Continent. It is only just to the Indian sportsmen of to-day to add that a majority among them are anxious to acquire the proper names of the animals they meet with, and there is accordingly a large-sale in India for the text books on Indian Zoology.

As an example of how statements about animals sometimes require strict investigation, I remember on one occasion an Englishman assuring me very positively that sulphur-crested cockatoos were to be found in large numbers in a particular jungle in the Central Provinces of India. On my pointing out the impossibility of such being the case, the only evidence he could bring in support of the statement that this essentially Australian bird was to be found so far from its proper limits, was that the Raj of the district told him so when he had been shown a domesticated specimen. To which I could only reply that a boastful spirit as to the resources of his own territory must have led the Raj to state what was not quite true.

I have still another charge to make against the commentators. Up to the very last edition of one of our Greek authors, which was published last year, a custom has been in practice of passing very stale comments from one to another, without reference being made to more recent and direct sources of information.

And here I would mention the names of two encyclopedists for whose works I have the greatest respect and admiration: they are Lassen and Ritter, to the researches by both of whom commentators are much beholden. But as may readily be conceived, during the last fifty years there has been a great advance in our scientific and accurate knowledge of the animals and plants of India, nevertheless we find modern editors making use of statements
proximately derived from Laassen, but which are often ultimately traceable to that most industrious compiler, Karl Ritter, who wrote nearly fifty years ago. Were he alive he would probably have kept better abreast with modern research than have so many who now use the data which he collected from still earlier writers. Surely such a statement as that there is at present a tribe of Khonds in the Dakhan who eat the bodies of their deceased relatives, is one that ought not to appear, as it does in a recent edition, except it can be substantiated. It may be true; but, without modern and undoubted proof of the fact, I think no one should be asked to believe it.

The original texts of Megasthenes and Ktesias not having been preserved to us, except as fragments which have been incorporated by other authors, we cannot say with certainty what they may or may not have contained; but it is sufficiently apparent that it is precisely the most marvellous and apparently impossible descriptions which have been preserved, sometimes out of mere curiosity, and sometimes for purposes of condemnation; the plain matter-of-fact stories about men, animals, and plants, if they ever existed, have been irretrievably lost.

Though not unaware that I run the risk of some adverse criticism when entering into an arena of controversy like this, I have already received a considerable amount of encouragement from quarters where such work is duly appreciated; but the highest incentive I have had in the elucidation of these myths, apart at least from the interest of the study itself, is, that as a former Indian traveller myself, I derive a sincere pleasure in so far establishing the veracity and relieving the characters of travellers from the aspersions which during twenty centuries, more or less, have been freely cast upon them.

I take for my text and for my justification, if need there be, the following passage from De Gubernatis, who, although the author of a zoological mythology, lays no claim to being a zoologist himself. He says: "And if I have sought to compare several physiological laws with the myths, it is not because I attribute to the myth a wisdom greater than that which it contains in reality, but only to indicate that much better than metaphysics, the science of Nature, with the criteria of positive philosophy, can help us to study the original production of myths and their successive development in tradition."

It will be observed in the pages which follow that, besides the simple identifications, there are what may conveniently be called compound identifications, of two classes. In the first, two or more animals, as described by the compilers, are shown to owe their origin to accounts by different authors of the same animals or plants, the identity of which was not perceived by compilers like Ælian. In the other class, under one name, characteristics belonging to more than one species are included. Both these, but especially the latter, have increased the difficulties of identification. Pliny's accounts of minerals furnish a striking example of both: on the one hand, under half a dozen different names, culled from different authors, he has described the same mineral over and over again, without recognizing the identity. In several cases, notably in that of the adamas, he describes several distinct minerals under one title.

But a few words remain to be said as to the arrangement of the facts contained in the following pages. Originally it was my intention to make use of some of them as illustrations of a paper on the origin of myths; but, as they multiplied, it seemed to me that they would have an additional value if they were so arranged that they could be easy of reference; and, in order to complete the list, I have included some identifications which have been made by others. This is more particularly the case with the plants yielding drugs; these have for a long time attracted the notice of botanists and other experts; but their determinations have not in all instances found their proper places in the footnotes of commentators.

There still remain a few accounts of animals and plants which have yet to be grappled with; some of these I hope to be able to discuss hereafter, and it may be that I shall see my way to account for some of the so-called mythical tribes of men described by the early Greeks. Some of them, however, appear to be quite beyond the

* Cf. Herodotus, by Prof. Sayce,
reach of explanation, but others may possibly be identified with particular tribes of what are commonly, but not always correctly, called the aboriginal inhabitants of India.

**LIST OF SPECIES MENTIONED.**

**MAMMALS.**

1. Πίθηκος ... ... Monkey (*Inuus rhesus*).  
2. Κερκοπίθηκος ... ... (*Presbytis pri-mamus*).  
3. "Όφις πτερωτός ... Bat (*Pteropus medius*).  
4. Μαρτυράς ... Tiger (*Felis tigris*).  
5. Κροκότατος ... ... *Hyaena* (*Hyaena crocuta*).  
6. Γρίφη ... Dog (*Canis domesticus*),  
   (Var. *tibetana*).  
7. Κύων ... ... Dog (*Canis domesticus*)  
   and (*Cuon loxian*).  
8. Δελφίς ... ... Dolphin (*Platanista gan-geticus* & *Delphinus*, *Sp*.).  
9. Κήπος ... ... Whale (*Balaeoptera indi-ca*).  
10. Έλεφας ... ... Elephant (*Elephas indi-cus*).  
11. Καρπάζων Ινδικός ... Rhinoceros (*Rhinoceros dix* ... *indicus*).  
12. "Όνων δύναμος ... ... Wild ass (*Equus ona-gra*).  
13. Υς ... ... Pig (*Sus indicus*).  
14. Λευκοκόρας ... ... *Nilgai* (*Pertax pictus*).  
15. Πρόβατα και αγές ... Sheep & Goats (*Ovis et Capra*).  
16. Αγριομοβός ... ... Yak (*Psephagus grum-niens*).  
17. Φαττάγης ... ... Pangolin (?) (*Manis pentadactyla*).

**BIRDS.**

18. Αετός ... ... Eagle (*Aquila chrysa-tus*).  
19. Βιττακός, ψίττακος ... Parrot (*Palawornis eupatrius*).  
20. Έποφ ... ... Hoopoe (*Eupura epepe*).  
21. Κέρκων ... ... Hill mainá (*Eulabes re-li-giosus* or *E. intermedia*).  
22. Πελεάς χλωρόπτελος ... Green pigeon (*Crocopora chlorogaster*).  
23. Αλεκτρονές μύγων ... Mundi pheasant (*Lopho-phorus impeyanus*).  
24. Κάλας ... ... Adjutant (*Leoptotilois argala*).

**REPTILES.**

25. Χελώνη ... ... Fresh-water turtle (*Tri-onys Sp.*).

**INSECTS.**

30. Μέλι ... ... Honey-Bees (*Apis dot-sata*).  
31. Μυρμήξ ο Ἰνδός ... Termites (*Termes*, *Sp*.).  
32. "Ελεκτρον, &c. ... Shellac & Lac insect (*Coccus laca*).  
33. Δίκαιον ... ... Dung beetle (*Scarabaeus sacer*).

**PLANTS.**

1. Οροτα ... ... Rice (*Oryza sativa*).  
2. Μέλι τί καλάμων ... Sugar Cane (*Saccharum officinarum*).  
3. Φοινίκ ... ... *Papyrus* (*Papyrus pan-gorets*).  
4. Κάλαμος Ινδικός ... Palm Tree (*Borassus flabelliformis*).  
5. Ναύπλιο ... ... Cocoa-nut (*Cocos nu-cifera*).  
6. Πάρηβον ... ... *Pepal* (*Ficus religiosa*).  
7. Δάφνη ήρια φύστσα ... Cotton (*Gossypium indicum*).  
8. Σαμάχαρα, part, ... Khusum (*Schleichera trijuga*).  
9. Δίκαιον ... ... Lycur (*Berberis tinc-toria*).  
10. Βάδιλλον ... ... *Bidellium* (*Balsamon-deron mukul*, Hook.).  
11. Πέταρα ... ... Pepper (*Piper nigrum*).  
12. Μαλαβάθρων ... Malabathrum (*Cinnamomum tamala*).  
13. Καρπών ... ... Karpion (*Cinnamomum Sp.*).  
14. Καυσία ... ... Cassia (*Cinnamomum cassia*).  
15. "Ινδικόν μέλαιν ... ... Indigo (*Indigofera tinc-toria*).  
16. Δενδρον λόπαν ἢχον ... Amalda, H. (*Cassia fla-tula*).  
17. "Ασός πορφυρών ... Dhaund H. (*Grisela to-menata*).  
18. Σαμάχαρα, part, ... Mahowd H. (*Bassia latifolia*).  
19. "Ελαιον σηπάνυον ... Sesamum (*Sesamum indica*).  

It belongs, as correctly stated by Ktēsias, to the African fauna.

* Vide No. 18 infra.  * Vide No. 8 supra.
MAMMALS.

1. Monkey (θήκας).

*Inuus rhesus*, Des.(?)—The Bengal Monkey, or *Macacus radiatus*, Kuhl.—The Madras Monkey.

According to Strabo,\(^{10}\) Megasthenes says, "There are monkeys, rollers of rocks, which climb precipices, whence they roll down stones upon their pursuers." There is not much to enable an exact identification of the species, but it was probably one of the above species of brown monkeys. I am not prepared to deny that this story may have originated in the title of 'monkey' which, as is well known, was freely bestowed upon the wild tribes of men who inhabited the jungles of India, and who, when attacked, often had recourse to this mode of defence against their better armed assailants.\(^{11}\) But that it is not impossible that the story may have referred to real monkeys will be apparent from the following personal experience of my own:—When at Malwā Tāl, a lake near Nainī Tāl, in the Himalayas, I was warned that in passing under a landslip, which slopes down to the lake, I should be liable to have stones thrown at me by monkeys. Regarding this as being possibly a traveller's tale, I made a particular point of going to the spot in order to see what could have given rise to it. As I approached the base of the landslip, near the road on the north side of the lake I saw a number of brown monkeys (*Inuus rhesus*), rush to the sides and across the top of the landslip, and presently pieces of loosened stone and shale came tumbling down near where I stood. I fully satisfied myself that this was not merely accidental, for I distinctly saw one monkey industriously, with both fore paws, and with obvious *malice* *propensae*, pushing the loose shingle off a shoulder of rock. I then tried the effect of throwing stones at them, and this made them quite angry, and the number of fragments which they set rolling was speedily doubled. This, though it does not actually amount to throwing or projecting an object by monkeys, comes very near to the same thing, and makes me think that there may be truth in the stories of their throwing fruit at people from trees,\(^{12}\) or at least dropping them on their heads.

Bābar in his *Memoirs* gives an account of several species of monkeys, both wild and domesticated, which were known in Western India in his time.

2. Long-tailed Monkey (κερακονώδης).

*Presbytis priamus*, Elliot.—The Madras Langūr.

There can be little doubt that another species of monkey, described by Megasthenes, as recorded by Strabo and Aelian, belonged to the genus *Presbytis*, and it may, I think, be identified with the Madras species *priamus* rather than with the Bengal species *entellus*. "The monkeys of India," writes Strabo,\(^{13}\) "are larger than the largest dogs. They are white, except in the face, which is black, though the contrary is observed elsewhere. Their tails are more than two cubits in length; they are very tame, and not of a malicious disposition, so that they neither attack nor steal." An account by Aelian\(^{14}\) is more detailed. "Among the Prasii (Sansk., Prāchyas, i.e., Easterns) in India there are found, they say, apes of human-like intelligence, which are to appearance about the size of Hyrkanian dogs. Nature has furnished them with forelocks, which one ignorant of the reality would take to be artificial. Their chin, like that of a satyr, turns upwards, and their tails are like the potent one of the lion. Their bodies are white all over, except the face and the tip of the tail, which are of a reddish hue. They are very intelligent, and naturally tame. They are bred in the woods, where also they live, subsisting on the fruits which they find growing wild on the hills. They resort in great numbers to Latāgā, an Indian city, where they eat rice, which has been laid down for them by the king's orders. In fact, every day

---


\(^{11}\) Natives commonly believe that the English are the descendants of the monkey army of Hanumā, the ally of Rāma Chandra. There are several proverbs turning on this notion, based on a prophecy said to be in the Rāmāyaṇa, that a race with the characteristics of Hanumā's monkeys would conquer India under certain conditions. The English are said to fulfil the characteristics and their rule the conditions.—Ed.

\(^{12}\) *Jungle Life in India*, p. 357.

\(^{13}\) Geographica, xiv, 1, 57.

a ready-prepared meal is set out for their use. It is said that when they have satisfied their appetite they retire in an orderly manner to their haunts in the woods, without injuring a single thing that comes in their way." Ælian gives another account also, which differs in some respects from the above: but, on the whole, considering the region to which the account of Megasthenes referred, I think that the species was the above, the technical description of which, given by Jerdon, is as follows:—

"Ashy grey colour, with a pale reddish or chocolate au lait overlying the whole back and head; sides of the head, chin, throat, and beneath, pale yellowish; hands and feet, whitish; face, palms, fingers, soles of the feet and toes, black; a high compressed vertical crest of hairs on the top of the head; hairs long and straight, not wavy; tail of the colour of the darker portion of the back, ending in a whitish tuft; much the same size as entellus, i.e.—length to root of tail, 30 inches; tail, 43 inches; but it attains a still larger size. Inhabits the Eastern Ghâts and southern portion of table-land of Southern India, also in Ceylon, but not extending to Malabar coast."

Setting out rice for the use of monkeys, as described by Ælian, is a common custom at present.

3. THE FLYING SERPENT (Οphis πτερωτός).

Pteropus medius, Temm.—The Flying Fox.

Strabo, quoting from Megasthenes, tells us that there are "in some parts of the country serpents two cubits long, which have membranous wings like bats. They fly about by night, when they let fall drops of urine or sweat, which blister the skin of persons not on their guard with putrid sores." Ælian gives a similar account. There can be little doubt that this is an exaggerated account of the great fruit-eating bats of India, which are known to Europeans as flying foxes. The extent of their wings, according to Jerdon, sometimes amounts to 82 inches, and in length they reach 14½ inches. Less accurate observers have stated the span to exceed 6 feet. Though noisy some animals in many respects, their dropings have not the properties above attributed. Flying foxes are eaten by some of the lower classes of natives, and Europeans who have made the experiment say the flesh is delicate and without unpleasant flavour. Though small species of European bats were well known to the Greeks, these large fruit-eating bats might well be regarded by them as something sui generis. It is quite probable that at the present moment many Europeans in India do not even know that they are true bats. As to the winged scorpions which, according to Megasthenes, sting both natives and Europeans alike, I can only suggest that they were hornets of large size.

4. THE MARTIKORA (Μαρτιχώρας άνθρωπόγονος).

Felix tigris, Linn.—The Tiger.

This animal was described by Ktesias as being of the size of the lion, red in colour, with human-like face, ears and eyes, three rows of teeth, and stings on various parts of the body, but especially on the tail, which caused it to be compared with the scorpion. Its name records the fact that it was a man-eater (Persian mard-khor in its archaic form), and this characteristic 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 it was the tiger, none of them appear to have seen how the several statements can be shown to be founded on actual facts. Pansaasas, for instance, attributes these details to the imagination of the Indians, excited by the dread of the animal. Others appear to be unwilling to regard the animal as being capable of identification. Thus Lassen, referring to Ktesias's assertion, that he had seen one of these animals with the Persian monarch, to whom it had been presented by the Indian king, asserts that "he cannot, in this instance, be acquitted of mendacity."

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 shikari—i.e., 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 the skins of their slaughtered tigers are liable to be injured by the plucking out or burning off the whiskers—to avert accidents. Some believe that the removal of the whiskers prevents any human being assuming the form of the tiger, others that the possession of tiger's whiskers endowed the fortunate possessor with unlimited power over the opposite sex. 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 molars of ruminants and horses. The Martikhor was therefore, I believe, the tiger, and the account of it embodies actual facts, though they were somewhat distorted in the telling.

It may be said that it would not be difficult to construct an account of the tiger derived from the attributes and characteristics ascribed to the animal at the present day by the natives, which would have a far less substantial basis of fact than has the one given to us by Ktias.

Aristotle gives an account of this animal, which, he states, was taken from Ktias.

Megasthenes, according to Strabo, states with reference to tigers, that the largest are found among the Prasii (Sanak, Prakhyus, i.e., Easterns), being nearly twice the size of the lion, and so strong that a tame tiger, led by four men, having seized a mule by one of the hind legs, overpowered it and dragged it to him. Not a very remarkable performance, the Indian sportsman will remark, who knows what a tiger can do in the way of dragging heavy oxen for long distances over obstacles.

5. THE KROKOTTAS, OR KYNOLYKOS
(Kroko'das Kynolikos).

Hyena crocuta.—The Spotted Hyena.

Ktias, according to Photios, describes the above animal as follows: "There is in Ethiopia an animal called properly the Kroko'das, but vulgarly the Kynolycos. It is of prodigious strength, and is said to imitate the human voice, and by night to call out men by their names, and when they come to fall upon them and devour them. This animal has the courage of the lion, the speed of the horse, and the strength of the bull, and cannot be successfully encountered with weapons of steel.

This I am disposed to identify (as from the references given by him in a foot-note, so also does Mr. M'Cride) with the spotted hyena (H. crocuta) of Africa—a very powerful animal—which, like its Indian relative (H. strivis), has a hideous cry at night. It is, I believe, not conspicuous for courage; but according to some accounts the lion is less courageous in reality than is generally supposed. That, however, is a small matter. I cannot but think that Lassen is wrong in identifying, on philosophical grounds, this animal with the jackal, the Prakrit name for the latter being kotthuaka (Skr. kroshhtuka). This involves his saying, first, that the above were "fabulous attributes given to the jackal, an animal which frequently appears in Indian fables;" and, second, that the Ethiopia of Ktias meant India.

6. THE GRYPHON, OR Griffin (Γρυψ).

Canis domesticus, var. Tibetanus.

Tibetan Mastiffs.

According to Ktias, as related by Photios, gold was obtained in certain "high towering mountains which are inhabited by the griffins, 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. On account of these birds the gold, with which the mountains abound, is difficult to be got." Aelian's account of the same animals adds some probably spurious particulars—such as that the wings are white, the neck variegated with blue feathers, the beak like an eagle's, and that, according to the Baktrians, they built their nests of the gold which they dug out of the soil, but that the Indians deny this. He

---

[30] [A long and very interesting account of the superstitions connected with tigers in the Central Provinces is to be found in Sleeman's Rambles and Recollections, vol. 1, p. 161 ff. Ed.]


[34] It is worth noting that this is commonly attributed by the natives of India to ghosts and goblins, especially to the chau or malignent female ghost of a woman dying in childbirth.—Ep.


states that the auriferous region which the griffins inhabited was a frightful desert.

Taking Photios's account alone, and excluding from it the word birds, and for feathers and fur, we have a tolerably accurate description of the hairy black-and-tan-coloured Tibetan mastiffs, which are now, as they were doubtless formerly, the custodians of the dwellings of Tibetans, those of gold miners as well as of others. They attracted the special attention of Marco Polo, as well as of many other travellers in Tibet; and for a recent account of them reference may be made to Captain Gill's *River of Golden Sand*. They are excessively savage, and attack strangers fiercely, as I have myself experienced on the borders of Sikhim. I remember seeing a very fine pair of them which were brought from Kashghar by Dr. Bellew. They suffered much from the heat on their journey from Simla to Bombay. Whether they ever reached England I cannot say.

This identification serves also to clear up certain of the details in the story of Megasthenes and Herodotes, as to the gold-digging ants, which have been identified by Sir H. Rawlinson and Professor Schiern, as mentioned in the introductory remarks, with Tibetan gold miners and their dogs. The former, on account of the great cold, are and were clad in fur, and it would appear, shared with the dogs in giving characteristics to the famous ants which were for so long regarded as a myth incapable of explanation. The "ants" which, according to Herodotes, were taken to Persia, and kept there, were, I believe, simply these mastiffs. He tells us that Tritantakhmes, Satrap of Babylonia, under the Akhaimenians, "kept a great number of Indian dogs. Four large towns situated in the plain were charged with their support, and were exempted from all other tribute."

Larcher, in his *Notes on Herodotos* (Vol. III, p. 339), quotes the following, without however noticing how far it aids in clearing the myth of the griffins:— "M. de Thou, an author worthy of credit, recounts that Shah Thamas Sophie of Persia, 1530-1566. — Ed."

one of these ants in 1559. *Nuntius etiam a Thamo Oratoris titulio quidam ad Solimanum venit cum muneribus, inter quos erat formica Indica, canis meleotensis magnitudine, animal mordax et saevum. Thaminus—Lib. xxiii.*

Herodotes himself evidently supposed the Gryphons to be a race of men.

Regarding the origin of the name griffin or gryphon, the Persian *girīfan* (to grip, or seize, is suggested by Mr. McCrindle as the source) Hindustani contains several words hence derived, as *girīfār*, a captive; *girīfē*, seizure, &c. The Tibetans call their dogs *gyôke*, or royal dogs, on account of their size and ferocity.

It may be added here, in its proper place, though already mentioned in the introductory remarks, that a passage in Pliny's account of the ants,* which has been the source of much difficulty to many who have discussed this question, admits, as I have elsewhere shown, of a satisfactory explanation. The passage is:—

"Indica formica cornua, Erythris in uede Herculis fissa, miraculo fuere." The horn of the Indian ant was probably an example of the pickaxe even now in common use in Ladakh and probably also in Tibet. It is a sheep's horn fixed on a handle: this is, I think, more probable than that it was a horn taken from one of the skin garments worn by the Tibetan miners, as has been suggested by Professor Schiern.*

7. Dog (Kōw).

*Canis and Cuon (?)—Domestic and Wild Dogs.*

There are various allusions by our authors to other dogs besides those which have been identified as the originals of the griffins. Thus Ktesias, according to Photios, says that "the dogs of India are of great size, so that they fight even with the lion." This may possibly refer to the well-known fact that packs of wild dogs (*Cuon rufulus*) prove a match for the larger carnivora. There are numerous well-authenticated cases of tigers having been killed by these dogs.

Aelian* relates that "KTesias, in his account of India, says that the people called the Kynomologoi rear many dogs as big as the Hyrkanian

---

* Olio, lib. 1. cap. xxxi.
* [The persons meant are Shah Tahmasb Safavi of Persia, 1524-1576 A.D., the celebrated successor of Humayün in 1548, and the still greater Sultan Sulaimán the Magnificent, 1530-1566.—Ed.]
* Hist. Nat. lib. xi. cap. xxxi.
* See ante, Vol. IV. p. 231.
* Ecloga in Photis, Biblioth. xxxi.
breed; and this Knidian writer tells us why they keep so many dogs, and this is the reason: from the time of the summer solstice on to midwinter they are incessantly attacked by herds of wild oxen, coming like a swarm of bees or a flight of angry wasps, only that the oxen are more numerous by far. They are ferocious withal and proudly defiant, and but most viciously with their horns. The Kynamolgoi, unable to withstand them otherwise, let loose their dogs upon them, which are bred for this express purpose; and these dogs easily overpower the oxen, and worry them to death. During the season when they are left unmolested by the oxen, they employ their dogs in hunting other animals. They milk the bitches, and this is why they are called Kynamolgoi (dog-milkers). They drink this milk just as we drink that of the sheep or goat."

There is at present a tribe in India who are noted for keeping a large breed of dogs, which are most efficient in the chase. These are the Labánas or Brinjárás, who, by means of their pack cattle, perform most of the inland carriage in the hilly central regions of the peninsula. I have met their caravans, and also their fixed habitations in the Central Provinces bordering Western Bengal, where they are very numerous. This general region is the one where the Kynamolgoi (or Kynokephaloi) may be presumed to have dwelt. In Orissa there is a Rájá of a petty State who keeps a very fine breed of dogs, by means of which deer are run down, especially, as I was told, during the rainy season, when the softness of the ground prevents them from running so fast as they are able to do at other times. There are similar breeds also in other parts of India.

According to the author of Indian Field Sports (p. 39), the Rájá of Kandâ in the Hazáríbagh District of Chutiâ Nagpâr had a breed of such dogs, which hunted in the hot weather and could take up the scent of deer many hours after they had passed.

The "oxen" referred to were probably wild buffaloes, which still do much injury to the crops in some parts of India, and are a cause of terror to the natives.

8. DOLPHIN (Δαλφίς).

*Platanista indica,* Blyth. *Delphinus (Sp. I)*

Ælian22 tells us that the "dolphins of India are reported to be of two sorts: one fierce, and armed with sharp-pointed teeth, which gives endless trouble to the fishermen, and is of a remorselessly cruel disposition; while the other kind is naturally mild and tame, swims about in the friskiest way, and is quite like a fawning dog; it does not run!! (sic in translation) away when anyone tries to stroke it, and it takes with pleasure any food it is offered."

The first of these is probably the Indus species of the very curious genus of river porpoise (*Platanista*) which is found in India. The jaws are provided with numerous conical, recurved teeth. These porpoises are very destructive to fish, and are occasionally accidentally taken in nets. According to Jerdon,24 they are speared by certain tribes of fishermen on the Ganges, who eat the flesh, and make oil from the blubber, which they use for burning.

Under the name Khúkt dáň, i.e., water hog, the *Platanista* is described in Bâbar's Memoirs by Erskine. Sir A. Burnes (Cabool, p. 8) calls it the Boolun (Balán).

The other dolphin mentioned by Ælian may, perhaps, be identified as a species of *Delphinus*, which often keeps company with vessels for long distances, though probably its tameness is somewhat exaggerated for the sake of contrast.

9. WHALE (Károv).

*Balaenoptera indica,* Blyth.—The Indian Fin-whale.

Ælian25 tells us that "whales are to be found in the Indian sea; they are five times larger than the largest elephant. A rib of this monstrous fish measures as much as twenty cubits, and its lip fifteen cubits." Further on, he states that it is "not true that they come near the shore lying in wait for tunnies."

The rib, twenty cubits long, was probably really the ramus of a jaw, and the length given is therefore not excessive, since one in the Calcutta Museum, according to Jerdon,26 from an individual eighty-four feet long, measured twenty-one feet; and it is said that specimens measuring up to one hundred feet have been stranded on the Indian coast. *Rumi* of the jaws of whales are even now not uncommonly mistaken for ribs.

Since the species of this genus of whales

---

22 Hist. Anim., xvi. 18.
24 Mammals of India, p. 159.
26 Mammals of India, p. 161.
feed on fish, the statement which Aelian denies was probably to some extent founded on actual observation.

10. THE ELEPHANT (Ἑλέφας).
Elephas indicus, Cuv.—The Indian Elephant.
There are, as might be expected, numerous allusions to the Elephant by Megasthenes, Arrian, and the author of the Periplus. Its mode of capture is described, as also are its training, its uses in the chase and in war, its habits, and certain peculiarities of its constitution. Some of these latter, as, for instance, those connected with the coming together of the sexes, are correct, though a myth in reference to this last exists even at the present day, and is very commonly believed by many.
The elephants of Taprobane (i.e. Ceylon) are distinguished, according to Aelian's account—derived perhaps from Megasthenes—as being larger, and more intelligent, than those of the mainland. The same author, too, describes a white elephant, and relates in reference to it a story of its devotion to its master.

The author of the Periplus mentions several ports, both in Africa and India, whence elephas (i.e., ivory) was an article of export, as we know it had been since the days of Solomon.

A very fair monograph of the habits and external characteristics of the elephant might be written from the facts recorded by the above authors, supplemented by such as are given by Strabo and Pliny.

11. THE KARTAZÔNON AND THE INDIAN ASS.
(Kaṟṭaṇaṇaṇ, ἰδίκος ὄσος).
Rhinoceros indicus, Cuv.—The Rhinoceros.
Geydā, Hin.
The Kartazonon of Megasthenes and the horned ass of Ktesias, although separately described by Aelian as if they were distinct animals, appear to be both capable of identification with the rhinoceros. This fact has been already more or less generally accepted by writers, although some particulars, especially those as to the colour, have given rise to much discussion and argument. It seems probable that the Rhinoceros was also the original of the monokeros, or unicorn, which, as we have good

[81] [Cf. Panjâb Notes and Queries, Vol. I. note 85. In J. A. S. B. for 1829, p. 101, it is stated that a Kumaun squire had seen a unicorn with the Rajâ of Garhwal and that on inspection it turned out to be a rhinoceros.—Ed.] The unicorn of the Highlands is Kesân Hodsoni,

cause to know, is usually represented as an Horned Ass. Aelian's description of the Kartaṇon is as follows:—"It is also said that there exists in India a one-horned animal, called by the natives the Kartaṇon. It is of the size of a full-grown horse, and has a crest and yellow hair soft as wool. It is furnished with very good legs, and is very fleet. Its legs are jointless, and formed like those of the elephant; and it has a tail like a swine's. A horn sprouts out from between its eyebrows, and this is not straight, but curved into the most natural wreaths, and is of a black colour. This horn is said to be extremely sharp. The animal, as I learn, has a voice beyond all example—loud, ringing, and dissonant."

Photios's account of the "horned wild ass" of Kt'isi, agrees, in the main particulars, with one by Aelian. That by the former is as follows: "Among the Indians there are wild asses as large as horses, some being even larger. Their head is of a dark-red colour, their eyes blue, and the rest of their body white. They have a horn on their forehead, a cubit in length (the filings of this horn, given in a potion, are an antidote to poisonous drugs). This horn, for about two palm-breadths upwards from the base, is of the purest white, where it tapers to a sharp point, of a flaming crimson, and in the middle it is black. These horns are made into drinking-cups, and such as drink from them are attacked neither by convulsions nor by the sacred disease (epilepsy); nay, they are not even affected by poisons, if either before or after swallowing them they drink from these cups wine, water, or anything else. While other asses, moreover, whether wild or tame, and indeed all other solid-hoofed animals, have neither huckle-bones (astragalus) nor gall in the liver, these one-horned asses have both. Their huckle-bone is the most beautiful of all I have ever seen, and is in appearance and size like that of the ox. It is as heavy as lead, and of the colour of cinnabar, both on the surface and all throughout. It is an exceedingly fleet and strong animal, and no creature that pursues it, not even the horse, can overtake it." &c.

the Tibetan antelope, which when seen in profile appears to have only one horn, as was stated by the Abbé Hoc. 

Regarding the astragulus, or huckle-bone, the statement of its absence in solid-hoofed animals is incorrect, and I can offer no explanation of the reputed characteristics of that of the horned wild ass, except that an example seen by Ktèsias had simply been dyed and weighted with lead. For short distances the rhinoceros can charge with great speed and force, and its voice is such as to merit to some extent the description by Megasthenes.

In reference to the colours of the animal, when I recall that I have often seen in India horses with tails and manes of a bright magenta, and with spots of the same colour all over their otherwise white bodies; that I have also seen elephants belonging to Rájás ornamented on their heads by the application of various pigments—I am led to conclude that the rhinoceros from which Ktèsias's description was taken was a domesticated one, which, in accordance with the natives' taste for bright colours, had been painted to take part in some pageant. Domesticated rhinoceroses are still kept by many natives; and they have, I believe, sometimes been trained like elephants to carry kaulds with riders in them. I once met a native dealer in animals who had taken with him, for several hundred miles through the jungles, a rhinoceros, which he ultimately sold to the Rájá of Jálpur, in Madras. He drove the animal before him, he told me, "as if it were a cow."

The horn of the rhinoceros is still held in much esteem by the natives of India, both for making into cups, which are supposed to sweat on the approach of poison, and for the preparation of a drug. They will pay sportsmen a high price for these horns, but are particular about obtaining the right article, as I learned from a gentleman who, as a speculation, brought a number of rhinoceros horns from Africa, but failed to dispose of them in the Calcutta bazaars.

An interesting account of the Rhinoceros, which in his time inhabited the valley of the Indus, is given by Bábar in his Memoirs. Among other things he says, "As the horse has a large stomach so has this: as the patean of the horse is composed of a single bone so also is that of the Rhinoceros: as there is a gunuk (marrow?) in the horse's fore-leg so is there in that of the Rhinoceros."

Having thus offered an explanation of what has hitherto been a difficulty to commentators, I should not be surprised if evidence should be forthcoming to prove that it has been the custom with the natives to adorn with coloured pigments the cuirass-like hides of tame rhinoceroses.

Since the above paragraph was written, I have obtained sufficient confirmation of the correctness of this view, for, on referring to Roussellet's work on the Native Courts of India, I find an account of a rhinoceros fight at Baroda, which took place before the Gaekwar. The two animals were chained at opposite sides of the arena—one of them was painted black, the other red, in order that they might be distinguished, for otherwise they resembled each other in every point.

Ktèsias' horned ass, therefore, had probably been whitewashed, and had had his horn painted blue and scarlet by his owner—who little foresaw what food for discussion and comment he was affording, by that simple act, to twenty centuries of philosophers and historians.

12. WILD HORSES AND asses
(Equia onager, Pall.).—Wild Ass of Kachh, &c.

According to Ælian there are herds of wild horses and also of wild asses. "These interbreed, and the mules are of a reddish colour and very fleet, but impatient of the yoke and very skittish. They say that they catch these mules with foot-traps and then take them to the king of the Persians, and that if they are caught when two years old they do not refuse to be broken in, but if caught when beyond that age they differ in no respect from sharp-toothed and carnivorous animals."

The mention of both horses and asses is no doubt due to the somewhat mule-like characters of the wild ass which is found in Western India, and is called gorkhar in Hindustán and gor by the Persians. A closely allied species is the kiang of Tibet: (E. hemorinua, Pallas). Even now by travellers they are sometimes spoken of as wild horses, but
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their neigh or bray, and tail, prove them to be true asses. In the Bikaner State, according to Dr. Jerdon, "once only in the year, when the foals are young, a party of five or six native hunters, mounted on hardy Sind mares, chase down as many foals as they succeed in tiring, which lie down when utterly fatigued, and suffer themselves to be bound and carried off. In general they refuse sustenance at first, and about one-third only of those which are taken are reared; but these command high prices, and find a ready sale with the native princes. The profits are shared by the party, who do not attempt a second chase in the same year, lest they should scare the herd from the district, as these men regard the sale of a few gorkhār annually as a regular source of subsistence."  

Bibar in his Memoirs gives a spirited account of his hunting the gorkhār in Kathiawād.

13. The Pig ('Ys)

Sus indicus, Schinz.—Indian Wild Boar.

Among statements by Ktésias which cannot be accepted, in the following, as related by Photios: "India does not, however, produce the pig, either the tame sort or the wild." Ælian in reproducing the same, adds that the "Indians so abhor the flesh of this animal that they would as soon taste human flesh as taste pork." Aristotle and Palladius also repeat the story of the absence of swine, which, if it had been true, would naturally suggest the inquiry—how came the Indians to abhor the flesh, and, still more, how came the fact to be known? It is notorious that certain tracts of India at the present day do not contain wild pigs, and also that several large sections of the people detest the pig, and do not allow it to be kept in their villages. There are, however, some Hindus of high caste who will eat the flesh of the wild boar; and the Sind Amirs had pig preserves for purposes of sport. If other evidence were wanting that the pig is not a modern importation, and that the wild pig is truly feral, appeal may be made to the fossil remains of pigs found in the Sivalik Hills to show that it belongs to the ancestral fauna. Among some of the aboriginal and

other tribes the keeping of pigs is, and probably always has been, a prevalent custom. Ancient Sanskrit writings would probably furnish evidence of the existence of pigs in India before the time of Ktésias.


Portus pictus.

So far as I know the Leucocrotta of Pliny has never been identified. He says it was the size of the wild ass, with the legs of a stag; the neck, tail and breast of a lion, the head of a badger, a cloven hoof; the mouth slit up as far as the ears, and one continuous bone instead of teeth. The last item I cannot explain; but the mane and tail of the Nilgāu sufficiently resemble those of the lion to have suggested the comparison. The Hippiphalos of Aristotle has also been supposed to be the Nilgāu by some writers.

15. Sheep and Goats (Πρόβατα και αγέη). Ovis et Capra.

Both Photios and Ælian state that the sheep and goats of India are bigger than asses. The former adds that they produce from four to six young at a time, and the latter that they never produce less than three, but generally four.

All these statements are without foundation, for, although there are large breeds of goats peculiar to certain parts of India, they never approach the ass in size, and the sheep are particularly small. Ælian alludes to the largeness of the tails, those of the sheep reaching to their feet, and the tails of the goats almost touching the ground. There are breeds of large-tailed sheep in Western India and Afghanistān called dumās, but I am unaware of the existence of any breed of goats which are remarkable in this respect. However in India some of the sheep are very goat-like and the contrary is also true. A wild goat of large size, said to be equal to an ordinary donkey, occurs in the Western Ghāṭs and the Nilagiri Hills. It is the Hemitragus hyloricus of Ogilby.


Porphyraeus grunniens, Linn.—The Yak.

The above name is that given by Kosmas Indikopleustēs, a monkish traveller of the
seventh century, to an animal which is most probably the same as one described by Ælian in the passage quoted below. Taking both of these accounts together, I do not hesitate to identify it with the Yak, which occurs not in India, but north of the Himalayan snow ranges. Yaks’ tails are even at the present time a regular trade commodity, brought into India through Nepal and other frontier states, and they are much used by Indian potentates for various decorative purposes, insignia, &c., and from them are also made the more humble fly-whisks carried by horsemen.

Ælian says:—“There is found in India a graminivorous animal (πορφυρίων ζώον), which is double the size of a horse, and which has a very bushy tail, very black in colour. The hair of this tail is finer than human hair, and its possession is a point on which Indian women set great store, for therewith they make a charming coiffure, by binding and braiding it with locks of their own natural hair. The length of a hair is two cubits, and from a single root there spring out in the form of a fringe somewhere about thirty hairs.”

Ælian gives also a second and separate description of an animal shaped liked a satyr, covered all over with shaggy hair, and having a tail like a horse’s. It was found in the mountains skirting the inland frontier of India, in a district called Korinda. When pursued it fled up the mountain sides, rolling down stones on its assailants. This, I think, was probably also the Yak. Compilers like Ælian have often mentioned the same object twice under different titles. “The animal itself is the most timid that is known, for should it perceive that anyone is looking at it, it starts off at its utmost speed, and runs right forward; but its eagerness to escape is greater than the rapidity of its pace. It is hunted with horses and hounds, good to run. When it sees that it is on the point of being caught, it hides its tail in some near thicket, while it stands at bay, facing its pursuers, whom it watches narrowly. It even plucks up courage in a way, and thinks that since its tail is hid from view the hunters will not care to capture it, for it knows that its tail is the great object of attraction. But it finds this to be, of course, a vain delusion, for someone hits it with a poisoned dart, who then flays off the entire skin (for this is of value), and throws away the carcass, as the Indians make no use of any part of its flesh.”

Kosmas describes it as “an animal of great size, belonging to India, and from it is got what is called the toupha,” wherewith the captains of armies decorate their horses and their standards when taking the field. They say of it that its tail be caught by a tree, it no longer stoops, but remains standing through its unwillingness to lose even a single hair. On seeing this, the people of the neighbourhood approach and cut off the tail, and then the creature flies off when docked entirely of its tail.”

17. THE PHATTAGES (Φαττάγις).

Manis pentadactyla, Linn. (?)—The Pangolin.

In Ælian’s elsewhere quoted account of the animals of India, which, from internal evidence, is considered by Schwanbeck, as pointed out by Mr. McCrindle, to have been largely borrowed from Megasthenes, the following passage occurs:

“In India there is an animal closely resembling the land crocodile, and somewhere about the size of a little Maltese dog. It is covered all over with a scaly skin, so rough altogether, and so compact, that when flayed off it is used by the Indians as a file. It cuts through brass, and cuts iron. They call it the phattages.”

It has been identified by Mr. McCrindle with the pangolin, or scaly ant-eater. This identification may, perhaps, be correct; but I must confess to some reluctance in accepting it, since the bājra-kīṭa, as it is called in Hindustānī, (Skr. vajra-kīṭa) seems scarcely to answer the description so well as would one of the land lizards, Varanus, or the water lizards, Hydrosaurus. In any case, the statement that the skins are used as a file capable of cutting metals must be regarded as apocryphal. The scales and flesh are used medicinally by the natives, being supposed to possess aphrodisiac properties.

Class, in Bāhar’s Memoires, Ensiklo., p. 249.
De Mundo, 21.
Cf. McCrindle’s Megasthenes, p. 163.
SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.
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No. CLVIII.

GOA PLATES OF

SHASHTHADeva II.—KALIYUGA 4343.

This inscription is from a set of copper-plates which were found at Goa, and are now in the Library of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

The plates are three in number, each measuring about 7¼ by 5¼. The edges of them are raised into rims to protect the writing; and, except in a few places on the outer side of the third plate, the inscription is in a state of perfect preservation throughout. The ring, on which the plates were strung, is about ¾ thick and 2½ 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. On the rim, which is about ¾ broad, it has, in the same characters as the body of the grant, the marginal legend—Sri(st)-Shashthadeva-pratishthapakah Āśr Kāmdeva-bhuvahmukhipādabha, "the illustrious king Kāmadēva, the establishe of the illustrious Shashthadēva,"—followed by a svastika. Inside this, in relief on a countersunk surface, it has a conventional sīhka or lion, couchant to the proper right, and facing to the front, with the sun and moon, and a sword, dagger, or umbrella, above it. The weight of the three plates is 3 lbs. 5½ oz., and of the ring and seal, 1 lb. 1½ oz.; total weight, 4lbs. 7 oz. The characters are Nāgari, of the period to which the inscription refers itself; and the virūma is represented by the same sign that is used for the short vowel \( \text{a} \). The language is Sanskrit throughout.

The inscription is arranged on the plates so that they turn over like the pages of an English book; but the order of them is reversed, and the inscription begins on what, according to English custom, would be the last page.

The inscription commences with an invocation of Śiva,—followed by a verse in praise of the same god under the name of Saptākotśā, —and another, in which the same god, under the name of Tryaksha, or "the three-eyed," is asked to preserve king Shashtha, the ornament of the family of the Kādambas, and king Kāvaṇa (line 3).

It then continues,—from a drop of sweat, which fell from the forehead of Parāmathana and touched the ground near the roots of a kadambara-tree, there sprang the four-armed and three-eyed Jayanta (l. 5). Many kings of his lineage followed; and at length there was born among them Gūhalā (l. 8). Then there was Shashtha (l. 9). His son was Jayakēśin (l. 10). His son was Vijayārka. Then there was Jayakēśin (l. 12), to whom the Chālukya king Purnāḍi gave his daughter Maīla-lamahādevī (l. 13) in marriage. Their sons were Purnāḍi and Vijaya (l. 14). From Vijaya there was born Jayakēśin (l. 15), whose wife was Mahādevī. Their son was Trībhuvanamalla (l. 16). And from him and his wife Māṇikādevī, there was born king Shashtha (l. 18), the full-moon of the ocean which was the family of the Kādambas (l. 19).

The inscription then introduces a certain 'king' Kāma (l. 22), Kāmadēva (l. 23), or Kavaṇa (l. 24),—the son of Lakṣhmidēva and Lakshmī,—whose wife was a sister of king Shashtha (l. 22), and who is described as the establishe of Shashtha. The inscription then proceeds to record that,—when four thousand three hundred and forty-eight years of the Kaliyuga had expired (l. 30); in the fifth year of his reign; in the Śādhārana svāvatāra; on Budhavāra, or Wednesday, the first day of the bright fortnight of Aśvayujā (l. 31); when the sun was in the sign of the scales; and at the time of the

1 The Kādambas of Goa; see Dynasties of the Kanarv Districts, p. 99 ff.
2 Śiva, as the destroyer of the cities of the demon Tripura.
3 The Western Chālukya king Vikramākhyā VI.
4 By this name he is mentioned also in the legend on the seal.
5 Shashtha-prāthākṣhā-kalāśamāhī (l. 29); and see also the legend on the seal.
6 By the Tables in Brown's Carnatic Chronology and Cowasjee Patel's Chronology, Kaliyuga 4345 was the Flavanga svāvatāra; and the Śādhārana svāvatāra was Kaliyuga 4351.
TEXT.

First plate.

