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### SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal for Sanskrit and Kanarese, (and, for the sake of uniformity, submitted for adoption, as far as possible, in the case of other languages), — except in respect of modern Hindu personal names, in which absolute purity is undesirable, and in respect of a few Anglicised corruptions of names of places, sanctioned by long usage, — is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ऑ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>एँ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>एँ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ऐँ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ओँ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>औँ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विनागा</td>
<td>विनागा</td>
<td>vīnāga</td>
<td>विनागा</td>
<td>विनागा</td>
<td>vīnāga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जितेश्वर</td>
<td>जितेश्वर</td>
<td>jītēśvara</td>
<td>जितेश्वर</td>
<td>जितेश्वर</td>
<td>jītēśvara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊपाध्येय</td>
<td>ऊपाध्येय</td>
<td>upādhyāya</td>
<td>ऊपाध्येय</td>
<td>ऊपाध्येय</td>
<td>upādhyāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आन्योऽर</td>
<td>आन्योऽर</td>
<td>añyōra</td>
<td>आन्योऽर</td>
<td>आन्योऽर</td>
<td>añyōra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single hyphen is used to separate words in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen only is used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, as divided in the original Text, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line; intermediate divisions, rendered unavoidable here and there by printing necessities, are made only where absolutely necessary for neatness in the arrangement of the Texts.

A double hyphen is used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the euphonic rules of saṃādhi. Where this double hyphen is used, it is to be understood that a final consonant, and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel, are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it is to be understood of the orthography of the original, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the final consonant either has the modified broken form, which, in the oldest stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the śūdra attached to it; and that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form. In the transcription of ordinary texts, the double hyphen is probably unnecessary; except where there is the saṃādhi of final and initial vowels. But, in the transcription of epigraphical records, the use of this sign is unavoidable, for the purpose of indicating exactly the palaeographical standard of the original texts.

The avagraha, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial a, is but rarely to be met with in inscriptions. Where it does occur, it is most conveniently represented by its own Devanāgari sign.

So also practice has shown that it is more convenient to use the ordinary Devanāgari marks of punctuation than to substitute the English signs for them.

Ordinary brackets are used for corrections and doubtful points; and square brackets, for letters which are damaged and partially illegible in the original, or which, being wholly illegible, can be supplied with certainty. An asterisk attached to letters or marks of punctuation in square brackets, indicates that those letters or marks of punctuation were omitted altogether in the original. As a rule, it is more convenient to use the brackets than to have recourse to footnotes; as the points to which attention is to be drawn attract notice far more readily. But notes are given instead, when there would be so many brackets, close together, as to encumber the text and render it inconvenient to read. When any letters in the original are wholly illegible and cannot be supplied, they are represented, in metrical passages, by the sign for a long or a short syllable, as the case may be; and in prose passages, by points, at the rate, usually, of two for each alabhar or syllable.
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THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE EASTERN CHALUKYA KINGS.

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

A FEATURE of special interest in the grants of the Eastern Chalukya kings is the record, that many of them give, of the length of each successive reign, commencing with that of the founder of the dynasty, Vishnuvartha I., or Kubja-Vishnuvardhana, a younger brother of the Western Chalukya king Satyashraya-Pulikēśin II. There has been no difficulty in deducing from these details the approximate historical period of each member of the family. But, the lengths of the reigns are mostly stated in even years, without fractions; the earliest case in which a specific date is given in the Saka era, is that of Amma II., whose coronation is recorded to have taken place in Saka-Saṁvat 867 (expired); and the reigns anterior to him covered, according to different records, from three hundred and twenty-nine to three hundred and forty years. Consequently, the limits within which the commencement of the reign of Vishnuvardhana I. might be placed, were rather far apart; and a good deal of uncertainty attended also the dates of some of the intermediate rulers. As a matter of fact, in the most complete and authentic genealogical list of the family that has yet been given, — that published by Dr. Hultsch in his South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 32, — the initial date of Vishnuvardhana I. has been placed no less than eleven or twelve years before what I shall shew to be really the correct time; and Dr. Burnell, in his South-Indian Palaeography, placed it, in the first instance five years after, and in the second instance eight or nine years before, the proper time (see page 4 below, note 5). The objects of the present paper are, to determine the exact period within which the starting-point of the Eastern Chalukya chronology must be placed; to adjust the dates of the successive reigns from that time; and to group together such historical details as are furnished by the records of the family and other documents.

There is a record from which we can determine very closely the period of the commencement of the reign of Satyashraya-Pulikēśin II. And obviously, this is a preliminary point which must be considered first. The information is given in the Haidarābād grant (ante, Vol. VI. p. 73, line 11 ff.), which records that, while residing at the city of Vatapi (Badami in the Bijāpur District, Bombay Presidency), Pulikēśin II. granted the village of Mākarappi to a Brahma, — atmanāḥ pravardhamāna-rājavībhīśhaka-saṁvatsāre tritīyē Saka-nipati-saṁvatsara-satroṣa chastrānārādhikēśha paścchasvatātīśhau Bhādrapad-āmāvasyāgam sūryya-grahaṇa-nilimātām, — “in the augmenting third year of (my) own installation in the sovereignty; when five centuries of the years of the Saka king (or kings), increased by the thirty-fourth (year), have gone by; on the new-moon day of (the month) Bhādrapada; on account of an eclipse of the sun.” I have had this date under consideration twice before; and it is
necessary now to dispose of it finally. On the first occasion on which I dealt with it (ante, Vol. XVI. p. 109 f.), I brought to notice that it had been calculated some years ago by Mr. D. B. Hutchison for Dr. Burgess, who passed the notes on to me, and also had been considered by Sir George Airy, with the result that the corresponding English date must be the 23rd July, A.D. 613; on that day there was a total or almost total eclipse of the sun; it was total probably at Bādāmi; or certainly close to that place; and the totality occurred when the sun was very near the zenith of Bādāmi; so that the eclipse was a very marked and memorable one for that locality. And I expressed the opinion that there could be no doubt that this eclipse is the one referred to. This opinion, however, was the result of a misconception. In the record, the given year, Saka-Saṅvat 534, is distinctly specified as an expired year; so that the details of the month and the eclipse belong to Saka-Saṅvat 535 current. In the published Tables, e.g. those of Mr. Cowasjee Patell and of General Sir Alexander Cunningham, which contain no distinct intimation that they are arranged for the expired years of the Hindu eras, Saka-Saṅvat 535 is shewn as commencing in A.D. 613. I was then under a mistaken impression, — which was by no means confined to myself; and which, I think, must in fact have had something to do with the case that was laid for consideration before Mr. Hutchison and Sir George Airy, — which led me to suppose that A.D. 613-14 was the equivalent of Saka-Saṅvat 535 as a current year. And, as the 23rd July, A.D. 613, corresponds to the new-moon tithī of the first pūrṇimā of Bhādrapada, — the month being in that year an intercalary month, — I entertained no suspicion as to the correctness of the result which I then published. Subsequently, however, I had occasion to consider specially the subject of the epoch and reckoning of the Saka era (see Gupta Inscriptions, Intro., Appendix I, pp. 137 to 144; and ante, Vol. XVII. pp. 205 to 210). And, as a result of what I established in that inquiry, the above date, the 23rd July, A.D. 613, is, as a matter of fact, later by one year than the date given in the original record; being in reality the equivalent of the new-moon tithī of the first pūrṇimā of Bhādrapada of Saka-Saṅvat 536 current (535 expired). On this point, there is now no possibility of any doubt. And, on the second occasion on which I dealt with the date now under consideration (ante, Vol. XVII. p. 141), I brought to notice that the real equivalent of the new-moon tithī of the pūrṇimā of Bhādrapada of Saka-Saṅvat 535 current (534 expired) was the 2nd August, A.D. 612. On this date, also, there was a total eclipse of the sun. But it was not visible in or anywhere near India; because the line of centrality, commencing at sunrise in the North Pacific Ocean, ran across North America and the Atlantic, and ended at sunset about halfway across Africa, towards the north. I and I left the matter then with an expression of doubt, as to whether the record really refers to the eclipse of the 2nd August, A.D. 613, or whether the eclipse intended being that of the 23rd July, A.D. 613, we have in this record a genuine mistake in respect of the year that is quoted; the question being one for settlement when we should be in a position to determine whether invisible eclipses were, or were not, to be occasions of ceremonies and public acts. This latter point is one that has not yet been disposed of. But, whatever may be the strict custom of later times, other instances are accumulating, in which eclipses of the sun, at any rate, which we know to have been not visible in India, are quoted in genuine early records as occasions of ceremonies. And though, looking back from the present time, and comparing the circumstances of the two eclipses, it does seem likely that a person in India would select for celebration that of A.D. 613, in preference to that of the year before, still there is in reality no option of the kind. We must, if it is found in any way possible, adhere to the details of the contemporaneous record,

1. See von Oppolzer's Canon der Finsternisse, pp. 174, 175, and Plate 87; as also for the details of the eclipse of the 23rd July, A.D. 613.

2. A noteworthy instance is the solar eclipse of the 2nd January, A.D. 987, which is referred to in Prof. Kielhorn's Vikrama date No. 52 (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 166). It was a total eclipse. But it was visible only over a comparatively small area in North America and the Pacific Ocean. And yet it is the eclipse that answers to the other details of the given date. Another instance is the solar eclipse of the 17th February, A.D. 698, which is the only one that answers to the solar eclipse in Phāligna in the fifth year of Vishnuvardhana II. (see page 8 ff. below).

3. See also a note on Wrong Predictions of Eclipses, ante, Vol. XIX. p. 383.
without seeking to vary them. And, though it was not visible in India, there really was an eclipse of the sun on the day denoted by the given details. Hence, I feel no doubt now, that we could not be justified in assuming the existence of any mistake in the Haidarabâd record; and that, be the explanation what it may, the eclipse intended in it is that of the 2nd August, A. D. 612, belonging to Saka-Saṁvat 535 current (534 expired); invisible in India though it was. As, then, the new-moon of Bhâdrapada, Saka-Saṁvat 535 current, fell in the third year of his reign, the new-moon of Bhâdrapada, Saka-Saṁvat 533 current, fell in his first year; and consequently the accession of Pulîkēśin II. took place, on some day still to be exactly determined, in A. D. 609 or 610; on any day from Bhâdrapada śukla 1 of Saka-Saṁvat 532 current, up to the pûrṇimânta Bhâdrapada krishna 15, the new-moon day, of Saka-Saṁvat 533 current. For the present, this point cannot be determined more closely; but this settlement of it is sufficient for the purposes of the inquiry in which we are now engaged.

The preceding result is our first guide, towards fixing the initial point of the years of Vishnûvardhana I. Now, as has been intimated, for the coronation of Amma II., we have the date of Saka-Saṁvat 506 current, with certain full details in the month of Mârgâśîrsha, the ninth month of the Hindu luni-solar year; and the corresponding English date is Friday, 5th December, A. D. 945 (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 102 f.). The previous reigns, as given in the same record, — P. in the series of documents quoted in the latter part of this paper, — covered three hundred and thirty-seven and a half years. Deducting 337½ from 867½, we have the early part of Saka-Saṁvat 530 current, for the approximate starting-point of the chronology. And this falls so near the period of the accession of Pulîkēśin II., that, on previous occasions (ante, Vol. VI. p. 73, Vol. VII. p. 185; Dynasties of the Canarese Districts, p. 23), I have assumed that a formal separation of the two branches of the Chalukya family took place practically at the time of the accession of Pulîkēśin II.; and that the separate sovereignty of the Eastern Branch existed from that same date. This, however, is a view which the further acquisition of knowledge compels us now to correct. In the first place, the Sêtâra grant of Vishnûvardhana I. (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 308 ff.), — dated in the eighth year of a Mahârâja who can be no one but Pulîkēśin II., — gives to him only the subordinate title of Yuvârāja; thus shewing that at any rate up to Saka-Saṁvat 539 or 540 current there had been no actual separation of the two kingdoms; Pulîkēśin II. was then reigning as the paramount sovereign of the entire Chalukya family, and Vishnûvardhana I. was assisting him in a subordinate capacity. And in the second place, the materials for determining precisely the period within which lay the starting-point of the years of Vishnûvardhana I., are to be found in another of his grants, from Chipurupalle (page 15 ff. below), and in two grants of his grandson, Vishnûvardhana II., the dates of which could not until recently be properly dealt with.

In the Chipurupalle record, Vishnûvardhana I. himself has the title of Mahârâja. And it records a grant made by him on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon in the month Srâvana; while, at the end of the charter, the date is also given as being, — sam 10 8 mà 4 di 10 5, — “the year 10 (and) 8; the month 4; the day 10 (and) 5.” or more explicitly, if the text is interpreted in the meaning which suggests itself as the most obvious one, at any rate according to European ideas, the grant was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon, which took place on the full-moon day of the month Srâvana, being the fifteenth day (of the bright fortnight) of the fourth month in the eleventh year.

For the approximate period with which we have to deal, there were eclipses of the moon on Srâvana śukla 15, commencing with the first such eclipse after the accession of Pulîkēśin II., as follows:?

Saka-Saṁvat 545 current; on the 28th July, A. D. 622. From the details given in von Oppolzer’s Canon, Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit finds that this eclipse was not visible anywhere in India.

? See von Oppolzer’s Canon, p. 353.
Saka-Saṁvat 546 current; on the 17th July, A.D. 623. This eclipse was visible all over India.

Saka-Saṁvat 555 current; on the 7th July, A.D. 632. This eclipse was visible all over India.

Saka-Saṁvat 564 current; on the 27th July, A.D. 641. This eclipse was visible all over India.

Saka-Saṁvat 573 current; on the 18th July, A.D. 650. This eclipse was visible all over India.

Saka-Saṁvat 574 current; on the 8th July, A.D. 651. This eclipse was visible all over India.

In this year Śrāvaṇa was an intercalary month; and the eclipse took place on the full-moon day of the first Śrāvaṇa.

The first point to be noted is, that there was no eclipse of the moon in Śrāvaṇa in the eighteenth year of Pulikēśin II.; when the month in question would fall in Saka-Saṁvat 550 or 551 current, according to what may be the exact date of the commencement of his reign. 4 The date, therefore, must belong to the eighteenth year of Vishnuvardhana I. himself. And the next point is, to determine which of the eclipses, noted above, is the one referred to.

Of these eclipses, the first two have been considered before, by Dr. Burnell, and by Dr. Burgess. Dr. Burnell's opinion (South-Indian Palaeography, p. 137, note 2) was that the only possible date is one or other of these two. And, while mentioning Dr. Burgess' preference, because it was fully visible, for the eclipse of the 17th July, A.D. 623, he rejected it because, "as this occurred in the evening, it seems, astrologically, inadmissible (conf. Hemachandra's Dānakhaṇḍa, pp. 61-62, 79);" and he expressed his own opinion that the eclipse of the 28th July, A.D. 622, "appears to satisfy all the necessary conditions." On the other hand, in some notes on the Eastern Chalukya chronology which he made over to me in 1878, Dr. Burgess, who had examined all the lunar eclipses in Śrāvaṇa from A.D. 600 to 663, repeated his conclusion that the eclipse in question must be that of the 17th July, A.D. 623. Both of these eclipses, however, equally fail to meet the requirements of the case. On Dr. Burgess' view of the matter,—if the full-moon of Śrāvaṇa, Saka-Saṁvat 546 current, fell in the eighteenth year of Vishnuvardhana I., then the full-moon of Śrāvaṇa, Saka-Saṁvat 529 current, fell in his first year; and his reign commenced on some day from the pārmimaṇḍa Bhātrapada.śrīśūla 15 of Saka-Saṁvat 528 current, up to Śrāvaṇa śūla 15 of Saka-Saṁvat 529 current. But, that Vishnuvardhana I. should ascend the throne of Vēṣṭa three full years at least, — or, on Dr. Burnell's view of the equivalent of the date in question, fully four years,— before the accession of his elder brother Pulikēśin II. to the throne of the Western Branch of the family, is out of the question. Anterior to Saka-Saṁvat 532 or 533 current, he could be Yuvrāja only on behalf of his uncle Maṅgalēśa. 5 But the contemporaneous Aihole inscription tells us (ante, Vol. VIII. p. 244), that Maṅgalēśa sought to secure the succession for his own son; and, with such an object in view, he certainly would not entrust any share of the sovereign power to either of his nephews, even in the eastern part of the country, if it then formed a portion of the Chalukya dominions. This reason, alone, is quite sufficient to lead to the rejection of both the above eclipses. And on this account, and on other grounds which will be shewn further on, I select, instead, the next, — the eclipse of the 7th

4 Nor was there any such eclipse in the sixteenth year of his reign, when the month in question would fall in Saka-Saṁvat 540 or 541. I note this, because I originally read the year of the date, now under consideration, as the sixteenth year; see page 17 below, note 8.

5 Or respectively one and two years, if the date in question were really in the sixteenth year of his reign. — In his genealogical Table (South-Indian Palaeography, Second Edition, p. 21), Dr. Burnell gave "about 629 A.D." for the date of Vishnuvardhana I., and apparently as his initial date. This must have been repeated from the first edition of his book, without allowing for the intermediate recognition by me of the date in the Chitapurpalle record. Taking the latter into consideration, with his date of the 28th July, A.D. 622, for the lunar eclipse, the initial point would lie in Saka-Saṁvat 526 current, in A.D. 65%. And Dr. Burnell himself, following my reading of the sixteenth year, gave "about 666-7 A.D." (loc. cit. p. 183, note 3).

6 I would note here, that I find that I allowed a careless mistake to remain uncorrected in Vol. XIX. p. 10, line 13 from the bottom, in connection with the accession of Maṅgalēśa; the words "A.D. 497 or 498" should be "A.D. 497 or 598."
July, A. D. 632, which occurred on the full-moon day of Srāvana of Saka-Saṅvat 555 current. Then, this date being in his eighteenth year, the full-moon of Srāvana, Saka-Saṅvat 538 current, fell in his first year; and **the initial point of the years of Vishnuvardhana I. may have lain, so far, anywhere from the pūrṇimāta Bhadrāpada krishṇa 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 537 current up to Srāvana śukla 15 of Saka-Saṅvat 538 current. As, however, the day of the eclipse, Srāvana śukla 15 of Saka-Saṅvat 555 current, is specified as the fifteenth day (of the bright fortnight) of the fourth month in his eighteenth year, that eighteenth year plainly began in or with the month Vaśākha of Saka-Saṅvat 555 current. Consequently, his first year began in A. D. 615, or with the month Veśākha of Saka-Saṅvat 538 current; five or six years after the commencement of the reign of Pulikēśin II. Taking the month as the pūrṇimāta month, ending with the full-moon tīthi, the corresponding English period is from the 21st March to the 19th April, A. D. 615. And, unless the immediately preceding Chaitra śukla 1 of the same year should be preferred, in accordance with an alternative possibility which will be considered further on, this gives the precise period within which lay the exact starting-point of the Eastern Chalukya chronology. I shall justify this result by means of two other dates of leading importance. Here, it only remains to add, that the historical event which gave this starting-point, was the installation of Vishnuvardhana I., not as the Mahārāja or independent king of a separate kingdom, but as Yuvarāja, associated in the government with his elder brother Pulikēśin II. Reference has been made already to his Sātāra grant, dated in the eighth year of Pulikēśin II.; the given month is Kārttika, which fell in A. D. 616 or 617, according to what may be the exact initial point of the years of Pulikēśin II.; and, when he issued this charter, at least eighteen months after the period that has been arrived at above, Vishnuvardhana I. still had only the rank and title of Yuvarāja.

We have now to consider two slightly later dates, of the time of Vishnuvardhana II., the grandson of Vishnuvardhana I. The first of them is contained in a charter, found somewhere in the Nellore District, Madras Presidency, which records that he made a grant of the village of Reyun to some Brahmana. — (ante, Vol. VII. p. 189, line 65 ff.; for a lithograph, see Vol. VIII. p. 320), varṣhadāmanā-rāja-dv[iti]ya-saṅvatārā Chaitra-māsa śukla-pakṣa daśamāsa Mahā-nakshatra 8 Buddhāravēśana, — "in the increasing second year of the reign, in the month Chaitra, in the bright fortnight, on the tenth tīthi, under the Mahā nakshatra, on Wednesday." With the earliest starting-point that has been proposed for the years of Vishnuvardhana I., that of Saka-Saṅvat 526 (expired) given by Dr. Hultsch, — and with the shortest period recorded for the intervening reign of Jayasimha I., viz., thirty years, the year in which this date should fall, cannot be looked for before Saka-Saṅvat 526 + 18 + 30 + 1 = Saka-Saṅvat 575 current. Still, allowing a slight margin before that year, the calculations for Chaitra nakshatra 10 are as follows:

Saka-Saṅvat 573 current; Chaitra śukla 10 began on Wednesday, 17th March, A. D. 650, at about 39 ghatīs, 50 palas, after mean sunrise (for Bombay), and ended on the Thursday, at about 42 gā, 10 p. But the moon was

---

1 I am not quite certain whether the superscript 1 of the first syllable was omitted altogether, from want of sufficient space between the top of the de and the subscript y in the line above; or whether it was inserted imperfectly, and then became damaged and illegible, along with the following St. But the letters de and yæ are so distinct that no reading can be adopted except devotion, 'the second (year).'

2 When I edited this grant, I thought that perhaps two akharas, containing the name of a second nakshatra, also, might have been broken away at the end of line 60, after mahād. But this is not the case. The last akara, ghati, does not reach quite to the end of the line, leaving a little more margin than usual; but this seems to be in consequence of an original fault in the copper. There is not room enough for two more akharas, without encroaching on the margin, where the second of them would be distinctly visible, beyond the fault. Moreover, the name of a second nakshatra would be altogether unmeaning, without also a word to indicate that the Mahā nakshatra had ended, and the next had commenced.

8 Read Buddhāravēśana. This is not an instance of the use of the instrumental singular; unless Buddhāravēśana was written by mistake for vedēśana. But it appears that the locative plural was used intentionally; under the idea that the tīthi, the nakshatra, and the week-day, were being expressed in a compound.

10 The grants K. to O., and Q. to W., say thirty-three years; P. and X. say thirty.
not in the Magha nakshatra on the Wednesday. Even by the Brahma-Siddhanta system of unequal spaces, which gives the earliest chance in the case of this nakshatra, the moon did not enter Magha till about 6 hrs. 34 min., = 16 gh. 25 p., (for Ujjain), on the Thursday.

Saka-Samvat 574 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Monday, 7th March, A.D. 651, at about 47 gh. 10 p.

Saka-Samvat 575 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Sunday, 25th March, A.D. 652, at about 30 gh. 20 p.

Saka-Samvat 576 current; Chaitra sukla 10 began on Wednesday, 13th March, A.D. 653, at about 35 gh. 50 p., and ended on the Thursday, at about 36 gh. 45 p. But the moon was not in the Magha nakshatra on the Wednesday. Even by the Brahma-Siddhanta system, the moon did not enter Magha till about 17 hrs. 44 min., = 44 gh. 20 p., on the Thursday.

Saka-Samvat 577 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Monday, 3rd March, A.D. 654, at about 58 gh. 40 p.

Saka-Samvat 578 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Sunday, 22nd March, A.D. 655, at about 58 gh. 35 p.

Saka-Samvat 579 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Friday, 11th March, A.D. 656, at about 41 gh. 5 p.

Saka-Samvat 580 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Wednesday, 1st March, A.D. 657, at about 19 gh. 55 p. But the moon was not in the Magha nakshatra on the Wednesday. By the Brahma-Siddhanta system, the moon did not enter Magha till about 3 hrs. 16 min., = 8 gh. 10 p., on the Thursday.

Saka-Samvat 581 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Tuesday, 20th March, A.D. 658, at about 17 gh. 5 p.

Saka-Samvat 582 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Saturday, 9th March, A.D. 659, at about 32 gh. 15 p.

Saka-Samvat 583 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Friday, 27th March, A.D. 660, at about 17 gh. 45 p.

Saka-Samvat 584 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Tuesday, 16th March, A.D. 661, at about 18 gh. 45 p.

Saka-Samvat 585 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Saturday, 5th March, A.D. 662, at about 23 gh. 30 p.

Saka-Samvat 586 current; Chaitra sukla 10 ended on Friday, 24th March, A.D. 663, at about 23 gh. 20 p.

Saka-Samvat 587 current; by Prof. K. L. Chhatre’s Tables, Chaitra sukla 10 began on Tuesday, 12th March, A.D. 664, at about 3 gh. 55 p. (for Bombay), and ended at about 57 gh. 45 p. on the same day; it was accordingly an expunged tithi for Bombay; and the same would be the case for Rajmahendri also, as the approximate difference in time is only 1 gh. 30 p. later. By Prof. Jacob’s Tables, Chaitra sukla 10 began on the Tuesday, at about 2 hrs. 20 min., = 5 gh. 50 p., (for Ujjain), and ended at about 23 hrs. 46 min., = 59 gh. 25 p., on the same day; and it was similarly an expunged tithi for Ujjain. The difference of time for Rajmahendri, however, seemed likely to make the tithi end
there on the Wednesday. And the moon was in the Maghā naksatra at sunrise on the Wednesday, by the Brahma-Siddhānta and Garga's systems of unequal spaces; and, later on in the day, by also the equal-space system. Under these circumstances, and because this Wednesday seemed to be undoubtedly the real equivalent of the given date, I asked Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit to determine the times accurately; and he has done so, with the following results, in which the times are all for apparent sunrise at Rājamahāndri:—Chaithra sukla 10 commenced at 6 gh. 49 p. on the Tuesday, and ended on Wednesday, 13th March, A.D. 664, at 1 gh. 1 p.; = 24 min. 24 sec.; and it is the tihti sukla 11 which, ending at 55 gh. 39 p., = 22 hrs. 15 min. on the same day, was the expunged tihti. And on the Wednesday, there was the Maghā naksatra for the moon, by all the three systems. By the equal-space system, it began at 29 ghatsas on the Wednesday, and continued during all the rest of the day. By the Garga system of unequal spaces, it began at 45 palas on the Wednesday, and ended at 57 gh. 12 p. on the same day. And by the Brahma-Siddhānta system of unequal spaces, it began at 55 gh. 5 p. on the Tuesday, and ended at 50 gh. 55 p. on the Wednesday.  

Saka-Sāvat 588 current; Chaithra sukla 10 ended on Sunday, 2nd March, A.D. 665, at about 40 gh. 35 p. 

Saka-Sāvat 589 current; Chaithra sukla 10 ended on Saturday, 21st March, A.D. 666, at about 42 gh. 30 p. 

Saka-Sāvat 590 current; Chaithra sukla 10 began on Wednesday, 10th March, A.D. 667, at about 10 gh. 20 p., and ended on the Thursday, at about 10 gh. 55 p. But the moon was not in the Maghā naksatra on the Wednesday. Even by the Brahma-Siddhānta system, the moon did not enter Maghā till about 7 hrs. 52 min., = 19 gh. 40 p., on the Thursday. 

Saka-Sāvat 591 current; Chaithra sukla 10 ended on Wednesday, 29th March, A.D. 668, at about 20 palas. And on this day there was the Maghā naksatra for the moon, by the equal-space system only; it was current at sunrise, and it ended at about 10 hrs. 30 min., = 26 gh. 15 p. By the Garga system of unequal spaces, it had ended at about 22 hrs. 2 min., = 55 gh. 5 p., and by the Brahma-Siddhānta system of unequal spaces, at about 19 hrs. 24 min., = 48 gh. 30 p., on the Tuesday. 

In my published version of this grant, the date was given as lying somewhere about Saka-Sāvat 591 current (ante, Vol. VII p. 186). How this statement came to be made and was allowed to stand, especially in the face of the fact that in the same paper a date in the fifth

11 It is not necessary; still, I may mention that on this occasion, simply from want of leisure, I furnished Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit with no information as to the object that I had in view; but gave him merely the details of Saka-Sāvat 588 expired, Chaithra sukla 10, and asked him to determine with extreme accuracy, for Rājamahāndri, the week-day and ending-time of the tihti, and the nakṣatra. — The above results are by the original Śrīya-Siddhānta. By the present Śrīya-Siddhānta they are very similar. — The tihti sukla 10 began at 6 gh. 10 p. on the Tuesday, and ended at 32 palas on the Wednesday; and the tihti sukla 11, ending at 55 gh. 20 p. on the same day, was expunged. By the equal-space system, the Maghā nakṣatra, for the moon, began at 29 gh. 33 p. on the Wednesday, and continued during all the rest of the day. By the Garga system of unequal spaces, it began at 32 palas on the Wednesday, and ended at 57 gh. 12 p. on the same day. And by the Brahma-Siddhānta system of unequal spaces, it began at 54 gh. 33 p. on the Tuesday, and ended at 59 gh. 31 p. on the Wednesday. — In determining the apparent times, only the chara-correction has been taken into account.
year of the same reign was referred to Saka-Saṅvat 582 current (id. p. 191), — and how it came to be made also in the editorial note issued with the lithograph (ante, Vol. VIII. p. 320), — I am not able to say. Looking through the above results, we see, indeed, that in Saka-Saṅvat 591 current the given titki did certainly end on a Wednesday, viz. the 29th March, A. D. 668; and that the moon was in the Magha nakshatra on that day, by one out of the three systems of the ending-points of the nakshatras. But these facts were not known to me then. And the year given in Dr. Burgess’ notes, is Saka-Saṅvat 579 (expired); which fitted in well enough with the view that the starting-point of the years of the dynasty lay in Saka-Saṅvat 529 current (528 + 18 + 33 + 1 = 550 current). In that year, the given titki did certainly end on a Wednesday; viz. the 1st March, A. D. 657. But this date is not admissible; for the reason that the moon was not in the Magha nakshatra on that day. The above results show that the only years in which the given titki, Chaitra śukla 10, was connected both with a Wednesday and with the Magha nakshatra for the month, are Saka-Saṅvat 587 and 591 current. The latter year might answer fairly well, on the understanding that the length of the reign of Jayasimha I was thirty-three years (537 + 18 + 33 + 1 = 559 current). But it is rendered inadmissible by the results for the remaining date, to be shown in the next paragraph; for, there is no eclipse of the sun in Phālguna, which would then answer to the solar eclipse in that month in the fifth year of the same reign. Accordingly, we can only accept the conclusion, that the English equivalent of the given date is Wednesday, 13th March, A. D. 664, corresponding to Chaitra śukla 10 of Saka-Saṅvat 587 current, on which day the moon was in the Magha nakshatra by all three systems.

The remaining date is contained in another charter of Vishnugovardhana II., obtained apparently from Maṭewāla in the Kistna District, Madras Presidency, which includes the following passage, — (ante, Vol. VIII. p. 198, line 19 f.), aṭtmanu vijaya-vāja-pāśaham saṅvatvārthe Phālguna(ma)-māsā amāvāsya-yām sūryya-grahaṇa-nimi(ttaṁ),12 — “in the year which is the fifth in (my) own victorious reign; in the month Phālguna; on the new-moon titki; on account of an eclipse of the sun.” Here we have to find an eclipse of the sun in the month Phālguna, which shall be in suitable accordance with the details of the earlier date in the second year of the same reign. And for comparison with the years mentioned above in connection with Chaitra śukla 10 in the second year, we have eclipses of the sun on the new-moon day of Phālguna as follows: 13 —

Saka-Saṅvat 573 current; on the pūrṇimānta Phālguna kṛṣṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 27th January, A. D. 651; a partial eclipse; the line of the middle of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° S.; and so the eclipse was probably not visible anywhere in India.

Saka-Saṅvat 580 current; on the pūrṇimānta Phālguna kṛṣṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 9th March, A. D. 658; a partial eclipse; the line of the middle of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° N.

Saka-Saṅvat 580 current; on the amānta Phālguna kṛṣṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 9th March, A. D. 658; a partial eclipse; the line of the middle of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° S.

Saka-Saṅvat 581 current; on the pūrṇimānta Phālguna kṛṣṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 23rd January, A. D. 659; an annular total eclipse; the central line of the eclipse ended at sunset in Lat. 54° N., Long. 39° E.; and so the eclipse cannot have been visible anywhere in India, even in the extreme north-west.

12 The second plate ends with the vi of nimittah; and the rest of the charter has been lost. The exact purport of it, therefore, is not determinable. But it appears to have recorded the grant of some land, to a Brahman, at the village of Palliyāla.

13 See von Oppolzer’s Conson der Finsterheiten, pp. 175-181, and Plate 90.
Saka-Saṁvat 588 current; on the amānta Phālguna krishṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 11th March, A. D. 666; an annular eclipse; not visible anywhere near India; the central line of the eclipse ended at sunset in Lat. 25° S., Long. 17° E.

Saka-Saṁvat 589 current; on the amānta Phālguna krishṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 28th February, A. D. 667; an annular eclipse; not visible anywhere near India; the central line of the eclipse commenced at sunrise in Lat. 24° N., Long. 6° W., and ended at sunset in Lat. 64° N., Long. 115° W.

Saka-Saṁvat 590 current; on the pūrṇimānta Phālguna krishṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 17th February, A. D. 668; an annular eclipse; not visible anywhere in India; the central line of the eclipse commenced at sunrise in Lat. 13° N., Long. 183° E., and ended at sunset in Lat. 36° S.

Saka-Saṁvat 591 current; on the pūrṇimānta Phālguna krishṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 6th February, A. D. 669; the line of the middle of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° S.

Saka-Saṁvat 592 current; on the amānta Phālguna krishṇa new-moon, corresponding to the 19th February, A. D. 670; the line of the middle of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° S.

In my published version of this grant, Saka-Saṁvat 582 current was given as the probable equivalent of the given year (ante, Vol. VII p. 191). And Dr. Burgess's notes are to the effect that the eclipse in question could only be one which occurred on the 18th January, A. D. 660; which day was taken by him as the equivalent of the new-moon of Phālguna of Saka-Saṁvat 581 (expired). On this day there was a total eclipse of the sun, which was visible, not long after sunrise, over probably the whole of Southern India. But, whether Bhādrapada is taken as the intercalary month in Saka-Saṁvat 582 current, according to the published Tables, and in accordance with the present system, — or whether the rule of mean intercalation is followed, according to which the intercalary month would be Kārttika,14 — the day in question was the new-moon tīthī, not of Phālguna, but of the amānta Pauṣha or the pūrṇimānta Māgha. However, we require an eclipse to fit in with the result taken above, that Chaitra śukla 10 in the second year of the reign of Vīṣṇupāvṛdhaṇa II. was Chaitra śukla 10 of Saka-Saṁvat 587 current, corresponding to the 13th March, A. D. 664. From that result, it follows that the Chaitra śukla 10 of his fifth year was the Chaitra śukla 10 of Saka-Saṁvat 590 current. Consequently, the new moon of Phālguna in his fifth year might lie either in Saka-Saṁvat 589 current, or in 590. And thus the required eclipse might be found in that of the 28th February, A. D. 667, falling in Saka-Saṁvat 589 current. But I consider this eclipse to be distinctly not admissible, because the day was the new-moon tīthī of the amānta Phālguna; whereas the pūrṇimānta arrangement of the lunar fortnights, which continued in use in Southern India up to at any rate Saka-Saṁvat 727 (see ante, Vol. XVII p. 141 l.), is certainly the proper one for the period with which we are dealing. The required eclipse is undoubtedly that which took place on the 17th February, A. D. 668, corresponding to the new-moon tīthī of the pūrṇimānta Phālguna of Saka-Saṁvat 590 current; it is true, as has been stated above, that this eclipse was not visible in India; but the same remark appears to be applicable to all the eclipses, one or other of which must be the one intended. Now, this date being in the fifth year of Vīṣṇupāvṛdhaṇa II., the new-moon of the pūrṇimānta Phālguna of Saka-Saṁvat 586 current fell in his first year; and the first day of his first year might, so far, be any day from Phālguna śukla 1 of Saka-Saṁvat 585 current, up to the pūrṇimānta Phālguna krishṇa 15 of Saka-Saṁvat 586 current. Again, Chaitra

14 I owe this to Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit.
śukla 10 of Saka-Saṅvat 587 current being, as we have seen above, in his second year, Chaitra śukla 10, also, of Saka-Saṅvat 586 current fell in his first year; and the first day of his first year might, so far as this date is concerned, be any day from Chaitra śukla 11 of Saka-Saṅvat 585 current, up to Chaitra śukla 10 of Śaka-Saṅvat 586 current. But the two dates together limit the period for the initial day of this reign to a very short time; and indicate that the accession of Vishnuvardhana II. took place in A.D. 663, on some day from Phālguna śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 585 current, up to Chaitra śukla 10 of Saka-Saṅvat 586 current; the corresponding English period is from the 14th February to the 24th March, A.D. 663.