[1] Om ēm nama[ṛ] Śīvāya (||) Śreyah[ṛ] śrī-Saptakōṭiḥ dēyād=vah sa yad-a-
[2] jōaṇā | bikhartya=ādi-varahō=pi daṁahēr-āgrē mahājalaṁ bhuvah || Śrīmat-Śaahṭhā-

mahih-

[3] pālah Kādaṁba-kula-bhuḥ(ḥh)haṣaṇum | Kāvaṇa-kshiṭipām Tyakṣhō rakah św=akṣīna-

samadām ||

[4] Puramathanā1-lalāta-svēda-biṇḍōh kadaṁba-kshiṭirṇa-tala-dhātri-sāṃkatād=āvirā-

[5] sit | tri-bhuvana-nuta-kir̥ti-śrīś=chatur-bāhur=ānchad-dhanur=īshu-phalak=āsiḥ śrī-

Jayaḥ-

[6] tas=trinētrah || Athā12 tasya kule jatāh kēpi bhu(ḥh)pā mahaujasah ||

ku(kṛ)=t-āṇē13Ka-

[7] makha-khyātī-vidāmbita-Bīḍunajasah || Tātah khyātē=bhavat=tēshu Paṁchānan-

parakrama[ḥ]14[15]

[8] Ġūhalla-nripta[h]15 srī(śrī)raṁ=Arjunaḥ Paṁvajēv-svatah || Tātah16 sva-sauryēpā

viruddha-Laṅkā-pu-

[9] raḥ śraṇa Paṁchānasaṛasya shasṭhāḥ | Shasṭhō nṛpaḥ kōṛy=abhavat=prasiddha-

siddhāḥ svayaṁ dha-

[10] ruma-bhrītāṁ dhūriṇāḥ (||) Tasya17 sun18 satāṁ=ādiyō Jayaḥē(śi)ī-nrīpō=bhavat |

tat-sutō Viya-


āchārya-dhuryatāṁ |
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[12] bhīhrad=srat=āpta-kṛtī17 śrī-Jayaḥē(śi)ī-nrīpō=bhavat (||) Tasmai Chāluṅkya-Permaḍī(ṇi)-

bhīpati-

[13] sa=tanayāṁ=sadāt | śrī-Mailalamahādēviṁ Śīvāy=ōmām=iv=āchalaḥ (||) Tasmād=asyāṁ=

ajāyō-

[14] tāṁ Permaḍī-Vijayau sutasu | Mahēśād=iva Pārba(rva)tyāṁ Shāḷāṇa-Gajāna-

naṇ || Tayōr=Bi(νi)va-

The construction of the original is Shaḥṭhāḥ-ḥh-pāṭah (l. 29) .... Kāmaṭēva-ḥh-pāṭah (l. 29) .... as Kāmaṭēvah (or perhaps su- Kāmaṭēvah) Shaḥṭhādēva (l. 47) .... pṛddat (l. 48) .... pṛddat-kṛdh (l. 48), which contains an unnecessary repetition of the names, and is ungrammatical, unless we assume either that Kāmaṭēva was also named Shaḥṭhādēva, or that Shaḥṭhādēva was also named Kāmaṭēva, and that one or other of them made the grant singly. It seems probable that something or other in this long passage was omitted by the composer or by the writer, and that the grant was really made by Shaḥṭhādēva and Kāmaṭēva conjointly.

In an Old-Kannarese inscription, dated Saka 1179, at Buralaṅka in the Hubbali Taluk of the Dāravē District, he is called Śivachīṭa-Čaṭṭayāḍēva.

The modern Goā. In Old-Kannarese inscriptions of the period, the name appears as Gōve; and we have Goē, the Sanskrit form of this, in the immediately following name of the god Gōvēvāra.

* From the original plates.
10 Metre, Śliṅka (Anuṣṭhūb); and in the following verse.
11 Metre, Śliṅka (Anuṣṭhūb); and in the following verse.
12 The vowel ṣ is very thin and faint in the original, as if it was omitted at first and inserted afterwards on revision.
13 Metre, Upajāṭī of Indravājēra and Upēndravājēra.
14 Metre, Śliṅka (Anuṣṭhūb); and in the following four verses.
15 Read śroujñāḥ.
16 Read kṛtīnāḥ.
vallabha  ||[*]
[16] Tasmâd  24  sasyân  samajânî  guṇa-maṇi-samudayā-mah-ôdadhis-tanayâh  |  Tribhuvana-
[17] malla  24  kshtipas-tri-bhuvana-rakshâ-vidhau  dakshah  ||  Tribhuvanamallah  24  nîpâlajy  
  jâtaḥ  śrî-  
[18] Mâ  24  nikâdēbyâ(yâ)m  |  śrîmat-Śaśâtha-nîpâlah  |  śâvad  =  Vâśvêṣa-p[â]* da-bhakti-
yuv[â] || śrî[â]* 21  Sa- 
[19] ptakî  24  śvara-pâda-pada-prasâda-labdha-sthira-râjya-lakshmiḥ  |  Kâdañcabha-vâns- 
  â[â]* 23  ñava- 
[20] pûrṇa-chândâraḥ śrî-Śaśâtha-dêvâ  jagati  prasiddhah  || Tyâgâ  26  satyê  cha  
asâhitâ  kulê  mahati  vi- 
[21] kramê  24  n-ânaya-tava  samô  râjâ  Śaśâtha-dêvâ  Kalaun  yugâ  26  ||  Lakshmy[â]* 22  śrî-Śaśâtha- 
  bhûpâla  24  Gânm-râkshâmâ-âkhyâ- 
[22] jê-jâtaḥ  śrî-Śâma-bhûpâtîḥ  śâyitaḥ  |  śrîmat-Śaśâtha-mahâpâla-svasâ  yasya  priy-ôbhavat  || 
[23] Kâmañcdâvâ-nîpâpaḥ śreśthâ  gahsthâ  gûa-gumhitâh  |  varishtha-Śaśâtha-bhûpâla- 
  pratishthâ-â  
[24] dhishhitîbhavat  || Sat-pratâpôdayadar-sthah  Kâvañ-character(vâ)sa-bhâskaraḥ  |  karavâla- 
  karâ-  
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[25] l-ârchi-rîrast-ârî-tamas-tatiḥ  ||  Hutavaha  21  Varuñâ-Purâñâ-tha-Nirru(rå) ti-Dhanadeśa- 
  Yama-pava- 
[26] na-samaih  |  a-samair-mahâra-samu(mâ)hai[â]*  |  śrî-Kâvañ-bhû(bhû)mîpô  jayati  || 
  Evarâviha-guṇa- 
[27] gan-âlânkârita-ârî-Śâptakotâjâvârâ-labdha-vara-prasâda-ârî Kâdañcabha-kula-tilaka-ârî-Śiva- 
 -chi  
[28] tta-vîra-Śaśâtha-bhûpâlah śrî-Mallinâtha-dêvâ-ârî-pâdâdîm-ârâdhana-prâpta-sâmrâjya- 
  lakshmihā 
[29] śrî-vîra-Śâmañcdâvâ-bhûpâlah  |  ashâchâvatvârinââd-adhika-trisâtô[â]* 26  jehau  chatubh- | 
  sahasrâehâ 26  Kâli- 
[30] yuga-saîvatsasaraehâ parâvritteehau satau  |  sa-vâra-yâm-bhavana-kâlê  paîmchame Sâdhâraña- 
  saîvatsa- 
[31] ré[â]* 25  jy-Śâyañja-su[â]* dha-pratispadi  Budhâvarê tuls-ôsim-ôpagatavati bhagava- 
  [26] vati  26  bhûskarê  vishuva-saîmvraûtau  |  mahâ[â]*-punya-kâlê  ||  Tasya- 
  Gârya  21  gôtrâ- 
  samtâpana-śrî-Nârâ- 
[32] yâna-yajyântah  |  putrô-ôbhû(bhû) n-Nâgadêvâ-âkhyô  yâya(jû)ka-ôirôma- |  -ni[â]* 26  || Tasya- 
  âbhû  jyây- 
[33] si  26  jâjâ  Jâkalâ-ôkhyâ  mahâ-satî  |  tasmât-tasyâh premâyâ bahu-saîmttâ(tâ)na- 
  sôbhineh  || 
[34] Śrî-Śaśâtha-bhû(bhû)pa-gurâvé vêda-sàstrârtha-sâlinê  |  bâl-âgnihîtrînê Jyâtha-Vîshnu- 
  dikshê- 
[35] ta-ôrmanê  || Abhinava  24  ânâkâpurâvâ-Gôpak-pûryâm-âcâsâ-Gi- |  -rîjâsê[â]* 26  |  ârî- 
[36] Gôvêsvâra-dêvâ sarba(vâ)-jan-ânândâ-dô  jayati  || Tasyâ  Gôpak-pûryâ uttara- 
  dig-bhûgê 

24 Metre, Kâryâ.  
21 The lower i is very thin and faint in the original, 
through having been accidentally beaten in when correcting 
the mistake at the commencement of the next line.  
20 The lower i is very thin and faint in the original, 
through having been accidentally beaten in when correcting 
the mistake at the commencement of the next line.  
21 Metre, Gûjhtî.  
26 Before this m, there is a large blur, owing to the engraver having engraved something or other by mistake 
and then cancelled it by beating it in.  
27 The visaryâ, mark of punctuation, or, and most of the 
i, were cut away in making the ring-hole, which was 
therefore made after the inscription was engraved.  
28 Metre, Upâjñâ of Indravarjâ and Upàndravajrâ.  
29 The tops of these two syllables were accidentally 
beaten in, in correcting the mistake referred to in note 
21 above.  
26 This r was cut away in making the ring-hole.  
30 Metre, Śûkâ (Anuâtubh); and in the following 
three verses.  
31 Metre, Āryâ; two short syllables are deficient in the 
second pûda.  
32 Read chatubh-sahasrâehau.  
33 The mark of punctuation, and the ta, were cut away 
in making the ring-hole.  
34 Read bhagavatî.  
35 Metre, Śûkâ (Anuâtubh); and in the following two 
verses.  
36 Read śrîvastî.  
37 Read gôparsyâst.  
38 Metre, Āryâ.  
39 Read Girîjîbôt.
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[2*] tasya vāyabya(vya)-bhāg[ā]* Kīṁjalauga-nāmā praśiddhāṁ vṛ̋hi-kshētram-sīti 
  Tatra chatur-dikṣu
[2*] śimā imāḥ | tasya prāchyaṁ śivachitta-tadāga-pāschimāḥ sētuḥ | dakṣipasyāṁ Paṭaṅga-
[4*] kshētrasya uttara-bhāgē pāśhāna-paṃkṭiḥ | prāchchyaṁ khārika [1*] uttaraśāyaṁ 
  Lāta-kshētrasya dakṣina-ta-
[4*] tē praśiddhāḥ pāśhāna-paṃkṭi-saḥitaḥ sētuḥ [1*] evaṁvidha-praśiddhā-simā-sa[m*]- 
  yuktā[ṛ]* pūrба(rvva)-ma-
[4*] ṛyāda-baḍha-karmā-sāntara-saḥitaḥ pūrba(rvva)-mayād-ōdaka-saḥitaṁ tatrṇya-
  Śāntikāridēbyā(vyā) ṣī(l).
[4*] sānya-bhāgē vistṛita-grīha-saḥitaṁ sarba(rva)namasyāṁ sarba(rva)-bādhā-parīharaṁ 
  parīhrataṃ
[4*] sālka-bāḍha-phalaṁ [ṛ]*jagāyānām-anāṅgulli-pṛēkṣānapāyaṁ Kīṁjolaḡā-ākhyaṁ samagraṁ 
  śā.
[4*] li-kshētraṁ tasmāi Jyēshtā-Vīṣṇu-dīksit-āryāya rājaguravē pādaun prakṣhalya 
  hirāmāṇyāḥ-ōdaka-
[4*] dhāra-pūrba(rvva)kāṁ āyur-ārogy-āsivary-ibhivṛddhī-dharmāḥ sa Kāmadēvaḥ[8] 
  Shashṭhadēvaḥ dāna-svarṇepa
[1*] prādāt | tasya-cātaḥārā-kāma-bhāga-sādhanaṁ tāmra-sāśanāṁ cha prāyaśchhitā l[l]
  Śrī[9*] Yajñavary-putra-
[4*] sya Sōmanātha-viṣṇu-abhādhit(ā)ḥ | tat-putra-Chatyaṅ-arṣayā kraṁit-jayati(t)ī śāsanē [l]
  Durgaṅa-pri-
[4*] ya-patṛ(t)*nā tulā-dibya(vya)-niyoginā | Nārāyaṇēṇā likhitam śāsanāṁ cha 
  niṛpajñaya (l[l]) Sā.
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  sarv[a]*n-eśān-ān-bhāvinaḥ pā[r]śthi[v][ēn]-
  harṣaḥ vasūdharō [1*] sāhāty-varṣa-saha-
[3*] sānī vīśayāyāṁ jāyate krimi[l] | Gūme-kēnam ratnikām-eśkāṁ bhū(bhū)ṁr- 
  apy-ēkāṁ-sa[ṛ][gu]laṁ | haran-naraka-
[3*] m-āṭpōti yāvad-ā-bhū(bhū)ta-saṃplavaṁ [l[l]] Ashtāvīśa(śa)i-kōṭyō yā narakaṃ 
  su-dāraṇāḥ kramē-
[3*] pa tāsu pachyaṁ[ṛ]ē devabrahmasva-hārīnaḥ [l[l]] Maṅgala-mahā-ārī-ārī || Ta chha 
  ta[1] || Chha ||

CORRESPONDENCE AND MISCELLANEA.

PTOLEMY'S GEOGRAPHY.

Sir,—Perhaps I may be permitted to make a few remarks on some of the identifications by Mr. M'Crindle of localities mentioned by Ptolemy.
I. Sambalako (141°; 29°30'), ante Vol. XIII.
   pp. 363, 364. This town, which was in the country of the Mandalai and on the Ganges river, was, I
   take it, not Sambhalpur on the Mahānadi, but Saumelpur on the Koil, a tributary of the Sohan or Sone (and therefore indirectly of the Ganges), in the District of Palamau. Although the precise site of the town has not been determined I have been able to fix its position approximately from the indications given by Tavernier, who visited it about the year 1665. 1 Diamonds from this locality

26 The reading in line 38 above is very distinctly Kīṁjalauga.
27 Read hīrāy.
28 Or perhaps su-Kāmadēvaḥ. See note 1 above.
29 Metre, Śīkā (Anushṭubh); and in the following verse.

1 See Economic Geology of India, page 27.
and another on the Sankh river a few miles to the south enjoyed some reputation in Delhi in Akbar's time and subsequently.

The statement on page 364 that Sambhalpur on the Upper Mahanadi produces the finest diamonds in the world, is scarcely supported by the only extant records of the now long-deserted mines, which, however, produced large stones, though, on the other hand, the produce is spoken of in the Central Provinces Gazetteer as having been of inferior quality.

II. Bénagouron (140° 20° 15'), see ante, Vol. XIII, page 364. This was one of the towns of the Salakénol, towards the Orooundi mountains, which Mr. McRindle believes cannot now be recognised. I would suggest its identity with the modern Wairagarh (lat 20° 26'; long. 108° 10') in the Chañada District. As an old city of Gondwànâ, which was taken possession of by the rulers of Berar, it has several times been referred to by early writers, who allude to the fact of diamond mines being in its vicinity. The earliest reference to it is, perhaps, in the Barhat Sâvithita, where it appears under the name of the Vêna Gaṅâ, on a tributary of which river it is situated. Farishta, in 1425, refers to the city and its diamond mines. In the 15th century, too, Nicolo Conti speaks of a diamond locality under the name Albenigaras or Abigaro, which I doubtfully refer here; but, regarding its identity with the Bairagarh of the Ain-i-Akbari there is no doubt whatever, in spite of the fact that Karl Ritter and Bœnell argued that it must have been—the former to the west, and the latter much further to the east, of its true position—Bairagarh (the modern Wairagarh) is therefore, I suggest, identical with Ptolemy's Bénagouron.

III. The Loadstone Rocks of Southern India, to which early writers have alluded, as noticed by Mr. McRindle, ante Vol. XIII, page 386,—so far from being mythical and owing its conception alone to the absence of iron in the boats and canoes of that region,—are a very solid reality, as there are in various parts of the country extraordinary deposits of vast extent of the purest magnetic iron which in some cases form whole hills and ridges, and in others afford the main sustaining backbones of the elevated portions of the country. Is it too much to conclude, knowing this fact, that the magnetic property of the rock was discovered in early times? If so, this, like many another 'myth,' proves to rest upon a very substantial basis of fact.

Science and Art Museum, Dublin, 17th July.

V. Ball

NOTANDA.

With reference to the inscription published by me in the August number (p. 293) under the title of "A Jaina-Vaishnav Compact," I have since found that an erroneous version of the same, made for Colonel Mackenzie, appeared in 1809 in Asiatic Researches, Vol. IX, p. 270.

In connection with the Gaṅga inscription published by Mr. Fleet in the same number (p. 229), he remarks (p. 7) that "the text of the Hoṣūr grant has not been published." This is not so: for I would point out that it was published by me in extenso in the Madras Journal of Literature and Science for 1873, p. 138. Other inscriptions of the same kings in my possession, not yet published, make it quite clear that Durvīṇita was a different person from Avīṇa, and that at the same time they give very important information regarding him.

LEWIS RICE.

Bangalore, 25th August 1885.

CURIOSITIES OF INDIAN LITERATURE.

ANOTHER MACABRONIC VERSE OF GUMAN! KAVI.


drohākṣi mārṇaṃ
nānākṣiḥ

śrīmad śravānī saṃśrpūra

mūlān mañśa bhaktān maḥā dūra

Terrible indeed is the nature of the wicked, and the workings of their mind are cruel, while their words are as if they were full of nectar;—"God in the mouth, and a dagger under the arm."

G. A. GRIESEON.

THE PROVERBS OF ALI EBN ABUL TALEBI.

Translated by K. T. Best, M.A., M.R.A.S.,
Principal Gujarat College.

Continued from p. 362.

295. Blessed is he who conquers himself, and keeps his desires in subjection.

296. Blessed is he whose breast is free from hatred, and his heart from deceit.

297. An ugly wise man is better than a handsome fool.

298. The heart of a fool is in his mouth, and the tongue of a wise man in his heart.

299. A wicked man never has a contented and tranquil mind.

300. The best contest is that which you carry on against yourself.

* See Economic Geology of India, page 37.
A CONSIDERABLE amount of attention has been directed in recent years to the Folk-Songs and Folk-Lore of India. In the former department, a highly interesting collection was published, some ten years or so ago, by Mr. Charles E. Gover, under the title of *Folk-Songs of Southern India*. And in the latter, in addition to numerous valuable papers that have appeared from time to time in the present Journal and in the *Calcutta Review*, a special monthly publication, entitled *Legends of the Parājāh*, is devoted by Captain R. C. Temple, B.S.C., to the Legends and Folk-Lore of Northern India, and has already run through one entire volume. And, in the Bhājpūrī Epic of Âlī and Rūdal, published by Mr. G. A. Grierson, B.C.S., in the August number of this Journal, p. 209ff., above, we have been introduced to another class of work which promises much, both for historical and linguistic purposes, as well as for those connected with the subject of Folk-Lore and Legends.

There is, however, another branch of vernacular literature, not so well known as these, and not of the same literary pretensions with them, which is equally worthy of attention,—I mean the popular ballads1 of the present century, which commemorate such historical and political occurrences of recent date, as have been of sufficient importance to interest, closely and personally, large classes of the lower orders of the people.

During the final consolidation of the British power, a people, accustomed by the influence of generations to the lawlessness that had prevailed under native rule, when every man's hand was lifted against his neighbour and the State was against them all, had to be brought into habits of obedience to constituted authority and of mutual peace and goodwill. In the course of this,—especially in the wild Western Ghânts, with their natural fortresses improved by art and strengthened into places of offence and refuge well-nigh impregnable,—there was hardly one of the numerous Gads or hill-forts, scattered over the Kanarese and Marīţhâ country, which was not the scene of determined resistance to the introduction of the British rule, or, later on, of some futile but troublesome rebellion against it. And ballads abounded all over the country, describing these events, and the final downfall of these ancient places of renown.

So also, in more recent times, there have constantly been matters of general interest, which have engrossed the attention of large classes of the community, and have been commemorated in songs that still endure. Such are the Disarming Act; the establishment of the Revenue Survey Department; the first introduction of the Income Tax; or some peculiarly hard case in which a cultivator, driven to despair by the dishonesty and tyranny of the village money-lender, has turned at last and slain the man who worked his ruin, and then, under some law unintelligible to the people, has with his life paid forfeit for the deed.

As I have said above, these popular ballads have no literary pretensions; in fact, no greater contrast can be imagined than between them and the artificial compositions, whether ancient, mediaeval, or modern, from which our knowledge of the vernacular languages of the country is chiefly drawn. Their linguistic value lies in the fact that, being composed by uneducated rustics, they give us what can be obtained from no written source that I know of,—the vernacular as it is actually spoken, with all its intermixture of provincialisms and borrowed words, by the men who compose and sing them. And their historical and political value consists in their giving us the genuine native view, never intended for European ears, of our system of administration, and of what is thought of the various measures that we have taken to introduce and enforce it,—the popular native opinion about the local officers, who, to the lower classes, represent the government in person, and who, in well-known cases, are constantly mentioned by name in these songs,—and illustrations, of the most ingenious kind, of traits of native character which are familiar otherwise only to those who have had long

1 Called, in the Vernacular, sometimes Pusodhâ and sometimes Lâyunf.
official experience in this country. Thus, in the first ballad that I shall give, the quaint way in which “that mighty Queen Victoris” is represented as being present in person in Bombay and taking into her own consideration the Magistrate’s report from Dhärwād, exhibits what is still the rustic belief in some up-country parts. The amusing description of the Magistrate,—who, when the news of Rāyānṇa’s insurrection reaches him, first wishes not to be bothered about “a matter that is past and gone,” and then, finding that he really must take cognisance of it, gnashes his teeth and bites his wrist and flings his hat about before he sits down to write his report,—would hardly be ventured on, save in a song like this, which was never composed for communication to European ears.

The description is a thoroughly characteristic one, of the way in which the three traitors, hearing of the reward proclaimed by beat of drum, conspire together and bind each other by a written bond of agreement to betray Rāyānṇa, before they make their overtures to the Magistrate,—of the manner in which they then worm themselves into Rāyānṇa’s confidence, so as to have him in their power,—and of their fear for themselves when the Magistrate thinks that so valiant a man deserves a better fate than death, and their request that, if he is pardoned, they themselves may first be hanged and put out of his reach. And, finally, the lamentation of the people when Rāyānṇa is executed,—the regret for him shown by the Magistrate, especially in paying out of his own pocket the expenses of his burial,—the way in which the people plant a tree over his grave, and swing their cradles on its boughs, and obtain offspring by worshipping the dead man,—all shew how the popular opinion is that, far from being a malefactor, Rāyānṇa was a hero, worthy of praise and admiration, and was put to death unjustly and without due cause.6

As regards the universal popularity of these ballads, I can myself vouch for it from ample experience. They are sung professionally by the Dāsas or minstrels, who are described so well by Mr. Gover, in the Introduction to his Polk-Songs of Southern India.3 But they are also known and sung by ordinary villagers all over the country-side, anywhere near the locality of the events to which they relate; and the ballads that I have collected have been mostly written down from the dictation of villagers,—only in a few cases, of professional Dāsas. Anywhere, for instance, in the south of the Belgaum District, or the north of Dhärwād, there is hardly a village, except the very smallest, in which someone cannot be found able to sing the ballad of Rāyānṇa of Saṅgālī, or the Lamentations of Trivva of Kittūr, or the Taking of Nargund. Nothing pleases the people more than that, when the villagers are all assembled for the examination of accounts, one of them, on the conclusion of business, should be told off to sing one of the best-known songs. And often, when I have arranged to have the ballad-singers brought to my tents after dinner in the cool of the evening, the news has got abroad, and testimony has been borne to the popularity of the subject by the crowds of people that have come out of the village to sit round under the trees and enjoy what was going on.

In construction, these ballads follow the principle of the Kanda or Kanarese metre, answering to the Sanskrit Aryā, Gī, &c., and consisting of feet of four short-syllable instants each. But no absolute metrical precision is aimed at; and,—though the principle of construction is distinctly recognisable,—in carrying it out by scanning, or in adapting the words to the airs, short syllables have to be drawn out long, and long syllables clipped short, ad libitum. And, as a rule, no attempt is made to arrange the stanzas or ‘paragraphs or verses’ in divisions consisting of equal numbers of feet. The rhythm of the songs can only be learned by actually hearing them sung. Another noticeable feature,—distinguishing them from anything based on the principles of classical composition, is that final rhymes are used, instead of the customary alliteration of the second initial syllable of each pāda or line of a verse, which is the characteristic of Kanarese poetry. The final rhymes, however, are much more marked in some ballads than in others,—according to

6 Compare the popular beliefs in the Pañjīb about the Nāthiś of Lohāb, hanged in 1853, in Slievan’s Rambles and Recollections, Vol. II. p. 229ff. See also Legends of the Pañjīb, Vol. II. p. 356, Introduction to the Ballads about Sarwan and Farfjan.

KANARESE BALLADS.

THE INSURRECTION OF RAYANNA OF SANGOLLI.

(Air of the Chorus.)

Sangolli Rayna-yika sarjya Sam-pagam-va Subhe-ya-

-darana myaga. talimadano pun-da

watta-radinda sutina hal-li mut-tiga ha-ki

badedar anna gota il-da hange hotoyo band-a

J. F. FLEET, BO. C.S.
the skill, or want of it, of the individual composer; and in most of them the final rhymes are laid aside, in favour of continuous alliteration or even of ordinary rhetorical prose, in passages of particular pathos or excitement. The tunes are very taking, but, like all native music, very difficult to catch and transfer to writing. The singing of the nūgīs, in fact, varies a great deal with the individual singer; but the tune of the pālī or 'chorus' seems to be always pretty constant and well-known. In a few instances I succeeded in catching the air of the chorus and transferring it to writing, as well as can be done according to the English system; the chorus of my first ballad, for instance, runs as given in the accompanying plate.

The most interesting of the ballads that I have collected are—the Lamentations of Šravva of Kittār; the Insurrection of Rāyaŋa of Saṅgōlī; the Taking of the famous Fort of Rānamandala at Bīḍāmī by the English; the Taking of Nargund during the Mutiny; a song on the Introduction of the Income Tax; the Insurrection of the Beças of Halagali in connection with the Disarming Act; an account of the Murder of a Village-Money-lender by an oppressed cultivator named Saṅgaŋa, and the trial and condemnation of the latter; a song on the Glory and Power of the English Nation; and an alliterative prose composition on the Revenue Survey Department. Of these, I now give

No. I.

The Insurrection of Rāyaŋa of Saṅgōlī.

The narrative of the events referred to in this song is best taken from the Historical Account of the Belgaum District* by Mr. H. J. Stokes, M.C.S. p. 82ff.;—

"The next event of importance as affecting

---

* Saṅgōlī or Saṅgōlā, is one who, in return for rendering public service, holds lands rent-free or under a quitrent by a sanad or written warrant.
* Dēšī is an hereditary officer, the chief local administrator of a dāta or purānī, i.e. district; another name for the same officer is Deṃukh. The duties of the Dēšī or Deṃukh, in the district under him, were very similar to those of a Pālī in his village; and he, as his coadjutor, a Dēşpādāy, corresponding to the Pālī's coadjutor, the Kuḷkārī, or village-accountant. The officers of Dēšī and Dēşpādāy do not hold office under the British Government; but the titles are still known and used, as in most cases the service-lands have been continued to the descendants of those who held office under the Pālī's rule.
* Kuḷkārī is the village-accountant.
* Dēśā is a Sanskrit word, meaning, literally 'standing together; a common place of abode,' which has become invested with the sense of 'a royal town,' a seat of government, and is now always used in the vernacular to denote a Native State that is not large and powerful enough to be called a Rāj or kingdom.
* The Līṅgāya are a sect, founded or developed by the famous Basava and Channabasava, whose special object of worship is the linga or phallic representation of the god Siva.
* Indā, or properly Iṅḍā, is a grant in perpetuity without condition. But it is now used loosely to denote any grant, present, or reward, of whatever nature and however trivial.
* Kuḷkārī is a clerk, scribe, writer.
* Kaḷaṅkī, or properly Kaḷaṅkārī, is a court for the administration of public business.
had then about one hundred men with him. Subsequently many more joined him, and he went about looting and burning various villages in Bījī, among the rest Nandigad. In a short time he had a thousand men with him. He spent the day in the Bālgund and Hāpjī-Badānāth hills; and at night they divided into parties to loot. The Māmlatādār13 of Sampaung, Krīsha Rau, my informant's father, got instructions to endeavour to arrest Rāyappa. He placed the treasure, Rs. 50,000, on top of the mosque in Sampaung, and leaving a guard of peons, he started for Bījī. In the popular account, it is against him that the revolt was made, and it is his exertions which are represented as having quelled it. It was hoped at first that the rising might be put down without military force, but when the Kīttār Sētānadī refused to serve, and the disturbance continued increasing, it became necessary to obtain the services of strong detachments. These regular troops, however, as might be expected, were not found well suited for pursuing bands of robbers through close and difficult country. Krīsha Rau, after scouring the jungles in vain, came from Bījī to Mūṣūkhan-Hubāḷi with a large body of Sētānadī, and some Jāghīr14 horse. There he learned that Rāyappa had eluded him, and had passed by a little-known path by Kāḍārūḷi to Sampaung, where he had burned the Kachērī and destroyed the records. The Māmlatādār hastened forward and overtook the rear of Rāyappa's band at the little tank outside Sampaung on the north. He had ten Sawārs15 with him, and succeeded in killing four of the rebels. The rest retired to Suttāgāṭṭī, where they divided into two large bands, one of which returned with Rāyappa to Kīttār hill by Saṅgōḷī, while the other looted and burned Marikaṭṭī. The Māmlatādār attacked the latter band on Nēsargī hill, and dispersed it, killing ten or twenty, and taking about one hundred prisoners.

At this time, the late Dēsāḷ's widow, Īravva, was living at Bail-Ḥoṅgāl. It was found advisable to remove her to Dāhrwāḍ. This nearly excited another rising; in fact, a thousand men got together at Ānegol to resist the removal of Īravva. Most of them, however, submitted on receiving a promise of pardon; while the rest joined Rāyappa.

Īravva died in July at Dāhrwāḍ,—it was supposed by poison, taken by herself or administered to her. Soon after this the insurrection was quelled. Krīsha Rau, the Māmlatādār, discovered that Līṅgānaṅgaṇa,11 Pāṭī16 of Khudānpūr, had wished his own son to be adopted on the death of the late Dēsāḷ, and resented the refusal with which his proposition was met. He was chosen as a fit instrument to betray Rāyappa. Emissaries were sent to join the rebels and persuade them to call in the Khudānpūr Pāṭī, who could aid them with three hundred men. Rāyappa took the bait, and wrote to Līṅgānaṅgaṇa to ask his cooperation. The Māmlatādār sent Līṅgānaṅgaṇa with a body of men; and, as he was timid and weak, Yeṅkānaṅgaṇa17 of Nēginhal, who was bold and courageous, was sent with him to support him. They joined Rāyappa, and continued with him, for a fortnight, looting. Then one day, when Rāyappa had laid aside his arms, and was bathing, Lakṣapāṇa, a Sanadī of Nēginhal, rushed suddenly on him and clapped him round the body, whilst another secured his weapons. The rest overwhelmed him, bound him hand and foot on a stretcher, and carried him in triumph to Dāhrwāḍ.

He was condemned to be hanged at Nandigad, the scene of his chief robbery. As he passed along the road to the gallows, he pointed out a spot for his burial, stating that a great tree would spring from his remains. He was buried where he desired, and a magnificent banyan is now shown close to the road near Nandigad, as the one which grew from his grave. Under the shade of it a temple has been erected, to which poor people who desire offspring, or wealth, or health, make pilgrimages from great distances; and where the husbandmen, on their way with their produce to the market in Nandigad, stop to vow an offering on their return, if they obtain good prices. This deification of Rāyappa is the

---

13 Māmlatādār, or properly Muḥmānldār, or Muḥmānldār, is the head revenue and magisterial officer of a Tāṅkā (properly Tāṅkā) or Subdivision of a District.
14 See note 5 above.
15 Jāghīr, or more correctly Jāghīr, is an assignment of lands or revenue for the performance of public service.
16 Pāṭī is the head managing officer of a village.
17 The Yeṅkānaṅgaṇa of the ballad. Yeṅkāna and Yeṅkāna are only different forms of the same name.
most singular part of his history. Whether it is to be ascribed to the remains of the old custom of devil-worship, and he be now glorified on account of the excess of misery he occasioned in his lifetime,—or whether his popularity as a leader of the poorer classes, in a cause which had their sympathy was the reason of his apotheosis,—are questions that naturally present themselves.

"Rāyappa’s outbreak lasted about four months. At one time he came to Kasbargi, with the intention of seizing Belgaum Fort by a rush at the time of changing guard, but did not carry his intention into execution. His betrayers were rewarded with Ināmas. Līnganaṅgūḍa got Kallolī near Kīttārī, and Yoṅkanāṅgūḍa Dōrī, a village in Dhrawīd."

**Translation.**

*Chorus.*—The noble Rāyīṇāyaka of Saṅgūlī,—the wicked fellow that he is,—is pillaging the Subbēdāra of Sambgām. Quickly have his men laid siege to all the surrounding villages, and beaten (the inhabitants of them); so that, oh my brother! a disturbance has arisen that cannot be estimated.

*First Verse.*—I tell you a tale of days gone by; sit, all of you, and listen to what I have to say.

Pride came upon the Kulkārī of Saṅgūlī. Most pleasantly had Rāyīṇāyaka been his close friend; but then a deadly feud broke out between them. When the Kulkārī Bāḷapa and Rāyāṇa were bathing,—"Wash me my waistcloth, and bring it here," said (the Kulkārī), and offered it to his hand. Angry at this speech, Rāyāṇa hardened himself, and said "Never will I touch your cloth." "How then, thou Haḷaba!" (said the Kulkārī); "how cautious thou art; have pride inflamed thee, that thou speakest this inpertinence to me?"

When he heard this, wrathful was Rāyāṇa, and he said, "I will leave off from now from doing your behests;" and so he turned and went away;—"Look now, Bāḷapa; you must submit to be pillaged by me; know that the time has come for the neighbouring villages to be sacked."

*Second verse.*—Quickly Rāyīṇāyaka went, and fell at the feet of the mother that bore him; and then, taking his sword, in firm resolve he set out.

Going to the Nizām’s Dominions, he stood before the king of Surapur, and, joining his hands together in supplication, he performed obeisance. "Truly Rāyīṇāyaka is a hero," said the king, who in his own presence saw him leap twelve fathoms at a stretch. Pleased and delighted was the king, and said, "No one is thy equal, my noble fellow; tell me, thou hero in war, what it is thou askest." "If thou art pleased with me," said the wily fellow, "give me a troop of three hundred Bēḍas, and let me choose each man for myself; and I will take the force and raise a mutiny."

Quickly and speedily Rāyīṇāyaka took the force, and led it to where all the ammunition was hidden among the trees.

*Third verse.*—Standing before them in a charming way, with plain purport he spoke a few words to the force that he had brought,—"Be you careful, keeping a good look-out all round, wherever you may go." And he brought up the Abyssinians, who are ready to eat a man if he laughs, and placed them round, and thus made his precautions for all his army; and he made his arrangements complete, and quickly gave them the order to march.

Swords for cutting; hand-knives; daggers for stabbing; ponardas; and pistols,—(these were the weapons that they had); fierce warriors were they all; (and they had) daggers, and bows, and spears, and arrows, and shields held up in bravery; and they wore armour on their bodies. With one accord, wearing in profusion sweet jasmine-flowers, and sounding their war-bugles in front, with great might, but hardly knowing what they were about, they came on, my brother! so that not one of them remained behind,—saying, "When shall we commence to fight and plunder?"

---

32 Subhēdāra, or properly Sūbahēdāra, is the term that is popularly used for Mālamatī; see note 13 above.
33 Haḷaba is an ancient man; an old servant, an old inhabitant. It is often used, as here, to express contempt and disrespect.
34 Lit. "from burning for you your pile of wood, grass, &c., arranged to be kindled at the close of the Holī festival."
Fourth verse.—He sat down in front of the foot-soldiers, carrying their drums and bugles and long horns, and beating their excellent tabors. He made them fasten jingling ornaments to the charming long horns, and made them carry chauris and strings of bells, and chain-bracelets on their fore-arms. Setting their teeth in firm resolve, stepping high with their feet, and drawing their swords, they leaped about in joy.

Channabasappa of the drawn sword went on in front to Śāṁśērā, saying, "Come on, and we will strike a wondrous blow." And Gajavira says, "Great is the disturbance that we will make to-day, so that nothing shall be left inside (the town)." And Bāḷaṇṇa of Kadāguddi, and Bāḷaṇṇa of Dōḍjākili, and Yellaṇṇa of the Woḍjas of Beljawāḍi, drew their swords, saying, "O wakeful Kāḷavva of Siranigi, and Kariyavva of Kakkērī, give your blessings upon our weapons."

So all the people, leaving not one behind, went on together to Śāṁśērā, and, scaling it, began the siege.

Fifth verse.—Entering into the fort, they created a great disturbance, my brother! and cut to pieces all the people that they could catch. Seizing them and striking them, slashing them and beating them, sportively they created such confusion that no one was left in the fort. Nothing does (Rāyaṇa) fear; swift of foot, and carrying a sword, he goes about slaying them; and cannot be caught.

Hearing the news of this disturbance in the fort, the Subhēdār rose in confusion and came there, (saying to himself)—"Here is Kāśi, and round me are the seven oceans; never before did such people come into my territory."

Quickly they carried off all the property that they had plundered, and left not the smallest thing in the fort. They looked round to see that no one was left anywhere. O my brother! a dense darkness enveloped everything.

34 Chauri is the long bushy tail of the Bos Grunniens, used as a fly-flap or fan, and carried as a mark of distinction.
35 Woḍja is a man of caste the special occupation of which is the digging of tanks and wells, and other similar labours. See Panjib Notes and Queries, Vol. I. notes 363, 446, 613, 614, 875, 876, and Vol. II. notes 59, 31, 32, 274, 916.
36 Kāḷavva and Kariyavva are local goddesses—forms of Dārāḍī.
37 Sēbēh, for Sēbh, means the English gentleman, i.e. the Collector and Magistrate.
38 There is an anachronism here, as the events of the ballad took place in 1829, when George IV. was king. It is due, of course, to the ballad having been actually composed after 1833 (though by an eye-witness of the events, as stated at the end), when the East India Company's administration was superseded by the Queen's Government. H. M. Queen Victoria's name quickly became well-known throughout India, and is the only English Sovereign's name that is known to the masses of the people.
39 The original has sīdara-mendi. Sīdāra is a corruption of the English word 'soldier,' and is applied only to white troops.
40 Here the original has kariya-mendi, i.e. 'black men.' This term is applied only to native troops.
41 From the subsequent context, it appears that the first attacking force was composed of native troops only.
locks, (loaded with) bullets and gunpowder. The crackling noise was like the parching of grain. They struck the trees in the ravine. The hill re-echoed the sound and thundered. For three hours they fought, till all their ammunition was exhausted. God was displeased with them!

Eighth verse.—When their ammunition was exhausted, they were in straits. Rāyaṇa saw that the sound of the firing of bullets had ceased, and he came at them. Like wolves among sheep, (he and his men) sprang in and scattered and dispersed them, and, drawing their swords, cut them down. The swordsmen surrounded them, and cut them down, without letting one escape; and thus they hemmed in all the force. Drawing out their pistols and cannons, and throwing all their daggers and bows and spears,—there they slew four hundred men. They cut the throats of all whom they saw; innumerable heads fell down upon the ground. They cut one company into little bits. When this deed was done in the ravine, a torrent of blood flowed forth, my brother! never had such a fight been fought before. Those that were left, fell down; and throwing away their swords, and chewing grass, they placed stones upon their heads, my brother!

When this had been done, (Rāyaṇa) blazed out (more fiercely than ever), and went to the neighbourhood of Kāttūr, where the army of the pure-white foreigners was,—saying, “I will destroy them, so that no one (save myself) shall rule the kingdom, and I will become pre-eminent in the world.”

Ninth verse.—They cut down numbers that could not be counted of the army of the foreigners who wear round hats; and they forced them into confusion, so that they were all dispersed.

Bāgiwāḷi. With dexterity Rāyināyaka forced his way into the Kachērī at Sampgaum, which was given to the flames and entirely burnt. Then passing through the village of (Bail)-Hoṅgal, he came to the fort of Kēttūr, and there he opened another device to them, saying—“Fear not; I see now, that it is only some woman who comes here (against us);” and his force sat there on guard, with their swords drawn.

What destruction he caused! Truly Rāyināyaka was indeed a hero; powerful was the star under which he was born!

Tenth verse.—“If you will seize him and give him up, I will give rewards.”—thus, in his wrath, the Sāheb caused proclamation to be made by beat of drum. O my brother! (Rāyaṇa) had plundered everything; no one could withstand him; he was pre-eminent as a hero among all people.

In a sneaking way, three men came together, and talked with cunning, and conspired in secret. Then going into the presence of the noble gentleman,22 they sent in word (of their arrival), and, confirming each other in their intention, they spoke out boldly; and they came there, having all together drawn up a document, of which the purport was, “We will catch Rāynāyaka, and bring him in and give him up to you.”

Then they went to Rāynāyaka, and spoke words of (apparently) pure friendship, laying aside all anxiety about their lives. “We are on thy side, O brother; only do thou save us; we have come out (with thee), swearing (to be true),”—(thus they spoke), touching salt and the dung of cows, seated in front of a flaming torch; thus they promised, with rite upon rite. And taking the oath of the thousand gods, (to all seeming), O my brother! they were his firm friends; but he knew not the treachery that was in their thoughts.

Eleventh verse.—“Let us go on,” (said) Rāynāyaka; “we will plunder the whole country, and lay waste all the surrounding villages.” They set out together, my brother! and quickly came to Hubbalī, and laid it waste, so that there was great lamentation.

Then said they; without hesitation, “Sending all the rest on in front, we four together

22 A sign of defeat and submission; see ante, p. 74, note 26.
23 i.e. the white troops.
24 i.e. the Sāheb, the Collector an Magistrate.
will follow behind." Rāyaṇa heard their words, and, losing his head, followed after them; falling into (false) confidence, he played the fool. They said, "Let us go to the stream and bathe, and go on when it is time to eat;" and Rāyaṇa listened to this speech. He laid aside his sword, and was off his guard, and sat down to take off his drawers. Then they seized him firmly, so that he could not move; and they placed him on a stretcher, and bound him, and carried him away. O my brother! the time of delusion had come to him.

They carried him into the Kachēri and set him down,—this mighty hero Rāyaṇayaka. The noble gentleman saw the beauty of his face, the sign that he was a brave and noble fellow; and, hearing all the matter, his bowels yearned for him, and he said that he ought not to be killed.

Hearing this, the three men spoke out boldly to the Sāheb,—"Great is the trouble that you have brought on us."

Twelfth verse.—Standing before the noble gentleman, and joining their hands in supplication, they say—"You are (our) father (and the protector) of our lives. If you let Rāyaṇayaka go, we cannot remain in the country; for he will cut us to pieces outright. First hang us, and then set him free;"—thus they spoke, standing in the presence of the Sāheb. Then the Sāheb, having listened, wrote to that purport to Bombay, and with good haste posted the letter.

When it arrived there and had been considered, they took counsel and sent (orders) that so famous a man should not be slain.

But before the written answer could arrive, O my brother! they made haste and hanged Rāyaṇayaka, while those (traitors) stood by.

They fastened a noose round the neck of the brave Rāyaṇayaka, and left him to swing, while all men stood by weeping, and while the people around were lamenting, saying, "Such a hero as Rāyaṇayaka should not have been put to death."

Thirteenth verse.—When the noose had been fastened, the noble gentleman stood there in meditation, weeping saying—"Such a hero should not have been put to death." And, standing there, he quickly said, "Spend (these) ten rupees, and bury him."

In a befitting way the people assembled and buried Rāyaṇayaka; it was as if the daylight had departed then (before its time)! They quickly brought a tree and planted it over the place, and (now) the cradles swing all round (the grave); and to those who worship the outspoken Rāyaṇayaka, (God) has given offspring in abundance.

Veṅkaṇagaṇḍa, and Niṅgaṇagaṇḍa, and Bāḷaṇaḥa,—these three men returned, laughing with joy (at the success of their treachery).

Channabasaṇḍa of the drawn sword, and the great hero Gajavīra, sat down and made a plan. And Bāḷaṇaḥa of Kaṅdhigḍiḍi, and Bhīmaṇḍa of the fort, and Yellanaṇḍa of the Wōḍaḍa of Belawad, went with all the people to the Kachēri; and, going to the noble gentleman, they said,—"Look now; you have deprived us of (him who was) our glory; the very fibre of our lives has withered and died." Then, carrying their drawn swords in their hands, they turned, and went away to the jungles; and all the occurrence, my brother! passed into oblivion.

This is the song that was made by the brave Basava of Maṇḍala-Hēbbali; he, the poet, himself witnessed (what occurred), and composed (this song) and described it.

**TEXT.**

**Pallā.**

Saṅgolli-Rāyaṇayikā sarjyā Sampagāmi-Subheyadārana myāga tālli mādatāno punḍa ||

wattaradindā suttina halli muttīgi hāki baḍedāṁaṇḍa gotta illada hāge hōtyo-banḍa || Pallā ||

**Ine nudi.**

Pūrvada māta helateva nimaga | sarvaru kanta kēḷari vistārā || Garva banta Saṅgolli-Kulakaṇṇige | chandadiṇḍa Rāyaṇiyika hondi-kōḍa idda | avara munda huṣṭiealle kadana-byāgi || Kulakaṇṇi-Bāḷappa Rāyaṇa jelakā māṭu-hotnyāga |

**33 Birada, for biruda, biruka, lit. : "badge of honour."**
dhōtra šāla tā anta koṭṭan-avara kaigi || Ishṭa māṭige śīṭa mādi dhīṭatāna
hididu Rāyaṇa muṭṭakill-and-aravi yendendigi || Fākale halābā jokyāg-iddi sokka
bant-ig-saṇa ninaga digar-ādī ninta idaragi || Kēli Rāyaṇa tāli sittu hōli
ād-ninnā biḍuvā-ṣeṇdu hōli hoṭa hindaka tirig || wollelo Bālaṇa nanna taḷi
māṭara hiḍiya inna dāli banta tiliyo suttin-hallig || 1 ||

2ne nudi.