A few words seem desirable here, to present the results which I put forward as the correct ones, in direct comparison with the views that I reject. With Dr. Burnell’s opinion as to the date of the lunar eclipse mentioned in the Chipurupalle grant of Vishnuvardhana I., and paying attention to the number by which the month is denoted, the initial point of his years would be the month Vaiśākhā of Saka-Saṅvat 528 current (see page 4 above, note 5). Adding the reign that then commenced and lasted for eighteen years, and either thirty or thirty-three years for the reign of Jayasimha I., and one complete year of the next reign, we arrive at the period Saka-Saṅvat 576 to 579 current, for the second year of Vishnuvardhana II., in which we have the date of Chaitra śukla 10, coupled with Wednesday and the Magha nakshatra. With Dr. Burgess’ opinion as to the date of the lunar eclipse in question, the initial point of the years of Vishnuvardhana I. would be the month Vaiśākhā of Saka-Saṅvat 529 current. And, proceeding in the same way, we have the period Saka-Saṅvat 577 to 580 current, for the second year of Vishnuvardhana II. And Dr. Hultsch has placed the initial point in Saka-Saṅvat 526 or 527 (expired); which brings us to either of the above periods, according to the date that is to be selected for the lunar eclipse. To suit the above views, we might take either Saka-Saṅvat 576 current or 580 current (see page 6 above); in both of which years Chaitra śukla 10 was connected with a Wednesday. But they are both inadmissible; in the first place, because in neither case was the moon in the Magha nakshatra on the same day; and in the second place, because in neither instance is there a solar eclipse in the month Phālguna for the fifth year of the same reign; in the first case, the only available eclipses (see page 8 above) are in Saka-Saṅvat 580 current, which could not fall earlier than in the sixth year; and in the second case, the only available eclipse is that of Saka-Saṅvat 581 current, which could not fall later than in the fourth year. Moreover, to each of these views there is the objection, which is in itself sufficient to entail their rejection, that they make the initial point of the years of Vishnuvardhana I. lie before the accession of his elder brother Puliṅkēśhin II. On the other hand, for the lunar eclipse of the eighteenth year of Vishnuvardhana I., I select that of the 7th July, A.D. 832, in Srāvaṇa of Saka-Saṅvat 585 current (see page 4 above). Following one of the alternative statements as to the length of the reign of Jayasimha I., and taking it as thirty years, we arrive quite naturally at Saka-Saṅvat 587 current, for the second year of Vishnuvardhana II.; and in that year, as required, the week-day for the given tithi Chaitra śukla 10, as an ended tithi, was Wednesday, 13th March, A.D. 664; and on that day the moon was in the Magha nakshatra (see page 6 f., above). And in perfect accordance with this, there was a solar eclipse in his fifth year, on the 17th February, A.D. 668, the being the new-moon day of the pūrṇimānta Phālguna of Saka-Saṅvat 590 current (see page 9 above). These three dates are in perfectly natural accordance with each other; and they entail no straining of the facts in any way, except in following the minority of the records, and taking the length of the reign of Jayasimha I. as thirty years only, on the understanding that some of the records mistakenly included three years of Yuvārāja-ship as part of his actual reign. And, as is required, they place the initial point of the chronology later than the accession of Puliṅkēśhin II., by five or six years. For these reasons, therefore, there can be no doubt that the dates now put forward are the correct ones; and that, as has been shewn in detail above, the first year of Vishnuvardhana I., and with it the chronology of the latter records of his dynasty, commenced in or with the month of Vaiśākhā of Saka-Saṅvat 538 current, corresponding to
the period from the 21st March to the 19th April, A. D. 615; — unless Chaitra śakla 1 of the same year should be preferred, in accordance with a possibility that is to be considered further on.

With these leading dates thus determined, and with the dates which elsewhere have been shewn to be the days of the coronation of Amma II. and Rājarāja I. (ante, Vol. XIX. pp. 103, 130), we can now proceed to adjust the beginning and the end of each successive reign. Anterior to the time of Amma II., the only difficulty, — apart from the fact that the periods are for the most part stated only in even years, without fractions, — is in respect of the reign of Narēndrämarāja-Vijayāditya II. The grant P. states that he reigned for forty-eight years; and M., N., and Q. to X., agree in this respect; L., however, puts the duration of his reign at forty-four years; while K. and O. say only forty. I find that from no point of view, if we look to such details as are considered in the arrangement of the first of my two Lists, can a reign of forty-eight years be allowed for, unless we make such large reductions as practically to shorten some of the reigns by a full year each; moreover, it seems almost an impossible length, following, in a new generation, after reigns of thirty-seven, eighteen, and thirty-six years, in three successive generations. Forty years is the period that fits in most naturally for the reign in question. But a reign of forty-four years can be admitted, without any special difficulty, if, from the time of Vishnuvartha II. to that of Chālukya-Bhima II., both included, we shorten by one month each reign of seven and nine years; by three months, each reign longer than nine years and under twenty years; by four months, each reign exceeding twenty years and ranging up to thirty years; and by five months, each of the four reigns in excess of thirty years. And this is the figure that I have here adopted; being strongly inclined to think that the statement in L. is the correct one, though, for the present, it stands alone; the explanation of the discrepant statements would be, that he actually reigned for forty-four years, after ruling for four years as Yuvarāja; that in M., N., and P. to X., the four years of Yuvarāja-ship were erroneously added to the forty-four years of his reign; and that in K. and O. a mistake was made in the other direction, and, it being thought that the forty-four years included his four years of Yuvarāja-ship, four years were deducted, and his actual reign was thus reduced to forty years.  

We thus obtain the results exhibited in the List on page 12 below.  

Partly to shew the way in which the details have been arranged, and partly to explain why there is apparently not always a uniform difference between the years A. D. and the Saka years, I have inserted certain months with the years A. D.  

These months, except in a few cases, are of course hypothetical, and subject to any future correction. But, allowing for this, the List may be taken as giving, very closely, the real dates for the successive kings of the Eastern Chālukya dynasty, up to the latest time for which information has been obtained.

18 In the case of Jayasimha I., the statement of the minority is certainly the correct one; since, from no point of view can a reign of thirty-three years be allotted to him. — Discrepant statements may possibly be obtained hereafter in respect of Gunaśa-Vijayāditya III. At present all the grants state that he reigned for forty-four years; but U. adds the alternative statement, “or forty-eight years,” in a separate verse.

19 The order of succession given by me differs from that given by Dr. Hultzsch in his Genealogical Table from after No. 27, Rājarāja I. Dr. Hultzsch took the succession of the rulers of Veṅgl. But from that point the Eastern Chālukyas were primarily kings of the Chēla kingdom; and Veṅgl was an appendage of the crown governed by viceroys. I have followed the actual dynastic succession.

17 To convert current Šaka years into years A. D., the additive quantity is 77-78. In the present day, with the Mēsha-Saniṅkṛatī occurring on or about the 12th April, 77 is to be added for the first nine months of a Šaka year, corresponding roughly to the English months April to December; and 78 for the last three months, answering to January to March. For the Eastern Chālukya period, when the Mēsha-Saniṅkṛatī ranged from the 19th to the 26th March, and Chaitra śakla 1 ranged from the 20th February to the 24th March (see Gen. Sir A. Cunningham’s Indian Erea), the additive quantities may be taken as 77 for the first ten months of the luni-solar Šaka year, corresponding roughly to the English months March to December; and 78 for the last two months, answering to January and February.
### List of the Eastern Chalukya Kings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order and Names</th>
<th>Length of Reign Y. M. D.</th>
<th>A. D.</th>
<th>Current Saka Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vishnudharana I, Kubja-Vishnudharana; the commencement of his years was in or with the month Vasakha of Saka-Samvat 538 current, corresponding to the period from the 21st March to the 19th April, A. D. 615</td>
<td>18 0 0</td>
<td>March 615 to March 633</td>
<td>538 to 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jayasimha I; eldest son of No. 1</td>
<td>80 0 0</td>
<td>June 633 to Feb. 663</td>
<td>556 to 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indra-Bhattaraka; younger brother of No. 2</td>
<td>0 0 7</td>
<td>Feb. 663</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vishnudharana II, son of No. 3; the commencement of his years was in the period from Phalguna sukla 1 of Saka-Samvat 585 current to Chaitra sukla 16 of Saka-Samvat 596 current, corresponding to the period from the 14th February to the 24th March, A. D. 663</td>
<td>9 0 0</td>
<td>June 685 to Jan. 692</td>
<td>685 to 694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Manjyuvaraja; son of No. 4</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td>Jan. 692 to Sept. 696</td>
<td>694 to 698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jayasimha II; eldest son of No. 5</td>
<td>13 0 0</td>
<td>Sept. 696 to June 709</td>
<td>699 to 702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kukkibi; youngest brother of No. 6</td>
<td>0 0 6</td>
<td>June 709 to Dec. 709</td>
<td>702 to 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vishnudharana III; elder brother of No. 7</td>
<td>37 0 0</td>
<td>Dec. 709 to July 746</td>
<td>703 to 709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vijayaditya I, Bhattaraka; son of No. 8</td>
<td>18 0 0</td>
<td>July 746 to April 764</td>
<td>709 to 727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vishnudharana IV, son of No. 9</td>
<td>36 0 0</td>
<td>April 764 to Nov. 799</td>
<td>727 to 744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vijayaditya II, Narandramigaraja; son of No. 10</td>
<td>44 0 0</td>
<td>Nov. 799 to June 843</td>
<td>744 to 766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Vishnudharana V, Kali-Vishnudharana; son of No. 11</td>
<td>1 6 0</td>
<td>June 843 to Dec. 844</td>
<td>766 to 767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vijayaditya III, Guhaka; eldest son of No. 12</td>
<td>44 0 0</td>
<td>Dec. 844 to July 888</td>
<td>767 to 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Chalukya-Bhima I; son of the Yuvardja Vikramaditya I, a younger brother of No. 13</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td>July 888 to March 918</td>
<td>811 to 841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Vijayaditya IV, Kollabiganda; eldest son of No. 14</td>
<td>0 6 0</td>
<td>March 918 to Sept. 918</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Ardha I, Vishnudharana VI; eldest son of No. 15</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>Sept. 918 to Aug. 925</td>
<td>841 to 848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Vijayaditya V, Bota; eldest son of No. 16</td>
<td>0 0 15</td>
<td>Aug. 925</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Tadapa; son of Yuddhamalla I, who was a younger brother of the Yuvardja Vikramaditya I (see under No. 14)</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>Aug. 925 to Sept. 925</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Vikramaditya II; younger brother of No. 15</td>
<td>0 11 0</td>
<td>Sept. 925 to Aug. 926</td>
<td>848 to 849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Bhima III; younger brother of No. 17</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
<td>Aug. 926 to April 927</td>
<td>849 to 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Yuddhamalla II; son of No. 18</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>April 927 to March 934</td>
<td>850 to 857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Chalukya-Bhima II, Vishnudharana VII; younger brother of No. 16</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
<td>March 934 to Dec. 945</td>
<td>857 to 868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Amma II, Vijayaditya VI; second son of No. 22; crowned on the 5th December, A. D. 946</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td>Dec. 945 to 970</td>
<td>888 to 893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Darnavirya; elder brother of No. 23</td>
<td>8 0 0</td>
<td>970 to 973</td>
<td>893 to 896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Darnavirya</td>
<td>29 8 0</td>
<td>973 to Aug. 1003</td>
<td>896 to 926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Vimaladitya; younger brother of No. 25</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
<td>Aug. 1003 to 1015</td>
<td>926 to 938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Raja I, Vishnudharana VIII; eldest son of No. 26; crowned on the 16th August, A. D. 1022</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>1015 to 1022</td>
<td>938 to 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Kalottunga-Chodadeva I; son of No. 27</td>
<td>41 0 0</td>
<td>1022 to 1033</td>
<td>945 to 986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Vikrama-Choda; eldest son of No. 28</td>
<td>49 0 0</td>
<td>1033 to 1112</td>
<td>986 to 1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Kalottunga-Chodadeva II; son of No. 29; we have a record of his time, dated in Saka-Samvat 1086</td>
<td>15 0 0</td>
<td>1112 to 1127</td>
<td>1035 to 1050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternative List of the Eastern Chalukya Kings; taking Chaitra śukla 1 as the First Day of each Regnal Year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order and Names</th>
<th>Length of Reign.</th>
<th>Current Saka Years</th>
<th>Order and Names</th>
<th>Length of Reign.</th>
<th>Current Saka Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1; Vishṇuvardhana I</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
<td>538 to 555</td>
<td>20; Bhima III</td>
<td>0 8 0</td>
<td>(849 to 850)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2; Jayasimha I</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td>556 to 585</td>
<td>21; Yuddhamalla II</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>850 to 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3; Indra-Bhaṭṭāraka</td>
<td>0 7 0</td>
<td>(855)</td>
<td>22; Chālukya-Bhima II</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
<td>857 to 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4; Vishṇuvardhana II</td>
<td>9 0 0</td>
<td>586 to 594</td>
<td>23; Amma II; the date of his coronation was the amata Mārgaśīraha krishna 12 of Saka-Saṃvat 868 current</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td>892 to 895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5; Māṃgī-Yuvārāja</td>
<td>25 0 0</td>
<td>595 to 619</td>
<td>24; Dāññapana</td>
<td>12 0 0</td>
<td>906 to 925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6; Jayasimha II</td>
<td>13 0 0</td>
<td>620 to 632</td>
<td>25; Saktivarman</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>926 to 937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7; Kokkili</td>
<td>6 0 0</td>
<td>(632)</td>
<td>26; Vimalāditya</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>938 to 944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8; Vishṇuvardhana III</td>
<td>37 0 0</td>
<td>632 to 668</td>
<td>27; Rājarāj I; the date of his coronation was the amata Bhādrapada krishna 2 of Saka-Saṃvat 945 current</td>
<td>41 0 0</td>
<td>945 to 966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9; Vijayāditya I</td>
<td>18 0 0</td>
<td>668 to 665</td>
<td>28; Kulantānag-Chāḍa dēva I</td>
<td>0 6 0</td>
<td>956 to 1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10; Vishṇuvardhana IV</td>
<td>36 0 0</td>
<td>683 to 721</td>
<td>29; Vikrama-Chōḍa</td>
<td>15 0 0</td>
<td>1035 to 1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11; Vijayāditya II</td>
<td>48 0 0</td>
<td>721 to 728</td>
<td>30; Kulantānag-Chāḍa dēva II</td>
<td>11 0 0</td>
<td>1050 to ......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12; Vishṇuvardhana V</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>763 to 769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13; Vijayāditya III</td>
<td>44 0 0</td>
<td>769 to 812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14; Chālukya-Bhima I</td>
<td>30 0 0</td>
<td>812 to 841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15; Vijayāditya IV</td>
<td>0 6 0</td>
<td>(841 to 842)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16; Amma I</td>
<td>7 0 0</td>
<td>842 to 848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17; Vijayāditya V</td>
<td>0 15</td>
<td>(843)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18; Tāḍāpa</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>(848)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19; Vikramāditya II</td>
<td>11 0</td>
<td>(848 to 849)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is, however, another way of looking at the matter, suggested partly by the manner in which the reigns are mostly stated only in even years, and partly by the results for the dates of Vishṇuvardhana I. and his grandson. It is that, irrespective of the actual days of their accession or coronation, the Eastern Chalukya kings may possibly have been in the habit of using regnal years coinciding with the luni-solar years, each commencing with Chaitra śukla 1; or at any rate, — and with still greater probability, — that this may be the real manner in which we ought to apply the details given in the later grants commencing with K. The two dates of Vishṇuvardhana II. adapt themselves just as well.

---

19 We have a record of his time, dated in Saka-Saṃvat 1056. In respect of the details of the date, there are some difficulties, which will be noticed further on.

20 It may be noted, however, that Vijayāditya's Alhore record, in which Āvayaṇa is specified as the third month in his thirteenth year (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 197), seems to prove that, if the Western Chalukya kings had any fixed point for the commencement of their regnal years, it was not Chaitra śukla 1.