Wattara mādi Rāyaṇyikā hetta tāyī pādaṇa biddu | matta kattu hiḍi-koṇḍa
opṭa dhīr || Magalāyara śṭīgni hōgi || Surapūr-arasara yidaragi nuntu karava
mugidu māṭidāna namakārā || Dhīra haṇḍu Rāyaṇyikā | hāri hannerādā-sakkatā
jadiṇā | araśa nōḍid-ivana kaṇṭhāra || Ārāśa meṛchi harahav-āgi sarjayā 'ninaga
sari-ṣeṇdu | yēna bōḍi 'bōḍa-anda raṇa-sūrā || Yena gaṇādāra nīnu | munnuvur
byāṭīki koṇḍa | inna ārisi wāṭeṇo pūra || daṇḍan-ellā tokoṇḍa bandū | bhaṇqāyī
māḍun-ṣeṇdu | avarīg-hēliṇā chāṭurā || Rāvaṇa mādi Rāyaṇyikā | dawāda
mādi tanda daṇḍana | giḍāḍaga wōḍiṭa yēllā bārā || 2 ||

3ne nudi.

Tanda daṅgīg-hēḷatāno hōndikinda māṭagōḷu munda nīna mādi wale sistā
| yeccheṛaṇda irari niḷu | suttu-kaṇṭṣi hussiṭār-āgī yattara hōdli niḷu
mattu | Haste manushyaraṇa tinnu-hantā | hàbaśarna tanda-ṭīṭan-ālā sūṭtu-kaṇḍa
māḍi bāndabā ṭāstār daṅgīg-ellā || Sista māḍi taiyar-āgī | wattarinda naḍir-endā
mattu | Kaṇḍau katti kai-chōṛgūlā || irawu kāṇjī kāku pūṣṭa || śīṭeṇa bhānaturo
samāṭa | kāṭārī bīllu šī bāṇa | dhīṭatana-hiḍiwālu dālu sīna toṭtaro chīkāṭā ||
Dundagyāṇvi hōndikinda | gāndha-kastariya dhariṣi | munda hōḷīgī hiḍiṣuṭā
abbarinda wōbarra uṣṭyada | kābarā illada bāṅḍar-aṇḍa raṇa-sūrī yāvāga māḍev-
antā || 3 ||

4ne nudi.

Bhēri kālī karni hiḍiṣa mirda halīgi hoḍaṣi | kāl-māndi munda mukāva kājāvāda ||
Rāṅgu-āgī iṛuḷuva karnīge jēgu jallī ghaṇṭi-saraṇaḷī | muṅgāyāga toṛeva
hākHASHAD | Halla tinta havapasta kāḷa kedari kattu hiḍiḍu jīgata māṭatāra kusi bandu |
Bichhuṅgattiyā-Chāgānannā muṇche Śamasarasagājā hōgi | vichiṭra hoḍavunu
naḍir-yēndā | Gajavīrā héḷatānā bāḷa gaddulā māṭuna yinda yēna uṣṭyada
walaginda | Kaṇḍīguddi-Bāḷaṇā | Duddakāḷiyāda Bhāmāṇa | Bēḷōṛīdā-_pythonwāda-Yellaṇṇa
kattu hirāḍ | sattuḷa Śīrāsāṇi-Kāḷavvā matta Kakkari-Kariyāvva namma kāṭīge
byāśana koḍār-endā || Yellā mandi kūḍi-koṇḍu nillād-hōgi Śamasarasagājāda | hallā
eyēri muṭīgi hākHASHAD || 4 ||

5ne nudi.

Gaṇḍa-waḷagā hōgi taṇuṇā bāḷa gaddulā māḍyār-aṇṇā || śikka mandi chāṇḍa
kūḍar-allā || Hiḍuḍu hoḍadu | kaṇḍa baṇḍadu | dandala māḍyāra gamikinda | gaḷḍadulō
māṇḍ-yāru uḷāyaḷaḷī || Yāṭarad-avaga illo darakārā | kāḷi-hagaro kāṭīgāra | kaṇḍa
hōgāṭana-ṣuṇiḷūḷ | Gaṇḍa-waḷagā gaddalā dāḍa | suttī kēḷi Subheyaḍaṛa gābary-āgī
yeḍda bandan-allā || hīṭṭalā Kāsi suṭṭ-yēḷa samadura | moppa namma nāḍa-waḷagā |
hīṭṭavara yār-yāra bandiṇḍīḷa || Lōṭi māḍida badkku yēḷa | rawaṇa māḍi wōḍar-
allā | ṣa gaṇḍa-waḷaga biḍulīḷa || Suttā-kaṇḍaśā nōḍidara | yāṭṭu yār-yār-illad-āṅg-āgī ||
Kaṭṭāla gaṇvada hākit-aṇṇā jāyāḷ || Āḍa rīti māṭagōḷann | Subheyaḍaṛa kunta-koṇḍu
Dhāraṇāḍaka barad aḷāḥād-kālāl || 5 ||

6ne nudi.

Barāḍa pāṭṭara wattarinda | wāḷikāru wōḍar-aṇṇā | dāri kūḍi-koṇḍa
Dhāraṇāḍaka | Gachchha bangaleda-waḷagā kachherī-āgīṭṭu | kāḍāḍa bichchī | wōḍāra
Sāhebāna hantaca | Ōḍi-koṇḍa Sāheba nōḍi | hōḍa māṭige inna-yēk-endu | gāḍi
bīṭa yeḍdaṇ-ā-khaṇpākā || Ṭoppīgi wōḍiṭu | muṅgai kaṇḍu | śīṭḷēṇa hallā tiṇḍu |
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kunta patra barada Mammayakka || Viktorya yembu hantã sakthi-wulla rápiyavuru |
moktã nõdi tilidãra tam-manaka || Aida-nûrã sódara mandi || yeradû-nûrã kariya-
mandi || kalavi koñtûl-ûgã tâkû-ûkã || Yeţadû ashu daŋûl bantû || kârîga-kastã 
mâsûlīkke || Bēlāgûnû Dâbrāwañhû jîhēkã || Subhheyañhû sugûndã yinna || sabara 
biyayada hûgã-bêk-antâna || jebaradinda Rûyana kolladaka || 6 ||

7ne nudi.

Siţîlinda Subhheyañhû || asha mandi hoñûsû-konjû-hûgõ || hûdakâyâno Rûyana 
mand-ell-aît-enta || Halla kolâ gûnda gañvîyã || gûnda kantûrã hûdakûta hoñûrsa || 
Hallâla gûndaûkâra bôdara môtû || Ivara daŋûl banto abmû sujûwa nûðyûnu 
Rûyinûyikã || Phalûra mûdí-avanda mandi kunût || Tavakadinda tayû-ûgî || gûnda 
jûvûgî lañûtû dûrà hûgî nintûro hûlî-gûlî hîdûsûtû || Illo adûna Rûyinûyikã || andu 
nûdo avara âgã païra-getti hoñûdarû sûtû || Gûnda maddû avata gûnda || garânâlû 
tûbûkû karûlû || hoñûsûtûro illa pursûtû || Àwàjã taďadûba aîla hûnûd-ûgã 
koľlad-gâlûna gûnda hoñûsûkâra || gudda nûð-hûûlûta gaddaûsûtû || Mûrã tâsa 
hoñûdarû-yellû maddû gûnda tiû tîrû hûtû || munadûnu avarge Bagavântã || 7 ||

8ne nudi.

Maddû tîrû bantû ëmûdara || gûnda hûkû sappûlû nintûdû || kanûa Rûyana 
manda bôte hoñûsû || Kuri-woljûgû tîla hokka mura-muřãra wogã-wogûdã hiri-hiriya 
kaďadûra kattûlû || Sutta-gaugi kattû-mandi yattûtyet-hûgûsû-kadûsû || muttûgû 
hûkû-ûrû daŋûsla ûlûlû || Pista pirûgûsû mûrtû || bêkû billû bût-ell-ûgûdû || nûda-nûrû 
mandi kondrû-allû || Ćàlûa mandi chaŋûlû kôdûra || raŋûta biddava gotta illûda 
tûnda tûnda mûdûyûnûsû tûbû || Koľlad-gâlûna kantañhû âgî nettûa kûwûlû barûdisû-ûgûbû 
hûntû îari sûri aûgîdûla yallû || Ùjûda mandi telûgra biddu || kattû chullû hûllû 
kachûkû || kallû hottû-ûngû teîlû ûlûlû || Àdakaiûle uruayakû yûdua || hûda Kûttûru 
tajûa ûlûlû || tûtû-Piraûgûsû daŋû-ûtû-adû || Sûri मûdî bûdûwûnû-sûntûra yûru rûjya 
ûlûdû-ûgûbû || sûri ûdûnû nûûûvû lûkûdaûlû || 8 ||

9ne nudi.

Chakkara-toppûgû-Piraûgûsûnûû || lekkû-illûda kaďadû daŋûsla || dikka teppûsi bûtûrû-yellû 
hûtû || Pûndûr-ûgûsû tawawunû honna || kanûa kanûa ûra bantû || daŋûsla namû-gûllûrûyû =
ûgâtûtû || Hallyàla Hanadamangûsûû || tajû gûnda Tâlâwûdû || hûgû ûdûsû-ûgûbû Gâdûsû 
pyûjû || Agasanñhûlû Ambûdûgûsûû || Kàdañhûlû Hûñchûkûsûû Belûawadû bûdû 
trûdû || Sûlûlû Dûgûsûû Bûlûgûsûû Ùtûgiû bûdû Bûgûdûrû mandi ûkûkûtû || 
Chamatûdûna Rûyinûyikã Sûmpagûñûyikû kûcherû hokku || benki hûda suţû hûtû || 
Hoñûsû-ûragû hûsî-konjûa Kûttûrû kûleûkû hûgû || ûlûlû avarûge hûlûtûnu ûgûtû 
ûjûra-byûdû = yûrû-ûvû=ûnûa barûtûla nûðûnû-ûllû || kûvûla kûntû-ûtû mandi 
hûnûdû-kattû || Ùjûsû tûlû mâdû-ûdûno || bantû hando Rûyinûyikû || hûtûda 
nakûshûra sâmûrûthû || 9 ||

10ne nudi.

Avana hûsûdû kaŋûsû || nimûga inûnu koñûsû-ûntû || daŋûsû Sûheba hoñûsû-sûntû 
hûtû =ûtû || Sûri mâdî biñûsû-nûnu yûru idûra =ûgalûlû=ûsûvûgra || mûri kunûa 
sarûva-ûlûsûgra bûntûtû || Harûndûna mûvûra kûdû || kušûlûdûna maîtû-ûdû || mañûlûta 
mûdyûrû kûnû-gûntûtû || Ùjûsûraûsa, mûnda hûgû barû koñû || hûtûtûnu kûyûma mâdî 
=ûntû || Rûyinûyikûna hûsûdû nimûga || tûnda koñûsû-ûntû bandûra || mûvûra kûdû kûgûla barû-koñûtû || Rûyinûyikûna-ûgûbû || bûhûnû-sûddû mâtanû-ûdûrû 
jûvûûlû-gûlûna kûjûlû yallû bûtû || Nûna kûdûsû iratû-sûdû || nûmûna mâtûra 
lûvûlû-ûlagû || ûnû mâdî bandûdûnu hûtûtû || Uppû gobbûra munû ûruwû ûlûnu 
dûvûgûsû mûnda kunûa hûlûtûnu kûyû koñû-koñûtû || Sûvûra dévûra âgû koñû || sakûsû-ûgû 
iddû-sûdû || tilûjûllûlû mûsûnû-sûntû =ûtû || 10 ||
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11th nudi.

Naḍi hōguna Rāyināyikā | nādan-yellā baḍada tarawuna kōḍa māḍi suttina
halīgōla || Kūḍi mandi hoṣṭīt-anā | davaḍa māḍī-Hubbaḷḷīge bandu | kōḍa māḍī
bōdana bāla gaḷa | Mandin-ellā munda kaḷavī | bōndaṅkīṅda nāḷvara nāmuva | hinva
hōgunt-antara ṛṭī niwałā || Māṭa kōḍi Rāyināyaka māna-sōta avara benna hattida
isāwāsaka bidda āda maḷḷa || Halṭaka hōga jaleka māḍī uṇu-yēleka hōgunt-andara
kāḷdī Rāyināyaka māṭagōla || Kattī ḳaṭa kabara biṭṭa | tōṭa chaṇḍa tagiyāka kantana
wottī hīḍāra benda māḍī bāḷā || Mandi kōḍi khorasaṁ mele tanda ḫīki
bīk-kōṇḍ-hōḍāra || avage wodagīt-unāya-kāḷa || Kacheri-walage wōda ḫlavāra
hechchina bhaṇṭa Rāyināyikā || Saradāra nōḍidana kaḷā || Dhīra ambu kūṇā
saradā || pūra tiḷḍu ivana kola-bārāṇg-āndā maragāva ivana karuḷa || Isṭu māṭu
kēṭi mūra mandi | nishtidindā Sāhebaga hēḷāra | kāḷṭu tanda īṭāri namaga
bāḷa || 11 ||

12ne nudi.

Saradāra munda nintu || karava mugidu bālāṭāra yivaru || nāmuva tandirī
namma īḷāvada suttā || Rāyināyikana bīṭṭāra nāmuva || nāmuva māṭara nāḍīg-
indīlā || nammanā kaḍada hākataṇa partā || Namaga mūṅche galig-ḥyāki
summanā bīḍāri nāmuva ivana || antār-ivarav Sāhebaga munda nintā || Idamnu
kōḍi Sāheba āga || adar-ante Mammāyaka baradā || hākidaṇo māḍī wae ḍhamatak
Taladāg-hōga chawkāsā-āgī || tiḷḍa vichyāra māḍī kaḷavyāra || belada manahṣaya
kolla-bārō-antā || Uttarā barada barawndar-olaga || wattara māḍī Rāyināyikana
galig-ḥyākārənāv avaru nintā || Dhīra Rāyināyakana koralige || sawaka ḫīki tōga
bīṭṭa || nintāro janaṛ-ellā maragutā || Hintā bhaṇṭa Rāyināyikana || matta
kolla-bārō-itt-antā || suttina janaṛ duḥkhā māḍūka || 12 ||

13ne nudi.

Pāsa koṭṭa Saradār-āga dyāsā ągī maraguta nintāna || hintā bhaṇṭana kolla-
bārō-itt-antā || Hatta rūpāyī kharca māḍī || matta īvara maṇḍa koḍar-enta
wattara māḍī hēḷāḍa Sāheba nintā || Chandadinda Rāyināyikana || mandi kūḍi maṇḍa
koṭṭa || indīge muḷāgīd-āṅgā ąṭi hotā || Āda jyāgāda mêli giḍā || byyāgadindā
tanda hachyāra || tugaṭāva toṭṭala suttā muttā || Satyavanta Rāyināyikaka || matta
janaṛu naḍa-kōṇḍāvarīge || putra-sattāna koṭṭadaṇa mastā || Veṅkanagaṇḍi Niṅkanagaṇḍi
Bāḷaṇāyikā mūvara kōḍi || harashav-āṅgī bandara makkontā || Bichecha-gatti Chanaḥasaṇṇa
hechchina bhaṇṭi Gajavīra || īvara kunta hākataṭo masalattā || Kaṭḍaṇḍi-Bāḷaṇṇa
killīḍa-Būmaṇṇa || Belawadā-woḍḍa-Yelanna || kacheriė hōḍarvēla mandi sahītā
Saradāra hōga antara yena bīrada kaḷade namadu || hōte namma īḷāvada koḍidi
sattā || Ḥirāda kattī kaḷagā hīḍa-kōṇḍa || tīṅgī giḍa bīḍa wōḍyāra || marata
hōḍit-anāya yalla māṭa || Maṇḍala-Hebbāḷḷi puḍḍa Basavara māḍida lāwaṇa
kaḍū ḫēḷiḍa kavi māḍi swathā || 13 ||

BIRDS.

18. The Eagle (Aërōs).

Aquila chrysaetos, Linn.—Golden Eagle.
Called Birgūt in E. Turkistan; Qarāqūsh in Kāshbhar.

Aelian* writes, that "hares and foxes are
hunted by the Indians in the manner follow-

* Ancient India, p. 43.

*Lassen suggests that Aelian** by mistake

** Loc. cit. p. 81.
substituted vultures for falcons. This is probable, since no true vulture could, by any amount of training, be taught to catch either a hare or a fox, the structure of their feet and claws being unadapted for the purpose. But the doubt expressed by the same author, as to whether eagles can be so taught, has been quite set at rest by a quotation from Sir Joseph Fayrer, made by M'Crinle, to the effect that when the Prince of Wales visited Lâhor there were among the people collected about the Government House some Afghanis, with large eagles, trained to pull down deer and hares. They were perched on their wrists like hawks.

It may be added, that the members of Sir Douglas Forsyth's mission to Yârkand and Kashgihar, in 1872-3, brought back full accounts of the employment of golden eagles for the same purpose in those regions.

Further, Dr. Scully, in a Paper entitled, A Contribution to the Ornithology of Eastern Târkistan, speaking of the golden eagle, says: "The trained bird is very common in Eastern Tarkistan, every governor of a district usually having several. It is said to live and breed in the hills south of Yârkand, and near Khoten, where the young birds are caught, to be trained for purposes of falconry. . . . The trained gađayâsh is always kept hooded when it is indoors, except when about to be fed, and the method of carrying it to the chase is the following. The man who is to carry the eagle is mounted on a pony, and has his right hand and wrist protected by a thick gauntlet. A crutch, consisting of a straight piece of stick, carrying a curved piece of horn or wood—the concavity being directed upwards—is attached to the front of the saddle; the man grasps the cross piece of the crutch with his gloved hand, and the eagle then perches on his wrist," &c.

19. The Bittakos or Psittakos (Brírâkos, ἰπτακός).

Palæornis eupatrius, Linn.—P. Alexandri,
Anatolou.

Ktâsîas describes the Brírâkos as a bird which "has a tongue and voice like the human, is

of the size of a hawk, has a red bill, is adorned with a beard of a black colour, while the neck is red like cinnamon; it talks like a man, in Indian; but if taught Greek, can talk in Greek also." This description serves to distinguish it from among the five or six species of parrots which occur in India, and it may confidently be identified with the above-named species, which is the largest and most commonly domesticated of them all.

Ælian says he was informed that there were three species of σπυράκος or φιτακός, all of which, if taught to speak as children are taught, become as talkative as children, and speak with a human voice; but in the woods they utter a bird-like scream, and neither send out any distinct and musical note, nor, being wild and untaught, are able to talk.

20. The Eops (Εώπως).

Eupupa eops, Linn.—The Indian Hoopoe.

The Indian hoopoe, according to Ælian, is reputed to be double the size of ours, and more beautiful in appearance; and while, as Homer says, the bridle and trappings of a horse are the delight of a Hellenic king, this hoopoe is the favourite plaything of the king of the Indians, who carries it on his hand, and toys with it, and never tires gazing in ecstasy on its splendour, and the beauty with which nature has adorned it. The Brakhmanes make this particular bird the subject of a mythic story," &c.

The common hoopoe of Northern India is identical with the European bird. In Southern India there is a nearly allied, but smaller bird, E. nigripennis. There is, therefore, no foundation for Ælian's statement that the Indian bird is double the size of the European, it being unlikely that any other bird could have been intended.

It may be added, from Jerdon's Birds of India, that "in captivity it is said to be readily tamed, and to show great intelligence and susceptibility of attachment. Musalmans venerate the hoopoe on account of their supplicating it to have been a favourite bird of Solomon (Sulaimân) who is said to have employed one as a messenger."

— Hist. Anim., xvi. i. 15.

Loc. cit. p. 97.
21. The Kerkion (Kerpin).

Eulabea religiosa, Linn.; or E. intermedia, Hay.—The Hill Maind.

By Ælian we are told "there is another remarkable bird in India: it is the size of a starling, is parti-coloured, and is trained to utter the sounds of human speech. It is even more talkative than the parrot, and of greater natural cleverness. So far is it from submitting with pleasure to be fed by man, that it has rather such a pining for freedom, and such a longing to wearble at will in the society of its mates, that it prefers starvation to slavery with sumptuous fare. It is called by the Macedonians, who settled among the Indians in the city of Boukephala and its neighbourhood, and in the city called Kyropolis, and others, which Alexander the son of Philip built, the kerkion. This name had, I believe, its origin in the fact that the bird wags its tail in the same way as the water-ouzel (oi κύγλοι)."

Jerdon states that the Hindustani name of E. religiosa in Southern India is kokin maind, which may be compared with kerkion. If this handsome and most accomplished musician and talker be not the bird referred to by Ælian, then I can only suggest some of the other less remarkable species of maind (Acridotheres).

Babar in his Memoirs describes several species of shārak, one of which with ear-lappets must have been a species of Eulabea.


The green pigeons of India, which fly in flocks, and feed upon fruit, are often a puzzle to strangers now, as they appear to have been to Megasthenes, or whatever other author it was from whom Ælian derived his information. He says: "One who is not well versed in bird-lore, seeing these for the first time, would take them to be parrots and not pigeons. In the colour of the bill and legs they resemble Greek partridges."

There are several species of green pigeons in India; but the one mentioned above is the commonest, and has the widest distribution.

23. Cocks of Largest Size

(Αλεξανδρὸς μέγας).

Lophophorus impeyanus, Lath.—Mundil.

The mundi pheasant must, I think, have sat for the following descriptive portrait by Ælian: "There are also cocks which are of extraordinary size, and have their crests, not red, as elsewhere, or, at least, in our country, but have the flower-like coronals, of which the crest is formed, variously coloured. Their rump feathers again are neither curved nor wreathed, but are of great breadth, and they trail them in the way peacocks trail their tails, when they neither strengthen nor erect them; the feathers of these Indian cocks are in colour golden, and also dark blue, like the smaragdus."

It is probable that mundi pheasants, captured in the Himalayas, were brought into India for sale, and thus became known to the Greeks. The same bird, I believe, referred to under the name katrous by Strabo, where he quotes from Kleitarkhos, and tells us that the bird was beautiful in appearance, had variegated plumage, and approached the peacock in shape. A suggestion that this was a bird of paradise is therefore absurd, and is otherwise most improbable, since birds of paradise are found not in India but in New Guinea. With this also I am inclined to identify "the partridge larger than a vulture," which, as related by Strabo, on the authority of Nicolaus Damascenus, was sent by Ptolemy, with other presents in charge of an embassy, to Augustus Caesar.

24. The Kelas (Kohar).

Leptopilos argula, Linn.—The Adjutant.

In the following passage from Ælian, we may, I think, recognize the adjutant: "I learn further, that in India there is a bird which is thrice the size of the bustard, and has a bill of prodigious size, and long legs. It is furnished also with an immense crop, resembling a leather pouch. The cry which it utters is peculiarly discordant. The plumage is ash-coloured, except that the feathers, at their tips, are tinted with a pale yellow."
The pouch and long legs sufficiently identify this bird with the well-known characteristics of the adjutant.

Bābab describes the adjutant under the name ḍvag. A tame one in his possession, he says, once swallowed a shoe well shod with iron, and on another occasion a good sized fowl, feathers and all!

**REPTILES.**

*Trionyx, Sp.?* i.e. a true river Tortoise.

In reference to this animal, Ἐλιανος tells us that "it is found in India, where it lives in the rivers. It is of immense size, and it has a shell not smaller than a full-sized skiff (κόκαφος) which is capable of holding ten medimnoi (120 gallons) of pulse."

I have not been able to find any account of the maximum sizes to which the shells of the Indian species of *Trionyx* attain, but I believe they do exceed four feet. Ἐλιανος's account is too vague, and probably too much exaggerated, for any closer identification. There is a marine chelonian found in the Bay of Bengal, called *Dermochelys coriacea*, the shell of which, according to Theobald, measures 66 inches over the curve.

It is difficult to suggest a name for the land tortoise, which Ἐλιανος describes as being the size of a clod of earth when turned by the plough in a yielding soil, as it might belong to several of the genera represented in Western India. He states that "they are said to cast their shells," which is of course an impossibility. He concludes by saying "they are fat things, and their flesh is sweet, having nothing of the sharp flavour of the sea-tortoise." An exact identification of this animal, so superior to the turtle, should prove of interest to aldermen!


26. **The Serpent a Span Long**  
("Οφίς στιλβόνου").

*Eublepharis Sp.—Bhikhupā* of the natives.

*Photios* 50 and Ἐλιανος 51 describe, on the authority of Ktésias, a snake, which I feel un

able to identify with any degree of certainty. The account by the former is the more concise of the two, and is as follows:—"In India there is a serpent a span long, in appearance like the most beautiful purple, with a head perfectly white, but without any teeth. The creature is caught on those very hot mountains, whose rivers yield the sardine-stone. It does not sting, but on whatever part of the body it casts its vomit, that place invariably putrefies. If suspended by the tail, it emits two kinds of poison—one like amber, which oozes from it while living, and the other black, which oozes from its carcass. Should about a sesame-seed's bulk of the former be administered to anyone, he dies the instant he swallows it, for his brain runs out through his nostrils. If the black sort be given it induces consumption, but operates so slowly that death scarcely ensues in less than a year's time."

The lizard named above, the *bhikhupā* of the natives, though toothless, is regarded as being very poisonous, and on this account I suggest, but with hesitation, that it may be the animal. It may, however, have been a true snake.

27. **The Skolex** (Σκόλης).  
*Crocodilus, vel Gavialis.*—The Crocodile, or *Gharīdā*.

Several authors who have derived their information from Ktēsias give accounts of the *skōlēx*. The most complete is that by Ἐλιανος as follows:—"The river Indus has no living creature in it except, they say, the *skōlēx*, a kind of worm, which to appearance is very like the worms that are generated and nurtured in trees. It differs, however in size, being in general seven cubits in length, and of such a thickness that a child of ten could scarcely clasp it round in his arms. It has a single tooth in each of its jaws, quadrangular in shape, and above four feet long. These teeth are so strong that they tear in pieces with ease whatever they clutch, be it a stone or be it a beast, whether wild or tame. In the daytime these worms remain hidden at the bottom of the river, wallowing with delight in its mud and sediment, but by night they come ashore in search of prey, and whatever animal they
pounce upon, horse, cow, or ass, they drag down to the bottom of the river, where they devour it limb by limb, all except the entrails. Should they be pressed by hunger they come ashore even in the daytime; and should a camel then, or a cow, come to the brink of the river to quench its thirst, they creep stealthily up to it, and with a violent spring, having secured their victim by fastening their fangs in its upper lip, they drag it by sheer force into the water, where they make a sumptuous repast of it. The hide of the skólēx is two finger-breadths thick. The natives have devised the following methods for catching it: To a hook of great strength and thickness they attach an iron chain, which they bind with a rope made of a broad piece of cotton. Then they wrap wool round the hook and the rope, to prevent them being gnawed through by the worm, and having baited the hook with a kid, the line is thereupon lowered into the stream. As many as thirty men, each of whom is equipped with a sword, and a spear (harpoon), fitted with a thong, hold on to the rope, having also stout cudgels lying ready to hand, in case it should be necessary to kill the monster with blows. As soon as it is hooked and swallows the bait, it is hauled ashore, and dispatched by the fishermen, who suspend its carcase till it has been exposed to the heat of the sun for thirty days. An oil all this time oozes out from it, and falls by drops into earthen vessels. A single worm yields ten kotylai (about five pints). The vessels having been sealed up, the oil is despatched to the king of the Indians, for no one else is allowed to have so much as one drop of it. The rest of the carcase is useless. Now, this oil possesses this singular virtue, that if you wish to burn to ashes a pile of any kind of wood, you have only to pour upon it half a pint of the oil, and it ignites without your applying a spark of fire to kindle it; while if it is a man or a beast you want to burn, you pour out the oil, and in an instant the victim is consumed. By means of this oil also the king of the Indians, it is said, captures hostile cities without the help of rams or testudos, or other siege apparatus, for he has merely to set them on fire with the oil and they fall into his hands. How he proceeds is this: having filled with the oil a certain number of earthen vessels, which hold each about half a pint, he closes up their mouths and aims them at the uppermost parts of the gates, and if they strike them and break, the oil runs down the woodwork, wrapping it in flames which cannot be put out, but with insatiable fury burn the enemy, arms and all. The only way to extinguish this fire is to cast rubbish into it. This account is given by Ktēsias the Knidian.

As regards the skólēx, I think we need not hesitate to identify it with the crocodile—the nature of the bait, a kid, used in its capture sufficiently proves that—in spite of the incorrect description of the animal itself; but although the oil of crocodiles is sometimes extracted and applied to various medicinal and other purposes by nāvī fishermen, the substance here described, and to which this origin was ascribed, was probably petroleum, the true source of which was not well understood, although Ktēsias elsewhere refers to a lake upon the surface of which oil floated.

As is pointed out on a subsequent page the supposed product of the dikairon was probably charas, so I would suggest that the skólēx oil was petroleum from the Pañjāb oil springs, where it appears to have been well known and held in high esteem for its various properties since the earliest times. Ktēsias's account confers upon it characteristics which were probably somewhat exaggerated. They may be compared with those of substances not unknown at the present day to persons of the Nihist and similar fraternities. We have it on record, however, that fire-balls, prepared with Pañjāb petroleum, were employed as missiles to frighten the war elephants of a Hindū king by a Muhammadan invader eight hundred years ago. In their accounts the Muhammadan historians make use of a word signifying naphtha, so that gunpowder was not intended, as has sometimes been supposed.

When carried as far as Persia, away from its source, it probably acquired the mythical origin described by Ktēsias; and the account of the animal itself was so distorted that the Greeks

---

62 Charas is a preparation made from the resinous exudation of the flowers of the Indian hemp (cannabis sativa) and is used as an intoxicant.—Ep."

63 Cf. Economic Geol. of India, p. 126.

64 See Jour. Soc. Arts, April 28, 1882, p. 505.
did not recognize the same animal as the crocodile of the Nile, which was of course known to them. At the same time it should be remembered that the gharīd (not gavial, as it is incorrectly called in English works on Zoology) occurs in the Indus, and would, no doubt, seem a strange animal even to people well acquainted with the crocodile of the Nile.

It attracted the attention of Bābar, who gives a description of it, as well as of the sher dī (water tiger), which was apparently the common crocodile.

Sir A. Burnes (Cabool, p. 65) mentions having eaten crocodile's flesh, and adds that "The gall bladder of the animal is carefully preserved by the natives and used as a medicine in cases of obstinate wounds and delusions."

Another mention of Indian crocodiles is to be found in the Periplus, where it is said that, when approaching the Sinthus (i.e. Indus) River, "the sign by which voyagers, before sighting land, know that it is near, is their meeting with serpents (sea snakes) floating on the water; but higher up, and on the coasts of Persia the first sign of land is seeing them of a different kind, called graai" (Sansk., graha, a crocodile). 64

28. SERPENT. (Ophi.)

Python molurus, Linn.—The Python.

Pliny 57 tells us that, according to Megasthenes, "serpents in India grow to such a size that they swallow stag and bulls whole."

This is somewhat exaggerated account of the capabilities of the Indian python, which is, however, sometimes thirty feet long, and three feet, or even more, in circumference. That it can kill and eat deer seems to be a well-attested fact, though how it would dispose of one with horns I cannot say. I know of one story recorded by an Englishman, 65 where in Sambhalpur the natives were in the habit of tethering goats near some rocks occupied by a monster snake, as an offering, which he very freely accepted and disposed of.

There is an account by Capt. E. A. Langley 66 of an encounter between one of these snakes of the above dimensions and a sportsman, whose dog was first killed by the snake. After it had been shot, a dead deer was found, which it had been about to swallow when disturbed by the dog.

The stories of monster snakes killing and eating horned cattle seem more than doubtful.

29. (Ophiς βαλανίος).

Hydrophis, Sp. (?)—Sea-snakes.

The sea-snakes of the Indian seas are thus referred to by Aelian: 67 "The Indian sea breeds sea-snakes, which have broad tails, and the lakes breed hydros (crocodiles?) of immense size; but these sea-snakes appear to inflict a bite more sharp than poisonous."

The species of Hydrophis have broad tails, as described by Aelian; but he underrates the effects of their bite; for although, as Mr. Theobald 68 states, "their fangs are small, their venom is extremely potent."

They may be seen swimming in numbers near some parts of the coast of the peninsula of India and the islands of the Bay of Bengal. I have taken them in a net towed from the deck of a steamer; and on one occasion, on the island of Preparis, I came upon an eagle (Onu cuna lecoagaster) in the act of eating one, quite a pile of snake-bones being at the foot of what was evidently his favourite perch.

Aelian's hydros I cannot identify, unless they be crocodiles; but these he elsewhere describes, under the name skdlēs. (See preceding page.

Although I am not yet prepared to identify the fish, crustaceans and molluscs, which are mentioned by our Greek authors, owing to the vagueness of the descriptions, I anticipate some success with them hereafter, but am compelled to reserve that part of the subject for the present, and therefore pass now to the insects.

INSECTS.

30. HONEY (Māl).

Apo doresa (?)—Bees. Dhanārī, Hin.

Photios tells us, on the authority of Ktēsius, 69 that "there is a certain river flowing with honey out of a rock, like the one we have in our own country."

66 Motte in Asiatic Annual Register, London, 1796.
67 Narrative of a Residence at the Court of Meer Ali Moorad.
69 Catalogue of Reptiles of British India, Appendix, p. 2.
70 Elcoba in Photii, Bibl. ixii. 13 (αι σαραμος φθιν ων εκ περας βιονα μελι).
I venture to think that this story may have possibly originated in the fact that the rocky gorges of many Indian rivers are the favourite haunts of wild bees. To those who know India, the famous marble rocks on the Narbadâ will suggest themselves; and all who have actually visited that remarkable gorge where the river is bounded by lofty cliffs of pure white marble, will remember the ladders which hang suspended from the summits, by which the honey seekers descend to rob the combs. What more natural than that honey brought from such a spot should be made the object of a story like that related by Ktesias.  

Perhaps we may venture a step further, and suggest that the following statement, by Strabo, quoting from Megasthenes, had the same origin:—“Stones are dug up in India which are of the colour of frankincense, and sweeter than figs or honey.” But the probability of any form of sugar-candy, the true origin of which was then unknown, having given rise to this story, should not be forgotten.

31. **The Indian Mirmex** (Μηρμήξ Ἰδρέως).

**Termes, Sp. (?)—Termites, or White Ants.**

The termites, or white ants, as distinguished from the gold-digging ants, receive special attention at the hands of Aelian, whose account appears to have been derived from an author named Iobas. He says: “Nor must we forget the Indian ant, which is so noted for its wisdom. The ants of our country do, no doubt, dig for themselves subterranean holes and burrows, and by boring provide themselves with lurking places, and wear out all their strength in what may be called mining operations, which are indescribably toilsome, and conducted with secrecy; but the Indian ants construct for themselves a cluster of tiny dwelling-houses, seated, not on sloping or level grounds, where they could easily be inundated, but on steep and lofty eminences,” &c. &c.

The above with its context affords a good description of Indian white ants, or termites, which unlike true ants, have soft defenceless bodies, and have therefore to protect themselves by their earthworks. Besides constructing the well-known so-called ant-hills, they, when extending the range of their foraging grounds, protect every step of their progress by covered passages, built up of minute pellets of moistened clay.

32. **Elektron** (Ἐλέκτρων) ὤψαρ το κύψεως ἕνας
γινώσκεται ὡς το κόλπος.

**Coccus lacca.—The Lac Insect, and its Products, Shell-Lac and Lac Dye.**

None of the commentators on the ancient accounts of India appear to have suggested that the elektron, to which reference is not unfreqently made, can be identified with a known production of India. Lassen, however, suggested that it was a gum exuding from trees. There are several points in the following descriptions which point with certainty to the fact that it was crude shell-lac, which is a secretion formed by the female lac insect, whose body affords the material of lac dye.

From Photios’s extracts, as given by Mr. M’Crindle, 18 we learn that, “Through India there flows a certain river, not of any great size, but only about two stadia in breadth, called in the Indian tongue, Hyparkhos (Ὑπαρχός), which means in Greek, ἑρων πάνω το ἐγκάθ (i.e. the bearer of all good things). This river, for thirty days in every year, floats down amber, for in the upper part of its course, where it flows among the mountains, there are said to be trees overhanging its current which for thirty days, at a particular season in every year, continue dropping tears like the almond-tree, and the pine-tree, and other trees. These tears, on dropping into the water, ‘harden into gum. The Indian name for the tree is seiptakhoras (σειπταχωράς),” which means, when rendered into Greek, γλακτός (i.e. sweet). These trees, then, supply the Indians with their amber. And not only so, but they are said to yield berries, which grow in clusters like the grapes of the vine, and have stones as large as the filbert nuts of Pontos.”

Further on we read: “In the same parts there is a wild insect, about the size of a beetle, red like carmine, with legs excessively long.

---

18 This explanation may I think be extended to the Biblical references such as “the brooks of honey and butter” (ἡμαί) mentioned by Zophar in the Book of Job, and the following: “He should have fed them also with the finest of the wheat, and with honey out of the stony rock should I have satisfied thee.” *Psalm lxxi. 10.*

---

**Geographica**, xv. c. 1, § 37.


**Ancient India**, by J. W. M’Crindle, pp. 20, 21.

**Aphrodisos**, according to *Pliny*, Nat. Hist. xxvii. 11.
It is soft as the worm called *skûlûs*, and is found on the trees which produce amber, eating the fruits of those trees, as in Greece the woodlouse ravages the vine-trees. The Indians grind these insects to a powder, and therewith dye such robes, tunics, and other vestments as they want to be of a purple hue. Speaking of the race Kynokcephaloi, they are said to "eat the fruit of the *siptakhoras*, the tree which produces amber, for it is sweet. They also dry this fruit, and pack it in hamper, as the Greeks do raisins. The same people construct rafts, freight them with the hamper as well as with the flowers of the purple plant, after cleansing it, and with 260 talents weight of the dried fruits, and a like weight of the pigment which dyes purple, and 1,000 talents of amber. All this cargo, which is the season's produce, they convey annually as tribute to the king of the Indians."

In spite of exaggeration, in the account above given of the red insects, I think they may be safely identified with the so-called lac insects, *Coccus laca*. They cannot have been cochineal insects, as has been suggested, since they do not occur in India. The *élektron* was certainly shell-lac, as above stated. The *Periplus* mentions *Aëkös χρωμάτων*, coloured lac, as an export to Adouki from Aïrakê, which, whether it means the dye itself, or garments coloured by it, as has been suggested, sufficiently proves that the substance was known at that early time. The *siptakhoras* tree presents some difficulty, owing to its combining attributes belonging to two distinct trees, which, however, grow in the same region. The tree which most abundantly yields lac is the *khusa*-Schleichera trijuga. It is found on others too, as *Zizyphus jujuba*, *Ficus Indica* and *Ficus religiosa*; but not, so far as my experience goes, on the *manuwa* (*Bassia latifolia*), the dried flowers of which are brought down from the mountainous regions in baskets for sale in the plains. The flowers are used both as food and in the manufacture of a spirit, the well-known *mahuvâ* spirit. It is possible that some of the confusion may have arisen from the fact that the *mahuvâ*, like other trees belonging to the same natural order, does exude a gum. The fruit of the *khusa*, though edible, is not so treated. The *fruits of the mahuvâ* include stones, and grow in clusters.

These identifications, taken together with the statement of Pliny, that the Hyparkhos, or Hypoburos river flows into the Eastern Sea, enable us, I think, to localise it as to say, that it was one of those which rise in Western Bengal (or Orissa), and among them it may have been either the Damûdû, the Dalkissar, Kossai, Bhrâmini, or Mahâmadi. Possibly the old native names of these, which I cannot at the moment refer to, may help to elucidate the identification.

As for the people called Kynokcephaloi, they are subjects fit for separate examination, it being here sufficient to suggest that they belonged to a Kolarian race.

33. **The Dikairon (必不可).**

*Scorabuus sacer*, Linn.—The Dung Beetle.

Under the name Dikairon, Ktesias described, according to Photios and *Ælian*, a bird of the size of a partridge's egg, which buried its dung in the earth. To this dung, which was said to be an object of search, the properties of an opiate and poison were attributed. It was so precious that it was included among the costly presents sent by the king of the Indians to the Persian monarch, and no one in Persia possessed any of it except the king and his mother.

By the Greeks it was called *dikiais* (i.e. just), that being probably the nearest approximation of a known word to the Indian or Persian name. An Arabic word *zikairon* (?) meaning concealer may perhaps, it has been suggested to me, be the original form of this name. This so-called bird! was, I believe, one of the *Cophagi* of Latreille, namely, the common dung beetle called *gobarandâ* in Hindustâni, which buries pellets of cattle droppings as a receptacle for its eggs and food for the larvae when hatched.

I do not know whether these pellets are used medicinally, though it is not improbable that they are, but I strongly suspect that the substance, described by Ktesias, to which he has attributed this origin was *charas*, a resinous product of Indian hemp (*Cannabis sativa*). It cannot have been opium, as it was not introduced into India till a later period.

---

*Of* *Jungle Life in India* *passim.*

*Ecloga in Photii, Bibl. ixxii. 17.*

*De Nat. An. iv. 41.*
I remember when in the valley of the Indus being very much struck with the rapidity with which these scarabaei formed pellets from cattle droppings and rolled them across the sand to suitable spots for burying. The pellets are often larger than the beetles themselves, and the method of rolling them is curious, as the beetle goes backwards, guiding the ball with his long hind legs and walking on the two pairs of fore-legs.

It would not be difficult to give examples of almost as extravagant ideas of the origin of many of our drugs which were till recently accepted. There are some even to the present day the true source of which is unknown.

The above may be compared with the suggestion on p. 307 that the oil of the skálæ was in reality rock oil or petroleum from the Pañjáb.

FOLKLORE IN WESTERN INDIA.

BY PUTLIBAI D. H. WADIA.

No. 1.—The King’s Lesson.¹

Once upon a time there lived a king who was very avaricious, and spent nothing in charity, but had a very sensible minister who would occasionally reason with him and forcibly point out the sin of leading such a selfish life, exhorting him at the same time to do something towards alleviating the sufferings of his subjects. The king’s miserly disposition, however, never altered.

One day the minister, who was a very outspoken man, freely expressed himself to his royal master thus:—“Your Majesty will excuse me for saying that you are getting old, and in course of time will be joined to your forefathers; and what have you done to please Íswar (God) and to recommend yourself to his mercy? But it is not yet too late to mend, and so let me beg your Majesty to try and win the favour of Íswar by doing some charitable and benevolent acts.”

“I think,” replied the king, “that it is useless to waste money in that way, for I have no faith in charity, and do not believe that the charitable are blessed.”

“Will your Majesty listen to me?” returned the minister. “I have a plan to propose to you, which, if you follow it, will convince you that deeds of charity and benevolence are not without their reward. My humble advice to your Majesty is to go abroad and see a little more of life as it really is: but if you wish to see it properly you must give your state for a time and go into the world as an ordinary man, and then I can assure you, you will see for yourself whether the charitable are blessed or not. If you travel as a king you will be shown nothing but the bright side of things; whereas, if you go about as an ordinary man, you will be able to mix with the people and learn how mankind really lives in this world.”

To this the king consented, and getting ready a ship set sail in it. He gave orders that the ship’s course should be left to the winds, that it might be carried where it should please Íswar to take it. After some time the ship reached a strange land where the king left it and went on shore all by himself. He found that he had arrived at a large city, and on inquiry learned that it was governed by a king who was of an uncharitable disposition, and had never in his life done any good thing; and had, moreover, mismanaged his state affairs.

The king went on till he came to a hut in which lived a cowherd and his wife. Going up to it he begged admittance and a night’s shelter. They stared at him a while, but being reassured by his honest looks, they took him in. On his inquiring of them as to how they managed to live, they replied that they were in the service of the king of the country, whose cattle they tended and milked, taking the milk to the palace, and being in return allowed a sídha (pittance) of rice enough for two, and some guj (coarse sugar) out of the royal stores.

That evening when the woman went to the palace with the milk, her husband said to her: “When they give you our sídha at the palace this evening, ask for a handful more for our guest.”

The woman did accordingly, but the servants were rude to her and refused to give her any-

¹ Told by a relative of the narrator: a Píral lady.
thing more than the usual allowance. The queen, hearing an altercation, came up, and demanded of the poor woman what she wanted.

"I was asking for a little more rice than usual, your Majesty," said she, "that we might feed a stranger we have taken in for the night."

The queen, who was as uncharitable as her husband, fell into a rage at this, and ordered her servants not only to give the poor woman nothing more than her daily allowance, but to curtail even that by a handful or two by way of punishing her for her impudence.

The cowherd's wife meekly took what was given her and went home, and when the rice was cooked she divided it and the guj between the stranger, her husband and herself. After serving the stranger with his share of the food, the poor couple retired into an inner room and sat down to theirs.

While they were at their meal the husband said: "Why did you not ask for a little more rice, wife, when you were given our daily pittance at the palace this evening, as I had told you, so that both we and our guests might have fared better to night?"