21 In the neighbouring country of Orissa, there is a custom of this kind, of regnal years commencing with Bhādrapada śukla 11 or 12 (see a note on "The Oṅko Reckoning of Orissa;" ante, Vol. XIX. p. 555 f.). The period to which its origin can be carried back, is not yet known. But the manner in which the month is specified in the Chālukyapallu grant of Vishṇuvardhana I. shows, — whatever may be its exact application, — that this system of years, commencing in Bhādrapada, did not originate with the Eastern Chalukyas.
to a system of years commencing with the Chaitra śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 586 current, as they do to an initial point ranging from the preceding Phālguna śukla 1 to the tīthi śukla 10 of the same Chaitra; and the narrowness of the limits, on either side of Chaitra śukla 1, within which the initial point must lie, seems in itself rather suggestive. Again, a still more pointed inference might possibly be drawn from the Chipurpalle grant of Vaiśhūvardhana I.; the date of which adapts itself just as well to a system of years commencing with the Chaitra śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 583 current, as it does to an initial point lying in the next following month, Vaiśākha. In this date, the details are “the year 18, the month 4, the day 15.” The actual month is Srāvaṇa, which is really the fifth month in the luni-solar year; and the actual day is the full-moon day, which is really the thirtieth day in its own month by the pārśvanāta arrangement of the fortnights, which is the proper one for the period in question. But, if the first month of the year is to be taken as a full month of twenty-nine or thirty days, i.e., if, instead of consisting only of the bright fortnight of Chaitra, it is to be taken as including also the dark fortnight of the pārśvanāta Vaiśākha, then, the following months also being treated in the same way, the full-moon day of Srāvaṇa is the fifteenth day in the fifth month. And the details of the date in question might be interpreted as meaning “the year 18, or 18 years; 24 completed months; and the completion of the tīthi ending on the 15th civil day of the next and current month.” Accordingly, while I am not to be understood as adopting finally, as yet, such a system of regnal years, which is for the present only a possibility, I present, on the upper part of page 13 above, an alternative list of the Eastern Chalukya kings, based on the adoption of Chaitra śukla 1 as the first day of each regnal year, and giving the current Saka years which may be taken as the first and last years of each successive reign. The assumptions involved are, (1) that the whole of the luni-solar year in which the accession, or at any rate the coronation, of any particular king took place, would be usually counted as the first year of his reign, and that his second year would begin with the Chaitra śukla 1 next after his accession or coronation; (2) that there would be exceptions, in the cases of accessions taking place very late in the luni-solar year; suppose, for instance, that a king actually succeeded to the throne in Māgha or Phālguna; in searching for an auspicious day for the ceremony, his coronation would very possibly be postponed till after the next Chaitra śukla 1; and it is most likely that his first regnal year would then run from that Chaitra śukla 1, and would not include the luni-solar year in which his actual accession took place; (3) that, from time to time, one and the same luni-solar year would come to be counted twice over, as the last regnal year of one king, and as the first regnal year of his successor; especially when a change of rulers took place about the middle of a luni-solar year; and (4) that the close proximity to Chaitra śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 586 current, of the limits within which the first day of the first regnal year of Vaiśhūvardhana II. must lie, indicates that that day itself was the initial day of his reign, according to this system of regnal years coinciding with the luni-solar years. The manner in which, by this more rough and ready method of regulating the details, the last year of one reign and the first year of the next must have occasionally coincided, makes it easy enough now to admit forty-eight years as the duration of the reign of Vijayāditya II. And accordingly, on the chance that that record may be the correct one, in this alternative arrangement I have taken his reign at that length; and the Saka years have been counted twice over in passing from Nos. 6 to 8, 8 to 9, 9 to 10, 10 to 11, 11 to 12, 12 to 13, 13 to 14, and 22 to 23. In all other respects, the lengths of the reigns are the same as in the first list. Even this system, of luni-solar regnal years, does not permit of allowing more than thirty years for the reign of Jayasimha I. For, though Saka-Saṅvat 555 current should be counted as the first year of his reign, in addition to being the eighteenth and last year of Vaiśhuvar-

[31] I do not mean “eighteen expired years;” as, whatever may be the Hindu practice in respect of eras, I cannot find reasons for looking with favor on a system of expired regnal years. Such a system might be created, by counting “the year one” from the Chaitra śukla 1 next after the day of accession or of coronation; and the year would be practically “the year one, expired;” the real first current year being that in which the accession or coronation actually took place. But the idea is too much opposed to common sense to be acceptable, without absolute proof, which, for the present at any rate, is not forthcoming.
dhana I., still his thirty-third year could not come before Saka-Saṁvat 587 current; and we have found that this is, not the first, but the second year, of Vishnuvardhana II. The Saka years for such reigns as were hardly long enough to materially affect the reckoning as presented in the records, are given in brackets.

(To be continued.)

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

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

No. 193. — CHIPURUPALLE COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF VISHNUVARDHANA I. — DATED IN HIS EIGHTEENTH YEAR.

The plates containing this inscription were first brought to notice in 1867 by Mr. Master, who sent them to the Madras Government. They were handed over for decipherment to the Rev. T. Foulkes, who published a fairly accurate translation of the inscription in 1870, in the *Jour. Beng. As. Soc.* Vol. XXXIX. Part I. p. 153 ff. And from a letter from the Collector of Vizagapatam, quoted by Mr. Foulkes, it appears that the plates were found near the village of Chipurupalle, — the ‘Chipurupille’ of the Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 106; in Lat. 17° 34', Long. 83° 10', — the chief town of the Chipurupalle Talukā or Sub-Division of the Vizagapatam District, Madras Presidency. Subsequently, Dr. Burnell published his own reading of the text, in his *South-Indian Paleography*, p. 137 f. (second edition); with a lithograph (*id.* Plate xxvii.). Since then, the original plates have been lost sight of. It is much to be wished that they could be recovered; because, if they were properly cleaned, a better facsimile could be published than that given by Dr. Burnell; especially in respect of the numerical symbols in the date at the end of the record. Failing, in spite of efforts kindly made by Dr. Hultzsch, to obtain the originals, I now edit the inscription from Dr. Burnell’s lithograph.

The plates, of which the first and last are inscribed on one side only, are three in number; each measuring, if the published lithograph is full-size, about 7" by 2". They appear to be quite smooth; the edges being neither fashioned thicker, nor raised into rims. The inscription on them, however, seems to be in a state of perfect preservation throughout. — There are holes for a ring near the proper right end of each plate; but I do not find any record as to whether the ring and its seal were found with the plates. — The characters belong to the southern class of alphabets; and are of the regular type of the period and part of the country to which the grant belongs. The average size of the letters is about 1/4". — The language is Sanskrit throughout; and the whole record is in prose, except for two of the customary benedictive and imprecatory verses, which are quoted in lines 16 to 19. — The orthography presents nothing calling for remark.

The inscription is one of the Eastern Chalukya king Vishnuvardhana I., otherwise called Kubja-Vishnuvardhana; this record mentions him also by the birūda of Vishamasiddhi. It is non-sectarian; the object of it being only to record the grant of a village to two Brāhmaṇas.

The grant was made by Vishnuvardhana I. himself, while residing at the town of Cheguṇḍra in a vishaya the name of which seems to be Pūki. For the latter name, I cannot propose any identification; unless an examination of the original plates should give such a reading of the name, as would enable us to identify it with the ‘Pudi’ of the map, seven miles south-west of Chipurupalle. But Cheguṇḍra is probably an older form of the name of Chipurupalle itself, where the plates were obtained. The village that was granted was Kālavakonda, or possibly Kālavakonta, in the Dimila vishaya. The name of the village does not appear to be now extant; unless it is preserved in the ‘Kondakira’ of the map, seven

1 With the termination of this name, compare pūraka in Brāhmapūraka, Kollapūraka, and Vasiṇapūraka (Gupta Inscriptions, p. 246).
miles in a north-westerly direction from Chipurupalle. There can, however, be no doubt that, as was suggested by the Collector of Vizagapatam in his letter to Mr. Foulkes, the name of the Vishaya has been preserved in the modern village of Dimile, in the Sarvasiddhi Taluk of the same District, fourteen miles towards the south-west from Chipurupalle. And this identification is of importance; because it shows that, at the date of this grant, the sphere of the sovereignty of Vishṇuvardhana I. included, if it did not lie only in, territory considerably to the north-east of the Veğli country, which is always referred to, in the later records, as being specially the locality of the rule of the Eastern Chalukya kings.

From line 14 we learn, that the grant was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon in the month Sṛavaṇa. And at the end of the record there are given, in numerical symbols, the details of “the year 18, the month 4, and the (civil) day 15.” The year denotes the regnal year of Vishṇuvardhana I. And, coupling these details with those in line 14, the corresponding English date is the 7th July, A. D. 632, corresponding to the full-moon tithi of Sṛavaṇa of Saka-Saṅvat 555 current; on this day there was an eclipse of the moon, visible all over India (see page 4 above). From the later records of this dynasty, we know that Vishṇuvardhana I. reigned over the Veğli kingdom for just about eighteen years.

**TEXT.**

**First Plate.**

1 Svaṣṭiḥ Śrīmapa-[Ch*]alukya(kya)-kūla-jalaniḥdhi-samuditō nipati-niśkarāh svā-
2 bhrūlāa-bhāg-[a*]nāmita-ṛj*[i*]puripati-makula-maniprabhā-vichhuriita-charanāravinda-
3 dvayaḥ Satyaśraya-sīravallabha-mahārāj[a]* Tasya priy-ānujaḥ sthalā-jalā-
4 vana-giri-vishama-durgīśvha labdha-siddhītiṣa-Vishmasiddhiḥ din-ānātha-dviṣa-
5 vasu-vrīṣṭiḥ

**Second Plate; First Side.**

6 sva-dān-āṅgaṣvā[ra*]ah parimagna-Kali-prabhaśa-anēk-samara-viṣaya-samudī[ta*]-
7 vimala-yāśo-viśeṣa-vibhūhiita-sakalā-dūmaṇḍalā Mahā-sīrīva vinaya-jīṣ[a*] Prithu-
8 reiva prithu-kī(k)īt[a*] Gaurīva matimān paramabrahmāya śrī(ārī)-
9 Vishṇuvarddhana-mahār[a*]jaḥ
10 Dimila-viṣhayā Kalvakanḍa-grām-adhivāsināh kuṭumbinā-samavēṭān-imam-śrīthān-śā-
11 jāpayati yathā [i*] Adhi(ḥ)ī-āvagata-vēḍa-vēḍaṅgasya Brahmaśarmaṃśaḥ

**Second Plate; Second Side.**

11 gata-sva-sākhā-ḥōḍita-sva-karma-ānushāna-tatparasya Du[r*]gaśarmaṃśaḥ putrā-
12 bhṛṇḍ[r*] vēḍa-vē-
14 Taṭā́rīkśa-ḥarāṇābhāyaṃ Vishnuśa[r*]maṃ-Madāvāśarmaṃbhāyaṃ Pāt(k)k[i*]-viṣhayē
15 Cherpura-
16 grāmam-adhivasaḥ Śrāvaṇa-maṣe chandra-grahaṃ-nimīttē sarva-karaṇa-paripāra-
17 p[ī*]grāhākṛṣṭ[ī]ya vya-puṣṭa-ayur-arōga-yāṣo-bhīvṛiddhyayē grām-yaṃ datil[a*]

Asya

---

* From the published lithograph.
* Read saṃtiṅ; the appearance of the visaya is probably only due to a mark of punctuation, imperfectly cleared off.
* Read taṭārīkśa; or perhaps taṭārīkṣaka.
* Read adhivasaḥ (maṇḍ); or adhivasaḥbhāṣ (amābhāṣ).
Third Plate.

16 kāsācādapi na bādhā karaṇāyā (ii) Atra Vṛṣā-bīmā [ii] Bahūbhīr-vvaśūdā
dattā bahu-
17 bhīr-saunāpāla he yasya yasya yādā bhumih tasya tasya tadā phalaih (ii)
Shashṭi varsha-
18 sahaśrāni svargge mōdati bhumī-daḥ ākshēptā chānunmānata cha tānyēva naraṇē
d vāṣeṭ (ii*) Sṛmati Mātsya(-ku (?)lo) prasūtah sva-bhūja-bala-pratāp-āvanata-
riṣub-
20 vṛtājñapti-Ātavidurjaya (ii*) Saha 108 ma 4 di 105 ii

TRANSLATION.

Hail! A very moon of a king, risen from the ocean which is the glorious Chalukya family; having the two water-lilies, which are (his) feet, inlaid with the lustre of the jewels in the diadems of hostile kings who are bowed down by the frowning of his creeper-like arched eyebrows; — (such is) the Mahārāja Satyārāya, the favourite of fortune.

(Line 3) — His dear younger brother, — (who is called) Vījhamāsidhī, because he has achieved success against fortresses, difficult of access, on the plains, in the water, in the woods, and on hills; who is a very cow of plenty, through raining down showers of treasures on the poor, the helpless, and the twice-born; who is a very Makaradhvaja (Kāmadēva), because his handsome form plays the part of Madana (Kāmadēva) among young women; who has drowned the power of (the wickedness of) the Kali age in the oceans that are his charities; who has adorned all the regions with the characteristic of (his) pure fame, that has arisen from victory in many battles; who, like Manu, is acquainted with courteous behaviour; who, like Pṛithu, is of far-reaching fame; who, like Guru (the regent of the planet Jupiter; the preceptor of the gods), is possessed of wisdom; (and) who is extremely kind to Brāhmaṇa, —

(L. 8) — (He), the Mahārāja, the glorious Vīshnupārtha (I.), issues a command to this purport to the assembled cultivators who reside at the village of Kāvakoṇa in the Dīmilā vishaya: vis: —

(L. 10) — “To the two sons’ sons of Brāhmaśārmāna, who studied and mastered the Vedas and Vēḍāṅgas, — the sons of Durgāśārmāna, who was intent upon performing his own proper rites, prescribed by his own ādibha, which had been duly learned (by him), — (viz.) to Vīshnāśārmāna and Māhāvāśārmāna, who know the true meaning of the Vedas, the Vēḍāṅgas, the epics, the Purāṇas, the law-books, and many other sacred works, who are of the Gautama gūtā, (and) who belong to the Tātirīya charaṇa, by (me) residing at (the town of) Cherupāra in the Pūki (?) vishaya, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon in the month Sāvāra, this village has been given, as an agraḥāra, with exemption from all taxes, for the increase of (my) own religious merit and duration of life and good health and fame. No obstruction (to the enjoyment) of it, should be caused by any one at all.”

(L. 16) — On this point (there are) two verses of Vyāsa: — Land has been enjoyed by many people, and has been preserved (in grant) by many; whosoever at any time possesses
the earth, to him belongs, at that time, the reward (of this grant that is now made, if he continue it)! The giver of land enjoys happiness in heaven for sixty thousand years; (but) he who resumes (a grant), or he who assents (to an act of resumption), shall dwell for the same number of years in hell!

(L. 19) — (The bearer of) the command (i.e. the Dātaka) is Aṇāvidurjaya, born in the illustrious Matsya family (?), who has bowed down (his) enemies by the strength and prowess of his arm.

(L. 20) — The year 10 (and) 8; the month 4; the day 10 (and) 5.

WEBER'S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS.
TRANSLATED BY DR. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

(Continued from Vol. XIX. p. 70.)

VII. The seventh aṅgām uvasagadāsā, upāsakādāsā, in ten ajjhayāsas; legends about ten upāsakas or pious fathers of families (gāhēval), who, by means of asceticism, &c., attained the divine condition and thereby releaseament.

Aṅgās 7—9 belong to the second group of aṅgās (see above p. 249, 307), from the general connection of the contents of each, from their common designation in aṅgā 3, 10 as dasātuka, from the special denomination of their introduction (uṇkhēva, upakshēpa), or conclusion (uṇkhēva), and from their very limited extent. [316] Aṅgās 7—9 thus stand in immediate connection with each other and bear the stamp of an undeniable unity.

This conclusion is drawn from the method of treatment which prevails in them, and which explains their inconsiderable extent. The first account contains (as is the case in part 2 of aṅgā 6) the pattern on which all the others are modelled. We need therefore refer merely to the points of contact, and make mention of what is new in the presentation of the subject. An especial characteristic of aṅgā 7 is this:—Though different localities are adduced for the single stories, which all belong to the period of Mahāvīra, the king is in every case (the name Śēṅga in the eighth story is the solitary exception) called Jīyasattu, the origin of which name must be sought in the Ajātaśatrū of the Buddhistic legends. The titles of the ten stories are found in aṅgā 3, 10 (S), and are in general the same as those given here; see above, p 271:—

1. Āgāndha in Vāṇiyagāma.
2. Kāmādeva in Chamāpā.
3. Chulaṇīpiṣṭha (piṣṭha) in Bāpārasi.
4. Surādēva, in Bāpārasi.
5. Chulaśaṅga (śāc S, sayana V) in Ālābhīyā.
7. Saddālaputta in Pāḷāsapura; he was a potter and adherent of the ōjvāsas (ōjvīkāh Gōṣṭāśāsīshāh, Schol.).

1 See the proceeding note.
2 uṇkhāyamanardhāh see Hēm. abhād., p. 244. We saw, it is true, above (p. 270 seqq.) on aṅgā 3, 10 that the designation dasa is in the texts cited there, but not our texts of aṅgās 7—9 with the exception of aṅgā 7; these must consequently be regarded as secondary in comparison to the former.
3 The smallness of these aṅgās is however to some extent only one of appearance, in so far as each of the numerous tales, which, from being identical with previous ones, are reduced to some phrases only, must be counted in full. At the end especial mention is made of the number of days necessary for the uddēnam, i.e. recital or recitation of each of the ajjhayāsas or sārāpās. The Vidhipāpa characterizes the 10 ajjhay as egasara because they are not divided into uddēnagas.
4 In each account there is a name beginning with Arūpā; in the first the name Arūpā itself, in the others it forms the first member of a compound e.g. Arupabha, Arupappahā, Arupakaṇṇātē, Arupasitthā, &c.
8. Mahásaya (sayaga V) in Rāyagīha.
10. Lētiāpi (‘piar), in Sāvattīhi.

Vardhamānadeśāna is the title of a metrical treatment in Prākrit gāthās of the contents of this aīga, to which I have had access. The MS. is cut short at v. 865 in the history of Ananda. An interlinear version in Sanskrit accompanies the Prākrit; its first verse cites the title Vardhī2. The sixth name is the same (v. 8) as in S V: kōlia (kōlika), the eighth (v. 9) Mahāsaya (but iātaka in the chhāyā), the tenth Tētalipi (Tētalipiṣṭa, see p. 310).

There is an anonymous commentary, which refers to a vyākhya on aīga 6 by the same author. The word kāhānīya (often erroneously kāññāya), which is frequently used in the scholia when the meaning of a passage is plain and needs no further comment, implies that these passages are “in everybody’s throat, intelligible by themselves.” This I owe to the courtesy of a communication from Bühlcr.

The table of contents in aīga 4 and Naundī (N) is as follows:—sē kiṁ taṁ uvācagadāsau ? uvācāsau naṁ uvācagadān (samovā N) nāgarājīn ujā chāhī vaṇa (N omits) rāyā anām maṁ dhammārīyā dhammahākaṁ hālaqaparāloka-īddhīviśesā, uvācagadān chaśī samvāyāva-vāramaṇa-gūpa-7 pachoha [318] khaṇḍa-pośabhvāvad-paṭivajjayaṇaś3, syuyaparīggaḥ tavāvahāśeṇa pājīmaṁ4 uvācagadā samālāṇaḥ bhattachakakaḥkāṇaḥ (‘paṁ N) pāvagama (paṭivagamaṇāṁ N) dēvaś5 sukula5 puṇapōhi6 aṁtakirṇīya ya (N omits) āghavijaṃṣi; uvācagadāṇaṁ7 naṁ uvācagadān riddhīviśeṣā pariṣa18 vīthāradaḥmaṇaśaṇaṇaś19 bōhīlābha-abhīgama-samattavīviddhāth-thirata21 mūlaṅgottaraganaḥ atichārā thitivīsā23 ya bahuḥviśeṣa pājīmaṁ24 bhīgghaṇa25 pālaṇa uvācagadābhīsīya26 nīrāsaggavya ya27 tav28 ya charītā samvāyāvagupvāramaṇapachakakkaḥ-apōśabhvāvasa apachchhimamārāṇaṁyā22 ya samālāṇa ya,22 appālaṁ jaha ya bhāvāttā, bāhuḥ bhattachā lāṇaṣaṇaḥ ya chheitīya28 uvācagadā, uvācagadā kappavravāvīmāputtamāṇa24 jaha aṁghavānita suravairavāvāvaparāḥđārīya29 sōkkhanī aṁghavānita, kamēya bhottāna uttāmaṁ,30 taō aukhāṇaṁ chaya samālā ya jīṇamāṇamāni bōhiḥ laddhaṇa27 ya samājantaṁ tamaraya-Oghavipa[319]mukkha31 uvēnti;30 jaha akkhaṇa30 savadukkhaṭvā hākumākhaḥ ētā nāma emāvāmāni.

VIII. The eighth aṅgam, aṅtakagadāsau, aṅtakrīdāsau, or aṅtakrīdāsaa, see Hem. abh., v. 244; in eight vāggas, embraces in all 93 aṣṭhāvānas, viz. (10, 8, 13, 10, 10, 16, 13, 10);31 it deals with legends concerning the pious, who have “put an end” to their worldly life.32
The number of the vaggas, eight, is very remarkable, as it is not in harmony with the concluding part of the title. Our surprise is however increased when we reflect that in aṅga 3 and aṅga 4 (see above 271, 286) ten aṭṭhānaśas were allotted to our text; in aṅga 4, besides, seven vaggas and ten uddāsaṇākālas. The Nandi agrees with our text in asportioning to it eight vaggas (and eight udd.,) but makes no mention of aṭṭhānas whatever. Furthermore the titles of the ten aṭṭhānas cited in aṅga 3, 10, have scarcely anything in common with those of our text (see p. 271, 322); some appear in aṅga 9. There is therefore here a violent opposition between [320] the tradition and the actual constitution of the text. We have seen above, p. 272, 291, that even Abhayadēva on aṅga 3 and 4 confessed that he was unable to explain the differences between the statements made there and the text constituting the aṅga.

In harmony with this is the fact that the existing text is in an exceedingly fragmentary condition, and is fulfilled with references to sections in aṅgas 5 and 6, upānga 2, and, according to the scholia, to the Dākṣeṣṭākāṇḍaṇa, the fourth chādāśāram. In many instances, the later aṭṭhānas of a vagg, just as was the case in part 2 of the sixth aṅga and in aṅga 7, present us with nothing more than a mere title. Each vagg is preceded by a statement in kāṭka-form of the contents of the ṣaṭṭhāna, which are therein contained. The scholiast on the Nandi thinks that by the vaggahṛdaya (mentioned among the aṅgaśāvatissa texts) the 8 vaggas of the Antakṛikāśūkṣā are intended. The same statement is found in the scholium on aṅga 3, 10; though there appears to be no proper place for any chāliḍa whatever.

The scene of the first story is in Bāravatī at the court of king Aśādṛavyaṇaḥ (Aṃḍabhakaviruṣṇi), or of Kaṅkāśāyana; in the court of Vasudēva, Baladēva, Ārīṭhānaṇa, Pañjana, Samanta, Aniruddha, Jāmabatī, Sambhābhāmā, Ruppiṇī, &c., which belonged to this story, and also that of Bāravatī itself, are met with as frequently as the recital proceeds. The ninth story of the first vagg treats of Pāsaṇa, [321] Prasenaṅgī. The third vagg begins with the history of Anīyasa, son of Nāgā nāma gāhavati, Sulaśā nāma bhārīya, under king Jīyasattra of Bhaṭtadalāna. The sixth vagg begins with the history of Makāyī under king Śaṇa of Rāyagī. The other localities are essentially the same as those in aṅga 7, viz.—Vaiṣṇavagāme, Śravatī, Pālāsapura, Vāṇaprasā, Chānḍā, and also Śāțā (Śāṭā). The last vagg treats especially of the ten wives of king Śaṇa, step-mothers (challamaṇḍyā) of king Kaṁja: Kaṭṭa, Śūkṣā, &c., who one and all zealously studied the sāṭṭhānas of the aṭṭhānas and are instructed therein by the Aṭṭhānaṇ (about whom no further notice is given). This piety is probably connected with the death of the sons of each, cf. upānga 8 (Nirayavaiṣanta); and their grandsons—sons of these sons—become ascetics if we may ascribe any probability to the legend, cf. upānga 9.

The kāṭkas with the titles of the aṭṭhānas for the single vaggas are:

1. Gōtamaṃ 26 Samudda Śāgarā Gambhīrā chēva hōi Thināṭe ya | Ayalā Kampillā khalu Akkhobbe Pasṇaṅ Vīphu ||

2. Akkhobbe Śāgara khalu Samudda Himayanta Achala nāma ya | Dharanaḥ ya Pāraṇaḥ ya Ajjhīhāhāde (Abhīhāhāde) chēva aṭṭhaṃ ||

3. Anīyasa Aṇāntasēṇe Aṭṭhānitaṇe Aṇīyasaṇe Dēvāsēṇe Sattusaṇe | Sārap Gā Ṣunmḥe Dūmubē Kūṭe Dālā Agāhīttha ||

24 The scholiast seeks to reconcile the contradiction as follows—prathamavargā duṣṭa 'ḥayaṇaṇaḥ 'ti tasmān-

khyayaḥ aṅtakṛikāda. This is of course a mere make-shift. If Abh. appeals to the Nandi on this point (see p. 291n), he can mean nothing else (since the Nandi contains nothing of the kind) than that the Nandi cites for our aṅga eight "vaggas" instead of ten "aṭṭhānas." This so-called "explanation" substitutes, without a word of warning "aṭṭhāna" for vaggas.

25 The text has vaggas, but Pāṇḍhikanāṭṭra and Vīdhippapā and also aṅga 3, 10 (above p. 274) have likewise vaggas.


27 Also in the Vīdhippapā: itthā aṭṭhānaṇi Gāyana-māla.
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5. Paśmāvati Göri Gaṇidhārī Lakkhaṇa Sūtāma ya Jāmībavatī Sachchabhāmā Ruppini Mālasiri Māladattī vī 11

6. Makāyī Kīnkam(m)ōth chēva Moggarasāni ya Kāsāvi Kēmatē Dhitidhārē chēva Kēlsē Harichāndanda vī Vārātē Sudhāsāg Punnabhaddē taḥa Sūmāabhaddē Supaṭīthē Mēha’timuttē Alakkhē aṣṭhāyatī tu sūlasāyām 11

7. Naṃdā Naṃdavatī chēva Naṃduttarā Naṃdisēṇiyā chēva Matē Sūmārūtā Mahāmarutā Marudēvā ya aṭṭhamā 11 Bhadda Subbaddā ya Sujāyā Sūmaṇāya 11 Bhūyadinnā ya bōdhavva Sēnīabhajāya nāmātī 11

8. Kāḷī Sukālī Mahākālī Kāpā Śukāpā Mahākāpā Vīrakṣāṅha ya bōdhavva Rāmākāpā tahēva Piusēkākṣā navamī dasamī Mahāsēkākṣāya 11

It is impossible to reconstruct any correct metre in these kāvikās, since the lines are a confused mass of iḷōka and āryā hemistiches.

The table of contents in aṅga 4, or Naṃdi (N) is as follows:—sē kiṁ taṁ aṁtaṅgaṉadāsā? aṁtaṁsēva naṁ aṁtaṅgaṉadānam nargaṁi uvijāpitā chēyām vana 15 rāyā 20 ammapyarā samōṣaṅgam dhannāyāryā dhannākāhā 13 iḷōgapaṅgālaṅā 25 bhōgaparīchāga paṇjavāya sūya 40 tāvā padimānam 13 [323] bahuviḥ tāvā 12 khanā aṣṭhayā maddavaḥ cha sōyaḥ cha sāchāṣeṣaṅgam 43 sattarasaṅghaḥ yā (B C, hā ya A) saṁjāmām (mō A, mō ya B C) uttamaḥ cha bāṃbhaḥ akiṁchaṅyang āvāvīryāya samiti gūtthū chēva, 44 tāha appamāyajāgō (‘gō A) sajīhāyajānāma 45 ya uttamaṁ samōṣaṅgam doṣhaṃ pi lakkhaṇām, pattāna ya saṁjāmuttamān jīva (jīva A) parīṣhāyām cha bhīvihāmmakhaṅyāmānā jha kēvalāsā 46 lāmbē, paryayān (‘yātō B C) 47 jātītō (‘itō B C, jatiyāu A) ya jha pāḷito (pāḷayō A) muṇhi, pāṇvagā 49 jō jāhīnā 49 jātīyāṇi bhāttārī chēyāyātā (chēyātā A, chēdātā B C) aṃtakarō (‘gōdō B C) muṇvarā 50 tama-rañ-‘gha 51 muṅkko mokkaḥsanaḥ aṣṭhayām cha pāṭī (A, patta B C), 51 ānāya ya ēvaṁ-’il ‘ēva pāṭiyāv (pāṭevā, B C) jāva.

IX. The ninth aṅgām, anuttaravāyāydāsā, anuttaravapaṅgikādāsā; 52 in 3 vāgga with 33 aṣṭhāyāṇas (10, 13, 10); contains legends of saints each one of whom attained the highest (anuttara) heavenly world (vimāna). 53

The name (‘Cadaśu) is here too at variance with the constitution of our text, but is in agreement with the statements of aṅgās 3 and 4, where only 10 aṣṭhāyāṇas are mentioned; while aṅgās 4 recognizes but ten (the Naṃdi but three) uḍḍesāṅgikās, see above p. 286. [324] We have already seen that, of all the names given in aṅgās 3, 10 as those of the 10 aṣṭhā, but three recur in aṅgās 9. This proves that we have here to do with a text that has suffered a transformation. Our text has been handed down to us in an exceedingly fragmentary state, consisting chiefly

52 Kīnkamma is found in aṅgās 3, 10, for aṅgās 8; this should have been stated on page 271. In reference to the question whether Mayāli is identical with Bhagāli, see the same page. Is Jāli equal to Jāmīla? The account here entitled Gaṇita of Śūmāla, as Lemmān informs me. See nīdāna.
53 In N we find the same transcription as in the case of 6, 7: sa: rē a: dveḥāvā dhāvīkā.
54 *paral-gīya riddhīyāsa N. 55 N inserts pariṅgāya before esa.
56 14 padimānam B C; N has instead of padimāna merey asāṅgaraḥ bhūta-paṅgāhākkhānam pāvagamaṇapāκaḥ smokka-puṇaḥ-dāmāḥ antakarīyāḥ aṭṭhavijñānti—dvālas aṅkukaputimā māṇikyāyanaḥ (cf. Lemmān on Asp. p. 24).
57 *sic A, bahuvihārā B C. 58 *saṃkheḥ cha satyaḥsaṁkheḥ.
59 *yātō samiti gūtthū chēva B C, samityāya gūtthayā ca. 60 svakhyādvīyānāya. 61 jānādē ṣāthāḥ.
62 pariṅgāya pravāya-ākāśaḥ, yāvānā ca yāvadvaṅgāhāḍūpanāṃ vastū yānā yānā tapaviśeṣaṃ nāyapyāpyaṇāṇādīnā pravāya-paṅgāvagāya, matē yānā yāvadvaṅgāvagāya, yānā yānā yānā yānā yānā yānā. 63 muptāya ānupādānaṃ anānāmaṃ pratiṃpanā yā munī yatra. 64 antakirāto mūrīvaro, jāta tī sālaḥ. 65 rāmaḥ A, rāmaḥ B C. 66 This should strictly be ṭāpāla; cf. my remarks on upāgā 1.
67 na ‘śām-uttarā vyāyā va ity aṃtuṁaḥ, upaptē (‘pāthō) janmāṭathā, aṣṭaśāmā pratiṁpanāḥ anāyasa tathā-vādāyāḥ bhāvāḥ upaptē (‘pāthō) yēmhi tán, tadvaḥtavatātipābhaddā dāśa đādēbhavaṇām palakhaṇītā.
of references to Méha (6, 1, 1) and Khandasa (5, 2, 1); the first story alone of each varga is passably complete, the others are cited merely by their catch words.

The events of these recitals transpire in Rāyagīha, Sāgīṭa, Vāṇīyāgāma, Hatthiṇapura. The names of the personages involved are to be extracted from the kārikās, which cite the titles of the 33 aṣṭīyaṇas; viz.:

I. Jāli44 Mayāli Uvaṭāli Parisassēṇe ya Vārisēṇe ya i Dihadaṇṭe ya Laddhaṇṭe Vēhallē Vēhāyase Abhayē ti kumarē ॥ See page 321, for the first five names.

II. Dihashaṇe Mahāsēṇe Laddhaṇṭe (again!) ya Ghūdhaṇṭe ya Yuddhaṇṭe ya i Hallē Dunmē Dūmasṇe Mahādhamaṇṇa ya āhitē ॥ ॥ Sihe ya Sihasēṇe ya Mahāśeṇeṇa ya āhitē ॥ Pumaseṇe ya bodhavved tērasmē hōi aijhāyāne ॥ ॥

III.55 Dhamme ya Sanakkhīṭe Sīdīṣe ya āhitē ॥ Pēlāc Rāmaputtē Pachāṇḍīna Puṭṭimāi ya ॥ ॥ Pēbhālapputtē (cf. aṣṭā 2, 2, 7) aṣṭācā Pōṭṭhēya Vēhallē ॥ dassē vaṭṭē imē yē dasa Pāha ॥ ॥

Our information in reference to these persons is limited almost entirely to their names [325] alone. In the first history (of Jāli), which is a prototype of the rest, it is at least related that he eklāvesa aṣṭācāṁ abhūjiti.

It is surprising that the table of contents in aṣṭā 4, or Nandi (N), is particularly explicit. This is probably to be explained by the fact that it has as its subject an entirely different text from that which we possess. It is as follows:—sō kin ūrī aṇutaraṇvavāyādasa? aṇuśāsa uṇā aṇutaraṇvavāyānaṁ pagaśi ujjitā cheś vaga ॥ ॥ rāya-555 । aṁma-555 iḍhāmāya । iḍhāmākhā । ihaṇga-555 । pavaṇjā suya । tavā-555 padmā । samēlaṇā āhaṭta-555 pūra-555 aṇutaraṇvavattā (A, vātā B C, ṛvaṇvavattā N) sakkulapachchhāya (yāti B C, echchālo N) pūṇābhī । amātikiriya āghāvijayaṁ; aṇuśāsa uṇā tiṇṭhagarasamāraṇaṁ paramamaṅgalaṇaḥariyāni (hittānaṁ A) jñāṭiśeṣaṁ ya bahuvīṣyaṁ, jñāṇasaṁśanāṁ cheva saṃkallāgaṇa (ganagana A) pavaṇagaṇadhaṭṭhālaganāṁ, thirjasāgaṇaṁ, parissahaseṇaṁ (śeṣa A) rīvusīpa A) balapamaddaṇṇānaṁ (balāpanca C) tavadīttaḥ (charitānasthaṇamsattāraṁ-vivihapagāṁ vitharapassathā guṇasāmjayāṇaṁ, aṣṭāgarāmaraharṣitāṁ aṣṭāgarāmusārāṇaṁ vannāṁ, uttamaṇavrata vaisiṣṭhānaṇaṅgavijayaṁ, jahā ya jagahiyaṁ bhagavaṁ, jārisa ya (omitted in B C) riddhi[326] viṣṇusvārasāṁsāraṇaṁ, jihgasāmayaṁ jahā ya uvaśānti jinavarāṇaṁ; jahā ya parikāheṇī (bhūnti A) dhāmanāṁ lōga (lōka A) grūta amara-narasurapagāṇaṁ, sūpta ya tassa bhanjiyaṁ (bhasyān A) avasāsakamavasipyavirattā nāra jahā (jāhā BC) abhuvānī (abhūvānti A) dhāmanāṁ urālaṁ saṃjñamaṭavaṁ cha 'vi bahuvīhappagāṁ, jahā bahūṁ vāsaṁ aṣṭācharitārāśīyanādaṁsaṣaparchirittajēgaṁ jinavarāṇaṁ-m-anugrayamahālīyabahūsiya, jinavarāṇa (jaṇ A) hiyāṇa-555-555 am āqūṭtattā, jā ya jahiṁ jattyāṁ bhavatiṁ cchēyāitā (vivah ČC, cchēyātā)
The title and the actual text or contents, between the actual text and the statements of tradition on this point, is especially great. There is nothing said in reference to questions (prārtha) which find their solution (vyakaranaṃ). The whole aṅga appears to be a didactic dogmatic exposition addressed to Jambu, but not asked for by particular questions. The Nāṇḍī and aṅga 4 state that it contains 45 eṣṭhayaṇas, 45 uḍḍēṇayaṇaś, etc.; but no such conclusion is warranted from the facts of the case, cf. p. 286. One suyukkhānīka, which these authors and the existing constituent parts ascribe to the text, is branded by the scholar Abhayadēva. He asserts that the text “pustakāṅṭare” consisted of two suyukkkāhānas (each containing 5 eṣṭhayaṇaś). To prove this the scholar adds verbatim et litteratim a special introduction confirmitory of his assertion; but this cannot be found in the MSS. of our text. This introduction has the same usual form as the introductions to aṅgaśa 6–9 and 11; and Abh. refers directly to aṅgaśa 6 for the correctness of his explanation, whereupon he adds: yaḥ cha ha dvi[328]sūrataklāsihādat ʾkta ʾṣya si na rūvāha, ḍhāścūrataklāsihātatā ēva rūvāhavātā. In all probability the enumeration of this text in aṅgaśa 3, 10, in the sixth place among the ten dasūś, shows that it stands in close connection with the present text or its 10 dāras. But we have seen, p. 272, that the names of the ten eṣṭhayaṇaś there have no connection whatever with our text, and that the author had before him quite a different text under this name. It is an important feature, that, as stated above, their statements or names are in essential harmony with those statements of contents in reference to our aṅgaśa, which occur in aṅgaśa 4, or in the Nāṇḍī; see page 334. It is of interest in this connection to notice the character of the remarks of the commentator at the beginning of the passage, in reference to the name prārthavyakaranaṇāvās. This name, he states, is found, kavaciti— it is found in aṅgaśa 3, 10 and in aṅgaśa 4, (see p. 334)— and consequently points to 10 adhyayanaś of prārthavyakaranaṇāvās. His words are:—āyaś cha vṛtattiyattho ʾṣya puṛvvaṣaṭḥ “bhūḥ, idānā ma āśravaṇpānchakasūrvaṇpānchakrayākiṣṭiḥ: ’hōḥ’ pālambhaṇē, atśayānām (cf. p. 334) puṛvvaṭhāyair aḍāṇyugurāṇāpūṣṭāḥ (ʾnāpyaḥ?) laṁbhaṇa-pratisākṣuṇpahpāṭhā “tārāttravātā.” However the corrupt conclusion is to be understood—cf. Ed. p. 439—one fact at least is patent; that we have here traces of the manifest consciousness that the puṛvvaṭhāyair were acquainted with a different text of this aṅgaśa than the aḍāṇyugurāṇaś. Everything shows that we are completely justified in asserting that we no longer possess aṅgaśa 10 in its original, [329] or in its ancient form. The introductory words of the commentary of Abh. are a proof of this:—ārīr vaddhāṇām ānāmya vṛkhyā kāchād vidhiḥ sat; prārthavyakaranaṇāγaya vṛkhyāṇyaśaḥ sātratāh 11 aṭṭha vayaṃ, āsātratā idām gahīlāhām, préyā ʾṣya kūṭāni cha pustakānā sūtraṃ vṛkhaṭṭhāyaṃ tatiṃ viṁśaṭya vṛkhyāṇaṅkaḷpād ʾita ēva vai ’va 11 21.