"I did ask," said the woman, "but the queen came up, and instead of adding a little more to our usual supply, ordered her servants to curtail it by a handful or two, and so I was obliged to be content with what was given me, and do the best I could with it."

Their royal guest overheard this conversation, and thus found confirmation of the report he had heard about the miserly habits of the king and queen of the country he found himself in.

After finishing what was placed before him the king lay down on the floor to sleep, and his host and hostess did the same in the next room. Before the king had composed himself to sleep, the cowherd arose, and coming up to him said:

"Awake! I have something for your ears only, and listen attentively, for I have a prophecy to tell you."

The king stared at him in astonishment, but the cowherd proceeded:

"Before daybreak to-morrow the palace yonder will be in flames. Do not be concerned or frightened at this, for the decrees of fate are immutable, but take a knife and hasten to the stalls where the cattle are kept, cut the strings with which they are tied and let them loose. You must then return to this cottage, where you will find my wife and myself dead in our beds. Do not be overcome with grief, but open the box in that corner there and you will find in it some money that I have saved up. Take some of it, run to the bāḍrānd buy such articles as may be required for our obsequies. This done, lose no time in having our bodies burnt with due ceremony, defraying the cost of that also out of the contents of the box, and you will find two gold coins still left in it. I shall tell you, presently, what use you are to make of them. When returning from the outskirt of the city after burning our bodies you will hear a dākhed (scavenger) quarrelling with his wife, and presently you will see him coming down a hill with two new-born babes placed in a winnowing fan. He will be abusing his wife for having given birth to twins this year, when he could not find bread enough for those she had already borne him, and saying that he will not bear it any longer, but will consign the unwelcome little ones to the sea. You must walk up to him, beg him to have mercy on the poor little things, give him the two gold coins, and tell him to have patience, for īswar will provide for his babes. When he hears this he will return home again with the infants, who will be no other than the wicked king and queen of this country, burnt in the fire by which their palace is to be destroyed, because their souls will have transmigrated into the bodies of the scavengers' twins.

"You must proceed towards the city after this and you will hear great rejoicings going on in a certain part of it, and on inquiry will learn that the two great ministers of the State are celebrating the birth, one of a boy and the other of a girl, just born to them. You will be told further that the two ministers, not being blessed with any progeny, had constantly been praying to īswar to bless them with children, and that as they were very righteous and pious, he had heard their prayers, so that both their wives had borne them children at the same time, upon which, as they were great friends, they had vowed that if one had a boy and the other a girl they would marry them to each other; and that this is why both the families
have equal cause for rejoicing. In one of them, however, you will hear that there is a cause of regret, viz., that the newly born boy refuses his mother’s breast. The boy will be myself, come back into the world a second time, whilst the girl will be no other than my wife. You must, therefore, ask the people to take you to the house of the minister, my father, and there you will see me lying in my mother’s lap. As soon as I see you I shall speak to you and then commence to suck my mother.”

The king, who had followed his host throughout most attentively, was at a loss to know what to think of all he had heard. He tried to go to sleep again after the cowherd had retired, but in vain. Meanwhile he could hear his friend snoring away in the adjoining room.

Before the day had broken, the disguised king, who had been tossing about in his bed, pondering upon what had been so strangely related to him, heard people shouting that the king’s palace was on fire. He instantly got up and began to look about for a knife. He soon found one, and hurrying to where the cattle were kept, cut the ropes with which they were tied up and set them at liberty. He then returned to the hut, and there, sure enough, he found the poor cowherd and his good wife dead in their beds. He forthwith proceeded to do as he had been bidden over-night. He got everything ready and burnt the bodies with all due ceremony, defraying the cost out of the poor man’s savings, which he found in the box in the corner, as had been pointed out to him. While returning from the burning-ground, he saw the shed coming down a hill with his two new-born babes, proclaiming in a loud voice that he was going to throw them into the sea. Remembering what his deceased host had told him he went up to him, and after a good deal of persuasion succeeded in getting him to promise to spare the lives of the infants, giving him, at the same time, the two gold coins still remaining in hand out of the cowherd’s box. The scavenger returned home with the infants and the two gold coins, to his wife’s great delight, and the king went on his way.

When he reached the city he heard the sound of music and singing, and on inquiring into the cause of the rejoicings was told just what the cowherd had predicted. When he approached the house of the Minister to whom had been born a son and heir he remarked that some of the people around looked sad and dejected, because, he was told, the newly born boy refused the breast.

“Take me to the child,” said the king to some of the servants whom he found loitering about the house, “and I shall work a charm that will make him suck his mother fast enough.”

The men looked at him for a while in astonishment, but at last, with the permission of the master of the house, they took him to the chamber where sat the mother with the baby in her arms, wondering how the boy was so pleased to have life without the nourishment he refused. The king went up to her, and as soon as the child saw him he began to speak, to the great surprise of his mother. They were quite alone, for every one else had been sent out of the room, and what the child said was:

“Have all my words been verified? Have you learnt the lesson you came to learn?”

The king had scarcely answered “Yes,” when the baby put his mouth to his mother’s breast and drank his fill. The gratified mother requested the stranger to explain the meaning of her baby’s questions, but the king wisely refrained from giving her any explanation and left the house amidst many expressions of gratitude from the parents of the boy, as well as from their friends, for the wonderful change he had produced in him.

Immediately after this he set sail for his native country, and when he arrived there, he was greeted by his Minister, to whom he related all that he had seen and heard, and assured him that he was now fully convinced that there was nothing in this world like charity and benevolence.

From that day he devised every means in his power to enhance the welfare and happiness of his subjects, and died regretted and respected by all for his numerous virtues, prominent among which were benevolence and charity. 3

---

1 Ordinary there would be no rejoicings at the birth of a girl, but many at the birth of a boy.
2 The point of this tale, which must be of purely Hindú origin, lies in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. The wicked king and queen are punished by being born again as the children of a scavenger, and the virtuous cowherd and his wife rewarded by becoming the children of ministers, who in India are not only people of very high position and great wealth, but are also usually high-caste Brāhmaṇas. The cowherds are everywhere a low caste. "Charity" in India usually means almsgiving to Brāhmaṇas.
Sanskrit and Old-Kanarese Inscriptions.

By J. F. Fleet, B. C. S., M. R. A. S., C. I. E.

(Continued from p. 291)

No. CLIX.

Paithan Plates of Rūmacandra.—Saka 1193.

This inscription is from some copper-plates which were found at Paithan in the Nizam's Dominions. I obtained them, for examination, from the Bombay Secretariat.

The plates, which are very massive, are three in number, each measuring about 1' 3" by 1' 8½". The edges of them are fashioned thicker, so as to serve as rims to protect the writing; and the inscription is in a state of excellent preservation almost throughout. The ring, on which the plates were strung, consists of a rod of copper about 5" thick, bent into a circle about 6½" in diameter, and fastened with a rivet through the two flattened ends; it had not been cut, nor, apparently, opened by removing the rivet,—when the grant came under my notice. On this ring there slides freely another ring, about 5" thick, which is let into the back of an image of Garuda, about 8½" high. The weight of the three plates is 2300 tolas, and of the two rings and the image, 457 tolas; total weight, 2757 tolas.

The characters are Nāgarī, of the period to which the inscription refers itself; the character ba is sometimes represented by an ordinary Nāgarī ba, and sometimes by a double va. The language is Sanskrit throughout.

The inscription commences with an invocation of Vārāha or the Boar (Vishnu),—followed by the usual verse in praise of Vishnu, in the same form, when he lifted the earth on his right-hand task from the depths of the great ocean.

It then continues;—From the lotus that grew from the navel of Vishnu, there was produced Viraśe (line 2). From him was born Atri (l. 3); and from him, Chandra, or the Moon. In the lineage of the moon, there was Purāravas (l. 4), who married Urvashi (l. 6). From him was born Yāyati; and from him Yadu (l. 8), through whom the race attained pre-eminence in the world.

In this family of Yadu (l. 10), the lineage of the moon, there was born Siṅghaṇa (l. 13), who subdued the king of Karṇāṭa (l. 13), and punished the Pāṇḍya, and repulsed with his arrows the leader of the Gūrjaras (l. 14). From him there was born Mallugī (l. 16). After him there was Bhilama (l. 19). From him there was born Jaiṭugī (l. 22), who slew the king of the three Kalihgas in battle (l. 20), and seized the whole of his kingdom, and who took king Gauṇapati (l. 23) from prison and caused him to smile. From him there was born Siṅghaṇa (l. 25), who was a very sun to dispel the darkness which was the Jamindras (l. 24), and who overthrew Balliṣa, and the Andhra king (l. 26), and Kakakala, and the lord of Bhambhāgiri, and king Bhūja (l. 27), and Arjuna. From him there was born Jaiṭugī (l. 32). His son was Kṛishṇa (l. 34), a very Nārāyaṇa among kings, who bathed his fame in the ocean which was filled with the rivers of the blood of the Gūrjaras (l. 35). His younger brother was one who supported the barden of the earth on his own arm, and thus delighted the king of serpents by relieving him of his duties and setting him free to roam about as he pleased,—and who overthrew Vihāra (l. 43). And his son was Āmaṇa (l. 44), from whom Rāma the son of Kṛishṇa (l. 46), took away the kingdom by violence.

And he, king Rāma (l. 58), a very Nārāyaṇa among kings,—when the Saka (year) eleven hundred and ninety-three (l. 62), or in figures 1193, had expired; on Budha, or Wednesday, the twelfth day of the bright fortnight of Māgha of the Prajāpāti saṅvātara which was then current,—gave (l. 63), as an agraṅava, to fifty-seven Brāhmaṇas of many gotrās (l. 64), the village of Vādāṭhāṅagṛāma (l. 59),

1 In Dynamics of the Kanarese Districts, pp. 73, 74. I have referred to this grant as the Agraṅava grant; I have now ascertained from Pandit Bhavevanalā Indrajit that it came from Paithan.
2 The Hoysaḷa king Vira-Ballāḷa or Ballāḷa II.
3 Bhūja II. of the Śilahātra Mahākulaśāstras of Kāśīpura.
4 Mahādeva, who for some reason or other is not mentioned by name in this grant. I had previously (Dynamics of the Kanarese Districts, p. 74) interpreted this verse as giving Mahādeva the name of the universal emperor Uraga; but its correct meaning is as now given.
5 The thousand-headed Śaha, who bears the world on one of his heads.
6 Vīśalaṇa of the Vīśāghrapallī branch of the Chalukyas of Anhilwālī.
which was situated on the north bank of the Gódpávar, and was the ornament of the Sê u na dêka (l. 58), and, with it, the villages of Pâtârapimpalagrama and Vaidyaghâhâragrama.

Lines 65 to 93 contain the names of the grantees, who belonged to the gôtras of Vâsishtha, Madgâla, Vishùrâddha, Bhârâdvâja, Kuândînya, Viâvâmitra, Garga, Harita, Gâryya, Jâmâdagnya-Vatsa, Gauâma, Kauâsîka, Vâdhryâva, Átrîya, Kâshyapa, and Dêvarâta,—and who were some of the Bavhrîcha átâhâd, and some of the Taittirîya.

Lines 93 to 96 define the boundaries of the villages that were granted,—mentioning, in this connection, the villages of Vânagânuv, Nêrûgânuv, Dôgî-nu, Kââtigânuv, Álûne-gânuv, Nâgâmâthânu, Jântegânuv, Pâmiva, and Vaâdakhâla, and the river Gaâgâ, which must denote either the Gódpávar or some tributary of that river.

Lines 96 to 100 record the conditions of the grant; viz.,—that there were to be no fines on the king’s servants, either for staying at the villages granted, or for setting out on journeys from them,—that harlots were not to be allowed to reside there, and gambling was to be prevented,—and that weapons were not to be carried.

Lines 100 to 117 contain twelve of the usual benedictive and imprecatory verses. And, finally, line 117 records that the charter was written by the Pûndî Dhanâsâvar, and the inscription ends with some of the usual invocations of prosperity and auspiciousness.

 Text.

First plate.

[3] dêva-dáityaîh | tasmâd =Atrî samajani jagaj-jâta-jaira-prâkaîsai=Chaûdras =tasmâd = | abhavad=amrit-ûdgâra-srîngârî-
[5] pta-vajra-grahâh || A-brâmâmândam =aûkâm=ta-ûrûvaî-rathâ-priyâm =llâm =vahan =yaî = | ch-ûkô bhûhjy =bhûjêna vijî-
[6] tûm =nrâî =tath =aîrvâsîn || Tasmî =ôva =Yaûtîr =âvîrâbhad =bhûmâôî.âî. | Ákâmânâlô sarvaî svar-vani-
[8] m-ôkrînair =ûkîrûqîn paritaî sphûruty =âvîrature =tàpichchha-nilam =nabhô || Tasmôd[14] = | ajâyata Yadu-
[9] reyad-upôgrâhôna =vânasîs=tataî param =agôî=jagatî pratiskîtîhîm || tasmîn =ath =îyam = | abhavat =prabhvây prâ-
[10] jânîm =llâmâyam =ta(=va)=pur =amaûdâ-balama =dadhânâm [[||]] Yadôr[15] =tasmîn =vâniî | samajani sa nirvâpî-
[13] m=brâyara=brûman || yad-vr(=va)=vrûta=pîtar=nama =samaram =abhajaj=jarjjarô Gûrjjar- | emdrenal sa sûrmâ-
[14] n=âvîrâît-tubîmakam-kulê Siîngâoñam sâhns-âmîkô || Tasmôd[17] =abhût =prabhur =asêhâ- | mahî-

10 From the original plates.
11 Metro, Sôkâ (Amshûtubbh).
12 Metro, Mandâkrânt américain.
13 Metro, Sôrûkâ (Anuñâmuhu).
14 Metro, Sièsâhrist.
15 Metro, Sôrûkâ. 16 Metro, Vâsàntaliaka.
17 Metro, Vâsàntaliaka.
patināṁ śṝ-mallugir-vijaya-kārman-kārmuka-śrīḥ | yasya pratāpa-taranau tarunē
tarunān
c̱hāyātva daiṅghyam-ajahit=ri-bhabhrītām  śrīḥ || Yasmin="bhrubhaṅga-bhīmē
cchalati vasumati-manḍa- ā
laṁ chañḍā-bhāṅor-bhīmbaṁ" śailendra-samañḍhē-tribhir=abhita imē samābhrīyanıt
śma sarvē | valgādhibhīr-vā-
c̱j-iṝjñādās=trura-ga-khura-hatah pamsabhir=bhiti-bhittaih kahōjṇīdraiḥ sa pravirasa-
tad-am(u) samabhaṇav=bhī-
liṣmaḥ sāvaṁ"bhumaḥ || Yahu4 sa[un]kṣyē tri-Kaliṅga-rajam-saṅgdhi=vidvēsh-
simantinī-netrāhpahā-
c̱presarat-pragabhā-śabarī-nirvāṇa-vair-arṣalaḥ || yaḥ=ch=aitasya samasta-rajyam=aharan=
matt-c-
bbh-kunibhsthall || kujat4 shaftapa-gita-fatbhava-bharur jītas=tatō Jaituṅi ||
Karāṭu-rā-
c̱t=samāniya karupā-varup-ālayah || priyamnāv-āsyam=karot=kshiter-Gaṇpati[ī]|
pā-
tiṁ || Hammira4-timira-taranī śaṇapī=ddharmasya samakramah kirt[tt]eh [tt]
tasmiy=qam-s-
c̱janī śṝ-Sīṃghapiṇḍa-śrūpālaḥ || Ballālo4 vijitaḥ parābhava-bhuvan samabhā-
c̱viṭo=Dhr[īṇh]-ādihiṇaḥ || Kakakkālo dalihaḥ ksaṇāṇa gilītō Bhalbhāgi-
c̱rāvār=īśvarāḥ || dargg-agre vinibadhya Bhōjya-nripat[ī|m] nayastō Rjuna nī-
c̱rjitas=tēn-ēti pratī[pa]dya kē bhuvī bhayaṁ bhūjur=na bhūṁbhūjaḥ || Kriṣyate-
c̱yad[ū]|-rajā-rajena bhavatā vakṣāñāṁ vīdveṇhīm-uyantē samara-sthallah-
c̱kariṣāṁ muktāvaliḥ"ś-rēgayaḥ || vafr* sahaṁti sana-maṁḍalēṣu tarunī-netrāṇī bás̄hū-ō
Second plate; first side.
tkarair=ubhīdō bhuvana-trayē=pi yaasāṁ= śācharyam-uj[ī]* jībhate || Tasmā4||
ajayata ja-
c̱git=t[tt]rāya-giryaṁi-pranḍha-pratapa-tapana-ōdaya-durnīvāraḥ || śṝ-Jaitu-
c̱gir=vasumati-valay-adhipātās=tōḍā4 maṇi-prakara-Śaṅkara-bhū-(chu)mī|bhitā-āṅgriśē
c̱|| Tasmit4=Krīṣṇa iti prasiddha-charitah śṝ-rāya-Nārāyaṇa jāta Kā-
c̱rt[tt]jika-chaṇḍra-kāmī-jayinīṁ kirt[tt]iṁ ri(chi)man narttayan | garj-ad-Gūrjara-
vīra-ō-
c̱sōqita*-sarita-sauja-tvārē Śṝpatiḥ || páthōdham saṃghrīṇo yadīya-hridaye nirudha-
c̱ pē adivitbō || Ādaya dvishaśatin karaka-nivahān kṛīvī balādūni tāi kṛishṭe Kri-
c̱śnā-mahībhrītā kriṣhīmata kṣāṭere mahī-ṁandaḷe | yēn-ārāti-vadhū-śivaṁ-galaḷ-
śūn-
c̱dr-āṇjalai(n)ai=sarubhiṁ klinē sau(sa)rya-subijam=sptam=abhitaḥ práptā yaśe
rāraśayah || Sa-
c̱tt[tt]vam yad=Ghanavāhanē Ravisūṁ vairōchanaṁ śṝ-Śibau dāṇe(naṁ) yach=cha
Dadhchī-nāṃni sakalama saṁ-
c̱grihya śrishtē=ddbhutah ||( ) rū(n)naṁ kṛishṇa-gaṭ-odbhavō-khila-kṛītu dāridrya-
pāthōnīdhī pīta-
c̱s=[ta]yagā-kara-pravṛddha-chulukēn=ōdḥhritya yēn-ārthīnāṁ || Tasya4=ānujo ni[a]-bhuj-
ārptā-bhu-
c̱mi-bhāraḥ sva[ch]jchanda-čhara-mudit-ōragnasārvabhaumaḥ || yō Viśalāṁ samara-
kautukināṁ surā-

38 Metro, Sraḍākhaṇā.
39 The original has rather an anomalous character here, probably owing to the engraver’s tool having slipped; but it cannot be meant for anything except basa.
30 Read dāru.
31 Metro, Śārdūlavikṛṣṭita.
32 Read shāla-kujat.
33 Metro, Śūka (Anuśṭubh).
34 Metro, Ārya; two short syllables are wanting in the third pāda.
35 Metro, Śārdūlavikṛṣṭita; and in the next verse.
36 Read gīr̄.
37 Read muktāvalī.
38 Metro, Vasantilaka.
39 Metro, Vasantilaka.
40 Read nāṭha lāḥ-chāḍā.
41 Metro, Śārdūlavikṛṣṭita; and in the next two verses.
42 Read ṛṣita.
43 Read rājasya.
44 Metro, Vasantilaka.
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[**] ṣāṃ=agrā sa-mūla-vibhavam dalayāṇi-chakāra || Tasmād[๔]-abhūd-Amaṇa-bhūmipālāḥ samaata-
[**] māhāvīra-mauliratnam | alikhyā(khyā)=āghaḥkaḥ | khura-lékhanibhir yad-rājibhir dikhau jaya-pra-
[**] sāsthiḥ || Prasahya tasmād-apahṛtya bhumikte Krishṇ-ātmājaḥ svām-avaniṁ sa Rāmaḥ | yasya-āsāi-
[**] r=uj[*] rīśhbita-kairav-ābhair=diśe yaśo-bhīpiḥ surabhikaroti || Mahāmāhīvīraḥ[๔] śrīṁān-
Rāmaḥ ||
[**] kahōṣhīrhitām guruḥ ||(।) yaśas-kshīrōga yaḥ Śaṁbhōr=murtitr=asāḥ=abhāshīṁchati ||
Yat-puṇya-giri-
[**] garbh-lēṭha-yaśō-mārūtā-māṇḍalē | brahmāṁḍa-param-āṇām=abhaṇād=bahulaṁ rajaḥ ||
Prāptaḥ[๔] śrī-
[**] Rāma-bhūp=passarata ripavaḥ saṁgarād=āśa hitva rājaṁ sapt-āṁgām=etat-pibata bluvi jalaṁ
[**] śitalam kva[pī yāṭaḥ | no chēd=asy-āsi-dhāra-vidalita-vapushas=tat-kshaṇād=eva
divyām dé-
vaṁśa-jāh kati-ka-
[**] ti-prājā bhavishyaṁti cha spīitaḥ śatra-bhrītaḥ kalāsu kuśalā dhūttā viñā Śkaṁśaḥ | va-
[**] rūnyō=aṣaḥ punar-eva Rāma-nāripaṭiḥ pratyaarthinām=arthinām yo na kva[pī parāhma-
(immu) khaḥ kshhitītal−ā.
[**] laṁkāra-chhūṛāmaṇiḥ || Vāk[०] prapaṇeča-pravrahānaṁ rītka(kta)ṁya yad-guṇa-sāgaram[०] ||
apārayaṁta nā− parisāmar
tāri-
[**] tuṁ kavi-nāvikāḥ || Sa khaly=evaṁvidhu-guṇa-gaṇa-ālaṁkṛita tanur-anārata-draviṣa
vitalaṇa−
[**] kṛśāṭhikṛit-āṛtiḥ-sārthāh || sakala-paripuṇthi-patthisvān vinirjītya nija-kula-krā-
[**] u-āgaṇa-sāᵐāṁrīya[०] padamuddhītya duḍhāno rāya-Nārāyaṇo Rāma-nāripaṭiḥ Śeṇa-dēś-ā-
[**] laṁkāra-bhūtan Gōḍāvarya-uttara-kūla-ṣthitaṁ Vādāṭhāgrāma[०] ] Pāṭārapūṇa-palagṛma−
Vaidyagō ṇhāra-grāma−dvā−
[**] ya-saḥitam-agrāḥārīkṛtya nidhi-nikshēpa-jala-pāṣhāṇa-salka-mō(au)nā-lika-śrōṇadāya[०]−
dāṃḍa-kāruṇ-ā−
[**] di-saṃsāt-ādāya-saḥitaṁ rāja-rājapuruṣhāraṁ apya=ava-amūlu-nirāya[०] ] pravṛṣṭa-grāma-
dravya-saḥitaṁ chatat−aṁgā−
[**] pa-viśuddhān bhakti-śrūddhi-ātisāya-hirany-ākṣhat-ōdaka-saḥitaṁ Sa(ṣa)kē cha ēkādaśasu
tri-navaty-adhi−

Second plate; second side.

[**] kēṣāv-āṣitaṛuṇ 1193 varttamāra-Prajāpati-saṁvatsar-amartagata-Āgraḥ-suddha-dvāśyām
Vu(bu)dhō ātma-
[**] nāḥ śrī-Śaṁsāgarā[०] pāṇi-prity-artham nāṇā-gōtrēbhīyaḥ sapta-paṁchśat-saṁkhya-kēbhīyaḥ
vra(brā)māṇḍābhīyaḥ
[**] praṭāti[०] Tē cha vra(ḥrā)maṇḍā nāmanā līkhyānti [०] Tatra Bahvṛichāḥ
Vāśīṣṭhāgōtra-Gōvīndā-suṭa-Viṣṇu[०]
[**] Mūdgalagōtra-Padmanābha-suṭa-Jāṇu || Vāśīṣṭhagōtra-Dāmōdara-suṭa-Ravaladevā(va ||
Vimśpriddha−
[**] gōtra-Dāmōdara-suṭa-Viṣṇu || Bhāravājā=ja gōtra-Ravaladevā-suṭa-Jāṇu || Kaumāṇya-
gōtra-Dhara−||

[०] Read śrāṇadāṇa.
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[52] Haritagotra-Āpadēvata-suta-Śrīkara | Gārgyagotra-Rāghava-suta-Kēsava | Kaumudinyagotra-Gauri-
[53] tama-suta-Mahādeva | Jāmadagnya-Vatsagotra-Mānyadeva-suta-Narasiṃha | Harita-
gotra-Anantaka-suta-
[54] Śaraṅga | Bhāradvāja-gotra-Vinayaka-suta-Jasamantaka | Bhāradvāja-gotra-Vinayaka-
suta-Āi-
[56] Kaumudinyagotra-Krishna-suta-Purushottama | Kaumudinyagotra-Krishna-suta-Rāma | Bhāradvāja-
[57] jagotra-Mallinātha-suta-Bhūnā | Haritagotra-Hari-deva-suta-Lakshmīdhara | Viśi-
[58] sīthagotra-Govinda-suta-Nāgadēva | Vāsishthagotra-Govinda-suta-Kēsava | Viśvāmi-
[59] tragotra-Sṛipati-suta-Elugii | Kaumudinyagotra-Nāgadeva-suta-Iṣvara | Gau-
[60] magotra-Dhanśvara-suta-Vāmana | Bhāradvāja-gotra-Dīvadāraka-suta-Brahmadēva | Gau-
Tāmā-
[61] gotra-Dāmādara-suta-Dhanśvara | Mudgalagotra-Mādhava-suta-Govinda | Bhāradvāja-
gotra-
[62] Nārāyaṇa-suta-Gaṅgādhara | Bhāradvāja-gotra-Gaṅgādhara-suta-Jagannātha | Atha Taittirī-
[63] yāh || || | Kaumudinyagotra-Somanātha-suta-Padmanātha(bha)bhattacharaya | Kaumud-
[64] yagotra-Padmanābha-suta-Na-
[65] raśimha | Kaumudinyagotra-Padmanābha-suta-Somanātha | Kaumudinyagotra-
[66] Padmanābha-suta-Sā-
[67] raśimha | Kaumudinyagotra-Padmanābha-suta-Gaṅgēvara | Kaumudinyagotra-Padmanābha-
suta-Hari-
[68] hara | Kaumudinyagotra-Padmanābha-suta-Trivikram | Kāśyapagotra-Mahādēva-suta-
[69] Kāśiśāh(f) | Gārgyagotra-Dēva-suta-Dīvāka | Kaumukhagotra-Mallideva-suta-Viṣṇu | Viśvāsa-
[70] gotra-Nāgadēva-suta-Viṣṇu | Āṭṛyagotra-Rāma-suta-Śaraṅga | Kāśyapagotra-Kāma-
[71] déva-suta-Somanātha | Gauṭamagotra-Viṣṇu-suta-Chauṭarī | Gārgyagotra-Nārāyaṇa-su-
[72] tā-Viṣṇu | Kaumudinyagotra-Sārangabhaṭṭa-suta-Rishidēva | Dēvaratagotra-Tīḷāpa-
suta-Trāṭik[ā].
[73] va | Kaumudinyagotra-Nāgadeva-suta-Ādiyā | Kaumudinyagotra-Narasimha-suta-Viṣṇu | Dēvaratag-
[74] gotra-Nārāyaṇa-suta-Bōpadēva | Dēvaratagotra-Bōpadēva-suta-Rāma | Dēvaratag-
[75] tra-Nārāyaṇa-suta-Viṣṇu | Bhāradvāja-gotra-Janardana-suta-Krishna | Dēvaratagotra-
Nārāyaṇa-
[76] yaṣa-suta-Ananta || Atha Bahvriḥbha(chaḥ) || || Bhāradvāja-gotra-Viṣṇu-suta-Rāmapadēvi-
[77] ta | Bhāradvāja-gotra-Rāmapāṇidhita-suta-Māṇideva-paṇḍita || Īvam-anāka-
[78] tōpi 57 [[*]] Athāṅgahāṭh [[*]] pārvatāḥ Viṅgahāṇu āgnyā[ē] Nērāngahānu dakh-
[79] yā Dīṅgahāṇu tathā Gaṅgā paśchimē Gaṅgā tathā Kāṭigāṇu tathā Alūna-
[80] gā[m]ṇa tu tathā Nāgapāṇiḥaḥ vāyavyeṣ Jāṅtigāṇu uttarāṃ Pāniva śānyo Vaśa-
[81] khaḷa [[*]] Īvaḥ sarvāṅgahāṭh-vaiṣṇu(ṣu)ddhā sa-pravīṣṭaḥ-khēṭaka-sahās-trayō
gṛmāḥ || || Atra chai-

Third plate.

[10] vaḥ samayah || || Rāja-sevakaḥ prāyaṇḍa-prayāṇaḥ su stah || ||
Tathā [[*]] āchāyatra-Aura-

[*] Read Dhāranī. [*] Read suta-Sārasvāti.
[*] Read vāpi. [*] Read uttarā.
ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF PLACES IN THE sanskrit geography of india.

By J. Burgess, LL.D., C.I.E.

In the first volume of this Journal (p. 21), Professor Rāmkṛṣṇa Gopāl Bhāndārkār called attention to the importance of Pāṇini and his commentators for occasional elucidations of the ancient Sanskrit Geography of India,—and an index of the names in Pāṇini together with the epithets applied to any of them in the scholiasts would be most valuable. But if we are to

---

15. Metro, Śīkṣa (Anuṣṭubha); and in the next two verses.
17. Metro, Śīkṣa (Anuṣṭubha); and in the following seven verses.
18. Read sarpiḥ.
make much progress in this branch of research it will be necessary also to analyse the geographical lists in the Itiákhás, Puráñhas, Kósás, and every other available source of information.

And of late years so many Sanskrit works have been edited with indexes that this task is not at all so formidable as it was not very long since, if only a few scholars would collect and arrange the passages relating to the same places and places of the same name, a great deal of light would be thrown upon the localities of many ancient geographical names.

Thus, for the identification of Maláya, discussed by Mr. Keshav H. Dhrua (ante, p. 106f.)—before trying to find some name resembling Maláya in the pages of Hiuen Tsang, it would be well to see first whether any help can be derived from other Sanskrit writings. There is a special difficulty in this case, in the fact that the Southern Máláya is so very well known that copyists and commentators, if not original writers themselves, may have mistaken the northern for the southern district of the name. The references we do find are also very vague. In Mahábhárata, vi. 353, we have a list of peoples:—"Vidchás, Mágadhás, Svákhás, Maláya s, and Vija- yas." In the Vishnú-Puráña (Hall’s ed.) vol. II. pp. 165-6, the same names occur in the same order; and in the Rámayana, iv. 40, 25, we have—"Sumbhás, Mánas, Vidchás, Maláya s, and Kásikásalas." The Vidchás, Mágadhás and Kásikásalas, at least are well known northern races, and the Maláya s associated with them, is in favour of the latter also being a northern people. In the Ratnakósha (Anfrecht’s Catalogue, p. 352b) Máláya s is merely named as one of the forty-eight dásás, which are not there arranged in any intelligible order. In the colophon of the Berlin MS. (Chambers’ Coll. No. 219) of the Sánkhyá-nasirirápañdítá (Weber’s Cátal. p. 28, No. 110), the author, Ashákshara, is called a native of Maláya. Lastly in Népál, on the upper waters of the Gánjaka and Rápti, is a district still known as Maláya bám, whose chief town Bórú or Malébhám is in lat. 28°33’ N., long. 83°2’ E. On referring to Lassen (Ind. Alt., 2d ed., Vol. I. p. 75) we find that he calls this district also Párvata,—apparently on the authority of Fr. Hamilton (Acc. of Nepal, p. 270) and in a footnote he remarks that Maláya is a non-Sanskritic name for ‘hill,’ but is old; and cites the Múdráráksik, where king Maláya kámu appears as son of the mountain- king Párvata, and his confederates are called Maláya and Káulába or Káulítá. This is more satisfactory than the identification proposed by Mr. K. H. Dhrua with Hiuen Tsang’s Mo-lo-sc, otherwise called San-po-ho. The supposed reading Mo-lo-pho, moreover, which General Cunningham prefers, is expressly cancelled by Julien as an erratum; and the other name seems to connect the district with Chám-páka (hodie Chambá) near the sources of the Rávi. Maláya bám, or Párvata, with its capital on the Gánjaka, would seem to answer best to the Maláya of the Múdráráksik, Mahábhárata, &c., and its chief city, unless we force our texts, which should, if possible, be always avoided.

Again, in Lassen’s note just referred to, the Little Gánjaka river is identified with the Ajitavati which is Julien’s reading of ‘O-ski-to-fa-ti, explained by Hiuen Tsang as meaning eu-ashing—invincible.’ Formerly, the Chinese editor says, it was incorrectly called ‘O-li-lo-po-ti-ho; in old times it was also called Hi-lá-na-fa-ti—in Chinese Yeu-kin-ho” (Hiranyavati). From this statement Lassen (Ind. Alterthum. Vol. IV. p. 686n) concludes that Hiranyavati was not the correct name of the river on which was Rámagrama, and which flowed 3 or 4 li to the north-west of Kúśinágará. Klaproth (Fou-kou-kis, p. 230) had conjectured the name to be Hiranyavati or Svaravañati. Now though the names Hiranyavati and Ajitavati have been accepted...
by Cunningham and others, the latter does not occur; so far as we know, in Sanskrit literature. Hi-lian occurs in Fa-hian (ch. xxiv.), and in the Po-su-king-tsang-king of Aṣrāgāhā, we are told that after Buddha had parted from the Chんだ's repast, he went onwards to the town of Kādi crossing the river Tsaos-khiin and Hi-lian; and when the Mallas went to his cremation they passed through the Lung-tsang (Nāga) gate of Kusināra and crossed over the Hi-lian river (Sacred Books, Vol. XIX, pp. 286, 323). Here Hi-lian is explained by Yeukis, as equivalent to Hiranya,—the old name, according to the Chinese editor of the Si-yu-ki. I know of no other mention of it, except that in the Dulf-va the same river is called Dvīgadāḥ, which is also equivalent to Hiranya.

Unknown to Sanskrit writers as Ajitavatī is, Pāṇini (vi. 3, 119 and vi. 1, 220 schol.) has Ajiravatī, and the Pali texts make frequent mention of the Achiravati,—e.g., Buddhaghosa's Parables, p. 103; Abhidhanapaddikā, 622; Oldenberg's Vinaya-śāstra, Vol. I. pp. 191, 293; Vol. II. pp. 237, 239; Vol. III. p. 63; Vol. IV. pp. 111, 161, 259, 278; and Rhys Davids' Buddhāst Suttas, pp. 161, 178. The Tibetan Dulf-va also mentions it.

It was on this river that Śrāvasti was situated, and General Cunningham agrees with Burnouf and others in placing this city on the Rāpti, and he calls it, after Hamilton (Martin's Eastern India, Vol. II. p. 306), the ancient Airavati, and the Chōtī Gāndaki he identifies with the Hiranyakavi or Ajitavati, and Mr. C. R. Forde accepts this view (p. 99). Besides the mistake of a fictitious Ajitavatī for Ajiravatī, it is at all certain that Hiranyakavi was the name of the same river as the Ajiravatī? Prof. H. H. Wilson, simply following the Buddhist records, placed Kapilavastu on the Rāh”, north of Gorakhpur, but General Cunningham places it about 39 miles due west, on the Mahanama,—on his map 16 miles west of the Kōhāna, though he says only “about 6 miles” from that stream, which he tries to identify with the Rāh”. Oldenberg (Budhā suvon Leben, p. 94) takes objection to this, and it must be evident that the forcing of names like Rāhi and Kōhāna into unison must be fatal to any scientific system of identification.

These two cases may show how careful it is necessary to be in arriving at a conclusion on points of this kind.

I now give a specimen of an alphabetical list such as might be formed of geographical names, but without giving many of the texts in full, which ought to be done at least in every case where the identification is liable to any doubt.

Ab'dans,—a mountain: Hāmichandra's Aśeś-kārthasaṅgraha, iv. 223.

Abhīnagarī,—another name for Dvārākā: śrīvīntāhā, ii. 1, 15.


Abhīsara or Abhisara,—a people, frequently mentioned in connexion with Dāvra; probably the same as the district of which the Greek writers describe Abisares, Abisesares or Em-bisasaro as king; Arrian, Anab., vi. 8, 20, 29; Curtius, viii. 12, 13, 14; ix. 1; Diodoros, viii. 90; Wilson, Ariana Ant. p. 190; Anist. Res. Vol. XV. p. 115; Bhīṣ. Saḥh. xiv. 29; xxxi. 19,—"Kīrātas, Kiras, Abhīsara, Halas, Madras," &c.; Vishnu-Pur. Vol. II. p. 140.

* The rivers in the kingdom of Bharata from west to east were, according to Greseset's text of the Rāpīlyana, (ii. 73, 86)—the Hiranyakavi, Uthārīka, Kusāli, Kapilavatī, and Dūlga. In Schlegel's text the Kusāli Kaṭkāhīlāhī takes the place of the Hiranyakavi. A river of this name is also mentioned in Mahābhārata, XII. 7531; and a Hiranyakavi in Mahābhārata, vi. 583; and Vishnu-Pur. Vol. II. p. 140.

---


* Anist. Res. Vol. XX. p. 69, where it is, however, misprinted Ajirapati.

* Lotus de la bonne Loi, p. 401.

* See Mahābhārata, viii. 2035, where a river of this name is mentioned.
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174.—“Darśakas (? Darvakas), Abhīsāras, Utūlas (or Utūtas, Kūtūlas), Saśalas, &c.; Mahābhārata vii. 3380; viii. 3652; Rājatarangīni i. 180; iv. 711; v. 141; Lassen, Ind. Alt. Vol. ii. pp. 1461, 147, 163. The city Abhīsāri is named, Mahābhārata ii. 1027; conf. Lassen, Ind. Alt. 175n.

Achchhāda,—a river in the Himalaya which is said to form the lake Achchhāda; Harivamsa, 955. The lake is near the Chandraprabha mountain and gives rise to the Mandakini river; conf. Vishnu-Pur. Vol. iii. p. 160n.

Āchhutaṇḍanti or Āchhutaṇḍanti,—a warrior tribe: Pāñ. v. 3, 116.

Āchhutasala,—a place in the Panjab: Mahābhārata viii. 2062.

Ahiṣṭhāna,—(the capital), a city: Amarakūsa, iii. 4, 128; Hēmabhūsha's Abhīsārahācintāmani, 972; Anakūṣṭha, iv. 156; Maṭihānīya, n. 163.

Adāra,—a district: Bṛh. Sañ. xiv. 25,—“in the north lie...and those who live near the sources of the Yamuna...the Āghūrās (or Āghtyās), Adāra, Antardvīpa, Trigarta,” &c.; Pāñ. iv. 2, 124.


Āgneyas,—people of Āgneyas: Mahābhārata iii. 13256.

Āgnidhram,—a people: Bṛh. Sañ. xiv. 25.


Ahu-kās,—a people: Mahābhārata v. 5531; Lassen, Ind. Alt. Vol. i. p. 758.

Ahvāra,—a fortress of the Uśnasas: Pāñ. ii. 4, 20, sch.; vi. 2, 124, sch.

Ailadhānna,—a town: Rādhyaṇa, ii. 71, 3. &c. &c.

MISCELLANEA.

THE PROBABLE INDIAN ORIGIN OF THE NAMES OF THE DAYS OF THE WEEK.

General Cunningham, in his paper on “The Probable Indian Origin of the Names of the Week-days” (ante pp. 1ff.), contradicts the statement of Dion Cassius that these names are of Egyptian origin, while he accepts it as to the relation between the hours and the planets. E. Meyer, of Posen had, not long previously, contributed a short paper on the same subject to the Zeitschrift der Deut. Morgenl. Gesellschaft und 1883 (Vol. xxxvii. p. 453ff.) in which he accepts the Egyptian origin of the custom, for astrological purposes, of dividing the day and night from sunrise to sunrise, each into 12 hours, and assigning to each hour in succession a planetary regent, and to the day the regent of its first hour.

The General's arrangement for the 24 hour regents, "in which," he says, "the progression is retrograde, or contrary to the motion of the sun," is entirely arbitrary; he first arranges the names of the planets in retrograde order, and then he must count round his circle in the same order. Had he arranged the planets round the circle in his diagram in the "direct" order, he would have come to exactly the same result by counting the hours in that order.

It may also be noted that any number of the form 7n + 3, where n is an integer (or 0), will give the same planets in the same succession as 24 does; so that, if the day had been divided into 3, 10, 17, 31, 38, 45, 52, or 59 hours, the first of each day in the week would fall in succession on the planets in the same order as with 24. It is by using the first of these numbers, 3, that the Sārya-Siddhānta (xii. 78) says the regents of the days are to be found. General Cunningham must have overlooked this passage, when he says the author gives no instructions as to how these 'lords of the day' are to be found," yet he refers in his next sentence to the slōka immediately following it.

s. Lib. xii. c. 18; see also, for other references, Stieler, Handb. d. Chronologie, Vol. i. pp. 178ff.

2 He cites the misconception of G. Seyfarth, Beitr.
Further, any number—which added to 24 (or to any of those just given) makes a total divisible exactly by 7,—if used to count round the circle in the opposite direction, will also fall on the planet-names in the same order. Thus, 60, the number of ghahits, added to 24 (the hours) gives an exact multiple of 7, and hence every 60th counted in the reverse order of the planets will give the same as every 24th in the direct order. The same result will be found by using 4, 11, 18, 25, 32 . . . 60, &c.  

Few, if any, who have read Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius*, will allow that "the Assyrian Damis actually accompanied Apollonius" to India. The ablest scholars have seriously doubted whether the hero of the romance with his Sancho Panza ever was in India at all; and no one credits the accuracy of the author's assertions," though in his time (A.D. 210–250) much might have been learnt for the purposes of his story about India from Alexandrian merchants, or even from Indians who visited Alexandria. It will not do, then, to push back the reference to the 7 rings presented by the Hindu Iarchas (not a Hindu name) who spoke Greek, to the earlier half of the first century, in order to support an argument.  

Then the very fact that the *Sārya Siddhānta*, in the only places where it refers to this point, speaks of the planets as regents of the "hours" (hord)—a Greek term—not of the ghahits, and arranges them "in downward order from Saturn," just as Dion Cassius says,—is strongly suggestive that the names which the planets gave to the days were derived from the Western division into *horos*, and not from the Indian one into ghahits. It seems, therefore, that there is no force whatever in the arguments of General Cunningham for the probable Indian origin of the names of the days.  

August, 1885.  
Jas. Burgess.

**CURiosities of INDIAN LITERATURE.**

**The Result of Good and EVil Literature.**

सन्तापादित सौरविलिका परमहिमिन न भूषणे तिथिकर्तव्यं न भूषणे तिथिकर्तव्यम् नावं नावं नावं नावं नावं नावं नावं

स्वयोऽलग्ने विधिप्रसंधिते सत्तिनिहितम् आकाशम् सत्तिनिहितम् आकाशम् सत्तिनिहितम् आकाशम् सत्तिनिहितम् आकाशम् सत्तिनिहितम् आकाशम्

"If a drop of water fall on heated iron it is utterly destroyed, not even its name remains, and yet the same drop on a lotus leaf takes the resemblance of a pearl, while it fall during the asterism of Arcturus, into a pearl oyster, it becomes a pearl itself. Always a man's qualities, whether bad, medium, or excellent, arise from his associations."

Compare, 'Evil communications corrupt good manners' and the Irish proverb, 'Tell me whom you're with, and I'll tell you who you are.'

G. A. Grierson.

**BOOK NOTICES.**

**Tagore Law Lectures, 1883. Outlines of a History of the Hindu Law of Partition, Inheritance, and Adoption . . . by J. Jolly, &c., Calcutta, Thacker, Spink & Co., 1883 (pp. XI. 207).**

First Notice.

Though the Tagore Lectures of former years have furnished very valuable contributions to our knowledge of the Hindu law, it is undeniable that Professor Jolly's volume, which is equally instructive for the practical lawyer and for the general student of Sanskrit, far surpasses the earlier ones in importance. It is, indeed, an attempt, and the first, to trace in a comprehensive manner the historical development of some of the most interesting topics of the Hindu law. Professor Jolly's researches are based on the careful study of a large body of published and unpublished materials, of which the first three lectures give a condensed account.

In the first lecture the description of the little-known commentaries of *Asahāya* on Nārada, of Mēdhātithi, Gōvindārāja, Nārayana, Rāghavā...

---

2 These numbers are expressed also by $7n + 3$, when $n$ is negative for the retrograde order.
3 See for example, *Friar's Indian Travels of Apollonius*.