It is perfectly plain from this that it is here a violent polemic against other text-forms.
That *aṅga* 10 originally, like *aṅgas* 7—9 and 11, was of a legendary character (cf. *aṅga* 3, 10), is rendered probable by a comparison with *upāṅgas* 9—12, which are of the same character. Their position at the end of the *upāṅga* series allows us to draw conclusions in reference to the *aṅga* corresponding to them. If this be so, the transformation of our *aṅga* must be placed at a still later period than that to which we have to refer the harmonizing of the 12 *aṅgas* and the 12 *upāṅgas*.

There are various criteria contained in the *aṅga* itself which determine the late date of its composition. I premise that the introduction which we possess, consists, if the vocative Jambū be omitted, of three *gāthās*, which state in brief the contents of the work:

> Ṛṣam-ō aṅhayasaṅvara-vinichehhayaṁ pavayāṇassa nīśāndhaṁ | vṛcchhāṃ niḥch- hayatathāṁ subhāsītatathāṁ mahāśāhīṁ || 1 ||

> [330] paṁchavidhāṁ pannattō Jīnēhiṁ īha aṅhayō aṣṭiśāya (aṅādē Ḍ) | hīnā mōsam79 ādattāṁ abambha (ः is wanting; perhaps ya) pariggahāṁ chāva || 2 ||

> jārīmā jāh nāmā jahā ya katō jārisathalam doōti ṛ | jī vi ya kāroṁīti pāva pāṇavahām tain nisāmēha || 3 ||

Then follows in prose, first an explanation of the *pāṇivaha*; then 30 of its synonyms (nāmaṁ imājī gonaṅśi); then the subject itself is treated of, at the conclusion of which the entire doctrine is referred immediately to Nāyakulanaṁdana (Ināta).40 Ēvaṁ haṁsa Nāyakulanaṁdandu mahāpā Jīpō n Vīraṁvanāmaddhājjo, kahēsi ya pāṇivahassa phalavāgaṁ: ēō sō pāṇivadha chāṇḍō . . . (as in the introduction) vāmanāsā.

The next four sections are similarly arranged, except that after the vocative Jambū the treatment of the aliyavayanaṁ, aktāmālāpaṁ, abambhaṁ, pariggahaṁ, begins without the interposition of *gāthā* strophies. The synonyms are invariably 30 in number and the conclusion is the same.

In the case of the five *saṅvaradārāṇīḥ*, two *gāthās* are found in the introduction of the first (ahimā) after Jambū !:41

> ittā saṅvaradārā-ī paroṣaḥ vṛcchhāmī ṛṇupuvvī ṛjāh bhaṇḍiṇāī Bhagavāya saṅvaduk-khavimukkhaṁ paṁśanāḥ || 1 ||

> padhāmanā hōi ahiṁśa, bīyaṁ sācchābhayaṁ taṁ paṁattam || dattām aṇuṇṭāya saṅvaro ya bāṁbhaccheratva pariggahattānaṁ || 2 ||

[331] The further details in *dāras* 6—10 are similar to those in *dāras* 1—5. The enumeration of the synonyms, which are here called *pajjavanāmāṇi*,—60 in the case of *ahimā*—is carried on in a style somewhat different, and the concluding formula is not the same:—dvām Nāyamunṇī Bhagavāya pannaviyā paṁsuṅhami saddhaṁ saddhavaṁāśaṃ ēṣam aṅghiyasaṁ svāśayaṁ paṁśhahāṁ (padhāmanā) saṅvaradārāṁ samattāṁ ti bēmi. The last two concluding words form a bond of connection between the existing reduction of *aṅga* 10 and *aṅgas* 1—4, to which these words belong. Furthermore, the appeal to the Nāya recalls *aṅga* 2. Perhaps we have to deal here with traces of ancient date; but, on the other hand, if we consider how many considerations make for the opposite conclusion, a conservative point of view will not permit too great weight to be laid upon these particulars, which are rather the result of an effort to impart an ancient flavour to the *aṅga*.

The following arguments, drawn from *aṅga* 10 itself, reinforce our conclusion that this *aṅga* is of late origin. The character of the language is late. The nominative in ē has assumed in almost every instance the place of the nominative in े, except in quoted passages. In the frequent compounds there is no deference paid to the laws of *saṅdhī* between the members of the

79 aṅkājīvāṇā.
80 See above, p. 251, on *aṅga* 2, 1, 97.
41 There are five *gāthās* more inserted between *dāras* 5 and 6.
compounds; also these are often not inflected at the end, (ātani priya) lupta-prathamābhu-
vachanānā padāni, are the words of the scholiast), but retain their pure thematic form. [328] In
the other aṅgas (e. g. in the tables of contents in aṅga 4) and especially inserted in
them, we find phenomena not dissimilar in character, but not in such numbers. Their presence
however invariably characterizes the passages in which they occur as being of secondary origin.
Furthermore—and this is conclusive evidence—the enumeration of the names of the non-Āryan
peoples is three times as great as that in aṅga 5, 6, (p. 302, 313). Here there are 53, there but
18 names. The list is as follows:—imā yā bahavē Milukkhā (milē BC) jāti, kiṃ tē, Saga-
Jaya-Sabara-Vavvara-Kāya-Murumūḍā-ṛḍa-Bhadaga-Tiṇṇya(Bhitṛya)-Pakkanāya-Kulakha-
Gēḍā(Gōḍā)-Shāla-Pārāsa-Kūnchā-Aūndā - Dāvapā - Villalā(Chillū) - Pulindōnā-Cūndā
(Dūvā)-Pūkkāla-Gām-dhādhraga (!)-Vaharī-Jallāra-Māmāṣa-Vaṅga-Malāyā ya Cucahānā ya
Chūlyā Kānkanā (Kōnkanagā B)-Māya-Palavā-Mālava-Maghara-Abhāsiyā Anakkā.
Chief-Nāsiya (Lāsiya BC)-Khass-Abhāsiya-Nidura (Nēṭara)-Marahāṭhe-Abhāsiya (Mauś-
tikāi)-Arava-Dōhṇivilāga-Kuṇahā-Kēkaya-Hūna-Rogama-Bharu-Mangara-Chīktavivāyā
ya. Some of these names are of evidently late occurrence. The peoples are all characterized as
pāvamatiṇṭ and kūrakamā.

[333] Especially interesting is the bitter polemic against erroneous teachers (naththikaviṇaṁ
vālīgavāgam) in dāra 2; under these are comprised the “Bandhāh” (Schoel.), and the
adherents of Issara (Siva) and Viṣṇu. Chiṇapaṭṭā appears in dāra 4, in the signification of
“silk dress.” In dāra 5 are found the names of the planets; but not in the Greek order; thus
Jupiter, Moon, Sun, Venus, Saturn, Rāhu, Dhumakēta, Mercury, Mars. The first of the series of
the 28 nakκhottas is unfortunately not stated; only the first and the last of the 72 kalās are
given: lēhaṅgū sāmarṣapāsā ngū; in the same passage and in the ninth dāra, 64 mahādiṅgaras
are likewise mentioned. rājanaṇa sippasēvanam etc.—The bhāṣā is characterized in dāra 6 as
bhagava, truth sahcham, in dāra 7, as bhagavānā bhājanā tattvagunahabhisayaṁ dasavihān
chaudāsasupuṇhīm pāhuddatthaviyām, which is a reference to the prābhātha division in the
14 pūsras. Abhayadeva comments on this aṅga.

The table of contents in aṅga 4, or Nandi (N), is:—se kīn tēn pāhāvāgaranaṇā? paṅgūna
sthūttaram pasipasaṇaṁ, a.apasipasaṇaṁ, a. pasipasaṇaśyaṇaṁ, vijjāti[334]sayā
nāgasunādhiṁ saddhāṁ divvā saṅvāyām aṅghavijñānti; pāhāvāgarandaśaṇā saṁsaṃyapa
namanuvāyāya (paṅgūyā A) pattīyabuddhāvivihatthahabhisāyaṁ (bh. omitted in A) bhāsīyaṁ,

82 Of the very frequent variants in the MSS., I have chosen those which appear to have the best authority;
83 cf. the similar enumeration in upāga 4.
84 Jallēsēh Māmāṣhēh Bākuṭhē Shol.
85 Mōṣa BC, Mēdi; see Elliot, Hist. of India, I, 519 fg. Indische Streifen, Vol. II. p. 405.
86 pāhūntara Maṇḍhā (Maṇḍhā E) Shol. The Marahāṭhe has nothing to do with the Mēchhās. Ramātha
in upāga 4.
87 līkaṇṭhikāh, vāmena pratipāṇaṁ lēkaṁ vadanati yē.
88 cf. chiṇaṇṭhāṣaṁ in up. 2 and 3. janaṇādhaśatayādkībhesaṁ daśvālākkāddī prāsiddhāṁ.
89 chaṭṭudāčayārībhiṁ prābhīṛṭhāvivhāvātāṁ tāvaṇagāṭhāsaṁvāhabhisāyayā yēnāntaṁ
90 tattā nagulabhāspaṇādāṭā maṇtravidyādhaṁ prāsaṁ; yēḥ, vidyāḥ or prāsaṁvidyāḥ; lāter on prāsaṇa
is treated outright as a fem. pumār vīdhāṁ jayamāṇā appriśā tva (sabhā)ubhām kathayanti tē appriśāṁ; tattā
nagulabhāspaṇādāṭā prātsiṁḥ yē vidyāḥ ubhāsam kathayanti tē prāsaṁprāsiṇāḥ; —Shol. in N yē prāsiṇā
appriśāḥ cha kathayanti tē prāsaṁprāsiṇāḥ.
91 Instead of vijītā N has merely saṅgrūṭhaspasiṇāṁ vāhupasiṇāṁ adādāpasipasiṇāṁ annē vi vīchātā divvā
vijñāṇyaṁ nāgasunādherdhīṁ saddhīṁ divvā saṅvāyāṁ aṅghavijñānti. Compare the names of the
paṃhādahudā found in aṅga 3, 10. This title appears above in the text. The old text appears therefore to have dealt with
chiruptic and other prophetic arts. The explanation in the commentary: anyā vīdāvītyā saṁbābhiṁ tēmaṁ
buddhāvivhāvātāḥāvadāyaḥ refers to magic in general, which was cultivated by the Jains especially; cf.
the statements in reference to the contents of the mahāparīnī, p. 251, the books of magic of Nāgārjuna, &c. The
orthodox belief could take umbrage at this part of the contents of aṅga 10.
92 sañviṁ A; upalakāspaṇvāya yakṣābhādhiṁ cha saha. 93 sañviṁ dhīrābhibhādhiṁ sañvīpāṁ.
94 prajñāpakā yē pratīkākaraṇāḥ tē (tāḥ) karaka-yādindhāsaṁ vividāḥthābhābhadhābhāsitaṁ tāman ādārāṁ
ghūṭhādhisāmabhidhābhīṁ prāsaṇāṁ vividāhṇagamamahārāṭḥ prāsaṇaṁ dasvā śākyāṇaṁ iti vijñāṇaṁ. The expression
pratīkākaraṇa, which recurs in the Nandi, is of interest; cf. p. 256 and Bhāg. 25, 6, 8, according to Leumann.
XI. The eleventh aṅga, vivāgasuyan, viññākaratān: in two śrutaskandaḥ, of 10 ujjhayaṇaḥ each, contains legends on the reward of good and evil deeds.

Its division is in harmony with our information on this point in aṅga 1 and Nānā, with this exception, that in aṅga 4 nothing is said of the two śrutaskandaḥ. See above, p. 270, 280, in reference to the kammavīṇa texts, which are connected in name and contents, and which have 10, 43 and 55 aṅjh., and are mentioned in aṅgas 3, 10, 4, 43 and in the Kalpasūtra.

Itādabhuṭi beholds some horrible deed, and is told by Mahāvīra, whom he questions concerning it, the previous history, e.g. previous births of the individuals in question. The event itself is then explained and the fate of the persons in future births is made known to the inquirer. Mahāvīra's answer thus treats the question in a three-fold manner. There is here no mention of a chācī chaitya, as is the case in other legends; [336] but a jākāhāyatana of this and that jākāha is continually referred to. The part played by the yāhśa here is at least as important as that in the Paliutta of the Buddhists, if not more so; — see Ind. Streifen, 3, 507a,— that being in fact exact representatives of the deva7 of the Brāhmaṇas.

Here, as in aṅgas 7, &c., the first history only is related in detail, all the others being briefly told. The titles of the tales in the first svaḥkhaṇḍa are:

1. Miyāputta in Miyāgama, son of king Vījaya and Miya, born blind and deaf and dumb, lame, and a cripple, without hands, feet, ears, eyes, nose, and with mere indications (āgī, ākṛti) of the existence of these parts of the body. The account is similar in aṅga 3, 10-

2. Ujjhaya ("yāc V"), son of the merchant Vījayaśīta and of Subhadā in Vīnīgama. A prostitute is here referred to, who was bāvattarikalāpamāti chāsāthāgāpi-guṇapāvatā. āthārasudābhāsva visarada. The latter are unfortunately not enumerated. (In aṅga 3, 10 Daṭḍama instead of Ujjhitaḥ).

3. Abhagga ("ggasṛṇo V"), son of a robber* Vījaya and of Kāraṇḍasiri in the robber-village (chāraṇapallī) Sālaṇāvi. (In aṅga 3, 10 aṇīl instead of Abhaggeśeṭa.)

---

* The image contains a note from the original text, indicating that this recall the legend of the Satap. Br. about Bhrigu Vārṇa (Ind. Streifen 1, 24), with the exception that there is no reference here to the tortures of hell, but merely to a retribution on earth.

* A trace of this in the Sūryaprajā Pratyabhijñā, with the commentary on the Sūryaprajā, and elsewhere, where it is explained by vyāvataryanam.

* Asīśābhijñānavamalāṃ,... badhyagahaḥśhīḥ ya; cf. Hāla, prāseṣṭa, p. XVII.
4. Sagada, son of the merchant Subhadda and of Bhadda in Suhaminda. (Also in aniga 3, 10).

5. Vahassatidatta, son of the purusha Somaadatta and of Vasudatta in Kosambi. (In aniga 3, 10 mahâna.)

6. [336] Naondvaddhama, son of king Sridama and of Bandhuisiri in Mahurâ. (In aniga 3, 10 Naundisa.)

7. Umbaradatta, son of the merchant Sagaradatta and of Gangadatta in Pañjaliputta. (In aniga 3, 10 Udumbara.)

8. Soriyadatta, daughter of the macehekaaâdha (matsyabandha Abh., fisherman) Samuddadatta and of Samudadatta in Soriyapura. (In aniga 3, 10 Soria.)

9. Devadatta, daughter of the house-owner Datta and of Kañhasiri in Rohu̍a (or Rohûa). (A different name in aniga 3, 10.)

10. Ainjâ, daughter of the merchant Dhanâdeva and of Pianâ in Vaddhamânapura. (A different name in aniga 3, 10.)

The ten ajhayañas of the second suyakkaâdha are:

1. Subhâ, son of king Addhisatta and of Dhâriti in Hatthisa.
2. Bhaddanaâdhi, son of king Dhanâvaha and of Sarassatî in Usabhapura.
6. Diaapatî, son of the yuvrajña Vêsama and of Sîrî in Kañkapura.
7. Bhaddanaâdhi, son of the prince Mahabala and of Rattatâ in Mahâpura.
9. Chaûnda, son of the prince Mahâchaûâda and of Juvasirîkaûâda in Champa.
10. Varadatta, son of king Mittanâdhi and of Sirîkaûâda in Sâgâya.

All these fine-sounding names, and those brought into connection with them, are in all probability pure fabrications; the names of the localities alone, e.g. Pañjaliputta, have some chronological value.

The table of contents in aniga 4, or Nandi (N), is as follows:—sê kim taâm vivâgasuê ò vivâgasuê nam sukaâdusukaâdhanam kammapan phalavivâgâ 10 ághavijumâti, sê 11 samâsaât duvihê paâm, tam: duhavivâgâ chêva suhavivâgâ chêva, tathâ nam dasa duhavivâgâ, 10 dasa suhavivâgâ; 10 sê kim taâm duhavivâgâ (gânî B C); duhavivâgâ suhavivâgânam (N omitted in ABC) nagarâch chôi ujja vâna râya ammâpiyârâ samâsara phukhâiyâ phum phum, makaha 12 nagarâgananânum 13 saumârapavannechhâphuparapura nê aághavijumâti, sê taâm duhavivâgâ; sê kim taâm suhavivâgâ? suhavivâgâ nam suhavivâgânam nagarânum 12 jauv dhammakâha ihalâgipallâgà 14 bhogapari pavâ 15 suyapariggaah tavo pariya 16 samûhâna bhatappachcha pûvâ 17 [339] dévalâga sukula puñâbhoi antakiriyâ in yâ ághavijumâti; duhavivâgânam 18 sam pani tivatikya aliya vayâya (yâyâga, A) cûrikka (rakka, A) karâga parâdaramûha saamaâgatae mahâ hâ A) tivâvakasyâ imûyappamâmâ pavyappâga asubhajhavanûma samâchheya 18 kamê mânâb pavyâgànam pâva asubhâgah phalavivâgâ uirâya (gânî naraûga A) gati tirikkhajûpi bahuviha 19...