---

3 Burgess insists on this in his translation of the *Sārya-Siddhānta*, i. 52; xii. 6, 79.
who seems to have merely copied Kullūka's spiteful remarks at the end of the Manvarthamukhāvali, and the exposure of the true character of the latter. Nobody who has compared the commentaries of Gōvindaśarāja and of Kullūka, can deny that the latter author was an impudent plagiarist, who appropriated without a word of acknowledgment a very large portion of the work of his predecessor, and took good care to point out every slip of the latter in malicious prose or verse. There are only two points in this section on which I differ from Professor Jolly. Mēdhātithi was not a Southerner, but a Kāśmirian. For he shows an intimate acquaintance with Kāśmir and its Veddī Śākhā the Kāṭhaka, and he once gives a vernacular Kāśmirian word. Secoedly Gōvindaśarāja, the son of Bhaṭṭa-Madhava, cannot have been a royal author. The son of a Bhaṭṭa must have been a Brāhman. In Professor Jolly's remarks on the modern law-schools I am glad to find fresh clear evidence showing that under native rule the Mitakṣara was considered a work of the highest authority even in Central India. This is so much the more valuable because Rao Saheb V. N. Mandlik a short time ago denied the high position of Vīmaṇavara's work. Very important, finally, is the clear exposition of the true character of the majority of the medieval Digests and Commentaries. Those which were written at the command of kings were certainly intended for practical use in the law-courts. They might, I think, be fairly compared with the edicts of the Roman praetors, because, like the latter, they lay down the principles on which lawsuits were to be decided during a particular period, and in a particular territory.

The chief novelty in Lecture II. is the explanation of the origin of the oldest metrical Smṛiti. I can, of course, only agree with the view that they must be considered the manuals of certain, as yet nameless, special law-schools, which arose on the disruption of the ancient Vedic Charana. Further details regarding this theory the outline of which I first gave in my unpublished Vienna Lectures on Hindi law (Jolly, p. v. and 347) will be found in my forthcoming introduction to Manu. The remainder of this lecture contains a clear summary of the views held at present regarding the history of the Dharmasūtras and of the most ancient metrical Smṛiti. With respect to the Vīmaṇavara, the modern representative of the Kāṭhaka-Dharmasūtra, it may be noted that the evidence which the antiquity of our Manu requires sifting, and additional arguments may be found by a further exploration of the classical literature and of the inscriptions, as well as by an examination of the relation of our Manu to the Mahābhārata. The latter undertaking will solve various questions which at present appear puzzling. An incomplete investigation of the Mahābhārata, which I have lately made, has shown that about one-tenth of Manu's verses occur in the epic either entire or in part, sometimes literally and sometimes with more or less important variations readings. The peculiar character of the resemblances and of the differences makes the conclusion inevitable that the authors of both works drew on the same source, and that this source probably was the oral tradition of the law-schools. If the existence of a large floating body of metrical maxims on the sacred law is once established, it is no longer difficult to understand why the secondary Smṛitis are written throughout in epic verse.

Lecture III., which treats of the minor Smṛitis and of the fragments of lost law-books, gives us the important results of Professor Jolly's extensive and patient researches regarding this hitherto unduly neglected branch of legal literature. We receive here for the first time detailed accounts of the larger Nārada and of the works of Brihaspati, Kātyāyana, Śārvatara, Vyāsa, Saṅkha, Uṣanas, and other authors. The larger Nārada turns out to be the older version. This discovery will perhaps help to correct the views expressed by some scholars, according to which the Indian law-books always grew in extent and never lost in bulk. The remarks on Brihaspati and Kātyāyana show that both authors knew and used a law-book of Manu closely resembling or perhaps identical with the existing text. With respect to Brihaspati's work—i.e., I think, permissible to assert confidently that it was a Vṛttikā on our Manusāhītā, written in order to explain and to supplement the rules of the latter. The only discrepancy between Brihaspati and Manu noted by Professor Jolly at page 159 disappears, if it is borne in mind that Manu does not reckon the patriki among the subsidiary sons. The relation of the Kāṭyāyanaśāhitya to Manu is more doubtful. The quotation of a prose passage from a Kāṭyāyana, which is made by Mēdhātithi on Manu, VIII. 215, indicates the former existence of a Kāṭyāyanīya Dharmasūtra, from which the metrical Smṛiti was probably derived. Professor Jolly's discovery, which I can only confirm, that the so-called Brihat- or Vṛddha-Manu was a later recension of Brihaspa's Saṅhita, deprives Professor Max Müller's opinion (according to which our Manus must be later than the fifth century, because its predecessor, the Vṛddha-Manu, enumerated the signs of the zodiac) of its foundation.

G. Bühler.
A SILVER COIN OF RUDRASIMHA.

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

I owe the original coin, of which a lithograph is published herewith, to the kindness of Major F. H. Jackson, of the Staff Corps. It was obtained by him in Kathiawar, and, with three others of the same class, was utilised to form sleeve-links, from which he detached this one at my request.

The coin seems to be of fairly good silver, and weighs as nearly as possible 34 grains.

The obverse has a very well executed king's head,—of the type customary in the class of coins to which this specimen belongs,—looking to the proper left; with a moustache; with the hair either bound round with a fillet, or confined under a close-fitting and bordered cap on the top of the head, and then hanging down loosely behind the neck; and with a necklace or collar round the throat. In front of the face, there is an unintelligible and probably meaningless legend in what are usually considered to be an imitation of Greek characters; eleven of them are entire; and there are parts of three more, which fell partially beyond the edge of the coin when it was struck. Behind the head,—in the place where the coins of this class usually have the word varsha, "in the year," followed by numerical symbols,—there are traces of a legend; but almost the whole of it fell beyond the edge of the coin; so that it is quite impossible to say what the date may have been.

The reverse had in the centre the usual chaitya symbol; but this, together with either a cluster of stars or the sun, slightly to the proper left above it, was destroyed in adapting the coin to the sleeve-link. The crescent moon, however, remained uninjured, slightly to the proper right above the chaitya. Round these central emblems, and inside a circle of dots, there is a marginal legend, in the usual characters of the coins of this class, and in a state of excellent preservation, except that, from the third to the ninth aksharas, the upper parts of the letters fell beyond the edge of the coin. The legend, which reads from the inside, and commences just above the crescent moon, is—Rajā mahākṣatrapaśa Rudradamna putrasa rājā mahākṣatrapaśa R[u]drāśiha, which represents—
Rājīśa Mahākṣatrapasya Rudradamaṇaḥ putraśya rājīśa Mahākṣatrapasya Rudradāsyaḥ, "Of the Rājīśa, the Mahākṣatrapa Rudrāśiha, the son of the Rājīśa, the Mahākṣatrapa Rudrādamān."

The chief interest of this coin lies in the exceptional and also very clear way in which the vowel ē of śīha, i.e. śīḥah, is expressed,—running right up into the surrounding circle of dots. The usual rule in coins of this class is to omit such vowels as fall on or above the tops of the letters. In accordance with this custom, we have, in the present legend,—nāha twice for mahā, the d of the second syllable being omitted altogether;—and rājīśa twice for rājīśa; in this latter word, the d of the first syllable is omitted altogether; in the second syllable, the d occurs because it is attached to a ja, and is formed by an upward continuation of the centre stroke of the consonant, instead of a forward continuation of the top of it; the ja would have been converted into ja by a backward continuation of the top of the ja; but this stroke was omitted according to custom.

It is this custom of omitting such vowels as, if engraved, would fall on or above the tops of the letters, that has led to the reading of saha or śāha (instead of śīha for śīḥah) and sēna, as the termination of the names of several of the Khaṭrapas, and to the Khaṭrapaśa being so frequently called the 'Sāh' kings.

Two other instances in which the name of the present Khaṭrapaśa Rudrāśiha occurs very distinctly, are —lines 2-3 of the Gūnda inscription, published by Dr. Bühler in this Journal, Vol. X. p. 157; and the Jasdan inscription, re-edited by Dr. Hoernle in this Journal, Vol. XII. p. 32.
Professor Peterson’s discovery (announced in his remarks on the Aucityalsākāra of Kāśmīra, p. 22) that a certain Sanskrit verse, of which a part is quoted by Patañjali, is ascribed to the poet Kumāradāsa, is, to say the least, very interesting; and I hope that similar discoveries may be made regarding some of the other quotations which occur in the Mahābhāṣya. To render in this matter such assistance as it is in my power to give, I have, for the sake of ready reference, collected from the Mahābhāṣya all those passages which may appear to be quotations from poetical works composed in classical Sanskrit. Many of those passages have been already cited by Professor Weber in his article on the Mahābhāṣya; but others are given here for the first time. I still consider the Mahābhāṣya an old work, and am inclined to believe that the occurrence in it of such verses or fragments of verses as we do find in it, tends to show that the so-called classical poetry is older than it has lately been represented to be. I have added similar quotations occurring in the Kāśikā-Vṛtti, which I have noted down during my study of that work.

Mahābhāṣya.

Vol. I. p. 3.

I. 430. उच्चारित्वं स्थविनिबिन्दुं कुटुंबकुटुं महाकाव्यः।
   द्रोणै चंद्रकृति गद्यं गद्यं नाम ताराय मकावकार ॥
   (Metre, Prakriti.)

I. 431. अहर्षकन्यान्म गताकारं पुरस्करं पुरस्करं।
   बैस्वयं न कृत्यं सर्वा हृ दुस्सिद्वी॥

I. 432. शुभदुग्धस्वालुषीनां।

I. 433. महर्षी नुस्थित सरस्वती श्रुती।

I. 434. महर्षी नुस्थित सरस्वती श्रुती।

I. 435. मात्रारूपम् चन्दनं संसार।

I. 436. मात्रारूपम् चन्दनं संसार।
   (Mete, Prakriti.)

I. 437. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 438. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 439. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 440. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 441. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 442. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 443. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 444. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 445. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 446. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 447. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 448. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 449. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

I. 450. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 25. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 102. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।
   (Mete, Prakriti.)

II. 119. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 147. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 167. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 213. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 214. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 220. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 280. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 422. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 423. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 424. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

II. 58. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

III. 25. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

III. 28. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

III. 39. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

III. 48. द्रुतित्वं न परिष्ठलिता विक्षिप्त ।

**See ante, Vol. III. p. 193.**

**See Prof. Peterson, on the Aucityalsākāra of Kāśmīra, p. 22.**

---

1 See ante, Vol. III. p. 193.
2 See ante, Vol. IV. 131.
3 See ante, Vol. II. 132.
A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF SILADITYA I. OF VALABHI.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN; GOTTINGEN.

This inscription is from some copper-plates which were found at Wālā,—the ancient Vālabhi,—the chief town of the Native State of the same name in the Gohilwād Prant in Kāṭhiāwār. They are now in the Library of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

The plates are two in number, each measuring about 11½" by 8½". The edges of them are fashioned thicker, so as to serve as rims to protect the writing. The inscription has suffered a good deal from rest; but, with the help of other grants of the same dynasty, drafted from the same form, it is sufficiently legible almost throughout. A few passages, however, are entirely lost, through the breaking away of the copper at the bottom of the first plate and the top of the second. The plates have holes for two rings; but the rings and the seal are not forthcoming. The weight of the two plates is 2 lbs. 10½ oz. The language is Sanskrit throughout.

This inscription was originally published by the Honble V. N. Mandlik, in the Journ. As. Br. R. At. Soc. Vol. XI. p. 359ff. At the request of the Editors of this Journal, I now re-edit it, to accompany the lithograph published herewith. My reading of the text is from the lithograph. Not having seen the original plates, I am unable to say how far the lithograph may be a faithful representation of them; but I am bound to state that the facsimile which

---

11 See Indische Sprüche, 2350.
12 See Sūtra II. 129, 12, where the verse ends सिद्धतु मुग्धम ब्रह.
13 The Kasālīr MS. adds in the margin सैन हर्तियाचर राजा शैव. पाणी भवान देव.
14 This appears to be the reading of Haradatta, for he adds विपश्वासुराशियते पाणीविपश्वासुराशियते; the printed text has मुग्धम ब्रहम भवान.
accompanies Mr. Mandlik's paper, shows several akṣharas which are not given in the lithograph, and furnishes in one or two cases correct readings, where those of the lithograph are faulty. On the whole, however, I feel no hesitation in saying, that the lithograph is far superior to that published with Mr. Mandlik's paper.

The inscription is of the time of Śiladīt+yā I., and is dated, in numerical symbols, on the six day of the dark fortnight of the month Jyēṣṭha, and in the year 286.

The historical information, furnished by this grant, is precisely the same as that given in the grant of the same ruler, dated in the year 290, which has been published in this Journal, Vol. IX. p. 237ff. The genealogy commences, as usual, with Bhāṭārka (line 2). Omitting some intervening names, in unbroken lineal succession from him there was Gaḥasena (l. 8). His son was Dhrāmsena II. (l. 13). And his son was Śiladīt+yā I, who also had the name of Dhrāmsadīt+yā (l. 19), and who issued the charter from Vālabhī (l. 1).

The dome is the Buddhist monastery, founded at Vālabhī by the royal lady Dūḍā (l. 20), which is mentioned in other Vālabhī grants. And the purpose for which the grant is made is the usual one, viz. to provide for the religious service and for the comfort of the inmates of the monastery and for the keeping in repair of the buildings.

The objects granted are—the village of Paḍarākūpikā (? (l. 23));—a field held by the Kūtumbīna Śūrāyaka and one held by... (?) at Uchchāpadhraka;—an irrigated field held by Arddhika and one held by Kumbhāna at the village of Kakkīja;—and a field held by... (?) at Indrāṇipadhraka,—all, it appears, in the Pusheṇaṭa Sthāli; and also four flower-gardens and wells on the outskirts of Vālabhī.

The officers named in the grant are the Dūṭekā Bhaṭṭadītiyaśās (l. 34), who is also mentioned ante, Vol. I. p. 46, l. 15, and the Saṇḍhīvigaśāhīdhikṛta and Dīvīrāpatī Vā...

1 Compare particularly the beginnings of lines 1-5 of Plate II.—This lithograph was not prepared by the present Editors.
2 See the passages quoted in note 22 below.
3 For akṣātra and vīra, compare, for instance, the grant published by Dr. Bhandarkar (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc., Vol. X. p. 80); and compare also ante, Vol. XIII. p. 80, note 43.
4 And sometimes Bhāṭārka.

Dr. Bhandarkar's translation was—"Bhāṭārka, who obtained greatness by a hundred wounds received in the midst of a circle of friends of matchless might, who with main force had subjugated their enemies" (ante, Vol. I. p. 14). And Dr. Bühler's was—"Bhāṭārka, who obtained as empire through the matchless power of his friends that humbled his enemies by main force: who gained glory in a hundred battles fought at close quarters" (ante, Vol. IV. p. 106).—These two translations were published before Mr. Mandlik's.
point out that अनुशासनस्य does not qualify मेरेजाम्. And, as regards the latter, I should, in the first instance, wish its correctness to be fortified by the quotation of parallel passages in which a simple genitive like मेरेजाम्, without the addition of some such word as वेत or वेतेन, conveys the meaning "(in the lineage) of;" for, in the absence of such passages, I would maintain that the genitive ought (gamakatīd) to be made dependent on the word मकुद्व in the following compound. Besides, it would appear that the obvious meaning of अनुशासनस्य is,—not "obtained by means of unequalled strength,"—but "endowed with or possessed of unequalled strength," a qualification more appropriate for soldiers or armies than for territories. Lastly, the employment of the word संस्त अस द residence preceding it must be taken to denote that or those with which or with whom the battles were fought, not the place where they were fought. Taking all this together, I would say that Bhaṭārka obtained glory in hundreds of battles which he fought with (i.e. against) the mighty large armies of the Maitrakas, who by force had subdued their enemies.

**Text.**

**First Plate.**

[1] ओऽ स्वाभवित्व वाक्यम्**

**Second Plate.**

[21] कृत्यात् लोकानां स्त्रियाः स्मारणमन्यात् 

---

* For this meaning of मन्दः see the St. Petersburg Dictionary."---**

[8] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[9] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[10] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[12] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[14] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[16] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[17] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[18] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[19] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[20] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[21] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[22] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[23] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[26] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[27] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[28] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[29] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[31] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[32] Read स्वाभवित्वः.
[33] Read स्वाभवित्�v
A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF PULIKESIN II.

BY THE HONBLE K. T. TELANG, C.I.E.

This inscription is from some copper-plates which belong to a goldsmith of Kāndaigaṁ, in the Mālwa Tūlūka of the Ratnāgiri District, and were found at the bottom of a well in his lands at that village. The original plates were procured by Mr. Kasinath Pandurang Parab, and were handed over by him to me, for publication.

The plates are three in number, each measuring about $8\frac{1}{4}$" by $3\frac{3}{4}$". The edges of them appear to be here and there fashioned slightly thicker, so as to serve as rings to protect the writing; and the inscription is in a state of excellent preservation throughout. The plates are strung on a ring, the seal of which bears the usual representation of the Western Chalukya boar, standing to the proper right.

The inscription purports to be one of the Western Chalukya king Pulikēśīn II., and to record that,—on the seventh lunar day of month Mācha, in the fifth year of his reign, i.e. in Saka 536 (A.D. 614-15)—the village of Pirigipa, on the north bank of the river Mahānadi in the island of Bērutdvipa, was granted to a Dravida Brahman named Nāriyā svāvāmin, for the purpose of maintaining the bāli, charu, and vaitavādevo sacrifices.

The seal attached to the plates appears to be a genuine one. But in the opinion of Mr. Fleet the very irregular formation of the characters, and the great inaccuracy of the language of the inscription, show the plates themselves to be spurious.

Text.*

First Plate.

[1] Svasti [4] Jayatya = āvishkriti Vīṣhṇu-śvavāla[m*] kāshōhit-āravad[a[m*] dakshāhi-
[2] n-d[n*] jad-ād[a[m*] aṣṭā-āgra-virānta-bhuvana[m*] vapa[h*] ||][*] Śūmatā[m*] saka[l-
bh-.
[3] vana-sa[m*] atāyamāna-Mānava-yā-sogūṭra[ā*]
[4] sapta-lōkamātrihī[8] sapta-mitrā[(tr)] bhir-abhivadhita[m*] Kārt[i*] bi-
[5] kāya-parirakṣhaṇa-prāpta-kalyāṇa-paraṁpariṣa[q][m*]

Text.*

First Plate.

[1] Svasti [4] Jayatya = āvishkriti Vīṣhṇu-śvavāla[m*] kāshōhit-āravad[a[m*] dakshāhi-
[2] n-d[n*] jad-ād[a[m*] aṣṭā-āgra-virānta-bhuvana[m*] vapa[h*] ||][*] Śūmatā[m*] saka[l-
bh-.
[3] vana-sa[m*] atāyamāna-Mānava-yā-sogūṭra[ā*]
[4] sapta-lōkamātrihī[8] sapta-mitrā[(tr)] bhir-abhivadhita[m*] Kārt[i*] bi-
[5] kāya-parirakṣhaṇa-prāpta-kalyāṇa-paraṁpariṣa[q][m*]

 Text.*

First Plate.

[1] Svasti [4] Jayatya = āvishkriti Vīṣhṇu-śvavāla[m*] kāshōhit-āravad[a[m*] dakshāhi-
[2] n-d[n*] jad-ād[a[m*] aṣṭā-āgra-virānta-bhuvana[m*] vapa[h*] ||][*] Śūmatā[m*] saka[l-
bh-.
[3] vana-sa[m*] atāyamāna-Mānava-yā-sogūṭra[ā*]
[4] sapta-lōkamātrihī[8] sapta-mitrā[(tr)] bhir-abhivadhita[m*] Kārt[i*] bi-
[5] kāya-parirakṣhaṇa-prāpta-kalyāṇa-paraṁpariṣa[q][m*]
THE BANAWASI INSCRIPTION OF HARITIPUTA-SATAKAMNI.

By Dr. G. BÜHLER, C.I.E.

The subjoined inscription, which has already been published, in text and translation, by Dr. Bhagwanal Indrajit, is re-edited here from the two lithographs on the accompanying plate, prepared by its discoverer, Dr. J. Burgess.

According to Dr. Burgess' account, as accompanying Dr. Bhagwanal Indrajit's version, it is carved on the two edges of a large slate slab, bearing the representation of a five- hooded cobra. "The first line is on the left margin of the slab from top to bottom; and the second line and the half are on the right-side margin—a letter being broken away at the beginning of the full line, perhaps two more a little way down, and some at the end." From the appearance of the lithographs, however, I conclude that only one letter has been lost at the end of the second line. It must also be added that several letters of the first line, plainly the seventh, eighth, and ninth from the end, and possibly others, have been damaged by abrasions or scratches, and that the preservation of some of the first ten signs of line 2 is clearly imperfect.

1 These two titles are repeated unnecessarily,—unless the Satyārāyas of line 8 denotes Pulkēti I., in which case, there is then an omission of Kirtivarman I. between him and Pulkēti II., who is mentioned in line 9. 
2 Read sub-brāhmaṇa.
3 We have to supply ṣhita here, if the grant is supposed to be made by Pulkēti II.
4 Read naptṛ, or perhaps pranaptṛ.
5 Read brāhmaṇa.
The alphabet resembles, as Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji has stated, that of the Nāśik inscription of Siriyāsa-Sātakañhi. Remarkable are the total absence of the distinction between short and long i, and the frequent neglect of the anusvāra, which latter may be owing to dialectic pronunciation. In the iā of rañjō, the hook on the right has been accidentally detached from the vertical stroke.

My interpretation of the inscription differs from Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji’s in several more or less important particulars; and I trust he will take it not as a mark of disrespect, but of respect, if I state in full the reasons for my dissent. First, I think his reading of the fifth word vasatādya improbable, and his translation “in the century” impossible. The lithographs, especially that of the rubbing, show at the top of each stroke turning upwards, and thus indicate that it originally had a superscribed vowel. But, even if we had to read vasatādya, this word could not mean “in the century.” A century might be called in Sanskrit vaṁsha-kañḥ, and in Prākrit vasatā; not vaṁshakāñḥ or vasatā. The gen., dat., and loc. of vasatā would be vasatā-īya, not vasatādya. Moreover, a phrase like “in the century of such and such king, in the year,” etc., does not occur in any known inscription, and would be meaningless. In his remarks Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji tries to connect it with the Kaśmirian Lōkakāla or Saptarṣi-eras; and Dr. Burgess adds in a note, that the year of the Lōkakāla is called by Albrundi “the Sānuvatāsara of the century.” Against this it must be stated, that none of the inscriptions and MSS. dated according to the Kaśmirian era, shows anything but Saptarṣi-vaṁvat * * , or simply Sānuvat * * ; and that Kalhaya uses occasionally Lōkakāla-vaṁhe, saṁvatārā, etc., or simply Abōdhe, Varhe. Moreover Albrundi’s passage, I think, has not the meaning assigned to it by Dr. Burgess. M. Beinard’s translation runs as follows,—

vulgaires dans l’Inde comptent par siècles, et les siècles se placent l’un après l’autre. On appelle cela le Sānuvatāsara du cent.” Hence it would seem that, not the year of the Lōkakāla, but the Lōkakāla itself was called “Sānuvatāsara du cent.” The Sanskrit equivalent was satāsaṁvatāsara, formed according to the analogy of saṁvatāsara, one of the names of the sixty-year cycle of Jupiter.

But, however that may be, my learned friend’s explanation seems to me inadmissible on grammatical and philological grounds. In looking for another interpretation, we should, it seems to me, first ascertain what phrases do occur between king’s names and dates, according to regnal years on other inscriptions. The ancient Prākrit inscriptions afford no help. But the Sanskrit land-grants of the early Kadamba, Pallava, and Chalukya, almost invariably show before the word saṁvatāsara ‘year’ an expression like “of the reign,” or “of the victorious reign,” or “of the prosperous and victorious reign”; and the ways in which this idea is expressed vary very much.*

If we now pay attention to the upward stroke above the iā of the doubtful word, and take it for the remnant of an i, we obtain the reading vaṁsatādya, which, as the legitimate representative of vaṁsa-satādya, may mean “of the rule of the universe.” For satā, which in classical Sanskrit means ‘existence,’ is used in all the modern Prākrits in the sense of ‘power, authority, rule,’ see, e.g. Molesworth’s Marāṭhi Dictionary, etc.; and, hence, it probably had the same meaning in the older dialects. With this explanation, the beginning of our inscription has to be rendered, “The year 12 of the universal rule of king....” &c. &c.

The second point on which I differ from Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji is the restoration of the beginning of line 2. He changes the letters jaya to jīya, supplies bha, and combines this with the last word of line 1. He thus obtains

*As the existence of the i is doubtful, I will mention that even vaṁsatādya may have a similar meaning, as it can stand for vaṁsa-satādya, “of the existence of the rule.”
the compound *jivaputabhaṇḍajāya* "of the wife of Jivaputra." With respect to the first change I agree, as the *ja* is mutilated, and the numerous scratches in other letters make it probable that the u-stroke of *yu* is accidental. But I supply *pa* (not *bha*), and take the whole compound to be *jivaputapajāya* "of her whose son and (other) descendants are alive." My reasons are that the existence of a name *Jivaputra* is doubtful, and that in the Nāsik inscription No. 14 we have a similar epithet of queen Gōtami,—*jivavatāya rājunātya*.

The fourth and fifth points of difference occur in the interpretation of the sentence *śīka kamanāti kāmača khadasitī*. Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji reads *kamanāti* with the lithograph of the impression, and *khadasitī*, combining the following *sa* with this name. His Sanskrit translation, *atra karma-trikām amātya-Skandaśrutiha*, shows that he corrects *amāchā* to *amacha* against the plain reading of both lithographs. This change is unnecessary. Whether we read *kamanāti* or *kamača*, the word must be taken as a nom. sing. of the masc. gender which refers to *amachā*. If we stop with *khadasitī*, interpreting it likewise as a nom. sing., the sentence becomes idiomatic Prākrit and corresponds to the Sanskrit *atra kārmāntikā mūḍyāḥ Skandaśrutiḥ*, which may be translated, "Here, or with respect to these (*donations*), the minister Skandaśruti (was the superintendent of the work)."

*Khunānta*, in Sanskrit *kāmnanta*, is a common word for "business, work," and *kamāntikā* is a regular derivative from it, which can only mean *superintendent of*, or charged with, a work. A royal lady, of course, required and had a *kāṃbhaṇī*, as the modern phrase is. The correctness of this explanation is further confirmed by the sentence which follows. Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji, who gets two proper names in the last sentence before and after achariyāsa, is forced to assume the loss of the word *putasā* at the end of line 2, and to translate, "The *Nāya* has been made by *Nātaka*, the disciple of *Dāmāraka*, and" (?) "son of the *Ākāra* *Jaya*naka." It is, however, plain from the lithograph that only one letter can have been lost; and it is equally plain that the name *dāmaraka* or *dāmaraka* is mutilated. If, on the other hand, we read *sajaya*takāsa, it is not doubtful that this adjective, like *kaliyākāsa, chēnulakāsa*, *ṣa*, in the Kanheri and other inscriptions, refers to the residence of the *ākāra*... *dāmaraka*, and characterizes him as an inhabitant of the ancient town of *Saṅjayantī*. The latter is mentioned in the *Dīgōja* *parvan* of the *Mahābhārata*, II. 31, 70;—

Nagarīṃ saṁjayantī śa pāśaṇḍaṃ Karahat-\[dātraṇe vaṣ̪a chakrī karanaḥ saṁnādaṁ aṣṭapayat\]\["The town of Saṁjayantī and the heretical (prince of) Karahatā, he subjected to his authority through envoys, and made them pay a tribute."—The fact that Karahatā, the modern Karā (rest Karhi) in the Southern Marāthā country, is mentioned together with Saṁjyaṅtī, while the preceding verse speaks of the Kēralā vasa-vaisā, proves that the town was situated in the Dekhan.\]

Regarding king *Hāritiputa-Sattakānśi*, the joy of the Viṇhuka Daṇṭu family, I am not able to say anything more than Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji. The first part of his family-name may correspond to the Sanskrit *viṣṇukatā*. But *duṭu* remains inexplicable. Sattakānśi, usually *Sattakānśi* (with the vowel in the second syllable short), is probably a title or a *bīruda*, which several Aṇḍhrā kings bear, but which may have been adopted by princes of other races. The reign of this Sattakānśi falls, according to the epigraphical evidence of the inscription, probably in the end of the first or the beginning of the second century. Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji thinks that it may be placed somewhat later.

**Text.**

[*] Sidham Raṭo Hāriti-putasa Viṇhuka-daṇṭa-kulam-ānanda-sattakānnsa vasa[vinša]-satya savachharam 10 2 hēmaṇtana pakho 10 7 divasa 1 mahābhuiya mahārāja-\[bālikāya\] jiva-puta-

---


*See the St. Petersburg Dictionary, s. v.*

*The bottom-line of the va has been lost with the exception of a small piece on the right, visible in the facsimile of the rubbing.*

*The facsimile of the rubbing makes it probable that the vowel ś was attached to the top of the va; see also the introductory remarks above.*

*The vowel ś is expressed by two small strokes attached to the lower end of the right-hand curve of the kh.*

*The letters bālikā are much damaged, but just recognizable.*
ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE ANIMALS AND PLANTS OF INDIA WHICH WERE KNOWN TO EARLY GREEK AUTHORS.

BY V. BALL, M. A., F. R. S., DIRECTOR OF THE SCIENCE AND ART MUSEUM, DUBLIN.

(Continued from p. 311.)

PLANTS.

It would be going beyond the special limits of this paper to attempt any discussion as to the identity of plants mentioned by our authors, but not belonging to India. I should not possess in such an analysis the qualification which has been of so much aid to me with reference to the productions of India, namely, a, so to speak, personal acquaintance with them as they appear, and are regarded by the natives in the country itself.

1. Rice (*Oryza*).

*Oryza sativa*, Linn.—Rice.—(Sansk. *Vṛkhi*).

In the *Periplus*, we are told that *ōriza*, which all agree was rice, was produced in Oraea and Araikā, and was exported from Barygaza to the Barbaric markets and the Island of Divisko-riddā, i.e. Socotra.

2. Honey from Cane called Sugar (Malā to kalāmun to lēγεμον σαχάρ).  

*Saccharum officinarum*, Linn.—Sugar Cane, its product called *Sarkārī* in Sanskrit, and *Shakar* by the Persians.

According to the *Periplus* it was exported from Barygaza (i.e. Bharoch), to the markets of Barbaria.

Mr. M'Crindle's résumé of the writings of the ancients with regard to this substance is of such interest that I quote it verbatim here:—"The first western writer who mentions this substance is Theophrastos, who continued the labours of Aristotle in Natural History. He called it a sort of honey extracted from reeds. Strabo states, on the authority of Nearkos, that reeds in India yield honey without bees. *Ælian* (Hist. Anim.) speaks of a kind of honey pressed from reeds which grew among the Pasis. Seneca (*Epist. 84*) speaks of sugar as a kind of honey found in India on the leaves of reeds, which had either been dropped on them from the sky as dew, or had exuded from the reeds themselves. This was a prevalent error in ancient times, e.g. Disko-

*Idamīvaka-sa*, i.e. *Indramayavaka*.

13 Regarding the restitution see the introductory remarks above.

12 The evidently mutilated letters may also be read *sāmā*. But Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrājī’s restoration is highly probable.

11 The rubbing seems to show that a vowel stood originally over the initial sa, and the second letter looks imperfect. I accept Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrājī’s restoration, because the combination *śivas̄kandana-gāśri* occurs also in Sanskrit names.

10 The final *śivas̄* is distinct in the lithograph of the impression.

9 As a small hook or line is attached to the end of the sa, the correct reading may possibly be *tašiγnā*, a variant form for *tašiγnā* which is common in Southern India.

8 The *śivas̄* above the *sa* is visible on the lithograph of the rubbing.

7 This may be read *śivas̄kandana*, according to the lithograph of the impression. But I prefer the form with short a and propose tentatively the restoration of *śivas̄kandana-gāśri*. The daughter of the great king,—of her whose son and (other) progeny is living, and who is associated (in this donation) with her son. With respect to these (gifts) the minister Khadasāti (Skandavati) (was) the superintendent of the work. The Nāga has been made by Natakā (Nartaka), the pupil of the *Achārya* [1]damūraka (Indramayu) of the town of Saṃjayantī.
ridès says that sugar is a kind of concreted honey found upon canes in India and Arabia Felix; and Pliny, that it is collected from canes like a gum. He describes it as white, and brittle between the teeth, of the size of hazel-nut at most, and used in medicine only. So also Lucian, alluding to the Indians near the Ganges, says that they quaff sweet gums from tender reeds."

It has been conjectured that the sugar described by Pliny and Dioscoridès was sugar-candy obtained from China, see supra, p. 309, where I have suggested that this was the origin of the "stones sweeter than figs or honey," which were supposed to have been dug out of the earth.

It would be easy to quote references to show that sugar-candy, as well as sugar in other forms, was an article of export to Afghanistan from India, in the time of Babar and subsequently.

3. Φλοῖς.

Papirus pangore, Nees. (?)—Papyrus Reed.

According to Hérodotos—"The Indians wear garments (λείψης φλοίων) made from a plant which grows in the rivers. Having collected and beaten it, they interweave it in the form of a mat, and they clothe themselves with it after the manner of a cuirass."

The above-named species of papyrus is commonly used for weaving into mats, and is sometimes used by fishermen as a protection for their bodies from wet and cold. In some respects the description would suit either hemp (Cannabis sativa, Linn.) or jute (Corchorus capsularis, Linn.); but on the whole I cannot accept that it was the fibre of either of these to which Hérodotos refers, especially as regards hemp, since he elsewhere describes its use by the Skythians, and compares its qualities with those of flax.

If not the papyrus, it was probably one of the other species of marsh plants* of which mats are made in India at the present day. "The luxuriance of the grasses and reeds in Sind," says Captain Langley, "especially near the Indus, surpasses anything I ever saw else-

where. The reed known as kand grows to an immense height, is notched like the bamboo, and has a beautiful feathery head. This reed is invaluable to the Sindians, for kuts, mats, baskets, chairs, &c. It grows in large tuft and vast tracts are covered with it between Khairpahr and the river." This kand (Typha elephantina, Roxb.) could certainly not have been the plant from which canoes were made, as has been suggested by some of the critics.

For purposes of mere flotation it is used by fishermen and others when dried and tied in bundles, but the suggestion that the boats capable of holding several persons, mentioned by Hérodotos, were made of it, is obviously absurd.

4. The Indian Reed (Kalamos Φλοῖς)

Borassus flabelliformis, Linn.—The Palmyra Palm.

It appears to have been calmly accepted by commentators that "the Indian reed," referred to by Grecian and Latin authors, was the same as the plant to which we give the name bamboo. So far as I have read their writings, excepting the alternatives mentioned below, I have not met with any suggestion that this identification is incorrect. To show in the first place that it is so, and secondly to name a plant which fulfills the required conditions, is however not difficult.

The facts that the bamboo does not attain more than about one-third of the size of the so-called reed; that it could not, therefore, have been used for the purposes for which the Indian reed is said to have been employed, and the absence of the larger kinds of bamboo from the region of the Lower Indus Valley, all combine to prove that the above identification of the commentators must be rejected.

The more important among the numerous references to the Indian reed are the following:—Hérodotos speaks of the inhabitants of the marshes, which are formed by the flooding of rivers in India, as fishing from canoes formed of canes, which are cut from node to node, each segment forming a boat. Pliny gives a similar account, and says that these

---

* Sprengel includes the rattan, Colamus rotang, in his identification. This is, if possible, a plant still more unsuited to the requirements of the case.

† Thalès, III. cap. xlviii.

‡ Thalès, III. cap. iii. and IV. cap. lixiv. lxix.

§ Saccharum sars, Borb., and S. spontaneum, Linn. &c. &c.

boats traverse the Akesinēs (i.e. Chenab river). So also Diodorus Siculus, who has written to the following effect:—"In India the lands bordering rivers and marshes yield reeds of prodigious size. It is all that a man can do to embrace one. Canoes are made from them."

Ktesias's account, as given by Photios, is that the Indian reed grows along the course of the Indus, and that it is "so thick that two men could scarcely encompass its stem with their arms, and of a height equal to that of a mast of a merchant ship of the heaviest burden. Some are of a greater size even than this, though some are of less, as might be expected, since the mountain it grows on is of vast range. The reeds are distinguished by sex, some being male and others female. The male reed has no pith and is exceedingly strong, but the female has a pith." Tzetzes, Theophrastos, and Strabo are other authors who treat of this subject. I have in the preceding note given an account of the kauad reed (Typha elephantina, Roxb.), which has been suggested as an alternative with the bamboo by Lassen; but although, as stated, bundles of its slender stalks, when dried, are used for mere purposes of flotation on the Indus, it cannot have been made into canoes.

Statements made by Lassen and Sprengel, that the bamboo sometimes has a diameter of two feet, are quite incorrect. Nine inches is an extreme and very exceptional limit, and as the larger species of bamboo do not occur near the Indus, on account of their only flourishing in moist tropical climates, we must look to some other tree as having furnished, when the stem was split, almost ready-made boats capable of holding several people. At the present day, excluding timber dug-outs made of Bombus, &c., the only trees so employed are palms; and among the species so used, namely, the cocoaanut, the date-palm, and the palmyn (Borassus flabelliformis, Linn.), I should be inclined to give the preference to the latter, as it is cultivated in Lower Sind. The diameter of a full-grown tree is from 18 to 24 inches, or the circumference is, say, six feet at the base; the height is from 40 to 60 feet, and in favourable localities, as in Burms, 100 feet. Canoes, capable of holding two or three people, are made from the stems of this palm in many parts of India at the present day. It is noteworthy, moreover, that the Sanskrit name is Trivrista, i.e. king of the grasses or reeds, from which in all probability the Greeks derived the name which they applied to it. The Phoenix dactylifera, or date-palm, which is now the common palm in the Indus Valley, attains a height of 100 to 120 feet, and the trunks of male trees may perhaps be used for canoes; but if, as is stated by Brandis, it was only introduced into Sind in the eighth century, it certainly cannot have been the tree mentioned by our ancient authors.

5. THE NAUPLIO (Nauplius).

Cocos nucifera.—The Indian Cocoanut.

Under the name Nauplios, which Müller suggests, as stated by Mr. McCrindle, is a mistake for nopali (the Persian nādīl or Sanskrit nārikula), the author of the Periplus, refers to the cocoanut, while Kosmas gives a very good description of it, under the name argelia, evidently a transmutation of the native name minus the initial n.

6. THE PARÉPHON TREE (Párambōr).

Ficus religiosa, Linn.—The Pápal, Hin.

The parēphon tree, as described by Ktesias, according to Photios, was a plant about the size of the olive, found only in the royal gardens, producing neither flower nor fruit, but having merely fifteen roots, which grow down into the earth, and are of considerable thickness, the very slenderest being as thick as one's arm. If a span's length of this root be taken it attracts to itself all objects brought near it (tava ḍhas ṭele laurīy), gold, silver and copper, and all things except amber. If, however, a cubit's length of it be taken, it attracts lambs and birds, and it is, in fact, with this root that most kinds of birds are caught. Should you wish to turn water solid, even a whole gallon of it, you have but to throw it into it and an obol's weight of this root, and the thing is

---

9 Bibl. lib. II. 2. xlvi. p. 183.
12 Khtidés, VII. v. 736, from third book of Apollonius of Urania.
13 Plant. Hist. ir. 11.
14 ibid. xx. 21.
15 Brandis "Forest Flora," p. 554, gives for the stems of Bambusa arundinacea, Bmet. diameters varying from four to nine inches.
16 Forest Flora, p. 558.
18 Ancient India, p. 95.
19 Belloc in Histor. Bibl. lxxii. Conf. Ancient India,
20 by J. W. McCrindle, p. 20.
done. Its effect is the same upon wine, which when condensed by it, can be held in your hand like a piece of wax, though it melts the next day. It is found beneficial in the cure of bowel disorders."

My reasons, for identifying the above with the pipal tree (Ficus religiosa) are as follows:—

Though of common occurrence in the moist tropical parts of India, it is seldom found except where cultivated in gardens and plantations in the Panjab and the arid tracts of Northern India generally, where, as it does not flourish, it is probably not often larger than a well-grown olive tree. Its small figs are inconspicuous, scarcely exceeding the larger varieties of peas in size, so that it might easily have been supposed to have had neither flowers nor fruit. Its roots sometimes clasp other trees in their embrace, and they are generally visible at the surface of the ground for some distance away from the trunk. There is no limit, however, to their number. Being regarded as sacred by the Hindus, offerings of various emblems and idols are often to be seen placed round the trunk; in some cases ancient stone implements and other stones of curious and grotesque shapes may be observed thus collected around it. In these facts I would suggest that the myth as to the attractive power of the roots, or, as Apollonios has it, the tree itself, for metals and stones, may very probably have originated. Its "attractive" power for birds and other animals is very readily explained, since from the glutinous juice which exudes from the stem bird-line is commonly made; and it may be that the "attraction" for metals, &c., merely refers to some adhesive substance prepared from this juice. The effects of the fresh juice when dropped into water or wine might possibly be to thicken them, but perhaps not to the extent stated by Ktesias. As to the medicinal properties, the seeds are believed to be cooling and alterative, and the leaves and young shoots are used as a purgative.

To the above, which constitute strong reasons in favour of this identification, there may be added, that although at first sight the name pipal presents no very close resemblance to paribon, still, when written as it is often pronounced, peepus, the I being replaced by n, it is not difficult to understand how the sound may have suggested to the ear of the Greek writer a combination of letters which he represented by χαρπε."


Gossypium indicum, Lam.—Cotton Tree.

No chain can be made here for originality in identifying with cotton the substance mentioned in the following extracts. It is an identification about which commentators are agreed. It is only mentioned here on account of some special points of interest connected with it; but it might have been omitted for the same reason that so many other substances have been named, namely, that their identity is not doubtful.

Ktesias, as related by several of his commentators, refers to the trees in India which bear wool.

Arrian, quoting from Nearhos, also refers to this product, which in its woven state, was new to the Greeks who went to India in the army of Alexander.

A cotton from stones, mentioned by some early authors, appears to have been asbestos, as I have elsewhere suggested."

The karpnos mentioned in the Periplus as an export from Arikos to Egypt, was the Sanskrit karpas, signifying fine muslin. The name survives in the modern Hindustani word khas, cotton.

8. The Siptakhoras Tree (σιπταχορας).

Schleichera trijuga, Wild, and Bassia latifolia, Roxb.

In the account of schipros, supra, p. 309f., the identification of the siptakhoras has, by anticipation, been already suggested. It appears to combine the characteristics of two trees which are found in the same tract of country. The khadum tree (Schleichera trijuga) was probably the tree which yielded the shell-lac, and it seems to have been confused with the mahewal (Bassia latifolia), since from the

[Does not the description, however, tally better with the Banyan tree or bar, Sar. vaṣa, Ficus Indica?—Ed.]

18 Thalia, lib. III. c. cxi.
22 Proceedings, Royal Dublin Society, 1888, p. 53.
latter there exudes a gum without the aid of lac insects. It may, I think, be accepted as almost certain that the so-called dried fruits were, as has been explained, the dried flowers of the mahewal, which are at the present time largely used as an article of food, and for the extraction of an intoxicating spirit by distillation. Both trees are found together in the same jungles.

9. **Lyconium (Clubia)**.

*Barberis tinctoria*, D. C., and *B. lycium*, Royle.

This substance, which, according to the *Periplus*, was exported from Barbarikon (i.e. a town on the Indus, in Indo-Skythia), and from Barygaza, i.e. Bharoch, was a plant whose roots yielded a dye, and the extract a medicine.

It has already been identified, as pointed out by Mr. McRindle, with the rasuul of the natives, which is prepared from the two species of Berberry named above. The first of them, *B. tinctoria*, is found both in the Himalayas and the mountains of Southern India and Ceylon; but the other species is only known from the Himalayas.  

10. **Baleium (Balaia, or Bālān)**.


It appears to be now generally admitted that this is the species of tree which yielded the gum-resin known to the ancients as *baleium*, and which, according to the author of the *Periplus*, was exported from Barbarikon on the Indus, and from Barygaza. Dr. Stocks has described the collection of Indian *baleium* as follows: "In Sind the gāgal is collected in the cold season by making incisions with a knife in the tree, and letting the resin fall on the ground. It exudes in large tears, soft and opaque, hardens and turns brownish black very slowly; a single tree is said to yield from one to two pounds of resin. It is brought to the bdars of Haiderabad and Karāchi, where it sells at the rate of four shillings for 80 lbs.

The *baleium* of Scripture was, it is supposed, a siliceous mineral allied to onyx.

---

11. **Pepper (Piper)**.

*Piper nigrum*, Linn.—Black Pepper. (Sansk., *pippali*).

Mr. McRindle's note on this subject, when referring to the mention of it in the *Periplus*, is as follows: "Kottonark pepper exported in large quantities from Mouziris and Nelkynda; long pepper from Barygaza. Kottonara was the name of the district, and Kottonarikon the name of the pepper for which the district was famous. Dr. Buchanan identifies Kottonara with Kadattanādu, a district in the Calicut (Kālikochā) country celebrated for its pepper. Dr. Burnell, however, identifies it with Kolattanādu, the district about Tellicherry, which, he says, is the pepper district."

Malabar continues to produce the best pepper in the world; but Sumatra and other islands cultivate and export largely.

The pepper vine is planted near trees which it ascends to the height of 20 or 30 feet. The berries, which are collected before being quite ripe, are dried in the sun; white pepper only differs from black by having the outer skin removed, for which purpose the berries are first macerated.

12. **Malabathrum (Malāthāthvum)**.

*Cinnamomum tamala*, Nees, and *Dāchāvī*, Hin.

The leaves of this tree, which are known to the natives of India as terpāt, or more correctly terpāt, appear to be identical with the malabathrum of the Greeks. It was obtained by the Thimal from the Sesatai, and exported to India, conveyed down the Ganges to Ganga, near its mouth; and it was also brought from the interior of India to Mouziris and Nelkynda for export.

Mr. McRindle, who seems to regard it as identical with betel (*Chica betel*, Mig.), (from which, however, it is quite distinct) mentions that according to Ptolemy (v. ii. 16), the best varieties of malabathrum came from Kirshia—that is to say, Rangpur in Eastern Bengal. The description given in the *Periplus* of how the malabathrum was prepared by the Thimal (Chinese?), from leaves which were used by the Sesatai to wrap up the goods.
which they brought to market, is very curious, and must refer to some custom of an Assamese tribe, which is still probably capable of elucidation. At the present day for instance the leaves of the (Zingiber? Sp.? ) are used in Assam to wrap up small parcels as also are those of the Śāl (Shorea robusta) in the parts of India where that tree grows. All the indications of position point to the mountainous regions included in and surrounding Assam as the home of the malabathrum, and there in fact the above-named tree abounds, extending westwards to the Satlaj, and sparingly to the Indus; and eastwards to Burma. It is also found in Queensland, Australia.

13. The Karpin Tree (Kaprival).

Laurus (cinnaomonum) Sp. (?) Pandanus odoratissimus (?)

Ktēsias’s description of this tree, according to Photius, is as follows:—“But again there are certain trees in India as tall as the cedar or the cypress, having leaves like those of the date palm, only somewhat broader, but having no shoots sprouting from the stems. They produce a flower like the male laurel, but no fruit. In the Indian language they are called maṇḍaka, i.e. unguent roses. These trees are scarce. There oozes from them an oil which is wiped off from the stem with wool, from which it is afterwards wrung out and received into alabaster boxes of stone.”

The nature of this tree has been much discussed. In some respects the description suits the Pandanus, the flowers of which yield, on distillation, a fragrant oil which is called karpa by the nātives, and in these particulars, especially its palm-like habit, it corresponds least well with the characteristics of the cinnamon. Mr. M’Crindle’s arguments in favour of its identification with the latter are of considerable cogency, though certainly not conclusive. He says:—“I have little doubt that the Sanskrit karpāra, camphor, is substantially the same as the Tamil-Malayālum karuppu (oil of cinnamon), and Ktēsias’ Kaprival, seeing that it does not seem to have any root in Sanskrit, and that camphor and cinnamon are nearly related. The camphor of commerce is obtained from a species of laurel (Laurus camphora, Nees.).” But this tree is not found in India, and it is believed that camphor itself was not known to the Greeks. Altogether it may be doubted whether a complete solution of the difficulty can be obtained. It is probable, however, that Ktēsias jumbled together the characteristics of some species of Laurus with those of the screw pine (Pandanus odoratissimus).

It may be added that in the Chinese work entitled Si-yu-ki which was compiled in the year 646 A. D. we find the following as given in Dr. Beal’s translation (Vol. II. p. 262):—

“The tree from which Kie-pu-lo (karpāra, i.e. camphor) is procured is in trunk like pine but different in leaves, flowers, and fruit. When the tree is first cut down and sappy, it has no smell; but when the wood gets dry it forms into beams and splits; then in the middle is the scent, in appearance like mica, of the colour of frozen snow. This is what is called in Chinese Long-nnão-hiang, i.e. the Dragon-brain-scent.”

14. Cassia (Kassia).

Laurus cassia, Roxb., &c.

The term Cassia appears to have been applied to different substances by the ancients, ten varieties are mentioned in the Periplus. They were produced chiefly from different species of Cinnamonum, but other plants wholly unallied to the laurel family may, it is thought by some authors, have contributed aromatic substances which were included in the same general denomination. As this subject has been dealt with by most commentators, more need not be said of it here.

15. Indicum (Indicem μδαν).


Among the exports from the Skythik port of Barbarikon, on one of the mouths of the Indus, the above substance is enumerated in the Periplus, upon which Mr. M’Crindle remarks:—“It appears pretty certain that the culture of the indigo plant and the preparation of the drug have been practised in India from a very remote epoch. It has been questioned, indeed, whether the indicum mentioned by Pliny (xxxv. 6) was indigo, but, as it would seem, without any good reason. He states

39 Eclips in Phot., Bibl. ix. 28.
40 According to some authorities this is only a

39 The Brythman Sea, p. 17.
that it was brought from India, and that when diluted it produced an admirable mixture of blue and purple colours. The dye was introduced into Rome only a little before Pliny's time.'

It is stated that as late as the close of the 16th century it was not known in Europe what plant produced indigo, although its preparation at Lisbon was described by Marco Polo. As is well known, it has hitherto been a most important product from British India, but the introduction of an artificial indigo renders it probable that the trade of the indigo planter is destined to become extinct ere long.

16. A Tree having bean-like pods (Δέντρον λασύνι γυνώς).

Casina fistula, Linn. Amalâda, Hin. 
Swarna, Sansk.

According to Strabo, Aristoboulos mentions "a tree, not large, bearing great pods, like the bean, ten fingers in length, full of honey, and says that those who eat it do not easily escape with life."

The above description suggests the pods of the Casina fistula, which are sometimes two feet long. They include, besides the seeds, a sweet mucilaginous pulp, which, however, is not poisonous, but is regarded as a valuable laxative. The seeds may be noxious. Possibly the pulp, if taken in quantity, might produce disagreeable effects.

17. Nardos (Νάρδος).

Nardostachys zatanunci, Jones—Spikenard.


From the Periplus we learn that gangetic nard or spikenard was brought down the Ganges to Gângâ, near its mouth, and was forwarded thence to Monziris and Nelkynâ. Spikenard, which was obtained in the regions of the upper Indus and in Indo-Skythis, was forwarded through Ozânâ (Ujjain) to Barygaza (Bharoch), and thence exported to Egypt.

The true origin of this aromatic drug was first discovered by Sir W. Jones, who was followed in its investigation by Roxburgh and Royle. They determined it to be the root of a plant named as above, which belongs to the Valerian family.

18. The purple flower (Αρέσκος ορθρυσκος).

Grisela tomentosa, Roxb. Dëhâd, Hin.

Among Photios's extracts from Kiòsins there occurs the following passage:—"Near the source of the Hypparkhos there grows a certain purple flower, which is used for dyeing purple, and is not inferior to the Greek sort, but even imparts a more florid hue."

I am inclined to recognize in this description the flowers of the dëhâd tree (Sanskrit, dhâtri-pushyperika, or agrindâ, i.e. flame of fire), which was named Grisela tomentosa by Bozburgh.

It will be seen by reference to any of the Indian Floras that the flowers of this wild jungle-shrub are largely used as a dye. Thus Brandis says that they are collected in the North-West, and exported to the Pahîjáb for dyeing silks; and Drury, that "in Khândesh, where the plant grows abundantly, they form a considerable article of commerce inland as a dye."

I have often seen baskets full of the dried flowers exposed for sale at the fairs in Chutìâ Nâgpûr, together with crude shell-lac, i.e. in the same general region as that in which the Hypparkhos river was probably situated. The petals being minute, it is the coloured sepal which actually afford the dye.

19. Oil of Sesame (Ελαίος σεπάμινος).

Sesamum indicum, Linn. Gingely Oil, Eng. 
Yellu cheeddi, Tam. Tî, Hin.

This is one of the most valuable oil-yielding plants in India. Both seeds and oil are still largely exported from India, as they were, or at any rate the latter was, according to the Periplus, from Barygaza (i.e. Bharoch), it having been brought there from the region in the Narbadâ valley, then known as Arîkâ.

It is much cultivated in India and Egypt, and has found its way even to the West Indies. The seed contains about forty-five per cent. of oil, which is, when carefully extracted, of a

32 B. xvi. C. 1, § 21.  
33 As. Res. II. p. 405.  
34 As. Res. IV. p. 169.  
37 According to Brandis the proper name is Woodfordia forbida, Sala.  
pale yellow colour. It has a sweet smell, and is one of the best substitutes for olive oil.

20. Kostos (Kόστος).

Aucklandia costus, Falconer. Sansk., Kushta.

According to the author of the Periplus, kostos was exported from Barbarikon, at the mouth of the Indus, and from Barygaza, it having come from Kābul, through Proklias, &c. 32 Much doubt existed as to the identity of this drug, till it was ascertained by Dr. Falconer, to be the root of the above-named plant, which belongs to the order Asteraceae. It inhabits the moist open slopes surrounding the valley of Kaśmir, at an elevation of 8,000 or 9,000 feet above sea-level.

The roots have a strong aromatic pungent odour, and are largely employed on account of their supposed aphrodisiac properties.

Considerable quantities, under the name pacchik, are still exported from Calcutta to China—or were some years ago; but it is possible the route from Lahore, whence they were brought to that port, has now been changed in favour of Bombay or Kaśārī. In China it is used in the manufacture of incense. Two varieties are distinguished by their colours and qualities.


Bruguiera gymnorrhiza, Lam.—Mangroves.

Kikrī, Beng.

According to a passage in Antigonos, we learn that Megasthenes, in his Indika, mentioned that trees grow in the Indian seas.

These were doubtless mangroves, which flourish in Sund, in the estuaries of the Indus, as well as in various parts of the coast of the peninsula, and the islands of the Bay of Bengal, spreading thence to the Northern parts of Australia. As is well known, mangroves grow below high-water mark, and, with their stems supported above ground by numerous roots, they present a singular appearance—one sure to attract the attention of European travellers in India.

Pliny's accounts of marine trees may possibly include the mangrove, but they are somewhat vague; they seem to refer rather to the appearances presented by different corals and algae.

APPENDIX.

My attention has been drawn by Professor Haddon to an article in the October 1884 number of the Edinburgh Review on Aristotle's History of Animals. Aristotle's history has not been often quoted in this paper, for the simple reason that it contains little or nothing of importance about Indian animals which is at the same time original. The statement of Pliny and Athenæus, that Alexander sent Indian animals to Aristotle, has been rejected as being without foundation by Humboldt, Schneider, and Grote. With this opinion, which is endorsed by the writer of the review, I fully agree, on account of the absence of original remarks regarding them; but I must take exception to part of what he says about Kaśās, for although he objects to Aristotle's mention of him as a man "unworthy of credit" (oikōmēs), and as a "manifest liar" (fairevēs), he himself says that the following, together with some of the races of men mentioned by Kaśās, are "simply creatures of the imagination," or "altogether fabulons." The animals so denominated are the Stelēs, Dikaiōn, Martikhor, and the Indian ass, the origin of the stories regarding each of which, and their respective identifications, I venture to believe I have successfully explained in the foregoing pages. His opinion as to the identity of the Krokottas agrees, I observe, with mine.

It has occurred to me that the Luscrecotta of Pline (B. viii. ch. 30) was the Nīlīdā (Portas pictus). According to his description it was the size of the wild ass, with the legs of a stag, the neck, tail, and breast of a lion, the head of a badger, a cloven hoof, the mouth slit up as far as the ears, and one continuous bone instead of teeth. The last item I cannot explain; but the mane and tail of the Nīlīdā sufficiently resemble those of the lion to have suggested the comparison.

The Hippelaphas of Aristotle has also been supposed to be the Nīlīdā by some writers.
The inscriptions which give the subject of the present paper, consist of fifteen collected by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajì, and published by him and Dr. Bühler in this Journal, Vol. IX. p. 163ff., and of one discovered by Mr. Bendall, and published by him in this volume, p. 97f.

The historical results of the former set, have been discussed at length by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajì in his paper entitled "Some Considerations on the History of Nepal," edited by Dr. Bühler, and published in this Journal, Vol. XIII. p. 411ff. These results, however, are, unfortunately, vitiatted by a radical error; viz., the reference of one series of the dates to the Vikrama era, instead of to the Gupta era nearly four hundred years later.

This was due partly to the misinterpretation of an important verse in the inscription of Jayadēva II. of (Harsha)-Sañvat 153; and partly to the want of the key-note supplied by Mr. Bendall's inscription. And it was, of course, the publication of this last inscription that led me to look carefully into the whole matter, and at length to hit upon the fundamental mistake, without a consideration of which it might still be argued that Mr. Bendall's date of 318 for Śivādeva I. and Anāśvarman stands alone in belonging to the Gupta era, and that, in spite of it, Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajì was right in referring the other larger dates to the Vikrama era.

The dates and other important points of the sixteen inscriptions in question, arranged in proper chronological order, are, in brief, these:

A.—Mr. Bendall's inscription; ante, p. 97f.—The charter recorded is issued from the house or palace called Mānagriha. The inscription is one of the Bhāṭṭāraka and Mahārāja, the illustrious Śivādeva I., the banner or glory of the Lichchhavikula. And it records a grant made by him on the advice, or at the request, of the Mahāstāmanta Aṃśuvarman. The Dūtaka is the Śvāmin Bībhavaran. The date, in numerical symbols here and throughout the series, is (Gupta)-Sañvat 318, + A.D. 319-26. = A.D. 637-38.

B.—Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajì's inscription No. 5; ante, Vol. IX. p. 168f.—The charter is issued from Mānagriha. The inscription is one of the Bhāṭṭāraka and Mahārāja, the illustrious Śivādeva I., the banner of the Lichchhavikula. It recorded some act, the details of which are broken away and lost, done by him, as in inscription A., on the advice, or at the request, of the Mahāstāmanta, the illustrious Aṃśuvarman. The date, and the name of the Dūtaka, are broken away and lost in line 11ff.

C.—Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajì's inscription No. 6; ante, Vol. IX. p. 169f.—The charter is issued from the house or palace called Kailāsakūṭabhaṇava. The inscription is one of the Mahāstāmanta, the illustrious Aṃśuvarman. The Dūtaka is the Mahāśravas [dānḍana-ga] Vikramā [maśēna]? The date is (Harsha)-Sañvat 34, + A.D. 605-7. = A.D. 640-41.

D.—Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajì's inscription No. 7; ante, Vol. IX. p. 170f.—The charter is issued from Kailāsakūṭabhaṇava. The

1 I do not think it necessary on this occasion to enter into a full discussion of the dates given by the inscriptions, which is unnecessary, and which would exceed the limits of this paper. It is sufficient to say that, in my visits to Mālwa in the early part of the present and the preceding years, I succeeded in obtaining some new inscriptions which satisfactorily determine the epoch of the era, and show that the part of Albl infrared's statement is correct, which tells in a nutshell that Aṃśuvarman in the era by two hundred and forty-one years.—Whether in converting a Gupta into a Christian date, we have to add 241 or 242 of the Śaka years, will depend upon accurate calculations which have not yet been made. But Albl infrared's apparent meaning is that we have to add 241 of the Śaka years. This gives as the equation Śaka-Sañvat 241 + A.D. 78-79 = A.D. 319-39 as the epoch of the Gupta era; and this is the equation that I shall use in this paper. There is one other point which should be mentioned here. It is that none of the Early Gupta and connected inscriptions give the name of the Gupta era (or any other special name), e.g., I have not yet been made. But Albl infrared's apparent meaning is that we have to add 241 of the Śaka years. This gives as the equation Śaka-Sañvat 241 + A.D. 78-79 = A.D. 319-39 as the epoch of the Gupta era; and this is the equation that I shall use in this paper.

2 In the date of this inscription, the Samvat and the year should be added, as it is a date in the Vikrama era only.

3 This person would seem to be Aṃśuvarman's sister's son, who is mentioned in inscription D. He must not be confused with Śivādeva II.'s father-in-law, the Mankhuri Bībhavaran, who is mentioned in inscription O. below, and was at least a full generation later. See note 10 below p. 345, on another point.

4 As in note 5 above.

5 This is the name as completed by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajì. But, if we accept it as correct, we must be careful not to confuse this person with the Bījbhavara Vikramāśina who was the Dūtaka of inscription P. below, more than two hundred years later. I have not seen the original of the inscription of this date.
inscription is one of the illustrious Aśūvarman, to whom no formal titles are allotted here. It mentions Aśūvarman's sister Bhogadāvī, who was the wife of the Rājaśputra Sārasam, and the mother of the illustrious Bhogavarman and Bhagadāvī. It records certain orders addressed by Aśūvarman to the officials of the Western province (paśchimādikāraka-vṛtti-bhūjā, lines 3-6; and paśchimādikāraka, l. 14), in connection with three śūṣka forms of the god Īśvara or Siva. The Dālaka is the Yuvārīja Udayadēva. The date is (Harsha)-Saṃvat 39, + A.D. 606-7, = A.D. 645-46.

E.—Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají's inscription No. 8; ante, Vol. IX. p. 171.—This is not a formal charter, issued from any specified place. It simply records that, by the favour of the illustrious Aśūvarman, a praṇātī or 'conduit' was caused to be built by the Vīrā ṣūgarī Vīhāravarna, for the increase of his father's religious merit. The date is (Harsha)-Saṃvat 43 (?), + A.D. 606-7, = A.D. 631-52 (?).

F.—Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají's inscription No. 9; ante, Vol. IX. p. 171f.—The charter is issued from Kailāśakūtabhavana (l. 3-4). The inscription is one of the illustrious Jīshuṣputra. It records that, at the request of the Śāmantha Chandravarman, a tailamaka or water-course, which had been constructed by the Bhattāraka and Mahārājadhīrēva, the glorious Aśūvarman, was made over by Jīshuṣputra to Chandravarman, to be repaired; &c. The Dālaka is the Yuvārīja, the illustrious Vīhāravarna. The date is (Harsha)-Saṃvat 48, + A.D. 606-7, = A.D. 654-55.

The Bhattāraka and Mahārāja Dhruvarāva, but the passage is much mutilated, and does not in itself suffice to explain the connection between Dhruvarāva and Jīshuṣputra.

G.—Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají's inscription No. 10; ante, Vol. IX. p. 173f.—The charter is issued from Kailāśakūtabhavana (l. 6). The inscription is one of the illustrious Jīshuṣputra. The details are much mutilated; but the subject is a tailamaka or water-course which had been constructed by the Mahāsmānta, the illustrious...dēva. The name of the Dālaka, and the date have peeled off and are lost. Lines 3 and 4 of this inscription again mention Mānagīrīha, and, in connection with it, the Bhattāraka and Mahārāja, the illustrious Dhrurāva, the banner of the Liechbhāvika. Between māṇagīrīha and dīthiyāti, in line 4, there are four (or perhaps five) aśkaraḥ which are much damaged, and are quite uncertain even in the rubbing; but the ha (not ṣa) is distinct enough; and this, and the whole construction, shows that we have here,—not Māṇagīrīha, the formal ablative of issue,—but the base Māṇagīra, as the first member of a compound, ending with santāti, that qualifies śī-Drurāva, and means something like "who belonged to a lineage which had its thoughts [obscured by residing] at Māṇagīra." As regards the connection between Dhruvarāva and Jīshuṣputra,—in line 5, after śī-Drurāva, Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají read pūrvaśrī sahasha, and interpreted the passage as showing that Jīshuṣputra acknowledged Dhruvarāva as his lord paramount. The interpretation is possibly correct; though the text may equally well mean nothing more than a courteous reference by Jīshuṣputra to one whose

* The original is somewhat damaged, but it has undoubtedly  in the first aśkara of this name; not  as given by Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají in his text and translation. And the spelling is the same in line 8 of an inscription of the Sūrasam family published by Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají, ante, Vol. X. p. 34ff. But very probably  is the more correct spelling; especially as line 8 of the present inscription mentions the śūṣka named Śārabhagāvāna.

* See note 4 above, p. 342.

* The dates seem to prevent the identification of this person with the Udayadēva of the Thākuri family, mentioned in inscription O. He was perhaps a Liechbhāvika, as suggested by Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají. If so, in this Liechbhāvika Dālaka of a Thākuri charter two have an instance parallel to the Thākuri Dālaka of a Liechbhāvika grant, suggested in note 4 above, p. 342.

* Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají takes Vīrā as a family or tribal name. It seems more likely, however, that, as suggested by Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají himself, it is an official title, synonymous with the vīrītābhyā of inscription D., and that the correct form is vīrītā (with the double  ) from vīrītā.

* The second symbol is doubtful; but it is either or . I have not seen the original rubbing of this inscription.

* Other names in this series of inscriptions, ending in ṣūla, are:—Vīhāravarna, the Dālaka of this inscription;—Adityagupta ( ), in L. line 4, and Śrīgupta, 1d. line 12.—Rāvīgupta, the Dālaka of N.;—and Adityagupta, in P. line 4.

* The two aśkaraḥ māṇe, immediately after māṇe, are clearly enough in the original rubbing, though they hardly show in the lithograph and are not given by Pandit Bhagwanal Indrají in his text.

* The purport of it, however, must have been the same as in the next inscription G.

* In the original rubbing śī is very distinct at the beginning of line 14. Two aśkaraḥ are illegible between it and dēva.
II. The Dūtaka is the Rājaputra Jayadēva. The date is (Harsha)-Saṃvat 119, + A.D. 606-7, = A.D. 725-26.

K. —Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji's inscription No. 2; ante, Vol. IX. p. 166 f.—This is not a formal charter, issued from any specified place. It simply records that, by the favour of the illustrious 'king' Mānadēva, a certain Jayavara, erected a stupa named Jayēvara, for the welfare of the world, (i.e. of all the people), together with the king, and endowed it with a permanent endowment. The date is (Gupta)-Saṃvat 413, + A.D. 319-20, = A.D. 732-33.

L. —Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji's inscription No. 13; ante, Vol. IX. p. 176 f.—This inscription is very much damaged. The name of the palace whence the charter was issued, is lost. And the king's name is illegible in line 3; but, as it is preceded by the titles of Paramabhaṭṭaraka and Mahārājāśākyaṇa, the name was probably that of Śivadēva II, as in inscription J.; and Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji filled up the lacunae in that way. This is a Buddhist inscription. The Dūtaka is the Bhāṭṭaraka, the illustrious, or perhaps the venerable, Śivadēva. The date is somewhat doubtful; but Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji read it as (Harsha)-Saṃvat 143, + A.D. 606-7, = A.D. 749-50, with the possibility of the second symbol being 20 or 30, instead of 40.

M. —Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji's inscription No. 14; ante, Vol. IX. p. 177 f.—All the introductory part of this inscription, recording the palace whence the charter was issued and the name of the king, is broken away and lost. The Dūtaka is the Yuvārāja Vijayadēva. The date is (Harsha)-Saṃvat 145, + A.D. 606-7, = A.D. 751-52.—Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji, taking Vijayadēva as a "vicarious" name of Jayadēva II, allotted the inscription, chiefly on this account, to Śivadēva II. As far as the date goes, the inscription may be one either of him or of Jayadēva II. But Vijayadēva cannot be a "vicarious" name of Jayadēva II. Occasional instances may be cited in which the special terminations of names vary; thus the Vasantaśena of his
own inscription N., appears in O. line 10, and in the Vaññikavai, as Vasatadvā; and Jayadeva I. of O. line 8 perhaps appears in the Vaññikavai as Jayavarman. But even this is rare enough. And I cannot call to mind a single instance in which (apart from the substitution of birudu) the inscriptions shew any variation in the first and really distinctive part of a king's name. If the present inscription is one of Sivadeva II., then Vijayadeva was another son of his; if, as seems to me more probable, it is one of Jayadeva II., then Vijayadeva was his son.

N.—Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji's inscription No. 3; ante, Vol. IX. p. 167.—The charter is issued from Mānagriha. The inscription is one of the Mahārāja, the illustrious Vasantaśeṇa.22 The Dūtāka is the Sarvānandayaka and Mahāpratihāra Rāguvarā. The date is (Gupta)-Sañvat 435, + A.D. 319-20, = A.D. 754-55.

O.—Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji's inscription No. 15; ante, Vol. IX. p. 178ff.—This is not a formal charter, issued from any specified place. The inscription,—which gives a good deal of genealogical information, to be commented on below,—is one of Jayadeva II., who also had the second name or biruda of Parachakrakāma. The object of it is to record that he caused a silver water-lily to be made, for the worship of Siva under the name of Paśupati, and that it was worshipped and installed by his mother Vasatadvā. The date is (Harsha)-Sañvat 153, + A.D. 606-7, = A.D. 759-60.

P.—Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji's inscription No. 4; ante, Vol. IX. p. 168.—The commencement of the inscription, recording the place whence the order was issued and the king's name, is broken away and lost. The Dūtāka is the Rājaputra Vikramasena.23 The date is (Gupta)-Sañvat 535, + A.D. 319-20, = A.D. 854-55.

The two dates of A. the year 348 for Sivādeva I. and Aṣmāvarman, and C. the year 34 for Aṣmāvarman, suffice to shew quite clearly that, here at all events, we are dealing with two very different series or eras. Acting on the identification of Aṣmāvarman with the king of that name who was reigning during

or very shortly before, Huien Tsang's visit to Northern India,21 which was about A.D. 687. Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji very properly referred the dates of (C.) 34, (D.) 39, (E.) 45 (?), (F.) 48, (J.) 119, (L.) 143 (?), (M.) 145, and (O.) 153, to the era established by Harshavarman of Kanauj, and dating from his accession in A.D. 606 or 607. And, this much being proved, it follows that the date of (A.) 318 must of necessity be referred to an era commencing just about three hundred years before that of Harshavarmana. The era that exactly meets the requirements of the case is the Gupta era,22 commencing in A.D. 319-20; for, (A.) 318 + 319-20, = A.D. 637-38, and (C.) 34 + 606-7, = A.D. 640-41. There can be no doubt that this era was well known in Nepal at an early date; for, Chandragupta I. married Kumāradēvi, the daughter of Lichchhavī,23 or of a Lichchhavī prince; Nepal is mentioned, in the Allahbād pillar inscription, as one of the countries conquered by Smāradgupta;24 and the Kāhā pillar inscription shews what, in Gupta-Sañvat 141 (A.D. 469-71), Skandagupta's empire extended, at any rate, up to the confines of the country. And it is not impossible that the Nepal Vaññikavai itself has unconsciously preserved a reminiscence, not only of the introduction of the Gupta era, but of the actual year in which it was introduced. The earliest king mentioned in it has the curious name of Bhukta-mānagata;25 and the duration of his reign is given as eighty-eight years. Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji has pointed out26 that this is not a real name, but is probably a corruption of bhukta-mānagata-varsha, "the year of the reign." I would suggest, as a matter worth considering and probably capable of being cleared up by a collation of manuscripts, that it is really a corruption of bhukyamāna-Gupta-varsha, "the year of the Guptas that was being enjoyed, i.e. that was current,"—that the eighty-eight years of the reign of this "Bhukta-mānagata" point to Gupta-Sañvat 88 + A.D. 319-20, = A.D. 407-8, when Chandragupta II., the successor of Samudragupta, was on the throne, as the time when the era was introduced into Nepal,—and that it is owing to the influence of this

21 The form Lichchhavī also occurs in two of the Gupta inscriptions,—the Baitari pillar inscription of Skanda-gupta; and a spurious Udaya plate of Samudragupta.
reminiscent, that the seven successors of this "Bhaktamukha" all have, in the Vēriśāvatī, names ending in gupta, a termination which does not appear anywhere else in that record.

As regards the other larger dates of (I.) 386, (K.) 413, (N.) 435, and (P.) 535,—all the circumstances of the case showed that they were, at any rate, not a continuation of the smaller dates belonging to the Harshavarman era. And, after examining the theory of the Śaka era, commencing A.D. 78, and rejecting it on the grounds that even this was not early enough, Pandit Bhagwanal Indraji (who of course wrote without knowing of Mr. Bendall’s inscription), finally referred them to the Vikrama era commencing B.C. 57. Curiously enough, the Nēpāl Vēriśāvatī states that Vikramādiya came to Nēpāl, and established his era there. But this occurrence is allotted to the time of the predecessor of Amśuvārman; i.e. to the end of the sixth, or the beginning of the seventh, century A.D. And Pandit Bhagwanal Indraji has shewn that the statement is certainly quite wrong as regards the king and the particular era intended, and that what it probably contains is a reminiscence of the conquest of the country by Harshavarman of Kanañj, and the adoption of his era as the result. This statement, therefore, can have influenced him but little, if at all, in his assignment of the above-mentioned dates to the Vikrama era.

The real grounds for his doing so,—grounds which, in spite of the existence of the date of (Gupta)-Sāvatī 318 for Śivādeva I. and Amśuvārman, still require to be cleared away,—are to be found in his erroneous treatment of O. the inscription of Jayatāwa II. of (Harsha)-Sāvatī 153; No. 15, ante, Vol. IX. p. 178ff.

Starting with a mythological genealogy, this inscription carries the descent from the god Brahman (line 3), through Sūrya or the Sun,29 Manu, Ikṣvāku, and others, down to Rāghu, Aja, and Daśaratha (line 6). After Daśaratha there were eight kings, in lineal succession of sons and sons’ sons, who are passed over unnamed; and then there was the illustrious Liṅgha-vā. Then comes verse 6, which records that “even still,” at the time of the writing of the inscription, “there exists a family which bears the second name of Liṅgha-vā,”—svačchha-vā Liṅgha-vā-nāma-vigat-bhadrav-para-vaiśākha (line 7). Pandit Bhagwanal Indraji, in his lithograph, text, and translation, gave aparā vaiśākha, “a new . . . race . . . . . . . . . . which bears the pure name Liṅgha-vā.” But, on examining his original rubbing, I find that the real reading is aparā (nāma), “another name, a second name;”—not aparā (vaiśākha), “another race, a new race.” This verse, therefore, is of some interest, in showing that,—in addition to the appellation of Liṅghhavīva or Liṅghhavikul, the latter of which actually occurs in inscriptions A. B. and C,—the family had another original name, which, however, is not recorded. After Liṅghhavi there came some kings, who again are passed over unnamed, and the number of whom is illegible at the end of line 7 and the beginning of line 8; and then the illustrious king Ṣupuṣpa (line 8) was born at the city of Pushpapura.22 After him omitting in the interim (to mention the names of) twenty-three kings, there was another king, the famous Jaya-deva I., who is treated by Pandit Bhagwanal Indraji as the first really historical member of the family, and the founder of the Nēpāl branch of it,24 and on the Vikrama-Saṅvat theory, is placed about A.D. 1. After this “victorious” Jaya-deva I., and again “omitting in the interim (to mention the names of) eleven . . . . . kings,” the inscription gives the first unbroken succession of names that it contains; viz.—Viś hadēva;—his son, Saṅkaradēva;—his son, Dharmadēva;—his son, Mānaḍēva;—his son, Mahīdeva;—and his son, Vāsantaḍēva. The first four of these names have already been made known by inscription L, and the sixth, in the form of Vāsantaḍṇa, by inscription N. And these six kings plainly belong to the family the genealogy of which forms the subject of all therefore, relates to a period antecedent to the settlement of the Liṅghhavīs in Nēpāl.

30 In accordance with this, the Vēriśāvatī enters the historical Liṅghhavīs of this inscription as members of a Sūrya-vā family.
31 But the number was probably twelve, as hīl using the rod and each trace seems to suit best the metre and such traces as are discernible in the rubbing.
32 i.e. Pāpīputra, the modern Bihār. Ante, Vol. IX. p. 180, note 44.—This part of the inscription,
the preceding part of the inscription, viz. the Lichchhavikula.

Then follows, in lines 10 and 11, the eleventh verse, which has been entirely misunderstood by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajit, and which has, through that misunderstanding, led to the erroneous reference of the larger dates of his inscriptions to the Vikrama-Samvat. He read this verse—

Asy=antarê-pty-Udayadêva iti kshitiśay-\[\text{[tata]}\]=cha Narêndradevaḥ mân-ñmatê nata-samasta-narendra-ñauti-
mâlê-rajô-nikara-pâñjula-pâda-pîthaḥ \[\text{[tata]}\] and translated—“Afterwards came thirteen (rulers) sprang from king Udayadêva;” and then Narendradeva, who was proud, and whose footstool was covered with the dust from the row of diadems worn by numerous prostrated kings.” With the exception that the original has pûñkula, not pûñkula, the reading and translation of the second half of the verse represent the original correctly. It is the first half that has not been properly treated. In the first place, Asy=antarê does not mean “afterwards,” or “after him.” The literal meaning of unita is ‘an interval’; and in anantaram it helps to make up the equivalent of ‘afterwards,’ only from its meaning in the first place “no interval after . . . . . .” But, standing without the negative particle, Asyata can have no meaning but that of ‘interval’; and it is used twice before by the composer of this inscription, in lines 8 and 9, distinctly in that sense. Asy=antarê can only mean “in an interval of this”; and, supplying vaññaya, from the vaññaka of line 7, in opposition with Asyata, we have “in an interval, i.e. at an intervening point, of this (lineage that has just been detailed).” The expression plainly introduces some names in respect of which it is intended to be conveyed that they are of another family or branch, and that the last of them comes contemporaneously with or immediately after the name of Vasanta-deva, the last mentioned of the immediately preceding succession, and the first comes at some unspecified point intervening between Vyishadêva and Vasanta-deva. In the second place, Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajit’s reading of kshitiśay-jātās cannot be maintained. In the two aksharas jyātā, the rubbing shows distinctly the double āj, of which, in the lithograph, the lower one is only sketched in faintly, as if it were doubtful; but the second akshara is as distinctly ta, not tā, as is in fact shown in the lithograph. There is a slight abrasion mark between the ta and the following akshara, which does not appear in the lithograph; but the rubbing shows most distinctly that this mark is no remnant of a half-obiterated ā, and that the stroke for ā, for which in fact there is no room, never was engraved here. The reading of the original, in short, is jātās, the nominative singular,—not jātās, the nominative plural. This is the first objection to the more serious error, the introduction of trayoñḍaśa, ‘thirteen,’ immediately after jātās. The second is that, of the six following aksharas which are real s-trayoñḍaśa [tata], the only parts that can be pronounced on with any certainty, are s, as part of the first, and, at the beginning of line 11, da, the third, which is well preserved and unmistakable. The others are hopelessly injured and unrecognisable; and,—with the exception that the first probably had a t below the s; and that the second looks more like thā (thādā), or dā (tādā), or pō (topā), than ye,—it is quite impossible, even from the rubbing, to say what they may be. But the culminating and final objection to the reading of trayoñḍaśa [tata] = cha is, that in the passage, as thus read, there is no such word as vyātiyā, vīḍyā, hitā, or yiṣṭikā, “having passed over or omitted (to mention the names of),” which we have in lines 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9, where, in each case, a specified number of kings is passed over,—and that the metre does not allow of our introducing any such word. The lacuna at the end of line 10 and the beginning of line 11 render it, as I said, impossible to decide what the original reading was.”
may have been. But the whole structure of the passage leaves no doubt whatever that the original contained nothing but an epithet, or perhaps two, of Nārendrādeva, and that,—so far from thirteen rulers having intervened between him and Udayādeva,—he was the son of Udayādeva.

Nārendrādeva's son was Śivādeva II (l. 12), who married Vatsadēvi, of the family of the Maukharies, who abounded in strength of arm,28 the daughter of the illustrious Bhogāvarman, and the daughter of the daughter of "the great"29 Ādityasēna, the lord of Magadha (l. 13). And their son was the Rāja, the illustrious Jayādeva II (l. 14), also called Parmachakrākīma (l. 18), whose wife was Rājamati, of the family of king Bhagadatta or of the Bhagadatta kings (l. 16), the daughter of Harsha, king of Gauḍa, Īḍra, &c., and Kaliṅga, and Kāgala (l. 18). The rest of the inscription details the beauty of the silver water-lily which Jayādeva II. caused to be made, and how it was worshipped and installed by his mother Vatsadēvi, and then concludes with the date.

Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji's acceptance of Udayādeva as the successor of Vasantādeva, and insertion of thirteen rulers between him and Nārendrādeva, led of necessity to the reference of the dates for Mānādeva of (I.) 386 and (K.) 413, and for Vasantādeva of (N.) 435, to the Vikrama era. It is unnecessary to repeat his calculations in full. But, starting with fifteen names between Vasantādeva and Śivādeva II., or nineteen from Mānādeva to Śivādeva II. (both included), all of which denote "generations of kings, not reigns of collaterals,"30 and taking twenty-one years as the smallest possible average for these generation-reigns,—he found that no era later than the Vikrama era would meet the requirements of the case, and that era would meet them. For, on the Vikrama-Saṅvat theory, Mānādeva's first date represented A.D. 329;—the interval from this to A.D. 750, the date of Jayādeva II., was 420 years;—and this, divided by 19, gave about twenty-two and three-quarters years as the average for each generation-reign. This was all right enough from his point of view.

But let us now take the matter from the correct point of view; viz. that Udayādeva did not come after Vasantādeva. This frees us at once from the necessity, under which Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji laboured, of forcing Vasantādeva and his ancestors back to such early times; and leaves us at liberty to follow the analogy of inscription A., and to refer his date and Mānādeva's to the Gupta era. The result is that we have for Vasantādeva the date of (N.) A.D. 754-55, just synchronous with the dates of perhaps (M.) A.D. 751, and certainly (O.) A.D. 759-60 for Jayādeva II., exactly what inscription O. seeks to convey;—and we have for Mānādeva, the grandfather of Vasantāsēna, the dates of (I.) A.D. 705-6 and (K.) A.D. 732-33, just about one generation before Jayādeva II.'s father Śivādeva II., for whom we have the dates of (J.) A.D. 725-26 and probably (L.) A.D. 749-50 (?).

Here the question naturally suggests itself,—as Udayādeva and his descendants were not successors and descendants of Vasantāsēna, who were they? I think the answer is perfectly plain,—that they were successors of Aṃśūvarman, and, though not his direct lineal descendants, belonged, like him, to the family in which the Vaiśāvaiti is called the Thākuri family.

Inscription O., in fact, furnishes another instance of the double government of Nepāl, to which Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji has drawn attention in the case of Śivādeva I. and Aṃśūvarman, and which is illustrated in the most pointed way throughout the inscriptions. We have two separate families, ruling contemporaneously and mostly on equal terms, but each preserving certain distinctive characteristics of its own. On the one side, we have the Lichihaśvīkula of the inscriptions, the Sūryavāsi family of the Vaiśāvaiti,—issuing its charters from the house or palace called Mānagiri,—and using the Gupta era. And on the other side, we have a family the name of which is not given in the inscriptions hitherto brought to notice, but which in the Vaiśāvaiti is called the Thākuri family,—issuing its charters from the house or palace called Kailāsakūta—

28 The original has dat evaḥ̄hau-vabāhau-adhyāya-Maukhari-sukha śīvarmanas &c.; not kula-śīvarmaṇa, in composition, as in the published text.
29 mahātaḥ.
bhāvanā,—and using the Harsha era.
To the former belong inscriptions A. B. I. K. N. and P.; and it was represented in A.D. 637-38 by Śivādeva I. (in A.D. 654-55 by Dhruvādeva), in A.D. 705-6 and 732-33 by Māṇadēva, and in A.D. 754-55 by Vaṃsantāśena or Vasantādeva. While to the latter belong inscriptions C. D. E. F. G. H. J. L. M. and O.; and it was represented in A.D. (637-38), 640-41, 645-46, and 651-52 (?) by Aṃśuvarman, in A.D. 654-55 by Jīshnugupta, in A.D. 725-26 and 749-50 (?) by Śivādeva II, and in A.D. 751-52 (?) and 759-60 by Jayādeva II. From the fact that each of the two families issued its charters from a palace, not a town,—and the fact that all the inscriptions are either at ‘Kāmāṇḍu’ itself, or close in the neighbourhoivd,—the two palaces of Māṇagriha and Kailāsakūṭabhāvanā appear to have been in the immediate vicinity of each other, in different divisions of one and the same ancient capital. And,—though the inscriptions give no specific information on this point,—from the fact that the order of Aṃśuvarman recorded in inscription D. is issued to the officials of the western province, and from the way in which, in inscription I., Māṇadēva is described as marching to the east and reducing to obedience the rebellious Sāmantas there, and then returning to the west, it seems pretty clear that the Lichchhāvikula or Sūryavātis family had the government of the territory to the east of the capital, and the Thākuri family of the territory to the west of it.

Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji has treated Aṃśuvarman as if he was at first the feudatory of Śivādeva I. There is, however, nothing in the inscriptions to support this. The inscriptions of Śivādeva I., it is true, record acts that were done by him “on the advice,” or “at the request,” of Aṃśuvarman; but this expression, though often used in respect of feudatories and officials, does not of necessity imply any state of subordination. And, whereas Śivādeva I. uses in respect of himself only the feudatory title of Mahārāja, in his own inscriptions he allot to Aṃśuvarman the equal title of Mahāsāṃanta,—not simply Sāṃanta, as represented almost throughout by Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji. The co-ordinate nature of the two titles is shewn by the Nirmanḍ plate, which couples them both with the names of Samudrasēna and all his ancestors. And a third title, Mahāsadvāvpati, seems to have denoted equal rank with these two; since the Wal' clay seal of Pushyēva gives him the two titles of Mahārāja and Mahāsadvāvpati; and the same two titles are coupled in the same way in a fragmentary inscription of the Yaudhāya tribe at Bījayagārdh. Śivādeva I. and Aṃśuvarman were only co-ordinate feudatories of a paramount sovereign, viz. Harshavardhana of Kanauj. During the time when Aṃśuvarman was a Mahārājadhēvi or a paramount sovereign, as recorded in inscription F., the Lichchhāvī tribe were of course feudatory to him. This was after his inscription C. of A.D. 640-41. His other two inscriptions D. and E., which give him no titles except that of sri, “the illustrious, or the glorious,” perhaps belong to a transitional period, when he hesitated about adopting the paramount title, and yet was unwilling to use a feudatory title any longer. He probably assumed the paramount rank and title, on the death of Harshavardhana, when, as Ma-twain tells us, the kingdom of Kanauj fell into a state of anarchy, and the minister Nafo-tala-na-shu usurped the supreme power. And Aṃśuvarman is probably the king of Nēpāl, who came with seven thousand horsemen to help the Chinese general Wang-hiwen-tse who defeated the usurper. In the time of Dhruvādeva and Jīshnugupta, it is possible that the Thākuri family may to a certain extent have acknowledged the Lichchhāvīs as superiors to them. But Śivādeva II. again had the paramount title and rank; and the Lichchhāvīs were then, of course, again the feudatories of the Thākuri family. Finally, the fact that the Lichchhāvi genealogy is given in the Thākuri inscription O., coupled with the use by Jayādeva II. in this inscription of no title but that of Rāja (line 14), with the epithet sri, “the illustrious”—may perhaps

39 From Jīshnugupta’s inscription F.
38 From Śivādeva I.’s inscription A.
36 ante, Vol. XII. p. 274ff.—The syllables sā and are destroyed, at the end of line 3; but there can be no doubt as to the correctness of Dr. Bühler’s restoration of them.
35 Notice at p. 8 above.
34 ante, Vol. IX. p. 50.
indicate that at this latter time the Thākuris again acknowledged a certain amount of superiority on the part of the Lichchhavis. Or it may be nothing more than another expression of the mutual courtesy of the two families, already exhibited in the inscriptions of Śivādeva I. and Jīshnugupta.

In conclusion, Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajī’s “Table of the Lichchhavi Kings of Nēpāl” requires to be entirely recast, thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE OF THE EARLY RULERS OF NEPAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE LICHCHHAVI OR SUBRAYAMSI FAMILY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF MANAGRIHA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Jayādeva I.—About A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330-355.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Names not recorded in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A.D. 355-830.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivādeva I., Mahādeva—A.D. 637.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vīshādeva.—About A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630-655.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhruvādeva, Mahādeva—A.D. 654.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Mahādeva, son of preceding.—About A.D. 733-753.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Vasantasūṇa, or Vasantadēva, Mahādeva, son of preceding.—A.D. 754.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE THAKURI FAMILY</th>
<th>OF KAILASAKUTABHAYANA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anūsūvarman, Mahādeva, and afterwards Mahādevadhāra—A.D. 637, 640, 645, and 651 (?).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jīshnugupta.—A.D. 654.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udayādeva.—About A. D. 675-700.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narānādādeva, son of preceding.—About A. D. 700-724.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śivādeva II., Mahādevadhāra, son of preceding.—A.D. 725 and 749 (?).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayādeva II., Rāṇa, son of preceding.—A.D. 751 (?) and 759.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Lichchhavi family, the earliest name for which we have as yet a definite date, is that of Śivādeva I., A.D. 637-38. And either Śivādrīdhāvarman, No. 14 in the Vahāvālī list of the Sāryavaṃśi family, or Śivāvārman, No. 16 in the same, seems to be intended for him. The next name is that of Dhruvādeva, A.D. 654-55, who is not given or represented in the Vahāvālī. The connection between Śivādeva I. and Dhruvādeva is as yet explained. But they probably belonged both to one branch of the family; though, from their not being mentioned in inscription O., certainly not to the same branch with Vasantadēva and his ancestors. Their contemporaries of the Thākurī family were respectively Anūsūvarman and Jīshnugupta. They were followed by another branch of the same family introduced (about A.D. 630-655, not A.D. 260) by Vṛisadēva, who was the contemporary of Śivādeva I. and represented, as far as definite dates go,
by Mánadéva in A.D. 705-6 and 732-33 (not A.D. 329 and 356), and by Vasaantasena or Vasantaadéva in A.D. 754-55 (not A.D. 378). The six names from Vyishadéva to Vasaantasena are given correctly in the Vanisávali, as Nos. 18 to 23 of the Suryavamsi family. If inscription O. is to be accepted throughout, this branch of the family was founded by Jayadéva I. He is doubtless the person who is intended by Jayavarman, No. 3 in the Vanisávali list of the Suryavamsi family. And, calculating back fifteen generations, at the average rate of twenty-five years, from Mánadéva, whose generation is represented by his recorded dates, we have for Jayadéva I. the date of about A.D. 330 to 355, not A.D. 1. But if Vyishadéva was a direct lineal descendant of Jayadéva I., it is rather peculiar that the composer of inscription O, writing only five generations after him, was unable to give the names of the persons, only eleven in number, who intervened before him and after Jayadéva I. —In the Thákuri family, the earliest name is that of Amisvarman, with the extreme dates of A.D. 637 and 651 (?); and the next is that of Jishugupta; A.D. 654-55. Amisvarman is mentioned in the Vanisávali, under exactly the same name, as the founder of the Thákuri family; but Jishugupta's name is not given or represented. The connection between them is not as yet explained. —They were followed by Udyaadéva (about A.D. 675-700, not A.D. 400) and his descendants, who, from there being no mention of Amisvarman and Jishugupta in inscription O, plainly belonged to another branch of the family. Udyaadéva was contemporaneous with Dharmadéva of the Lichchhavî family; he is not mentioned in the Vanisávali, being certainly not the Udyaadéva Varman, No. 24, in the Vanisávali list of the Suryavamsi family. His son, Naréndradéva, is possibly the person intended by Naréndradéva No. 7, in the Vanisávali list of the Thákuri family. His son, Śivadéva II. is not mentioned in the Vanisávali. His son Jayadéva II. is possibly the person intended by Jayadéva, No. 11 in the Vanisávali list of the Thákuri family.