9 In Vîtiprâkripâ are the following inversions:—Diaapatii 6, Mahavalla 7, Bhaddanâdhi 8, Mahasrâda 9.
10 "gâ N.
11 sê up to suhavivâgâ chêva omitted in N; samâsaât B C.
12 In N again transposed na. u. va. et al. nà. am. dhuêbhâ dvîryâ.
13 nagara to jauv dhammakâha omitted in N; nagarâgananâm tit, bhagavatâ Gautamasya bhûkshhûdharâm.
14 ihalâgipallâga rûyâ dûvihê 15 pavâ A.
15 pavâ in B C.
16 bhogaparachehhà pavâyânâr pariya 17 susaripagghà tavo-vâhûh phalavivâgâ bhatappachchhâkkaõi nam phûvâgànamâni suhapparanâmâ pavâl pavâchhâl pavâvâbhihà antakiriyâ a ághê 18 N.
19 N omits all the following.
20 papaprayogâsubhâhivâgasamaîchâ Câma.
(hā A) vasuṇāya-paraṇāparaṇabhaddhāṇaṃ(śārpaṇa 2 A), maṇuṣyaṭṭā (tattā A) vi śārgayāṇaṃ jahānā 20 pāvakammas-sēya pāvagā hōnti phalavivāgā bahuvasaṇaṇivāsānā 22 nāsākanāthānugṛthakēhārahara-Charaṇaṇaḥkhetḥāya jibhaḥkhetḥāya (jibhavāvṛhchi) 2 A anjāna 22 kaṣaṇādhanāna 22 (dālā B C, dālā A) gayaḥchaliṣa malaṇa pālaṇa 24 aulāhaṇa 25 sūla-layā(sūla.tā A)-iṣāla-iṭaṭibhaṇaṇa 25 taī-sāṣa-tattatālā-kalakala-ahāhāśiḥeṇaṃ kuṇhāpiṇa 27 kampana 28 thiravandaṃ 29 (kāmichā A) vēha (vēha A) vajjaḥvabhi A kutata 20 patibhayakaṇa 31 karapalivanaṇa 32 dāruṇiṃiṣu dukkhāṇi apōvaṃiṣu bahuvihaparamaparabhuddhā 28 aḥaṃchamti, pāvakammavāllī (vēli A) 340 avēyaṇātā 34 ḫnā ṃ tā tā mokkha, 35 tavēṣa 37 dhītihāṇyaśuddhakācchēha 38 sōhaṇa 39 tassā va 'vi hōtī, 40-ettō ya 41 suhāvāgāṣu mūn (omitted in A) sīlasaṃjana niyamaya gurapavāra-hāṃsya sāvan-aṇaṣyayāpaṇya (paṇi A) 40-tikālamati 44 visuddhahattapāṇi paṭayaṇaṇaṃ 43 yiṣu bhāṣaṃśaṣiṣṭaṃvaparipūraṇaṃ bhāṣyaṃ 46 payachihūṇa 47 payogasuddhāni 48 jahā (jahā A) ya nivarttēniṃ A niṃ 49 bōhīkaṇhaṇā, jahā ya (jahā A) paritikāraciṃ (tā tā karotī A) 51 naraṇaṃvataviṃśa suragatigamanaṇiṇa 32 pariṇatā 53 aratiṣṭhavīṣyaṃśaṃkīcchhātattā-śaśamkaṇa 54 añāna(aṇi A) tamaṇāhakācchhrhhallasuddhātārāṃ jaraṇaṇaṃ-341 jōni-san- khkhuḥbhāyaḥbhakacchvālaṇā 56 vāla A) sōlasaṃāṣyaśāyaṇavanāṇa (C, paṇyādaśakaṇa 56 apāṇa-sāvonāvyaggaṃ 57 samśāsraṃgaram īṇaṃ, jahā ya nihāṃhānti aṃgaṇaṇaṃgaṇaṃ, jahā ya apūbhavaṃ aṣiṣṭa suragatavapūmāpākoṣkhaṇi apōvaṃiṣu (omitted in A) tāi ya kālaṃtracchayāṇaṃ iḥ vā naraḷōgāṃ āgāyaṇaṃ, śu-vā(vaṇpa BC) rān-āhu-ti-jākula-jamaṃ-arōgga-buddhi-mēhā (omitted in A) visisē 48 mittajana (jīna A) saṃgha 42 dhāma dhamma A-dhaṇa (omitted in A) vihāvaṃ samīdhi (dīda A) sāraṃsudanyavisēṣā bahuvihākāmābhogābhavaṇā (cābbhava BC) sōkkhāna,26

20 jahā to paḥchāyaṇa omitted in A.
21 visiṣṭāhāṣṭi(A) idi yuvā patibhayakara karappadpanaṃ chē ti dvānaṇauṃ.  
22 marakhaṇaṃ vē dēhāya khaṭraṭaśiḥaṇā. 23 kāsāṃ vīlaḍaḍaśāādāmyaṇaṃ sgnib kāṭgaṇiṃ tēna dahanā. 
24 vidērapāram. 25 vīraṃṣēkhaḥdhā dyobadhaṃnaṃ, cf. lampīya A Up. § 70.
26 laṅīha A; iśeṇa layata laṅkēṇa vājhyā bhāniṇaṇaṃ gātritūṇā.
27 iśaṇa kuṇhāpiṇa, iśpaṇa B C; kuṇhā(bhyā) bhījanīvāśeḥ pākha.
28 kampanāṃ īśtalajalchāḥbāhnālaṇā īśtalajalchāḥ gātrīkampanaṇaṃ. 29 niśvī janīyamitraṇagābāndhaḥ.
30 kuṇākāśaṃ aśtrēpaḥ bhēdanāṃ vārdaḥ(nan) kartamāa.
31 patibhayakaraṇa A, patibhayo karas BC, patibhayakaraṇa C; bhayaṇaṃnaṇa.
32 palī B C (without kara), karapalli A; karapadpanaṇaṃ vaśaṇāvahāṣiṣṭasya tāluḥbhāṣyaṇa (f) kasarēvagā; aau(agni) pāṛveddhāhan (f); tāni ṃrē yēḥaṇaṃ dukkhāṇaṃ tāni, tāni tathā cha dāruṇiṃ chē ti karmadārayaḥ.

This appears to mo quite unnecessary; there is no idi in palṭeṇā, which is merely a neutr. pl.

badha A; āvā Śeti gatyate.  
33 pāṇapakamavallyā phalaṇabupākyā, ... yato vēṣāyataḥ (an)anubhūya karapaḥlaṃ iti gatyate.  
34 hur yasmād-arthē.  
35 viyōgaḥ karpaḥa sakṣītā, āvānām iti gatyate; av. hu ma 'tāi m. is a species of formula solemnis- 
36 kiṃ sarvātāḥ nē 'tya kā; tapasa manadakhiṃvātātena.
37 dēhīt A; dhītih chōtesamādhiḥhanāṃ, dhanīyaṃ atyarthanāṃ, buddhaṃ nipūṭiḥ, kachhan bamiḥvāśeḥo yata 
38 tātāḥ tēnu, dhītyākhyate ti A.
39 ādhaman apayanayānaṃ.
40 hōyā BC; tasya kāmavāśaḥaya vē 'vi tēti saṃbhāvanāyāṃ, hotthā sampadyate; nē 'yaṃkābhāpāyō 'eti 
41 ti bhēvēhu.  
42 susṭhau vīṭhah anubhūtyāḥ yēḥāḥ ti śevitēṣu, tēnu bhaktādi dētēvā yaṃ prābhāḥbhāḥdēhi ni(r)vartayaḥ! 
43 tathē 'khyātya ih śambhūdhaḥ, iha ca saṃbūdhaḥ pāpi saṃpanā.  
44 anukampāvyapāyogas tēna.
45 tīnā khēṣu ya mātir buddhāḥ, yad uṣa dēyāmi 'ti paritośoḥ, dīyamānē pāhē, dētē ca pāḥa iṣi tā 
46 tikālamati, tāya.
47 hīyaḥ suṣaṃśiṣṭas A; ... tīrvaḥ prakāsitaḥ, paricām 'bhavasānaṃ, nīcētā 'saṃsārāḥ mātir buddhī 
48 yeṇēṃ tē hitasakhaḥbhāvyasyatvaparipūraṇaṃśitaṃcetayaṃ. 49 pradīya.
50 pāli A; āsamāvāśaparantarāhārtaṇaṃ.
51 āvā Śeti gatyate.  
52 tānŚadē kho(u)fā mātirārthaḥ.
53 parici mukravāti, khaṭrāvāti nayaṃaṭṭaḥ, saṃsāraṃgaram iti yōgab; on the fol. see Aupapā. § 32 (Leumann, 
54 p. 44).
55 gamaṇa B C, catīgamaṇa A; 'gataśo vīṣṭapāṭhaṃ vīṭhapāṭhaṃ.  
56 visēka, sila, B; 'mātirātāvā sḁ ṇeva śāloḥ parvataḥ taḥ śaṃkātaḥ saṃkūpya yah. 
57 mahābāṣyayamakaraṇaṃcākṣajalajantujātisamaddhā praviṣṭājan chakravālaṇaḥ jalapārimāṇaṇaḥ yatra.
58 payaṇdaśakaṇaṇaṃ B; śōṣaṇa kāśāyaḥ yēva śāpādiṇi maṇḍakārāni prakāṇḍāni atyarthārthani yatra.
59 BC, ayaṇaṃ aṣamadāyāna A; anākdam, apanavarga nanoānāt.
60 medhāvijehāhāḥkhyāyanta iti yōgab.  
61 avajanaḥ pitrīprīvīyādoḥ. 
62 dhammaṃdhaṣṭa C; 'vīhāvā B; dhammaṃdhaṣṭa pē yōbīhavā lakṣhāḥ.
There once lived together an old woman and her son, who dragged along a very wretched existence, often contenting themselves with one meal a day. They continued in this state for a very long time, till one day a cultivator, a neighbour of theirs, taking pity on them, called the old woman's son, who was then getting a big lad, and gave him a few melon seeds. He then shewed him a plot of ground belonging to him, and told him to sow them there, and to take care of the plants, till they produced melons which, when sold, would help him to live in a little better style.

The boy took the seeds with gratitude, and lost no time in digging up the ground allotted to him, and in sowing the seeds. A few days afterwards, little plants began to shoot up, and he watered them, manured them, and took every possible care of them. In due time they grew big, and flowered, and yielded an abundance of melons; but to the great disappointment of the poor boy, when he went in the morning to gather them for sale not one could be found. He was at a loss to understand what had become of them, so he went to his neighbour, who had given him the seeds, and told him all about it, and asked for his advice. The neighbour, who was a cultivator of great experience, at once came to the conclusion either that some one was in the habit of stealing the melons, or that some animals were eating them. But the difficulty was to find the delinquent! So he gave the boy some wax, and told him to mould it into the figure of a man, and set it up in the middle of his field as a scare-crow. The boy took the wax, and made a nice little figure of it, and took it the same evening and set it up in his fields.

That night a fox, who had come every night and eaten the melons, came there as usual. But when he saw the wax figure, he thought somebody was watching, and to make himself sure that it was really a human being, went up to the figure and said to it: — "Who are you?" But did ever a figure speak? The fox asked him over and over again, but, of course with no success. At last he got annoyed at the supposed person not answering him and said: — "How often shall I ask you? Are you deaf that you can't hear, or are you dumb that you don't speak?"

But for all this no reply came forth. Again the fox said: — "Take care now; if you don't speak, I will give you a blow that will make you cry."

Still no reply, and so the fox gave one strong blow, but his paw stuck in the wax and he could not extricate it. Upon this the fox said: — "Let go my paw."

Still he could get no reply, nor was his paw set free. Upon this the fox said: — "What! You won't let go my paw? Do you want another blow? This time I will give you a blow that will knock you down! So you had better let go my paw."

---

1) शुभवित्वासु उत्तमो येशान् ते शुभविपीक्षतमस्ते तेषु, भयेचित्रयतेषु, इत्यादि च शान्ति।
But for all his entreaties and threats, the supposed human being would not answer him nor would he let go his paw. And then the fox, enraged beyond measure, gave another blow with his other paw, with the result that this paw also adhered to the wax, and all his attempts to extricate either paw were useless; and so in his rage he said: "Look here now, just you let go my paws, or I shall get wild and give you such a kick on your stomach that it will burst and all your entrails will come out."

But what is the use of threatening a wax figure? The fox gave one strong kick, only to find his leg also stuck fast in the figure. He was now mad with rage, and sometimes with entreaties and sometimes with threats he asked to be let go, but all to no avail. At last he said: "I ask you for the last time to let me go away quietly, for if I am provoked further, I will give you another kick and that will be certain to kill you."

In this way he begged and threatened, and threatened and begged, but it was all useless. He wriggled and struggled too, but all for nothing, and at last, losing his temper, gave a second kick with the same result as before, and got stuck to the figure with all four paws like a man tied up. Still he did not despair of setting himself free, and said: "Well, well, you have caught all my paws; but won't you let them go? If you don't, I shall know what to do: I will give you a bite and eat you up."

The figure gave him no answer, nor would he set him free. The fox therefore said: "Look here, I will not go on asking you for ever, and if you don't let me go at once, I will bite you without fail. Now do let me go!"

But seeing that all his entreaties were of no avail, he opened his mouth as wide as he possibly could, and gave a huge bite at the figure, so that his teeth dug deep into the wax and stuck fast in it. He struggled for a very long time, but all his attempts proved futile, and in this position he remained all night, thinking upon his fate the next day.

The following day when the poor boy came as usual to see his melons, he saw the fox stuck in the figure, and said: "Oh, ho! you thief, so it's you that have been taking my melons every day, and stealing my daily bread! You are nicely caught. How will you get away now? I'll teach you to rob my melons!"

Thus saying, he prepared to kill the fox, who sobbed and cried, and begged hard to let him free, but all in vain. The boy seemed determined to kill him, and at last the fox said: "Only set me free, and I will pay you back a hundred-fold. I will even get you married to the king's daughter, and then you can enjoy yourself all your life." In the end, after much entreaty, the boy let the fox free, on condition that he would not steal nor eat any more of his melons, and that he would get him married to the king's daughter. The fox agreed, and never afterwards touched the melons.

He had now a very difficult task to perform, in getting his benefactor married to the king's daughter. He at once set about it. But one day as he was taking the road leading to the king's palace, he saw a goldsmith making a small bench of gold, which had only required a finishing touch. So he went to the other side of the goldsmith's house, where his child was playing alone, the mother having gone to fetch water, and took it up and threw it down on the ground, which made it cry, and then he ran up to the goldsmith and said: "Is your gold worth more than your child, that you should not go and see after it when it is half dead with the fall it has had? Shame upon you!"

The goldsmith, who was very busy at the time, did not see the fox till he spoke to him, nor had he heard his child cry till he was told about it. So he ran off, to take up the child and to soothe it. In the meanwhile our hero, the fox, quietly took up the bench, and made for the king's palace. As soon as he reached it, he told the guards to inform the king at once.

---

1 Among Hindús, or rather in Maráthí, this bench is known as pēd; the Salsette Christians call it pirand.
that he had come on a very important business. The king came out and offered him a chair, upon which he brought out his golden bench and said with a disdainful air:— "I never sit on chairs, I always carry about my own seat."

The king was, of course, astonished at this, and thought that the fox must be a great personage if he always sat on a golden bench. Preliminaries thus successfully over, the fox began:— "Your Majesty, it is our desire to enter into a bond of relationship between Your Majesty and ourselves, by asking Your Majesty's daughter in marriage with our son."

The king, who was bewitched at the sight of the golden bench, and took him for a really great personage, agreed to the proposal, and appointed a day for the celebration of the auspicious festivities. He began at once to make preparations on a very grand scale, which extended over several days. For he had money and gold and corn, and everything else in abundance.

The fox then went home, told the boy of his success at the palace, and said that he must be ready on a certain day. The poor boy was overjoyed, for who would not be, at the news that he was to be married to a king's daughter? He too had to make grand preparations, but here was a difficulty; where were the means? So he had recourse to his friend the fox, who promised to do everything for him.

Now there was a small rivulet running through the town, past the boy's hut, and further on past the king's palace, and the fox went about from house to house and collected all the rice husks of the village and threw them into the rivulet for several days. When the king saw all these husks, he was astonished and thought within himself:— "My son-in-law must be a really great personage, as he is evidently going to invite thousands of guests, or why would he grind so much rice?"

There were only now a few days left before the wedding, and the fox went about collecting all the *patavėlis*² he could from the village, and these he threw in the rivulet. The king was still more astonished to see such a number of *patavėlis* being already thrown away from his son-in-law's house; for what could it mean, but that his son-in-law's guests had already come and were being feasted even days before the wedding?

These tricks were all very well for duping the king, but the bridegroom had to have a befitting dress, and he must also have a large house, if not a palace, wherein to receive his royal bride, and it was far beyond the comprehension of our hero as to where to get these from. So he again had recourse to the fox. Even these the fox did not despair of providing, and one day climbed a high mountain and there began to cry so long and so loud that Īśvara and Pārbati heard him, and coming up to him asked him what he was crying like that for. The fox said:—

"Ō Īśvara and Pārbati, all honour be to you! How shall I tell you of my sorrows? I was once caught stealing melons, but on promising the owner to get him married to the king's daughter, I was released by him. I have succeeded in persuading the king to give his daughter to my benefactor, but the difficulty is to get suitable dress for him, also a befitting house and food and other necessaries requisite for the occasion. I beg of you, therefore, to help me. We want a large house and a *pądāl* for a day or two, after which I know what to do."

Īśvara and Pārbati were much moved, and said:— "Go home, and you will find a large palace most handsomely furnished, and a *pądāl* richly decorated, with tables and bread and all sorts of dishes laid out ready for you, and a handsome dress for the bridegroom!"