THE DATE OF THE KOTA BUDDHIST INSCRIPTION OF THE SAMANTA DEVADATTA.

This inscription has been edited by Dr. Hultsch at page 45ff. above. The reading of the date given there is — Samvat śarañaka (read samvatśarañaka) 7 Mañhā śudi 6 | —— "In the (regnal) year, in figures; 7, on the 6th day of the bright half of Mañhā."

Even if only because of the peculiar way in which, according to this emendation, mañhā is compounded with śarañaka, this is not at all a satisfactory rendering of the date, and must certainly be abandoned. And, in his original edition of the inscription, in the Jour. Germ. Or. Soc. Vol. XXXVIII. p. 546ff., Dr. Hultsch had interpreted the date differently—Samvat sa 541 Mañhā śudi 6 | with the suggestion that the sa might represent either kata, 'hundreds,' or the numerical symbol for 100, or Śaka, the name of the era.

I now give a lithograph of the date, reduced from the lithograph given with Dr. Hultsch's original notice, and compared by me with the paper-rubbing of the inscription: —

1 Not of the fortnight, but of the month; and in accordance with the arrangement indicated by Runes Thalag. — "The preceding dark portion, and the following light portion, together form a month" (Beal's Budhdh. Rec. West. World, Vol. I. p. 71.)
THE CHANDRAGUPTA AND VIKRAMADITYA OF THE UDAYAGIRI AMRITA CAVE INSRIPTION.

This inscription, published by me in this Journal, Vol. XIII. p. 185, is dated (Vikrama-Samvat 1093 (A.D. 1036-37). The object of it is to record the visit of a pilgrim named Kanha to the cave. But the really interesting part of the record is the statement, in lines 5 to 8, that the cave was made by Chandragupta, and that the reign of Vikramaditya came after that event.

I quoted this as apparently a record of tradition of the eleventh century A.D.,—to be taken for what it may be worth,—to the effect that the reign of the Vikramaditya, after whom the Vikrama era was named, was at least subsequent to the time of Chandragupta II. of the Early Gupta dynasty.

At page 61 above, Dr. Burgess has suggested that the statement refers to the great Maurya king Chandragupta, of the fourth century B.C., and a Vikramaditya who is given as his son by one of the Mackenzie palm-leaf Telugu MSS. at Madras.

But,—judging by the lists in the Vishnu and other Puranas (see Hall’s edition of Wilson’s translation of the Vishnu-Purana, Vol. IV. pp. 186-190 and notes)—no such person was known of in Northern India. And there is nothing whatever to connect Chandragupta, the Maurya, with the Udayagiri hill. On the other hand, there are two inscriptions in other caves on the hill, which mention a name that is unmistakably that of Chandragupta II. of the Early Gupta dynasty;—one of them recording that he actually came in person to the hill; on which occasion the “Tawa Cave” was excavated by the order of his minister Virasena, otherwise called Saba, who accompanied him.

As regards the age of the “Amrita Cave,”—there is no inscription to shew the period to which it must be allotted. But General Cunningham1 is of opinion,—from the more copious decoration of the pillars, and their new style,—that it is the latest of all the Udayagiri caves. At any rate, therefore, it is not earlier than the “Tawa Cave.”

It is possible that the mention of the name of Vikramaditya, is due to nothing but a dim knowledge of the fact that this was a title2 of Chandragupta II. But,—whatever opinion may be held as to the identity of this Vikramaditya,—all the circumstances of the case render it beyond a doubt that the Chandragupta who is referred to is Chandragupta II. of the Early Gupta dynasty.

BOOK NOTICES.


Dr. Peterson’s Second Report follows the First after a reasonable interval, and is like the latter replete with matter both interesting and calculated to advance our knowledge of Sanskrit literature. Though Dr. Peterson spent the autumn vacation of the year under report, 1883-84, on leave in Europe, he nevertheless found time to pay at Christmas a visit to the famous library of the Mahârâja of Alwar—a fact which speaks highly for his energy and his zeal in the good cause. His trouble has been rewarded by a number of important discoveries. The list of Vedic works in the Alwar collection, given at pp. 167-183, as well as the remarks in the body of the Report, show that the fame of the library has not been exaggerated, and that the Mahârâja really possesses a considerable number of rare books.

Among the MSS. referring to the Rigveda those containing the sacred books of the Sânkhâyanas are particularly valuable. It is very probable that, as Dr. Peterson contends (pp. 4-7) the MSS. of the Sânkhâta contain the text which the Sânkhâyanas at present study. Whether it is the same as that to which their old Sûtras refer is another question altogether and very doubtful. Copies of the Kaushitakibrahmaṇbhâthya by Vinâyaka, which in the list stands erroneously as No. 33 under the heading Āsvalâyaṇa-Sákha, as well as of the fragments of Varadatâ's and Ânartiya's commentaries on the Srautasthāras ought to be procured for the Government collection. The latter possesses only incomplete transcripts of the Brâhmaṇabhâthya and nothing but the text of the Śrûtarâtras (Nârâyana’s commentary on the Gîyùstas) is represented by a good old copy in the Collection of 1879-80. It will also be advisable to have Lakshmîmidhara’s Galitâdiplâk (No. 35, p. 168) copied. The question

2 See, for instance, the silver coins, the legends of which are given at p. 65 f. above.
3 Reprinted from the Oesterreichische Monatschrift für den Orient.
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of the Gailas deserves more attention than it has received hitherto; the old copy of the Dipika, bought in 1879-80, is defective. Dr. Peterson is right in declaring (p. 8) the Sudarshanamáhíti (p. 167, No. 7) an erroneous entry. The MS. undoubtedly contains Sudarshanáya's commentary on the Āpastamba-Grihyasutra. The book is common in Southern India, and is represented in Dr. Burnell's collection, lately purchased by the India Office. An examination of it, which my pupil, Mr. Winternitz, has made, shows that it is partly based on Haradatta's Anúkula-Vritti (Elphinston College Collection of 1867-68), referring to the same work. The discovery of a new MS. of Dyá Drivéda's Nātimmari (pp. 8 and 102-103) which gives the date of the author, is extremely interesting. As Dyá Drivéda wrote in Sárvat 1110, he preceded Sáyanácharaya probably by 300 years, and it is evident that the latter author must have copied from him or that both have drawn on a common older source.

Dr. Peterson's hope (p. 9) that the second Alwar MS. of the Black-Yajurveda-Saúhitá may contain the Átrayik-Sákhá, will, I fear, prove deceptive. For the published edition of the Taittiriya text shows also the division into Kándas and Prapáthakas; and the number of the Prapáthakas in the complete Kándas agrees exactly with the latter. Among the works belonging to the White-Yajurveda No. 62, the Manusástra deserves to be examined. No. 115, said to contain the Grijí-ganátrakáhdyamántras (Po. Dívamisír) is, I suspect, Bhágvata on the manuscripts of the Práśabhrangíyásatra. If so, it ought to be copied for Government as the similar work of Murúrimi No. 2 of 1872-73, is defective. The collection of the Athreya-MSS. includes, besides the Vaidnábhásháya, noticed by Dr. Peterson, two very rare works, the Práthidhábhádhyás, Nos. 16-17, the only known copy of which is in the Chambers Collection at Berlin, and the Saúhitá-viśheśvarána (No. 31), a commentary on a portion of the Kaúšikágríhyásatra. The only known copy of this Vritti is in the Bombay Government Collection of 1870.

From the discussion of the Vedic MSS. Dr. Peterson turns (pp. 10-21) to an analysis of some books connected with the Kavyaprakásha, which he found in Alwar and Jeypur libraries. The first work noticed is Vidyábhúshána's Saúhitáyakaumudí which possesses some historical interest, as it makes mention in the mañagha of the Vaishnava sectarian Chaitanya (circa 1485 A.D.) who according to the commentary, the Krishnánsánti, was the author's "most beloved teacher," and of the conversion of Gajapati, i.e., Pratáparudra of Utka (not Atkula, as the spelling is, p. 13) or Orissa by Chaitanya. The Sáhitáyakaumudí is an independent commentary on the Káriká of the Kavyaprakásha; and with respect to the origin of the latter its author gives expression to an opinion, similar to that which Dr. Peterson tried to establish in his First Report. He alleges that the Káriká do not belong to Mamma, but to Bharatamuni, the reputed founder of the Sáhitá, Nátyá, and Sángita Sástras. The same story is mentioned also in a commentary of the Kavyaprakásha, Jayaráma's Tilaka (pp. 21 and 107), but is rejected as improvable. Dr. Peterson, though very naturally gratified by the discovery that the learned in India, too, have doubted the unity of Mamma's textbook, finds it necessary to alter his former opinion. He has now recognised that the meaning which I attributed in my review of his First Report to the verse ṭhy ātha mardá viśudhahā viśhinus, etc., is correct, and expresses his approval of the view of Jayanta, who explained the Kavyaprakásha in 1294 A.D. and ascribes both the Káriká and their commentary to one author (p. 20). Under these circumstances I will not quarrel with Dr. Peterson for his note (p. 16) on my explanation of the passage tadasahau etc., though I see no reason for retracting my former remarks. In connexion with this subject I will add that Jayaráma's remark "some of Mamma's Káriká are found in Bharata's Saúhitá" probably furnishes the clue to Vidyábhúshána's story. Two other works, Ruchaka's Kavyaprakásha-Sántika and Ratnánartha's Sármsamuchchayaša, a novel, are used in order to settle Mamma's date, which is fixed in the first half of the twelfth century. A note at the end of the Sántika calls this work kṛti rājñam-kamam-at-kumarakarhakasinm; and the somewhat corrupt colophon of the first Ulláś speaks of the śrāvīrṇakamalamammaratukavirachita-nágasthakādyapradhasanaikika. Hence Dr. Peterson, who corrects: "rājñamcallo" to "rājñakalaka," infers that the Sántika and its original were the joint production of the three authors, Mamma, Alaka and Ruchaka. Alaka is known, as Dr. Peterson showed in his first report and again proves in the present one, as the author of the end of the Kavyaprakásha. Ruchaka he identifies with Manka's teacher Ruyyaka who flourished in the reign of Jayasinha of Kaśmir and wrote a treatise on poetry, called Alankaśra-svara. In support of this identification he uses the Sármsamuchchaya, a work chiefly based on Jayanta's ancient commentary of 1294 A.D. It quotes an Alankaśra-svara by Ruchaka and a commentary on an Alankaśra-svara by Alaka. The fact that we have two almost
homonymous authors, either of whom is credited with an Alankārārasarvāsa, as well as the discovery that Alaka completed the Kṛṣṇapratīka and commented on an Alankārārasarvāsa, make Dr. Peterson's inferences very tempting. If I, nevertheless, hesitate to accept them without reserve, it is:—1, because, as far as I remember, the Sāṅkhāra is, according to the Kamīrīnirn Panjāpt and MSS. No. 247 of the Deccan College Collection of 1875-76, the independent work of Ruchaka;—2, because the substitution of Ruchaka for Ruyyaka is not easily explicable either on phonetic or palaeographic grounds;—and 3, because Alankārārasarvāsa is a not uncommon title for works on poetics. A full solution of these difficulties is easily possible, if Dr. Peterson will compare the Deccan College MSS., and will look out the quotations from Ruchaka's work in the Bombay copies of Ruyyaka's Sāṅkhāra.

In spite of these objections to details, I agree with Dr. Peterson with respect to Mammata's age. I do not think that he can have written, as I formerly supposed, as late as the 13th century. For a note in a Jaina Prabandha and a renewed examination of my acquisitions of 1873-74 have taught me that Sūmāvara, the court-poet and Purūhita of Viradhañvala and Visalādāva of Dholkā wrote a commentary on the Kṛṣṇapratīka, and that a copy of his work is found in No. 66 of the Deccan College Collection of 1873-74. Its full title is Bhūtā-Sūmāvaro-vīračita-Kāyāḍāp- Kṛṣṇapratīkasamāhita. If a Gujarāti poet of the first half of the thirteenth century thought it worth his while to explain the work of a Kamīrīn, the latter cannot be placed later than the twelfth century.

To the following remarks on some other works found in Alwar libraries (pp. 22-23), chief among which is "the Gōlādhyāya of an astronomical Siddhānta which professes to be a part of the missing and long-sought-for Rōmaka-Siddhānta" I must add that the extracts at p. 110 do not bear out the assertion made. Portions of the genuine Rōmaka-Siddhānta, as well as of the equally important Vāsishtha-Siddhānta are, I think, contained in No. 34 of the Deccan College Collection of 1870, No. 78 of 1883-69 and Nos. 35-36 of 1870. All these MSS., as well as Dr. Peterson's new one, ought to be examined by a competent astronomer like Dr. Thibaut.

Next Dr. Peterson proceeds to an analysis of two new works, cursorily noticed in the First Report,—Dāmadeñaragupta's Sambhallmat, pp. 23-33, and Sūmādēva's Yaśastilaka, pp. 34-49. The former is an early specimen of Indian papyrus, similar to and possibly the prototype of Kāñcānḍena's Samayamātrāvītā. Though, like the latter, it is written with considerable verse, its contents do not it to neglect. The chief value of the find will probably be that it teaches us what Kāñcānḍa, (Śāntaratnagīt, vi. 495) means when he calls the poet Dāmadeñaragupta, whom Jayāpida made his minister, kaśīvatākāvīyaṃ. The Yaśastilaka, which turns out to have been written in 959 A.D. (not in 825, as the First Report asserted) and to be not a historical poem, but an ordinary Jaina romance, written in order to elucidate the doctrines of the sect, possesses yet some interest on account of its numerous quotations from Kāvya and Śāstras. Very important is the mention of the poet Rājaśekhara along with Kālidāsa and Māgha. Rājaśekhara's time is now pretty well defined by his quoting Asandavardhana, circiter 850 A.D., and by his being quoted in Sūmādēva's work. Professor Bāndār kar's note on the kings mentioned in the colophon of the Yaśastilaka, pp. 47-49, is carefully done and exhaustive.

The remaining portion of the Report is taken up with notices of some books purchased during the year 1883-84. The discovery of a Vīravratīdaya (pp. 49-57) which differs from the well-known bulky volumes on Āchāra and Vīvahāra and is simply a commentary on Vījñavallka, possesses considerable importance for the practical lawyer, because Mitramiśra is one of the authorities recognised by the law courts. For the history of Vījñavallka's text, its value, I fear, will be small, because its date is very late. Copies of Viśvarūpa's Vṛttika and Dēevādēha's Vṛttī would be more welcome. Historically interesting is the new volume of elegant extracts, the Harihārarālti, from which Dr. Peterson deduces (pp. 57-64) numerous valuable details. I can notice here only one point. If Rājaśekhara did write a Bhājaprabandha (pp. 59-60), its hero cannot be the famous Pramāra Bhoja of Dhar, who certainly did not begin to reign in 966 A.D., as his inscriptions and his Kāraṇa are dated from 60-80 years later. I will add that Dr. Peterson can render a very great service to his colleagues, if he will see that all the Sanskrit anthologies are printed. The owner of the Nīrṇayasāgar Press will probably undertake what cannot be inscribed in the Bombay Sanskrit Series.

In Jñānavimala's commentary on Mahēśvara's Śabdabhōjapratīka (No. 100, pp. 64-65) Dr. Peterson has found the exceedingly important statement that the Aindra grammar begins with the words sīdhāra anukūtādādā vṛddhā. This discovery settles, indeed, the question, if an Aindra grammar really existed; it also raises the hope that the work may still be found in one of the Jaina libraries.
The remarks on the value of Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra are very true. The earliest poets whose works we possess, seem to have carefully studied it and to have used its rules for their compositions. The best commentary on Vātsyāyana is, as the English translation (printed by the Hindoo Kāmasūtra Society, London, 1888, for private circulation) states, the Jāgamaṅgala-Vṛittī, written in the 13th century. I regret that I cannot "forgive" Dr. Peterson's suggestion that the Hindus derived their Kāmasūtra from the Ionian Greeks. Many passages in Vedic literature and in the Buddhist Vinaya make it perfectly believable that this "science" is of true Indian growth.

The last twenty pages refer to Jaina and especially to Digamba works. Vasumanditā's Achārayāti, the Tālītāvṛttī, the Cāmasūtra, the Dīpāntarajñāna, the Śatāparahitaśāstra, with a commentary, and Merutunga's Prabhavatāntāna are very valuable acquisitions. It may be noted that two copies of the text of the first work are found in the Collection of 1875-76, Nos. 656-57, and that the usual title of the book is Mālādhara. Merutunga's Prabhavatāntāna is included in the Collection of 1873-74. Dr. Peterson's remarks on these and other Jaina works are most instructive and the extracts in the Appendix judiciously selected. One might, however, have wished to learn something definite about Samantabhadra's Prākrit grammar, No. 96 of his list, and about the Digamba Bīrāhikapabdahṣa. In 1876 Panjita Phalāchālā and Chinānadhī protested that the Bīrāhikapabdahṣa was a Śvetāmbara forgery (Ind. Ant. Vol. VII. p. 29). What proofs are there that the MS. found is a Digamba book? It is also a matter of deep regret to me to see the discussion on the Jaināpattirāpana (pp. 67-74) disregarded by an unnecessarily bitter attack on Dr. Kielhorn. Dr. Kielhorn's identification of its reputed author Pāṇjaḍā with the Tīrthaśākara Vardhamāna is no doubt erroneous. But there is no need to represent his view, which was a very natural inference from the few facts known to him, as a dire offence. Dr. Peterson's remarks, the correctness of which is disputed by Mr. Paṭhak, and seems by no means certain, show that the questions of Pāṇjaḍā's identity and age are surrounded with great difficulties. I am at present not prepared to give a definite opinion on the disputed points, whether Pāṇjaḍā's other and real name was Dēvānand or Gūnamand, whether the Paṭḍamāstuka belongs to Śrāvakārī or to Dēvānand, and whether Pāṇjaḍā lived in the fifth century A.D. or in the seventh. But I must call attention to one fact: viz. that Pāṇjaḍādā is doubtlessly a biruda or honorific epithet, not the real name of a Yāti. Though it may be customary to designate Dēvānand or Gūnamand by this term, just as it is usual to call Kumārābhāṣṭa, Bhaṣṭrādā, yet there must have been many Jainā Pāṇjaḍās, just as there are many Bhaṣṭas. Hence the utmost caution is necessary in using inscriptions or passages from books which mention a Pāṇjaḍā for fixing the date of the Pāṇjaḍā.

In conclusion, I can only congratulate Dr. Peterson on the results of his work in 1883-84, and express the hope that the Third Report will make us acquainted with a still greater number of Ratnas, and will show a still more rigorous exclusion of all works of doubtful value from the list of purchases.

G. Bühler.


"A hundred years have elapsed—a century of arduous and unremitting labour, and the time has now arrived for a review of the progress made and of the services rendered to the cause of literature and science by the Asiatic Society of Bengal since its foundation." Such are the opening words of the valuable volume before us, a volume which we owe to the united labours of Dr. Rajendralal Mitra, Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, and Mr. P. N. Bose, and which will be received with gratitude by all who take an interest in India and in Oriental studies generally. The Asiatic Society of Bengal may indeed be proud of what it has accomplished since the days of its foundation; and its centenary festival could not have been celebrated in a more fitting manner than by placing before the world a record of the names and labours of its distinguished members, who—few of them trained to be scholars or Orientalists by profession—have opened up new fields of inquiry, and have made discoveries which must ever rouse the grateful admiration of later generations, and have laid the foundations of many branches of study, which, thanks to their genius and painstaking toil, we are prosecuting with ease, and with some hope of completing the building designed by them. But there was another, if we may say so, more practical reason why such a record, as has now been presented to us, should have been written. The Researches, the Journal, and the Proceedings of the Society fill, we are told, no less than 103 volumes. "These 103 volumes represent, roughly speaking, a total of 50,000 pages of
closely printed matter, replete with innumerable essays, papers, monographs, and notes of great interest." By most men these volumes can be consulted only in one of our large public libraries; and a scholar interested in any particular subject in coins or inscriptions, language or literature, manners or religion, geology or geography, &c., even when within reach of one of the centres of learning, has had to search through many volumes in order to ascertain what, or where, or whether anything had been written on it in this Society's journals. Such search, if not rendered altogether unnecessary, has now been at least greatly facilitated by this Centenary Review.

As has been suggested above, the Review consists of three parts. In the first part Dr. Rajendralal Mitra has sketched what may be called the outward history of the Society; how it was founded by Sir W. Jones; what rules were made from time to time regarding the election of members, their contributions, meetings, &c.; how the Society acquired a house of its own, and founded and extended its library; what gifts were made to it of coins, inscriptions and other objects of interest; how it created the finest Museum in India, undertook the completion of a series of valuable works, the printed sheets of which had been directed by Government "to be sold as waste paper," gave its liberal assistance to Oriental publications of all kind, and particularly established and successfully carried on the Bibliotheca Indica, &c. Towards the end Dr. R. Mitra has given a few personal notices of some of the most renowned scholars with whom the name of the Society is intimately associated, of Sir W. Jones, F. H. Colebrooke, Sir Charles Wilkins, H. H. Wilson, James Prinsep, B. H. Hodgson, and others; and in four appendices he has added a statement showing the number of members from time to time, a list of the officers of the Society from 1784 to 1833, a list of the books published directly or indirectly by the Society, and finally a valuable alphabetical index of the papers and contributions to the Asiatic Researches and the Journal and Proceedings of the Society.

The literary work done by members of the Society or under its auspices has been more fully detailed in the second and third parts of the Review, the former composed by Dr. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle and the latter by Mr. P. N. Bose. Dr. Hoernle has arranged the matter which fell to his share under the heads of Antiquities, Coins, Ancient Indian Alphabets, History, Languages and Literature; and Mr. Bose has described the achievements in Mathematical and Physical Science, Geology, Zoology, Botany, Geography, Ethnology, and Chemistry. Under similar headings both scholars have appended to their own account and estimate of what has been done, accurate classified indices of all the papers in the Society's publications arranged in the order in which they have been published,—indices which will prove of very great value to future inquirers. That both Dr. Hoernle and Mr. Bose have had to go through an immense amount of reading is evident from the innumerable references which are crowded together in the pages of their reviews. It is equally certain that what they have done has been a labour of love to themselves, and that they will earn the gratitude of many scholars for what they have so successfully accomplished.

Where three men have done so much to ensure our grateful acknowledgment of their services, it would seem inviolate to single out one of them for particular praise. But there can be no doubt that, of the scholars named, it is Dr. Hoernle, whose task has been the most laborious; just as it is his share of the work which will prove of the greatest interest to most readers of the Indian Antiquary. The great discoveries which form the foundation of our knowledge of the history of Ancient India, the decipherment of the Indian alphabets which will ever render illustrious the names of men such as James Prinsep and Alexander Cunningham, and the researches of Prinsep, Thomas, and others, into the coinages of various Indian dynasties, were indeed sure to prove attractive themes to a scholar who combines accuracy in details with a wide range of reading; and the account which he has given of them will in turn be regarded as perhaps the most attractive portion of this Centenary Review. That opinions should differ regarding some of the statements made by Dr. Hoernle, and the views suggested by him, is only natural, when we remember how fragmentary is our knowledge of the history of India, and how often new discoveries force us to cast aside what were before accepted facts. It is true that some scholars do consider A.D. 186 as the initial year of the Gupta era, and that some do place the accession of Kanishka A.D. 78; though an impartial examination of all the evidence available would appear to prove that the Gupta era really commenced A.D. 319, and that Kanishka must have reigned long after the date assigned to him. But such and similar details in no wise detract from the value of the work before us; and the writer of this notice feels sure that all readers will join him in thanking both those who designed, and those who were directly instrumental in bringing about the publication of the Centenary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

F. KIELHORN.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abda, a mountain mentioned by Héma-chandra</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abdhinagarli, another name of Dvara-kā</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abēria of the Periplus denotes the Abhiras</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhita-lā, a town, references to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhinav-Pampa, a Kanaresque poet, flourished just before Śaka-Svant 1076</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhiras, a tribe (Abēria of the Periplus, and Abēriā of Ptolemy) references to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhisaras, Abhissaras, a tribe, references to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abēriā of Ptolemy denotes the Abhiras</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abisares, Abisesares; see Embisesaros</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aborigines of India, religion of the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achāra-Sāra of Viraṇandi was finished in Śaka-Svant 1076</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achāra used in the sense of a master (mason)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achēhōdā, a river and lake in the Himalaya mountains, references to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achiravati river; see Ajiravati</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achyu-tadantī, or Achyutantī, a warrior tribe, reference to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achyuta-thala, a place in the Paśjāb, reference to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ādāra, a district in the north, reference to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ādhipātana, a city, references to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ādhrisyā, a river, reference to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adisatras of Ptolemy denotes Ahiċchhattra</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āgnēyas, a people, reference to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āgulīras, a people, reference to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agrīoous of the Greeks is the yak</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ahiċchhattra, Ahiṣtha, Ahiśhētra, a district, references to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āhukas, a people, references to the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Āhvama, a fortress of the Uśinaraś, references to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ailadhāna, a town, reference to</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aindra-grammar, discovery of a MS. proving the real existence of the</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ajiravati (Achiravati) river, notes on the identification of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ajītavati river; a doubt as to the real existence of the name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ajīta¬rpa, an official title; probably equivalent to the dātaka of other inscriptions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akbar marries a Jaṭīñī, a relative of Mihr Miṣṭhā</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allāna, crushed by the Mongols</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ālānā, a hero of Hindi Epic poetry; 209ff;—his genealogy, 255;—cycle of legends about him 255ff</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

ass, Indian, ancient Greek notices of, 234f.;—is the rhinoceros 234f.
Astiah, a fortress in Ghur 84
Atábégas of Azurbáiján 171ff.
avamédha-coins attributed to Samudragupta, notes on the 95n, 150
Audh, notes connected with the history of 165
angry by Chinggis Khan 142
Aurangábád District inscription 314ff.
Azurbáiján overrun by the Mongols 171

Bagh Rádá; see Údál 206ff, 255ff.
Baiana, Bayán, Biánah; see Byánah 9n
Bainas Játá; customs of the 61
Bakragupta, or Vakragupta; this name must be discarded as non-existent 66
balábijgan-gólú means a particular staff for measuring land 15
Balkh, captured by the Mongols 143
Ballada, Kanarsee, the Insurrection of Ráyañá or Sangh óli; edited 293ff.
Ballála II. (Hoyzála) was overthrown by Singhána II 314
Bamúyán (=?) Andaráb, 86; captured by the Mongols 87
Bánapal heroes of Hindu Epic poetry 255
Banavási Prákrit inscription of Hárítipúta-Sítákañjá; edited 391ff.
bandages to relieve pain 29n
barbarikos, a town on the Indus, in Indo-Skythia 338, 339, 341

'Baroda' plates of Dhrúva II., of Sáka-Sanvat 757; edited 196ff.
'Baesh' plate of Góvindáchaunda of Vikráná-Sanvat 1181; edited, 101ff.; commented on 98ff.
Basrakoh; see Tálikán 81ff.
Batálamun, derivation of the name 27
bdelion of the Greeks is the tree that yields gíyal, 'fragrant gum resin' 333
bee; see honey 306ff.
Bháyáná, mediæval name of Byánah, q. v. 9
Bénagouron of Ptolemy, identified with Waýrágahr in the Chándy District 292
Benares District inscription 139ff.
Bendigérí or Bendigere plates of Krsna, of Sáka-Sanvat 1179; edited 68ff.
Bengal Asiantic Society, notice of the Centenary Review of the 355ff.
Bengal, Bihár, and Audh empire, division of the, in the tenth and eleventh centuries 161ff.
Bengal, history of the Pála kings of, 162ff.;—notes on the Séná kings of 183ff.
Bengali books, destruction of, by the Musalmans, 134;—language, religious origin of the modern, 185;—literature, growth of, 187;—vernacular, development of the, 186ff.
Bero, a god of the Kárrálas (Aborigines) 127

Bhágavata-Purdá; a note as to its date, 185n;—a copy of the whole of it, made by Viyápati, is still in the possession of his descendants 189
Bhágavatas in the Southern Maráthây country 74
Bhagavatapura, town in Central India; a residence of Vákpáti-rája of DmüÁ 159
bhátra is a corruption of bhátra, rähtra, 'a raft' 26n
Bhambhágiri, the lord of, was overthrown by Singhána II 314
Bharatpur State inscriptions 9n
Bharut ('Bharhut') Stópa inscription of Dhanabhútí; edited 138ff.
Bháthákka, of Válahhi, fought with the Mátirákas 328ff.
bhádáräkd, a title of the goddess Durgá 159
Bháttévári, a goddess (probably Durghá) at Ujjváir 159
Bháumayantras; description of one from Málwa 237ff.
Bháyádáva, Dándásáyaka, Térá; inscription of; edited 147ff.
Bhimarathi, a river or stream near Beigaun 74
Bhójá of DmüÁ; Uváta wrote at Avantí in his time 69ff.
Bhójá of Kánauj, notes on the history of 99, 102
Bhójá, a king who preceded Chandrádeva of Kánauj 99, 102
Bhójá II. (Siláhará of Kolápúr) overthrown by Singhána II 314
Bhójpur, a dialect of Bihár 209
Bháthák, race, according to tradition, included the Pála kings of Bengal 101
Bhágála, the proper name of a king (perhaps Mahápála of Bengal) 165a
Bhár, history of the Pála kings of, 164ff.;—notes on the Séná kings of 183ff.
Bhári Language, Grammar of, 208;—dialects of 209
Bijayágadh, near Byánah; a reference to inscriptions at this hill-fort 8
bird-standard on coins 93, 179
biscros; see bishkáuprd 306
Blahbáliq visited by Ch'äng Ch'óm 146
báshkáuprd, ancient Greek notices of the báltakos, psáltakos, sítakos, of the Greeks is the parroquet 304
boar-emblem on seals 140, 380
boats made out of reeds (palm-trees). Greek accounts of 336
Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiantic Society's plates of Sázádityá I.; edited 327ff.
Borám, a god of the Bhdítalas (Aborigines) 127
Borun, son of Mukhuli, 268;—succeeds him 272;—his successes in China 273
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brahmajjãdins in the Southern Marathã Country .......................... 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmical surnames in the Southern Marathã country ..................... 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brãhmadvãya-Upanishad; see Mâhãndrâya-Upanishad ..................... 4ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Museum plates of Ereqanga; edited, 229ff; of Vira-Satyâraya; edited 140ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha, notice of Rockhill's translation of the Life of .............. 364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist inscriptions ............................................ 45ff, 139ff, 327ff, 344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhagupta, silver coins of ..................................... 67f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekkaraya of Vijayanagara, an inscription of the time of; edited .... 233ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria, Mongols in ............................................. 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bundelkhandi, a dialect of Bihãri ................................... 209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byãna, a town in the Bharatpur State; see Ekhayãna and Sripatã 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byãna inscription of the Rája Mangala; noticed, 9f,—of the Adhãrikãja Vijaya; edited . 8ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centenary Review of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, notice of the .... 355f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central India inscriptions ........................................ 45, 159, 321, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon, a prince of, in Egypt ....................................... 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaitanya; an old rhyme giving the date of his birth as Sãka-Saãrat 1401, 1906;—spreads Vidyãpati's writings, 182;—is mentioned in the maniçala of Vidyã-bådhaÍana's Sêhityakaumudí 353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chãlukya-Chandra; a name of Saktivarman (Eastern Chãlukya) .......... 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chãlukyas, Early, attributed to the Soma-rainãsã, 50, 55;—Purãnic genealogy and history of the .................. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Eastern, genealogical inscriptions of the. 48ff, 55ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western, a genealogical inscription (spiruous) of the ................ 330f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chãlukyas, Western, a genealogical inscription of the ................ 14ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of late date at Kalyãnapura ...................................... 140ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chãlãdãsã, a poet; the contemporary of Vidyãpati .................... 188ff, 193ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta of the Udyaigiri cave inscription; his identity discussed ........................................ 61, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandragupta II. (Early Gupta); the silver coins of ................ 65ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch'ang-Ch'ung, the Taoist philosopher, 144;—visits Chinggis Khañ, 144;—his journey through Asia .................. 145ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang-yewon, Chinese general of the Mongols 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character of the Koreans .......................................... 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charas, ancient Greek notions regarding ........................... 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatça-vãdãva, vernacular form of the name of ........................ 309f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shãshãhãdãva II. (Later Kãdambas of Goa) .......................... 289n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaturvedins of Gujarãt ............................................. 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaulukyas of Anhilvãd, notes on the history of the ................ 64, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chellãr plates of Kulottunga-Chõjaãjãva II. of Sãka-Saãrat 1056; edited ..................... 55ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chhatravatî; see Ahiçohhchatra ..................................... 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese accounts of Chinggis Khañ .................................. 143f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Emperors, the Kin and Sung; their quarrel ..................... 267, 271, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinggis Khañ pursues Muhammad Shah Khwãrizmi, 81;—captures Tãlikã, 82;—his treatment of his adopted son Kutuk, 84;—captures Bãmiyãn (Andarãb), 86;—attitude towards his sons, 87;—defeats Jalãla'd-din Khwãrizmi, 87, 88;—his cruelties at Balkh, 143;—folk-tale of Chinggis and the stag, 143;—Chinese accounts of his doings, 144;—mission of Ch'ang-Ch'un to him, 144ff;—his religious views, 151ff;—his great hunt at Samarkand, 169;—summons a general council (kurîlla) . 170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ch'icçolce' plates of the Mahârâja Satyavarman; edited .......... 10ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chóla country; kings of the ...................................... 204f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chóla successors of the Eastern Chalukya kings ....................... 48ff, 55ff, 203ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chólas, genealogy of the ......................................... 204f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chûl-i-Jállû, desert of ........................................... 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coconut, the Indian; Greek notices of it under the name of nauplos .............................................. 336f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins, gold—of the Early Guptas ................................... 92ff, 179ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Jaya-Prakirnãyasãs .............................................. 96n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Kîcha ........................................................... 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Nara-Bûlãditya ................................................... 99n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Vîshnu-Chandrasãitya .......................................... 99n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins, silver—of the Early Guptas ................................ 65ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Budhagupta ....................................................... 67f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Chandragupta II. ................................................. 65f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Dãmdãragupta (doubtful) ........................................ 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Isanavarman ..................................................... 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Krîshnãraja ........................................................ 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Kãshãtrapas, 325;—a note on the legends of them ............ 65ff, 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Kumãragupta ........................................................ 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Rudrasimha ....................................................... 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Skandagupta ........................................................ 66f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coins of the Early Guptas; their weights follow old Roman, Lydian, and Macedonian standards ................. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colours sacred to the planets ...................................... 4f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Coorg&quot; inscription of Satyavarãya-Kãntirãvarman; edited ........ 76ff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copper-plate grants; mention of a model form for drafting them .... 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cosmogony of the Aborigines of India .............................. 126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Cotton-tree, Greek notices of the Indian 337
Crocodile, ancient Greek notices of the 306
Cures amongst the Aborigines of India 181
Curiosities of Indian Literature 124, 200, 296, 281, 392, 323

Dadhpadra, ancient name of Dohad, q.v. 124
Dadhipura, the modern Sanskrit name of Dohad, q.v. 124
Dalias of Dehli, their slang, &c. 156ff
Dāmodaragupta, a doubtful silver coin of 67
Dambal Buddhist inscription of Vikramāditya VI, comments on the 15
Darbar villages of the Jālandhar and Bāri Doabs, the 61
Darbangā, history and list of kings of, 187
popular etymology of the name refuted 183n
darsana, in the sense of 'religious procession' 233
Dāsa-granthi in the Southern Marāṭhā Country 74
dates; see eras.

recorded in decimal figures 10, 18, 19, 20, 76, 103, 123, 140, 160, 168, 234, 317
recorded in numerical symbols 55, 66, 67, 68, 75, 78, 328, 333, 342ff, 351
recorded in numerical words 63
recorded in words 12, 69, 103, 123, 130, 200, 398, 317
days of the lunar month, mentioned in recorded dates:

bright fortnight; first 234, 288
fifth 102
sixth 46ff
seventh 191
tenth 20, 98
twelfth 74, 314
thirteenth 123
fifteenth 292
full-moon 24, 161
twentieth 351
dark fortnight; second 10, 53
third 19
sixth 328
ninth 161
unspeciﬁed; seventh 309
days of the week, names of the, as occurring in records:

Adi 19
Bṛhaspati 18, 20, 234
Buddha 288, 314
Chanda 8
Guru 53, 70, 190
Ravi 102
Śaṅkun 141
Soma 10, 123

their names in India, as with the Greeks and Romans, were taken from

do's of the planets, and this nomenclature is of Indian origin, 1ff;—this theory of the origin of the nomenclature disputed, 322f;
—the methods by which their names were fixed 2, 322f
death-customs of the Aborigines of India 132f
decimal figures, instances of the use of, 10, 28, 29, 73, 103, 123, 140, 160, 168, 234, 317, 318;—in composition with a numerical symbol; an instance 351
demons in the Kin-Shan Range 150
Derbend captured by the Mongols 175
Dasisa gana, Dāsiya gala, a Jain sect belonging to the line of Kūnčakundāchārya 23ff
Dēvadattā, sāmanta, the Shērgaḍh Buddhist inscription of; edited, 45;—interpretation of the date 351f
dēva-grīha-jagat, perhaps means 'a temple and its grounds,' or 'a temple with the buildings connected with or attached to it' 161n
Dēvarāja, a name of Navakhā (Western Gaṅga) 230
devil-worship, a possible modern instance of, in the Kanarese country 297
Dhanabhāti (Śūigā), Bharut Stūpa inscription of; edited 138ff
Dhārā, city in Central India, the kings of 159
Dhārāvarshā, a birūda of Dhrūva II (Rāshtrakūṭas of Gujārat) 198, 202
Dharmādeva (Lichchhavī of Nāpāl); his date was about A.D. 680 350
Dharmāditya, a title of Siṅhāditya I of Valabhi 328
dharmarājika means a stūpa 140ff
dhavākāra is a corruption of dhavālādāra, 'a mansion' 26n
Dhrūva II (Rāshtrakūṭas of Gujārat); 'Ba-
roda' plates of Śaka-Saṅghārāj 757; edited 196ff
Dhrūvavēla, Mahārāja (Lichchhavī of Nā-
pāl); his date was A.D. 654 344, 350
diamonds, the Sūdrakād myth regarding 275
dikaios of the ancient Greeks is the dung-
beetle 310
divination among the Aboriginal tribes of
India 126ff
dogs, ancient Greek notices of the Indian 292, 283
Dohād, town in Gujārat; see Dadhipadra and
Dadhipura 124
dolphin, ancient Greek notices of the 283
Dūḍā; a grant to the Buddhist monastery founded by her at Valabhi 328, 329n
Durgā, goddess, a grant to 159
Durgābhakti-Tamāqyati of Vidyāpati, was written in the reign of Narasainhadīva, 188, 189;
text and translation of the opening lines; edited 192f
dāta, an official title; probably represented by the dātādāpyaka of other inscriptions 161n
**INDEX.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Dvēdīns of the Southern Marāṭhā Country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Drārakā; see Abdhinagarī.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Dyā Drivēḍa wrote the Nīlamāśjāni in Samvat 1110.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>eagle, ancient Greek notices of the golden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>eclipses, Chinese science of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.. lunar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>.. solar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Egypt, Simhalese Prince in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>elation ēsamēnōn of the Greeks is, gingly oil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>elektron of the Greeks is the lac-insect and its products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>elephant, ancient Greek notices of the.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>elephant-emblem on seals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Ėmbirūroas, a king mentioned by the Greeks, was probably king of the Abhirāras.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>emblem of dynasty engraved on the plate, instead of on the seal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Enchanted Stag and Chinghiz Khān.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>epops of the ancient Greeks is the hoopoe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>eras, dates recorded in various—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Gāgāya-vahā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75, 98, 323, 342ff, 348</td>
<td>Gupta-Valabhi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342ff, 348</td>
<td>Harsha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Kālyuaga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Lakṣhamanaśēna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351f</td>
<td>Mālava (Vikrama).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351f</td>
<td>Šaka.......24, 25, 26, 50, 56, 74, 76, 123, 202, 234, 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Vikrama.....8, 102, 123, 140, 159n, 161, 351f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229ff</td>
<td>Erēṣanga (Western Gāṅga); plates of; edited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101f</td>
<td>‘Etawah’ District inscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Fatehpūr Ḥaswā, traditions regarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Faridūdīn 'Attār, death of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84, 85</td>
<td>Fikī, the Noyan, adopted son of Chinghiz Khān.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94f</td>
<td>fire-altar emblem on coins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Fīrūzkoh, capital of Ghūr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Fīwr, fortress in Kādās, attacked by the Mongols, 83, 84;—description of, 119;—captured by the Mongols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>flags, different kinds and arrangements of.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104f</td>
<td>Folktales, from Madras, 77ff, 103ff, 134ff, 135ff;—from Kaśmir, 26ff, 239ff;—from Western India.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31ff</td>
<td>fortights of the lunar month; an instance of the reckoning according to which the dark fortight preceded the bright</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX.

Gónpa-kapuri, ancient Sanskrit name of Gos in Western India 289

Gośtrás, names of, as occurring in records:
  Agastya 74
  Árshiika 74
  Átrēya 58, 74, 315
  Bharadvāja 74
  Bhārādvāja 50, 75, 315
  Bhārgava 74
  Dévarśa 74, 315
  Garga 74, 315
  Gārgyā 74, 289, 315
  Gautama 74, 103, 315
  Harita 58, 74, 315
  Hārita 330
  Hārita 49, 50, 50, 334
  Jāmagnya-Vatsa 74, 315
  Kāṇvārya 299
  Kapi 58, 74
  Kāpāshahala 74
  Kāśyapa 59, 74, 75, 100, 232, 315, 331
  Kanādinya 74
  Kauixka 58, 74, 315
  Kuśihīna 58
  Lāvānā (?), 202
  Maitrāvarūṇa 58
  Maitrīya 58
  Mānasa 49, 50, 330
  Maunigala 74
  Mauna-Bhārgava 74
  Mūdgalā 315
  Parāśara 58
  Parāśara 74
  Purākutas 58
  Šāśipila 74, 100, 188
  Sañaka 63
  Šrīvatsa 74
  Vādhrayāva 315
  Vādōla 58
  Vasiśtha 74
  Vasiśtha 315
  Vatsa 58, 74
  Vaiśvānuvidha 74, 315
  Vaiśvāmitra 74, 315
  Yaska 58

Góvinda IV. (Bāshāmkūṭas of Gujarāt) was an usurper 197

Góvindachandra (Gānadhāvāla), 'Baashi' plate of; edited 10ff

Góvindárāya, of the Latest Chālukyas of Kālīṣnapura 141

Grundadeva, 'the tutelary village god,' mentioned in an inscription 11

Grass, chewing; a sign of defeat and submission 299

Graves, position of Mūsalmān 299

Griffin (Gṛpfôma) myth regarding the, cleared up 275, 276, 281, 282

Guddavādi viśaya, in the Vēngi country, including certain villages 50

Gūgali, guggala, Greek notices of, under the name of bidellion 338

Gūhāśāna of Valabhī, an earthenware inscription of; edited 75

Gujārāt, Bāshāmkūṭas of, a genealogical inscription of the 196ff

Gumāni Kavi of Pañjā, a Bihāri poet, macaronic verses of 124, 206, 236, 361, 292

Gūnapura, a town in Central India; a camp of Vākpatīrāja of Dhārā 159

Gupta, Mahārāja (Early Gupta); discussion as to whether his name was Gupta or Śrī-
gupta 94, 180

Gupta era did begin, as stated by Alībrūnlī, in 319-20 A.D., 342n;—it is convenient to call it by this name; but there is nothing in the inscriptions to show specifically that it was founded by the Guptas, 342n,—it was introduced into Nēpāl in perhaps 407 A.D., 345,—various dates recorded in it 75, 98, 328, 342ff

Guptas, Early; review of Mr. V. A. Smith's paper on their gold coins, &c., 92ff;—further notes on them, 179ff;—the legends on their silver coins 65ff

Gūrāna, gudrēa, gurasa; a note on the application of these titles 11, 139, 140n

Gwuiliān, see Wōliān 87

Hamadān, rebels against the Mongols, 173;—raided in the revenge 175

Hammiras were overthrown by Singhaha II. 314

Hāritiputra, Hāritiputra, Hāritiputra, a metonymic of the Early Chālukyas and their descendants 40, 50, 56, 330

Hāritiputra, a metonymic of one of the Sātakārīs 334

Hāritiputra-Saṭakārī, Banawalité inscription of; edited 331ff

Harshavardhana of Kanaūj; a reference to his defeat by Pulikēśin II., 331;—he conquered Nēpāl and introduced his era there, 316,—various dates recorded in this era 342ff

Hasrā, capture of, by the Muḥamādīans 260

Headless Horsemen, a version of the 260
heaven of the Aborigines of India .......... 129
hippopæphas of the Greeks is perhaps the
nīlghī ....... 341
Hiranyavatī river, notes on the identification
of the ........................................... 320f
Hirāu intrigues in, 117;—captured by the
Mongols ........................................ 118
holy places of the Aborigines of India .......... 126
honey, ancient Greek and Hebrew notions
regarding, 308, 309;—from canes called
sugar, Greek accounts of ................................ 334f
Honorian III., Pope, his dealings with the
Georgians ................................ 174
horse, ancient Greek notices of the wild .... 285
human sacrifices among the Aborigines of
India .............................................. 128, 129
hunt, description of a Mongol ................ 169, 170
hymans, ancient Greek notices of ............. 281
Hyphasis, Hypebaros, river; identified ...... 310
identifications, geographical .................. 310, 319, 320
idols of the Aborigines of India ............... 126f
Ichikadai, nephew of Chinghiz Khan .......... 118
Indarāb, Andarāb; see Bānīyān .......... 87
indigo, Greek notices of the Indian ........... 339f
indikós melan of the Greeks is Indian indigo 339f
Indra (Eastern Chalukya) reigned for seven
days ........................................... 50, 55
infanticide among the Jātās .................. 62
inscriptions, Cuneiform, of Western Asia,
noticed ........................................... 392
inscriptions, Sasan, on an incense-burner ..... 97
inscriptions on copper; edited—
Chalukya, Eastern ............................ 48ff, 55ff
Chalukya, Western; spurious .................. 330f
Chalukya, Latest ................................ 140f
Chōja successors of the Eastern Chalukyas
.................................................. 48ff, 55ff
Chihuri dynasty ................................ 139f
Ghādaḍavāla..................................... 101f
Ganga, Eastern, of Kalinganagara ............ 10ff
Ganga, Western, of Mājār; spurious .... 239ff
Kādamba, Later, of Goa ..................... 288f
Pāla of Bengal ................................ 162f
Rāhṭrakūṭa of Gujārāt ........................ 186f
of Śivasinīha .................................. 190f
Valabhi dynasty ................................ 327f
Yādava of Dēvagiri ............................ 68ff, 314f
inscriptions on earthenware; edited—
Valabhi dynasty ................................ 75
Chalukya, Western ............................. 14f
Ganga, Western, of Mājār ................... 76f
of Hāriti-pata–Sātakāra ........................ 381f
miscellaneous ................................. 8ff, 14ff, 46ff
Nēpol rulers ................................... 97f
Pāla of Bengal ................................. 139f
Raṭṭa of Saundatti and Belgaum .......... 14ff
Sūnga ........................................ 13ff
Vijayanagara dynasty ......................... 233ff
vīna used in the sense of a liṅga ............. 140
Īśānavarman, silver coins of ................. 68
Iṣwālmal, the Child of Promise" according to
the Muḥammadasa ............................. 209
Iyār-i-Dānīsh, the, is not yet edited ........... 264
Jagatai, campaigns of ....................... 86ff
Jñānavyā family, or lineage of the river
Ganga ........................................... 229 and n
Jain inscriptions .............................. 8, 9f, 14ff, 233ff
Jains, early division of the, into Nīgrangonas
and Śvētapātas ................................. 15
" and Vaishnavas, a compact between
them; edited (see also p. 292) ............... 233ff
Jaitung I. (Yādava of Dēvagiri); certain kings
overthrown by him ............................. 314
Jalābhuddīn Khvārizmi; his wars with the
Mongols, 82ff;—defeats the Mongols under
Kutukū, 86f;—defeated on the Indus by
Chīnghiz Khan, 87f;—marries a daughter
of the Chief of the Khozhars, 89;—his
doings in Sindh ................................ 90
Jāṭa of the Pañjāb, notes on the ........... 61, 62
Jayadeva I. (Lichchhavī); his real date was
about A.D. .... 330 .............................. 350f
Jayadeva II., Rājū (Thākuri family of Nēpol);
his date was A.D. .... 751 (?). .... 759 .......... 344f, 348, 350f
Jayadeva, poet, author of the Gītāgīvinda; his
date discussed and allotted to the early
part of the twelfth century A.D., 183,
185n;—tradition says there were two poets
of this name .................................. 183n
Jayaprakīryanāyas, gold coin of ........... 95n
jāhūri ki dalī, the 'swagger trick' .......... 157
Jārāti pottāla, an ancient division of the
' Etawah' District, including certain villages 102
Jīnhugupta (Thākuri family of Nēpol); his
date was A.D. ..... 654 ......................... 343, 350f
jōgasati is a corruption of yōga-pattaka, 'a
garment worn during contemplation' ........ 25n
journeys, customs on ......................... 135n
jūb, explanation of the term .................. 85n
Kācha is the real name on the coins attributed
to Ghaṭūkacha, 95f;—the name occurs
elsewhere only in an inscription in the
Ajantar caves ................................ 96
Kādambas, Early; notes on their history 12ff, 15
Kādambas, Later, of Goa, a genealogical in-
scription of the ................................ 238ff
Kāleśaṇāśabhaṇa, the place of the Thākuri
rulers of Nēpol ............................. 342ff
Kajjil Ban, the .............................. 209n
Kakka, Karka III., must be struck out from the list of the Rāshtrakūtas of Gujarāt 197
Kakkalla, a king overthrown by Singhana II. 314
Kalachuris of Tripura intermarried with the Pālas of Bengal 99
kalamis indicus, the Indian reed, Greek accounts of 335f
Kāli, a village goddess 79, 108, 109
Kalinga country in the possession of the Eastern Ganges 11
Kalinganagara, the capital of the Eastern Ganges 11
Kalyān, fortress near Hirāt, 117;—captured by the Mongols 118
Kāvākāvaya, Late Chalukyas of 140ff
Kāma, Kāmadēvā, Kāvāja, brother-in-law of Shaśtrādhēva II. 288, 289n
Kanarese Ballads; the Insurrection of Rāyanta of Sangōli; edited 293ff
Kanauj, information about the history of, 99ff, 101ff, 164f
Kandahār in the Mongol days 85
Kandālāmā plates (spurious) of Pulikēśin II. (Western Chalukya); edited 330f
kāṅgar, kāṅgrī, description of the, 265,—origin of the, 266;—derivation of its name 266
Kanbhera, Kanbhera, a form of the name of Krishna (Yadava of Dēvagiri) 68, 73
Kanho is a Prākrit form of the name Krishna 73n
Karbhāṭa, the modern Karbhāḍ near Battārā, a reference in the Mahābhārata to 333
Karvān; see Bāmiyān 87
Kārūnd, a form of marriage 61
Kārnavatika, an official title denoting 'a superintendent of a work' 333
Karṇa, a king who preceded Candraḍēvā of Kanauj 59, 102
Karpōn-tree of the Greeks seems to combine the characteristics of some kind of laurel with those of the screw-pine 339
Kārtavirya II. (Rāvaṇa of Saundatti and Belgœma), Tērālī inscription of; edited 14ff
Kartasāvon; see asa 284f
Kāśāhara, a āśā in Gujarāt, including the river Vihisara and certain villages 202
Kāṭikī-Vṛtti, quotations from classical Sanskrit poetry in the 327
Kāśmir, folktales from, 239;—legends from 266f
kassia of the Greeks denotes aromatic substances produced chiefly from different species of cinnamomum 339
katākam-ukaliśa is not a chronogram, but means only 'a camp was pitched' 141
Kāṭhśāmā inscriptions 75, 337f
kēlas of the ancient Greeks is the adjutant. 305
kēlaśa of the ancient Greeks is the mainā 305
Khējaka, ancient name of the modern 'Kaira' in Gujarāt 198
Khokhar, daughter of the Chief of the, marries Jallālu'd-dīn Khwārizmī 89
Khulīlīs meets Chinghiz Khān 178
Khulāna meets Chinghiz Khān 178
khusum-tree, Greek notices of the 309f, 337f
kīśā; see jūśī 83n
Kīn Emperor of China, the; his wars with the Mongols 287ff
Kīchakas, Mongol attacks on the 175, 176
Kollagīra, Kollāpura, ancient names of Kollāpur, in the Southern Marāṭha Country 23ff
Kōndaṇakūnda; see Kōndaṇakūṇḍa 163ff
Kōṅgīvarman, Satyavāka (Western Ganges), Coorg inscription of; edited 70f
Kōṅgāva-Keśavkal, an explanation of the early history in the 124
Kōṅgulaṇji Twelve, a group of villages near Miraj 141
Korumbellī plates of Rājarāja II. (Chōla successors of the Eastern Chalukyas); edited 48ff
Kōṅsāvardhana, a mountain in Central India 46, 48
kostos of the Greeks is the Sanskrit kuśātha, an aphrodisiac drug 341
Kōṭā State inscription 45ff, 351f
Kōtiak, chief of the Kīchakas, first reports the approach of the Mongols to the Russians 176
Kramita, a Brāhmaṇical surname in the Southern Marāṭha Country 74
Krishna (Yadava of Dēvagiri), Benēlgiri plates of; edited 68ff
Krishnārāja, an early king, silver coins of 63
Krishnārāja (Early Kadamba) conquered the Nāgas 13
krōkottas of the Greeks is the hyana 281
Kṣatrapas, a note on the legends of the silver coins of the 65n, 325
Kufic alphabet, a 181
Kulja, visited by Ch'ang-Ch'un 147
Kulōttunga-Chōṣādēva II. (Chōla successors of the Eastern Chalukyas), Chellīr plates of; edited 55ff
Kulōttunga-Chōla-Rājaśivarvarman, the legend on the seal of the Leiden plates of; edited 205
Kumāragupta (Early Gupta), silver coins of 66
Kupiṇakūṇḍa, a Jain author; his works, and proposed date in the time of the Early Kadambas 15, 23, 24, 25
Kūṇḍa dēśa was a part of the Kupāla country, and included the village of Tējādēla 21, 25, 26
Kuntalā country included the Kūṇḍa dēśa 21
kōnoiškos; see kroktas 281
lac-insect and its products, ancient Greek notices regarding the 309
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Lakshmanasena era is current in Mithilā, but not in Bengal
language, German philosophy of; 122, 123
languages, transanganetic, 120ff;—monosyllabic; 121
Lasha, David, king of Georgia; 171;—George, king of Georgia; 172
Lāt; the extent of this province to the north and south in the time of the Rāṣṭrakūtās
legends from Kaśmir; 26ff
Leiden plates of Kulottunga-Chōja-Rājaksetarivarman and Rājendra-Chōja-Parāksetarivarman; the legends on the seals, edited; 205ff
Lākhapārīḥdēśikā, an existing manuscript of
a Mā, letter-writer; 64
leprous, cause of, in folktales; 252n
Lestgha, Mongol attacks on; 175
leivavitare, see karvad; 61
leucocotis of the Greeks is perhaps the nāgī; 341
Lichchhavi; in two instances the variant
Līchchhivī occurs; 345n
Līchchhāvikulakāta, a birada of Śivēśa I. of Nāpāla, 342;—also of Dhruvādēva of Nāpāla; 343
Līchchhāvia rulers of Nāpāla, 342ff;—their
palace was Mānagriha, and they used the
Gupta era; 348ff
life-index in folktales; 251n
lion-emblem on seals; 288
lizards, onemis from; 118ff
Leadstone Rocks of Southern India; a suggestion as to their real existence; 299
Lucknow Museum plates of Gōvindachandra; edited; 101ff
lykion of the Greeks is the hēmos tinnatoria
and lycium; 338
lunar month, fortnights of the; an instance of the reckoning according to which the
dark fortnight preceded the bright; 351
macaronic verses of Gumāni Kavi...124, 206, 236, 261, 292
Madras, folktales from; 77, 108ff, 134ff, 153
Māghanandi, a Jain teacher, the Mayalādeva
of Kollagirī; 23
Mahābhāṣya, quotations from classical
Sanskrit poetry in the; 326ff
Mahādeva (Yādava of Dēvagiri) overthrew
Visala of the Chaukukyas of Anhīlvād; 314
Mahānadi, a river in Rēvātīdvīpa, q.v.; 330
Mahādrāraṇya-Upanishad of the Taittirīya-
Aranyaka of the Black Yajur-Veda, an
examination of the contents of the; 4ff
mahāraja, properly a feudatory title, applied
to a paramount king, 67, 70;—it denotes
equal rank with mahāsēmananta and mahā-
simāddhipati; 349
mahāsēmanata and mahāsēmanika; these
titles denote equal rank with mahārāja; 349
Mahīdhēva (Līchchhāvia of Nāpāla); his date
was about A.D. 733; 350
Mahīlā (Pāla of Bengal), Sārnāth inscription
of; edited; 139f
mahāvēka-tree, Greek notices of the; 309ff, 337f
Maithīlī hymns describing the meeting of
Vidyāpati and Chandōdas; edited; 139f
Maitrakas, a tribe or dynasty with which
Bhatāraka of Valabhi fought; 328ff
mañalabathra of the Greeks is the ḍād-chiṣṭa; 338f
Mālava tribe or kings, an instance of the use
of the era of the; 351f
malaya is an old non-Sanskritic name for
'hill'; 320
Malaya of the Mūdrārakṣaṇa is identified as a
tribe on the northern frontier of India, in the
country called Mo-lo-so by Huen-
Tsang, 105ff;—this identification questioned in favour of their belonging rather
to Malayahēmi in Nāpāla; 320
Malkhan, a hero of Hindu Epic poetry; 260ff
Mālāwa Jāṭha, the; 61
Mānmatā wrote in the first half of the
twelfth century; 353f
Mānandēra (Līchchhāvia of Nāpāla); his real
date was A.D. 735-732; 344, 348, 330f
Mānagriha, the palace of the Līchchhāvia
rulers of Nāpāla; 342ff
manjālādeva, a religious title, equivalent to
pāṭēchaṛīya, and, in a religious sense, what
manjālādeva is in a political one; 23n, 24
Māṅgala, Rāja, Byānā inscription of; noticed 9f
mangrove, Greek notices of the Indian; 341
Mānījāṭha, the; 61
Manasrākha; see Tālīkā; 81f
Mantu; about one-tenth of his verses occur
in the Mahābhārata; 324
marine trees, mentioned by the Greeks, are
the Indian mangrove; 341
Marpo (Ladak) may perhaps be derived from
Malayapada, 'the site or abode of the
Malayas'; 107
marriage, levirate; see karvad; 61
mārtākārā of the Greeks is the tiger; 290
Māthātithi, author of the Manabhdāṣṭya, was
a Khāṣṭriya, not a Southerner; 324f
metals sacred to the different planets; 2, 4
metamorphosis; 135ff
metronymics; see putra; 49, 50, 56, 139, 330
Mihīr Miṣṭṭa; his relative married Akbar; 61
Mīlānṣaṇa, the Hundred Thousand Songs of... 262
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mint-marks on coins .................. 93
miraculous vehicle in folktales, the .......... 251f
Miraj State inscription .................. 140ff
Mirîjî, an ancient form of the name of Miraj
in the Southern Marâthâ Country ........... 141
Mithilâ alphabet; a dispute as to its origin,
186a;—country, history and list of kings of 187
Mîlalo of Chunniqof, defeated by the Mongols,
176;—of Galicia, 176, 177;—Romanovitch, 176f
Mo-lo-so of Hien Tsiang supposed to represen
Malayam, the habitation of the
Malays' .......... 107
monkeys, ancient Greek notices of ........... 279
monograms on coins ........... 93
monosyllabic languages ........... 121
month, fortights of the lunar; an instance
of the reckoning according to which the
dark fortnight preceded the bright ........... 351
months, names of the, as occurring in records—
Ásavyâju .......... 25, 238
Bhadra .......... 10
Bhadrâpada .......... 10
Bladrapa .......... 234
Bhadrikâ, Utara .......... 53
Chaitra .......... 23, 101, 108
Jyâshâtha .......... 98, 141, 328
Kârtika .......... 161, 202
Mâgha .......... 48, 314, 339, 351
Pauha .......... 102, 140
Srâvana .......... 74, 191
Utara-Bhadrikâ .......... 53
Vaisakhâ .......... 23, 123

Mrîgâyâramana (Early Kadamba), suggested to
be identical with the Sâvakumâramahâ-
râja whose preceptor was Kuñjakudâ-
chârya .......... 15
Munung, son of Jagatai, death of .......... 86
Muhâmmad Sâh Khârâqizul .......... 81ff
Mukulâ, Mongol general, in China, 143, 207f;
—his invading forces, 207;—captures Ta-
yuan-fu, 267;—his merciful method of
waging war, 269;—captures Sas-châm, 271;
his death .......... 272
Mûlasangha, a Jain sect connected with the
Dêslîya gâga and the Sarasvatî gachhha .......... 25
myrmeks of the ancient Greeks is the white
ant .......... 309
myths of the ancient authors often founded
on facts .......... 275ff

nafâ, dealings in India on .......... 156
Nâgâ chieftains of Central India .......... 45ff
Nâgas, historical references to .......... 13, 14
Nâgândha State inscription .......... 133ff
nâleshâtras, the number of stars in the, is in-
dicated by the singular, dual, and plural
names, 45;—the stars in the different .......... 43ff

Nara-Bhâdhyâ, gold coins of .......... 93a, 179
Nârâyana-Upanishad, another name of the
Mahâdârayâna-Upanishad, q.v. .......... 4ff

nards of the Greeks is the gangetic nard or
spikenard .......... 310
Nârândradhâra (Thâkuri family of Nêpâl); his
date was about A.D. 700 .......... 350f
Nârikâl, a town in Gujarât; see Naçapura and
Naçatpura, 123f;—inscription of Vikrama-
Sañvat 1572; noticed .......... 123ff
Nasirâddin Kubchâta of Sinhâ, fighting Jalâl-
uddîn Khârîczâl .......... 89, 90
Naçapura, ancient Sanskrit name of Nârikâl,
q.v. .......... 123f
Naçapura, modern Sanskrit name of Nârikâl,
q.v. .......... 124

nauplios of the Greeks is the Indian cocoon
Sañvat, image and temple of, at Têrdâl 24, 25
Nêpâl inscription, 97f;—rectification of the
chronology of the early rulers of the
country, 342ff;—the Gupta era was intro-
duced in this country in perhaps 407
A.D., 345;—was under the co-ordinate
double government of the Lichchhavâs of
Mânagiri and the Thâkuri family of
Kâllââkânapâbhavana .......... 348ff

Nezâkhâr, the Habashite commander of Taluk.
84

afâ, probable Greek notices of the, under
the names of hippodaphos and leucrotcan
nin-lâkh necklace of Mârâ, the .......... 299, 256

Nirgranthas and Svetapâtas, early division of
the .......... 15

Nîtimûrajâr of Dêyâ Dridâdî was written in
Sañvat 1110 .......... 333

Nokrekoh; see Tâlikhîn .......... 81f

Noujâr; see Pathen .......... 137

North Kanâna District inscription .......... 331ff

numerals in trade dialects .......... 155

numerical symbols, instances of the use of, 65, 67,
68, 75, 98, 228, 328, 331, 342ff, 351;
in composition with a decimal
figure; an instance .......... 351
" words, an instance of the use of .......... 33

Nusrektuh; see Tâlikhîn .......... 81ff


Ochîgin, Mongol vice-regent in Mongolia .......... 273
Ogotai, son of Chinhîz Khân .......... 115ff
ogres in folktales .......... 250ff
omens from lizards .......... 112ff

ordeal in Kašmir, 25n;—among the Abori-
gines of India .......... 134

oruses of the Greeks is rice .......... 334

Pâdorandani, a name of Kuñjakudârya, q.v. .......... 15

Pâla kings of Bengal, the history of, the, 136, 162ff;—their Buddhist tendencies, 186
—are allotted by tradition to the Blûhibar race,
101;—they belonged to the Gâharwar race .. 101
INDEX.

Pāli inscriptions ........................................ 138ff, 331ff
polīdhawana or polīketana, denotes a particular arrangement of flags ........................................ 104ff
palimpsest grant, an instance of a ...................... 49
Pallavas are said to have been conquered by the Western Gangas in battle at Viṣṇuṇa .................................................................................. 230
Palm leaf Manuscript from Japan, description of an old ........................................ 228ff
Pampa; see Akhīname-Pampa ................................ 14
pāñcahamahābāda, notes on the meaning of 202n pāñcahamahāyajña, 'the five great sacrifices' ........................................................................ 202
paññāli, use of the term in Kaśmir ........................ 28n
pangolin; see phattuyūs ........................................ 287
Pāṇīj, a Mithilā historical record ......................... 157
Pāṇḍjāra, Bengāli genealogists ............................ 157
papyrus-reed, Greek accounts of the ... 305
Parakṣērāvarman, a name of Rajendrā-Chōḍa 206
Paramārattevahaya-Upāniṣad, résumé of the contents of the ........................................ 5
parben-tree of the Greeks is the pīpal-tree ........ 309ff
Pārma, Rāja, the Chandellī ................................ 205ff, 255ff
parroquet, ancient Greek notices of the 304
Parvēśvara, a mountain king in the north of India ........................................................................ 107ff
Parvān Pass, Chinghīs Khaṇ in the ...................... 85ff
Pāṭaliputra seems to have been the capital of the Eastern Guptaś ................................. 38ff
pattācchārya, a religious title synonymous with mārga-cchārya, q.v. ............................................ 23n
pattākala, an official title ..................................... 161
Pāṭeṣhevarāna, a Brahmānic surname in the Southern Marathā Country ................................. 74, 75
Pāthēn, a god of the Kākā (Aborigines) .............. 127
Paudārakā-laṅkhra, a locality near Belagáma ........................................ 74
peacock-emblem on coins .................................. 65ff
Pelagius, Papal Legate to the Georgians ............. 174n
pēppur, black, Greek notices of the Indian ........ 389
petroleum, ancient notions regarding .................. 307
phattuyūs, Greek notices of the Greeks is the pangolin ......................................................... 257
pheasant, ancient Greek notices of the marduk 305
phērōs, the Kāshmir cloak, legendary origin of 265
phōloś of the Greeks is the papyrus-reed ............ 305
pig, ancient Greek notices of the Indian ............ 268
pigeon, ancient Greek notices of the green ........ 305
pīpal-tree, the Indian; Greek notices of it under the name of parbōn ........................................ 339ff
planets accounted kings, 4;—as regents of the day and hours, 1ff;—colours sacred to them, 4;—metals sacred to them, 2, 4;—personified as heavenly kings, 4;—referred to as gods; 4;—rings bearing the names of them, 2, 4;—stones sacred to them 4
plants and animals of India which were known to early Greek authors, identification of the 274ff., 900ff, 334ff
Pon; see Boru .................................................. 268
porphurōn anthos of the Greeks is perhaps the dhāved-tree ......................................................... 340
Prakṣāditya, coins of ........................................ 179
Prākrit inscriptions ........................................ 138ff, 331ff
Pratāparudra of Utala; his conversion by Chaitanya mentioned in Vidyāvīthakānī's Sākhyakaukaṇud ......................................................... 333
pravrasas, mentioned in records:—
Gaṇapata-Avattātha-Aṅgirasa ................................ 102
Prīthivī Rāja of Dehrī, his doings with Mal-khan ........................................ 255, 260
priests of the Aborigines of India .............. 126ff
proverbs:—Arabia, 92, 124, 185, 206, 261, 292, 292;—Hindustāni, 155, 157;—Tamil, 78, 108, 109, 138;—about the Jaṭā ........................................ 66
pūttakos of the Greeks is the parrotquet .......... 304
Pūṭyapāda is a birudā, not the real name of a Yati, and may have belonged to others besides Dēvanandin or Kūtvanandin ........................................ 335
Pulikēśīn II. (Western Chalukya), spurious Kāndalākṣa plates; edited ................................ 309ff
punishment for thieves in Kaśmir, a .................. 32
purāṇa-vedhana ceremony ................................ 115
Purāṇic genealogy of the early Chalukyas, 49;—of the Yādavas of Dēvagiri ............................ 314
Parshaparākṣī, of Vidyākṣa, was written in the reign of Sīvasımaha, 188;—the opening and concluding lines; edited ........................................ 191ff
putra, as the termination of metronymics; see Gāḍiputa, Gūtīputa, Hārītīputra, Hārtīt-
putra, Hārtītpatra, and Vāchhiputra. 49, 50, 56,
139, 330
python, ancient Greek notices of the ................ 308
Qandahār; see Kandahār ................................... 85
Rāchamalla-Permanadī, a name of Satyavāya-Kōŋāvarman (Western Gaṅga) .................... 76
Rākhapasaṇāgaṇasya was written by Śratakrifti-Traṇīvidya ......................................................... 14
Rājakēśarāvarman, a name of Kūlottunga-Chōḍa ................................................................. 305
Rajamahērī District inscriptions ...................... 148ff, 355ff
Rājarājā II. (Chōḍa successors of the Eastern Chalukya), Kūrāmichi plates of; edited, 48ff;—the date of his ascension was Śaka
Saṅvat 944 ......................................................... 50
Rājakēśkhara, a poet; his date fixed as between A.D. 850 and 925 ........................................ 354
Rājendrā-Chōḍa of 'Tanjore,' notes on the family and date of ........................................ 203ff
Rājendrā-Chōḍa-Parakṣērāvarman, the legend on the seal of the Leiden plates of; edited .... 206
Rājīputānā inscriptions ...................................... 8ff
Rāmchandra (Yādava of Dēvagīri), Paithān plates of; edited, 314ff;—he established himself on the throne by force ........................................ 314
INDEX.

Ramānuja; by the Sudākālatarasana his date is A.D. 1127

Rāśtrakūṭa kings of the Kṣṇugada Rājakula, a suggestion as to the proper identification of the

Rāśtrakūṭas of Gujarāt, genealogical inscription of the

Rāṣṭhīras of Kanauj, so-called, 99ff.—were an offshoot of the Gādāwar race

Ratnagiri District inscription

Rāva is a Prākrit form of the Sanskrit rāthea

Rātta of Saundatti and Belgaum, an inscription of the

Rāya-Koladhara, a birupa of a Western Chalukya king

Rāya-Nārāyaṇa, a title of the Yādavas of Dēvagiri

Rāyanna of Sangolli, a Kanarese ballad on the inscription of; edited

Rēḍi, near Vengurlē, is probably the ancient Rēvatiḍvēpa

reed, the Indian, of the Greeks, is the palmyra-tree

Rēvatiḍvēpa, probably the modern Rēḍi near Vengurlē

rheoceros; see asas

Rigortha, a Brāhmaṇical surname in the Southern Marathā Country

rings bearing the names of the planets

Rishi Saļjaṅ; see Saļjaṅ

Rōmako-Siddhānta, MSS. containing portions of the genuine

‘root’ in language, true nature of the

Rōḍal; see Udāl

Rudrasīṁha (Kahatrapa), a silver coin of

Rōpa-Nārāyaṇa, a Bengali poet, 188;—a name of Bhairavasīṁhadāva, 193;—a name of a priest, 191;—a name of Śivasīṁhadāva

Russian Icons, Arabic ornaments on

Russians, Mongol attacks on

Rusudan, Queen of Georgia

Sabean inscription

sacrifice, difference between Brāhmaṇas and Jains in respect of

Sād contra Jāhan sends Muhammadan doctors to Chinghiz Khān

sāka, sīha, sīva, as the termination of the names of some of the Kahatrapas, is a misselection of sīha (sinhā)

Saif Rād resists the Mongols

Śāliśvēra, a mountain king in the north of India

śakha, śaka, śīva, written in records—

Bahurpica

Kauthumi

Taittirīya

Vāja-Mādyamādina

Śākta worship in Bengal, decline of the

Saļjaṅ, a god of the Gārōs (aborignes)

śaun, an abbreviation of saunyateṣvī vitamin

śaunyateṣvī custom

Samarkand, Ch'ang Ch'ûn at

Śāntrādhiṇa in the Southern Marathā Country

śamaya used in the sense of Vaishnava religious mendicants invested with authority as censors of morals

Sambhalaka of Ptolemy, identified with Sau-melpur on the Koll

Sanjayantl, a town in the Dekkan

Sanjarāhchārya; some remarks on his date

Śānkaradēva (Līchchhavīs of Nēpāl); his date was about A.D. 855

śānveśa, an abbreviation of saunyateṣvī vitamin, 98, 103, 168, 341;—is sometimes used, without a qualifying name, for the dates in the Śaka era; an instance

śānveśa du cent, as used by Albr̩m̩n̩, denotes the Lōkakāla itself, not the year of the Lōkakāla

śānveśa of the sixty-year cycle mentioned in records—

Bhāva

Īśvara

Kīlaṇa

Plava

Plavanga

Prajāpati

Śāhāraṇa

Śaunyate

Subakr̩it

Śaunyat Sol̩āh

Śāṅgī State inscription

Śaunyate, classical poetry, quotations from, in the Mahābhāṣya and Kālidās-Vṛttī

Śaunyate, MSS., notice of Dr. Peterson's Second Report on

Śaunyate, MSS., notice of Prof. R. G. Bhandarkar's Report (1882-83) on

Śaunyate was the current literary language in Bengal up to the 12th century A.D.

Śantipur as an ancient name of Bījāyagadh, very doubtful

Saptakōṭiśa, Saptakōṭiśvara, a god (a form of Śiva) of the Later Kālambras of Goa

Śānāṭh inscription of Mahālā; edited

Sarvaśāṅkhyāra, an Eastern Chalukya title

Sarramangalasat, a residence of Dhravā H. 202

sārvarājśaṅkhṛatī, a title of Sau-mudragupta

Śātakān̩i, Śātakār̩i, a birupa of several Andhra kings and perhaps of other races

Śātakār̩i-Hārtīputra, Sūriwāsi Prākrit inscription of; edited
INDEX. 369

Satyārāya, or Vira-Satyārāya, of the Latest
Chālukyas of Kalyanapura .................. 141
Satyārāya-Konginivarman, Coorg inscription of; edited .................. 76ff
Satyavarman, Mahādrīja (Eastern Gaṅga),
'Chicacole' plates of; edited ............. 10ff
Samuelson on the Koll, identified with the
Sambalakha of Ptolemy .................... 291
Sāvatīli dēśa in the Vengi country, including
certain villages ......................... 50
seals of grants, emblems on, 10, 49, 55, 68,
101ff, 140, 229, 288, 314, 330;—legends on, 49, 55,
102, 205ff, 298
seasons, an instance of the ancient division of
the Indian year into only three .......... 333ff
Sembalapura, town in Central India .......... 159
Seṅga dēśa, as the termination of the names of some
of the Kālitrīpasas, is a misleaders of Seṅga
(rīśhka) .................................. 326
Seṅga kings of Bengal and Bihār, 188ff;
supplanted the Pālas about A.D. 1080 .... 165
serpents, ancient Greek notions regarding ..... 208
Se dissimons Elatos of the Greeks is gingly
oil ........................................... 340
Seṅga dēśa, a district on the north bank of the
Gaṅgāvarī, including certain villages ..... 315
Seṅga Vadh, the; noticed .................. 152
Seṅga Wise Masters, the; noticed .......... 152
Shaṅṭhādēvā II. (Later Kādambas of Goa),
Goa plates of; edited .................... 288ff
Shērgāth inscription of Dēvadatta; edited,
45ff;—interpretation of the date ........ 351ff
sheep, ancient Greek notions of the
Indian .................................. 298
ṣiddhā at the commencement of an inscrip-
tion ..................................... 333
ṣīlān dīt kī dāllīt, the 'plain-language
trick' .................................... 157
sign-manual, an actual representation of
a. 198; and; Plate
Śīlādītāya I. of Valabhī, Walā plates of the
year 236 of; edited ..................... 327ff
silence, vows of, on the part of faqṭāra, instan-
ces of .................................. 247n
Śīndūdā, the Book of; noticed ............. 152
śīndūrā stands for śīndhura, 'elephant' .... 24n
Sing Bongā, a god of the Hoa and Santāla,
(Aboigne) ................................. 127
Singhān I. and II. (Yādava of Dēvagiri);
certain kings subdued by them ........ 314
śipakha-ara-food of the Greeks combines the
characteristics of the ykusam-tree and the
māhuva .................................. 306ff, 337ff
śitakos, see psitakos ....................... 304
Śivachitā; a name of Shaṅṭhādēvā II. (La-
ter Kādambas of Goa) ................... 289n
Śivadēvā I., Mahādrīja, (Lichchhavī of NēΗāl);
Gômādhāmitīi inscription of him and
Aṁśuvarman, of Gupta-Saṅvat 318;
edited, 97ff;—the same noticed, 342ff;
—like Aṁśuvarman, he was a founda-
tory of Harshavardhana of Kauṇāji,
343;—his date was A.D. 637 .... 342, 350
" II., Mahārājādērāja (Thākuri
family of NēΗāl); his date was A.D. 725-
745 (P) .................................. 344, 349, 350ff
Śīvakumāramahārāja, proposed to be identi-
fi ed with the Early Kadamba Mṛgēśāvar-
man ................................. 15
Śivasinha, king of Mithilā, 187ff;—a copper-
plate grant by him; edited ............... 190ff
Śīvakandaśāgarī, daughter of a Mahādrīja ..... 334
Skandagupta (Early Gupta), silver coins of .. 66ff
Skandavati, an official of Śīvakandaśāgarī .. 333ff
skōṭēs of the Greeks is the crocodile ........ 306ff
snakes, ancient Greek notions of the sea ..... 308
śodara, a corruption of 'soldier;' used to
denote white troops .................... 299n
Śomādēvā wrote the Yakastilaka A.D. 959 .... 334
Śomavatīśa included the Chalukyas, 55; and
the Yādavas of Dēvagiri .................. 314
Southern Marāṭhā Country inscriptions 14ff, 140ff
spikenard, Greek notions of Indian ........ 240ff
spirits, worshipped by the Aborigines of India 158
spurious inscriptions ..................... 141, 229, 330
Śrāvaṇa-Belgola compact between the Jains
and the Valuhaus; edited ............... 233ff, 292
Śṛgupta or Gupta, Mahādrīja (Early Gupta);
discussion as to the correct form of his
name, 94, 180;—an instance of the occur-
cence of the name, but of another individ-
ual, in a NēΗāl inscription ............... 344n
Śṛipathā, the ancient Sanskrit name of Byāna,
q. v. ..................................... 8ff
Śrutakirtti-Travijīya, author of the Ed-
gha-Pāścāvia, flourished about Saṅ-
vat 1045 ................................ 14
Śambhatīrtha, the ancient Sanskrit name of
'Khambāy' ................................ 123
stars of the different nāka-katras ........ 43ff
stones sacred to the different planets ..... 4
sugar-candy was exported from India to
Afghanistan in the time of Bābar and subse-
quently .................................. 335
sugar-canes, Greek accounts of ............ 334ff
sun, the worship of the, seems to have become
general in northern India about the time of
Skandagupta, 95;—as a symbol on inscrip-
tions and coins ........................ 95
Śung Emperor of China; his wars with the
Mongols ................................ 267ff
Śūrga dynasty, a genealogical inscription of
the; edited ............................. 135ff
INDEX.

surnames, Brāhmaṇical, in the Southern Marāṭhā country .................. 74
Sūryavansas included the Lichchhavis .......... 346
śāstras mentioned in records:—
Āpastamba ........................................ 50
Śrīvijaya, a Brāhmaṇical surname in the Southern Marāṭhā Country ... 74
Śvetāvatāras and Nirgranthas, early division of the ...................... 15
śyuḍḍāda; explanation of the term .......... 21n
Tagore Law Lectures, 1883, notice of Professor Jolly’s .......... 323f
Taian; see Tāliktān ............................... 81f
Tālātītya-drayagaca; see Mahādrāyagaṇa-
Upanishad ......................................... 4ff
Tāliktān, a province of Asia, 81;—captured by the Mongols .......... 82
Tāntrik worship in Bengal, decline of the ...................... 189
Taoist doctrines, 149, 150;—philosophers .......... 144
Tāri, goddess of the Khonds (A borigines) 182, 189
Tāyin, apparently an epithet of Buddha ........ 47
Tērdal inscription of Vikramāditya VI.
(Western Chalukya), the Mangalika Gongi-
deva, Kārṭavīrya II. (Baṭṭas of Saundatti
and Belguum), and the Dayanadagaṇa Bhāyī-
deva; edited .................. 14ff
Tērdalā, a village in the Kūndī dēsa; the modern Tērdal in the Sāgīlī State ........ 21
termite, or white ants, Greek notices of the, 309
Thākuri rulers of Nēpal, 342ff;—their palace was Kālīsa-kūṭābāhavanas, and they used the
Harsha era ........ 343ff
Tiao-li, Princess of Lian-tung, 273;—visits
Chinghis Khān .......... 274
Tigers, ancient Greek notices of .......... 250
Tinizapadra Twelve, a group of villages in
Central India .................. 159
Tortoises, ancient Greek notices of the .......... 306
Transvaalistic Peoples, descent of the .......... 159ff
transliteration of Sanskrit .................................... 292, 293
Trees growing in the Indian seas, Greek ac-
counts of .......... 341
triśārda, ‘the king of the grasses or reeds,’
the palm tree, is probably the origin of the
Greek kālamos indikes .................. 336
triśārda, the trident mark; a symbol of the
Vaiśāṅava faith .................. 233, 235
Triśulīṇa, a Brāhmaṇical surname in the
Southern Marāṭhā Country .................. 74
Tulak, a fortress of Gūṭr ................................ 84, 117
Tulai, son of Chinghis Khān .......... 85
Uache; see Ochigin .................. 273
Ujā, a hero of Hindi Epic poetry .......... 209ff, 255ff
Udayadvēna (Thākuri family of Nēpal); his
real date was about A.D. 675 ........ 35ff
Udayagiri cave inscription mentioning Chandra-
gupta and Vikramāditya; commented on .......... 6
Ujjain plates of Vākpatirāja of Dhār; edited 159ff
Ujyajin, the goddess Bhāṭṭāyārova of .......... 159
Ukā, the Jūrī, story of .................. 119
Uruntai, see Bībābālīgh .................. 146
Uparisadh; see Mahādrāyagaṇa, and Parama-
tattavadhamya .......... 4ff
Uvāha wrote in Avantī, while Bhūja of Dhār
ruled the country .......... 63
Vāchaspati-misra, a Mithila writer, was a con-
temporary of Vidyāpati .......... 188
Vāchispata (Vasteśpatra), a metronymic of
one of the Śūrgaṇas .................. 139
Vāghēla, a note on their relations with the
Chaulukya of Ahīlīvīd .................. 64
Vaishnavas and Jains, a compact of the 14th
century between the .................. 233ff
Vaishnava-Pada-Kalpataru, a collection of
Vaishnava poems in Bengal .......... 182, 188, 193
Vaishnava poems in Bengal attributed to
Vidyāpati .......... 182
Vākpatirāja of Dhār, Ujjain plates of; edited
Vaikragupta; see Bakragupta .......... 66
Valabhi dynasty inscriptions of the; edited, 75, 327ff;—the correct interpretation of
the opening passage of these inscriptions .......... 329ff
vīrtta, an official title, synonymous with vṛt-
tībhuj .......... 343ff
Vasabhi, the ancient name of ‘Basahi,’ a
village in the ‘Etawah’ District .......... 102
Vasanta-deva, or Vasantačandra, Mahārāja
(Lichchhavis of Nēpal); his real date was
about A.D. 754 .......... 345, 348, 350ff
Vasarāvi, the ancient name of Vasrāvi .......... 63
Vatsarāvalī, an officer of Śiliḍita I. of
Valabhi; discussion as to the proper reading of
his name .......... 328
Vāyuleśvarā Kaśyapeśvarā, the story of .......... 79
Vēṭārthadā, a Brāhmaṇical surname in the
Southern Marāṭhā Country .......... 74
Vēṭārthdā, a river in the Kāsahradā dēsa .......... 202
vēṭārthdā = vēṭā-nagara; ‘a sea-side town’ .......... 20a
Vengi country, Eastern Chalukya and Chōla
kings of the .......... 40ff, 55ff, 204
vīhan, used in the sense of mṛṣadhyयa .......... 47
Viduṣumand Kōdumundan, the story of .......... 77ff
Vidyāpati, the Bihāri poet, and his contem-
poraries, 182ff;—ṣaṇīṭita mentioning his
patrons, 182n, 189n;—the charter of the
grant of Bīsapti to him, 190ff;—a copy made
by him of the whole Bhāṣāvaṇa-Pardna is
now in the possession of his descendants,
189;—his genealogy, 187ff;—he wrote the
INDEX.

Durgābhakti-Tarāsīngini in the reign of 
Narasimhadēva, 188, 192,—legends about 
him, 189,—was at the court of Śivasīnha 
and Narasimhadēva, and his poems appeared 
in the 15th century, 157;—various works 
composed by him ........................................ 188 
Vigrahapāla, Ángachhī plate of; edited..... 162ff 
Vijaya, Adhirāja, Byānā inscription of; edited 87ff 
Vikramā era; the dates of some of the Népal 
inscriptions were wrongly referred by 
Pandit Bhagwanal Indraji to this era........... 312ff 
Vikramśitya of the Udayagiri cave inscrip-
tion; his identity discussed ...................... 61, 353 
Vikramśitya VI. (Western Chalukya), Tērāda 
inscription of; edited .............................. 14ff 
Vilāndha, a place where the Western Gangas 
are said to have conquered the Pallavas in 
battle ..................................................... 230 
Vīrakṣaṭadeva family .................................... 33ff 
Vīra-Baṣāṇī; sect included both Jains and 
Buddhists .................................................. 15 
Vīraśṭrādaya, a commentary on Yājña 
valkya ...................................................... 354 
Vīramadśi finished the Āchātra-Sutra in Śaka-
Saṃvat 1076 .............................................. 14 
Vīra-Nosamba, the Bengālī grant of, is not 
earlier than the 12th century A.D. ............... 141 
Vīra-Satyākṣāya, British Museum plates of; 
edited .................................................... 140ff 
Vīsala (Chalukya of Ankñilwād), overthrown 
by Mahādēva (Yādava of Dēvagiri) .......... 314 
Vīshnura-Chandradītya; gold coin of ......... 93n, 179 
Vīshnuvaradhana, another name of Rājarāja 
II. (Eastern Chalukya) .............................. 53 
Vīva-sattī, 'universal rule' ........................... 332 
Vōlga, Mongols on the .............................. 178 
Vīshadēva (Lēchhavīs of Nēpal); his real 
date was about A.D. 630 ......................... 350ff 
Wairāgār in the Chāndā District, identified 
with the Bēsagacron of Ptolemy .......... 299 
Wāla earthenware fragment of Guhasāna (of 
Valabhi) of the year 247; edited, 75;— 
plates of Śikṣācārya I. (of Valabhi) of the 
year 286; edited .................................... 327ff 
Wālān; Wálīhān; see Bāmīyān .................. 86ff 
Walkh, a fortress near Samarand .. 88 
witchcraft among the Aborigines of India ... 126ff 
wool-bearing tree of the Greeks is the Indian 
cotton-tree ............................................. 337 
worship of ancestors among the Aborigines of 
India, 126ff;—of mountains ...................... 128 
Yādava of Dēvagiri, genealogical inscriptions 
of the, 68ff, 314ff;—Purāṇī genealogy of the .. 314 
Yōjñik, another name of the Mahānārāyaṇa-
Upanishad, q.v. ........................................ 4ff 
Yōjar-Vīḍū, Black; see Mahānārāyaṇa-Upani-
shad ..................................................... 4ff 
yak; see agri-bous .................................... 285 
Yama is a god of the Aborigines of India ... 127 
Yāsasilaka of Śomadēva was written A.D. 
959 ...................................................... 959 
Yāndhāya tribe, a fragmentary inscription of 
the, at Byānā; noticed ......................... 8

ERRATA IN VOL. XIV.

p. 8, note 4, for 30th July read 13th August.
p. 14, note 1, for Pulēkāsin read Pulikāsin.
p. 55a, l. 21, for Chittur read Chellur (see 
p. 54a, l. 29, for Chittor read Chellur.
p. 55b, line 23, dele the comma after Kācha.
p. 165a, l. 42, after for photo-lithography insert 
The other ring also was probably a plain one, as 
the seal of the dynasty,—Garuṇa, half-man and 

half-bird, in the act of devouring a serpent,—is 
engraved in the lower proper right corner of the 
second plate.
p. 230a, l. 14, and note 7, for Vilanda read 
Vilanda.

.. Text, line 10, for mu-maikāhī-āhu read 
mū-maikāhī-āhu
p. 233a, l. 33, for bhīdas-ill read bhīdas-ill
p. 234a, l. 22, for Vaishnava read Vaishnava
"A book that is shut is but a block"
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