The fox went home, and saw to his great pleasure a large palace most handsomely furnished, and a *pądāl* richly decorated, with tables laid out with bread and every requisite necessary for the occasion. The dishes and plates were of solid gold and silver, and there also was the bridegroom, most beautifully dressed, and quite a match for the king's daughter!

---

² *Plates made of leaves.*

² *The shami-sa of North India; it corresponds somewhat to the marquee-tent of Europe.*
The king in the meanwhile had sent some of his men to see what preparations his son-in-law had made, and when they saw the large palace, and the pandāl, and the tables laid out with gold and silver dishes, their eyes were dazzled, and they went and reported what they had seen to the king, who was now more than convinced that his son-in-law was a man of great importance.

The wedding-day at last dawned, and our hero had no friends or relatives to accompany him to church, so the fox went into the jungles and began howling, when lo! thousands upon thousands of other foxes came running in from all sides to the spot where our fox was. He explained to them why he had called them together, and they were all willing to follow him. He next cut a lot of palm leaves and tied them to the tails of the foxes.

The bridegroom now set out for the church, to get married, followed by a retinue of foxes with the palm-leaves tied to their tails, which, as they marched along, raised up such a cloud of dust, that the whole village was enveloped in it. The king saw it from afar and was at a loss to understand what could be the cause of it, and feared that it was a foreign king coming with a large army to conquer his kingdom. So he sent some men to see what it was or who was coming, and they reported that his son-in-law was coming, with thousands upon thousands of guests. The king, who was not prepared to entertain so many people, sent word to his son-in-law not to bring them all, but to come with only a few.

This just suited the fox, who sent back all the other foxes and went alone with the bridegroom. They went to the church, where the marriage ceremony was performed, and then all the guests returned to the king’s palace, and regaled themselves on a sumptuous dinner which awaited them. Dinner over, the bridegroom, taking his royal bride, returned to his own house, where a very sumptuous supper was eaten, after which dancing and singing were kept up till very late in the night, and then everybody went to sleep.

Now it will be remembered that the large handsome palace and the pandāl and everything else was only to remain for a short time, and so everything suddenly disappeared, and the following morning the bridegroom found to their dismay, that not even the old woman’s hut remained, and he and his wife were sunk in poverty. On that very day the king was to come with all his guests to dinner, and as soon as the fox saw the party coming he cried out at the top of his voice:

"The bride’s feet have brought ill-luck! The bride’s feet have brought ill-luck! See in what affluent circumstances we were till yesterday, and the bride has been scarcely a day here when everything has disappeared! The bride’s feet have brought ill-luck! The bride’s feet have brought ill-luck!"

The king arrived with his retinue, and was surprised to see his daughter and son-in-law in such a position, and he enquired what was the matter. Quick as lightning, the fox replied:

"What is the matter? Why, do you ask what is the matter? The matter is this, your daughter’s feet have brought ill-luck to us! your daughter’s feet have brought ill-luck to us."

The poor king, whose men had told him of the splendour of his son-in-law’s palace and everything else they saw, thought that what the fox said must be true, and that his daughter’s feet had brought ill-luck to her husband! So he consoled him by a promise of half his kingdom in compensation for the loss he had sustained.

Our friend, the poor boy, took it contentedly, and when many years afterwards the fox died, the boy gave him a grand funeral, with music. And after that he lived happily with his royal bride to a very old age.4

4 This is an exceedingly interesting instance of the grateful animal class of tale, in which, contrary to custom, a fox is the hero. It also exhibits in a remarkable degree the mixture of Hinduism and Christianity that clearly prevails among the poorer Christians of Saxe.
TEXT.

ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার। মহুত্তার গারিবধার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার ঠাকুরদার। এক ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর। এক ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর।

থাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর ঠাকুর।
hota ek soniachaun piram. Magle dara sonoarchaun por khelat hotam; tiala kohlihazun tukl fraud ani apsyla, ani dhabat aila ani sonarala kalt bolet: "Are, sonam tulja jasti holaun tujj pora khiris, ghaterti te bagis nauhin, ani piram harvarala baislaan.

Tavaani sonar dhabat gela porala tukvala taurian kohlihazu piram tuklala ani palala. Piram guhunsiun gela rajaheh ghar, ani simpanala sugattala rajala varavabal holinsun gex aghitsaun kama hai karunsiun. Simpad zonuinsan sugattala rajala.

Tavaani raza aila ani kader dilaam kohliala baisva. Tavaani kohlihazu soniachaun piram karaam ani baisla holinsun: "Shavr ase kaderavar kon baisel; mian miapi baasa sanda sangati jhetah.

Rajazun bagaian te ajabun bhalra ani euzun lagla g kohla koniun mohota manus asavai kain ge to soniache piyavvar baisel. Tavaani khabar mact karumnun rajazun vicharala kama hai karunsiun.

Kohlihazu zabab kela: "Raja sahi, tomisi anasi sorriri; tomichi sorrir amcheh sorrira diav.

Rava piram bagunsiun anretuk bhulla gex tabortob kabal aila, ani ek dis nemiil varaja lavala. Kaia dis gelo ani raza lagla karava taitari varadachi.


"Thauro dis rela varadali tavaani kohla gharoghar furunsiun patraveli kaunatilalia ani tiads nadimani sorilla, tavaani raza tia patraveli bagunsiun jasti ajabun bhalra gex zavain muraed taliyant aseel tavaani tiachun sorriun dhaimi athamae eunusiun khatan pitun.


Rajalal samyavin sorriri kellei pun nauriala kpraun kpraun paitaz, ghar dar paji, ani rajachhiun manasam etin tiachee sarkan khanaam pina paji. Hia kartan ailaun tunch pasiun, bangava tunch madat ek don disam kartani.

Itvaralii ani Parbatizun kaalkut aili un boliun: "Za, saraam taitar hai; kpraun, kpraun, ghar dar, mandap, ani khanaam pinaam, ani saraam bizaan jen kia lagel tauram taitar hoi.

Aisai itvara ani Parbatizun boliun ani naped zhailini.


Rajacheh gharar mohotaam jantaar keltaan. Taiaan khalaam piana ani ratecheh nauncii jhetaan ani apsyla gharar jellur.

"Naurichhi paimun khojaa, naurichhi paimun khojaa." Rajaa ani..."
tiacimi mañana ailiin titi tarjajban bharilini ani vichariilam kolhipar kaza hailam aisaani."

Baza tarj duzun lagla jha vaarta khar ni aati, kata ge itchamenta manasunzun saraam tiala aangatilam hotaam zaurah bagiltaa tauram, ani az bagiiti to kains nahnin.

Rajazun dhur dilam purala, ani ardaam razi tiala dilam hia kartan ge itcham sokri aatsham nihaam aitilam garibhahar zahilam. Puriain khoaamas ardaam razi jhetilam ani nivat rela.

Muraad varsam bharilin ait koil же melaa; puraam tiala gurilam. Ardaam razi jhaasam to puraam aitcham bako riilam khoasalin, ani jokriin mhatamz zahilin.

---

**CALCULATIONS OF HINDU DATES.**

No. 47.

Until recently, the latest known name in the dynasty of the Rashtrakutas of Malikech was that of Kakaka or Kakka III, who was overthrown by the Western Chalukya king Tailapa II. about A. D. 973-74. An inscription from Maihat, however, No. 57 in Mr. Roe's Inscriptions at Sravana Belega, has now brought to notice a later name, that of Indraraja, with the date of A. D. 982. In addition to being mentioned by his own proper name, this Indraraja is also spoken of by several tirudas, among which is that of Ratta-Kandarpa; and this shews the family to whom he belonged. Further, he is described as a son's son of Krishnarajendra, who, there can be little doubt, is Krishna IV., the father of Kakka III.; but, whether this Indraraja was a son of Kakka III., or of another son of Krishna IV., is not made clear by the record.

The inscription is an eulogy of the virtues and prowess of Indraraja: and it concludes by giving the date of his death. He died, apparently, by the performance of the Jain vow of sattikhana or self-starvation. The passage containing the date, as given by Mr. Roe (loc. cit., Texts, pp. 55, 71), runs—

Vanadh-bahhdi-pramita-samkhya Sak.1
avnipala-kalam
neneysie Chitrabhanu parivarttiise Chitra-
sitatar-ashthami. 1

---

1 Read samkhya-sak, as required by the metre. — J. F. F.

2 Read somnvaradolu-sakula. — J. F. F.

3 It may be noted, in connection with the question as to the period when the mean-sun system was supplanted by the southern luni-solar system in Southern India, that by the mean-sun system, the same samvatara, Chitrabhanu, was current at the commencement of Saka-Saivat 904 current. But Chitra Saka 10 then ended at about 42 ghatsi on Thursday, 31st March, A. D. 981; and so cannot be connected with a Monday in any

---

**EXAMINATION OF SOME ERRORS IN WARREN'S KALASANKALITA.**

Warren's Kalamakala, published in 1825, has been so long before the public, that any formal and detailed criticism of it cannot now be called for. Still, as it is quoted even to the present day. — It may also be noted, in connection with the published Tables of intercalary months, that the next inscription, No. 53, in Mr. Roe's book, gives a date in the adhika or intercalated Aśāha of a Chitrabha na samvatara which appears to be the same one as that dealt with above. The date does not include the week-day, or any other item by which the details can be actually tested. But the record is in accordance with Mr. Cowasjee Patell's and General Sir A. Cunningham's Tables, which give Aśāha as the intercalary month for Saka-Saivat 905 current.
sent day as an authority, and in many respects deservedly so, it will probably not be thought out of place if I point out some of the more important errors in it. Not only is the rectification of them really needed from a general point of view; but also it will render it still possible, for any one who wishes to do so, to use Warren's Tables, and yet to obtain correct results from them.

The chief object of the Kalasankalita was (Preface, p. ii) "to abridge the tedious process of converting dates proposed according to European style into the corresponding Tamil, Telugu and Muhammadan time, and vice versa;" for which respectively the first, second, and fourth Memoirs in the Kalasankalita were written, while a separate Memoir, the third, treats solely of the Cycles of Jupiter. I do not propose saying anything, of the fourth Memoir, which relates entirely to the Muhammadan reckoning. I confine myself to the information given in this work in connection with the Hindu astronomy.

The Tamil and Telugu reckonings are chiefly solar (sauras) and lunar (chândras) respectively. The chief object of the book, i.e. the conversion of Hindu into European dates and vice versa, is accomplished through the medium of the Tamil solar reckoning; and therefore the method used is not of particular interest to those who, like me, are not in the habit of using that reckoning. But for Europeans, for whom the book is chiefly written, it is as useful as any other method, if not more so.

The calculation of a tithi is given in the second Memoir; and the method of finding the apparent places of the sun and moon being fully explained and illustrated with examples there, the nakṣatra, yōga and karaṇa of a given day can be easily calculated, though Warren has not distinctly given methods for them. The method, however, of calculating the tithi, given there, is a little cumbersome, notwithstanding the fact that the process is shortened by the use of the Tables. It can be calculated far more easily by the method in the Appendix to the second Memoir. This Appendix, which was written by Andrew Scott in A.D. 1797, with the aid, it seems, of the information communicated to him by a native astronomer, an inhabitant of a village near Chicoaco, is "a commentary on Vavilala Cuchinna's Rules and Tables for computing the Telugu Calendar," and though Warren inserts it "rather as a Tract extremely remarkable, both for the singularity of the topics which it investigates, and for the ingenuity displayed in expounding them, than as an instrument which is likely to prove serviceable to the main object of these Memoirs," it is, practically viewed, of more importance than the Memoir itself of which it forms an Appendix: because it contains short and easy methods of calculating nakṣatras, yōgas, and karaṇas, and the apparent places of planets with regard to their longitude and latitude. Warren has calculated a lunar eclipse in Fragment IV. Of the other astronomical articles treated of in a Karana-work or contained in a Hindu Pauṣaḥdī, the conjunctions of planets, and the mohdpata (the time of equal declination of the sun and moon), can be calculated from Warren's book, if the computator knows their definitions. Some other matters, such as heliacal risings and settings of the planets, the conjunctions of the planets with the stars, and the times when the planets become retrograde or stationary, can also be computed with the help of some additional information from other sources. But even with such additional information, it would be found difficult to calculate a solar eclipse from Warren's book. Nevertheless, it may be said generally that it is a good practical work on Hindu astronomy. The most praiseworthy feature of it, is the successful attempt to analyse and demonstrate almost every rule and problem in the subjects treated of. In this direction it goes beyond the scope of a Karana or a practical work, and resembles a Siddhānta-work, on the Hindu astronomy; though it does not boast of treating of all the subjects of a Siddhānta. It is far superior to the scanty information on "Indian Measures of Time" in the "Indian Metrology" by Jervis, who, though his knowledge of the Hindu astronomy scarcely went beyond the Laghuh- and Brihat- Tithichintāmani, — works by which only the week-day, nakṣatra, and yōga of a given tithi not earlier than Śaka-Samvat 1447 expired (A.D. 1825) can be calculated, did not fear to give wrong information and to draw erroneous conclusions on the general subject of Hindu astronomy. A similar tendency to assume a knowledge of the whole region of Hindu astronomy betrays itself once or twice even in Warren's writings. When he wrote (Preface, p. iii) "the author (Warren) had also in view to familiarize the learned Natives with the use of Tables constructed and disposed in the manner of those of the European Mathematicians; and also to reconcile them to the idea of brevity and expedition in computations, to which they are singularly averse," he seems to

1 The epoch of Vavilala Cuchinna's work, is Śaka-Samvat 1229 expired, and it is based on the present Sūrya-Siddhānta.
have overlooked the fact that no less than twenty
out of the forty-nine Tables given by him in
connection with the Hindu astronomy were
directly borrowed from Hindu works; and that
most of the other Tables were necessary only
to convert the Hindu dates into their Euro-
poean equivalents. And he was not aware that
Tables similar to those which he gave, might
be in use in other parts of India, or
perhaps even in the very province in which
he lived. His assertion (Pref. p. i.) that “the
results of the present research . . . . .
were derived from systems which we see nowhere
supported by recorded observations, or modified
(for several centuries past) by improved theories,”
is subtle and liable to dispute. But such
instances are rare, and it may be said that
Warren was a good appreciator of the merits of
the Hindu astronomy, and was not merely a
fault-finder. His book gives a good insight into
the Hindu astronomy; and those foreign writers
who wish to be judges on the subject of the
Hindu astronomy, may do well to give it a
thorough perusal.

There is ample proof to show that Warren was
a good mathematician and a careful computator.
But notwithstanding this, some mistakes have
crept into his book; and without a knowledge of
them, the utility of it is liable to be affected.
The book seems to be still one of constant refe-
rence; and it, therefore, will be useful to note
the more important mistakes in it, which is the chief
object of my present remarks.

As might be expected, partly from the fact that
no regular system had then been established, and
partly from the author’s admission that he himself
was totally ignorant of the Sanskrit language (page
351), most of the Sanskrit technical terms, used
by Warren, are very corruptly spelt in the
text, and in reading the book it is necessary to
read first the Glossary (pp. 353-396), where they
are corrected and defined; and in some instances
it has to be searched rather carefully, before the
required words can be found. Even in the Glos-
sary, however, some words are not correctly dis-
posed of. For instance, śrijatāḍidiyugāṇa
(स्रीजात्यादियुगाणम्), which is spelt strostidī digona
in the text, is given as śrijatāidydiugōna in the Glos-
sary (p. 334). Also some words are wrongly
defined, though this is not often the case; for in-
stance, the word spelt as sootadina in the text, is
given as suddha dina, and is defined as ‘the day on
which a particular phenomenon is to occur’ (p. 385).

But I think it is really meant for suddhi-dina
(सुद्धिदिनम्), used for the tithi-suddhi, and so
should be defined as ‘the day on which the
Māsha-Saṅkṛanti occurs,’ though Warren has
used it for the day on which any suṅkṛati
occurs, or the luni-solar year begins.

On pages 376, 384, definitions are given of the
words prākchakra and spṛk, the latter of which is
said to be wrongly written in the Text as sprohu
or srohoo. They are explained as meaning
respectively ‘the epicycle on which ancient
astronomers corrected the precessional variation,’
and ‘a lunar intercalary day, repeated during two
successive solar days in the calendar.’ But
there are in reality no such terms. The second
of them seems to be meant for tridīṇasprṛk,
‘(a tithi) which touches three (civil) days.’
And the former seems to owe its existence only to
Davis’ incorrect translation (see page 84, note)
of the 9th, 10th, and 11th verses, and the first
half of the 12th, of the Triprāśas-Adihāra of
the Sūrya-Siddhānta. On page 389, avanatāmśa
(under the word vanatāmśa) is said to mean
‘degrees of altitude.’ But it really means
‘zenith-distance.’ The correct term for ‘altitude’
is unnatāmśa.

The terms solar ahargaṇa and luni-solar
ahargaṇa, used throughout, are rather mislead-
ing; and it would have been better to use “ahar-
gaṇa at the beginning of solar years (or months),”
and “ahargaṇa at the beginning of luni-solar
years (or months).” These are the senses in
which the terms in question were used. And it
would have been at any rate advisable to give the
definition of them.

A misunderstanding in connection with the
Second Chronological Table, into which Warren
himself seems to have fallen, is likely to
be impressed on the reader’s mind, and it might
easily render its fourth, fifth, sixth, and tenth
columns quite useless. One is likely to suppose
that the entries in these columns are for the end
of the apparent last amudēdaṇḍ of the year; but
this is not the case. The luni-solar ahargaṇa
in the tenth column is calculated from Table XLIX.
(p. 64); the very nature of which shows that it is
for the end of the last mean amudēdaṇḍ, and not
of the apparent one. The heading of the fifth
column, — “date of the last mean conjunction
in the luni-solar year,” — also shows the same fact;
and I myself have ascertained it from several
calculations. The difference between the ending-
times of a mean and an apparent tithi, amounts

2 This word, by the bye, is wrongly defined in Monier-Williams Sanskrit Dictionary, as meaning ‘the conjunction
or concurrence of three luna-ions with one solar day.’
sometimes to as much as about 25 ghatikt. Sometimes it may be the case that both the mean and the apparent tithi end on the same day; but in most cases, the apparent tithi would end one day before or after the day on which it ends as a mean tithi. Warren writes (Chro. Tables, p. xiii.) "since the Solar Civil date of the last conjunction in the year 4923 of the Cali yug fell on the 12th Chitra" [the Bengal solar Chaitra], "it follows that the Pratham Titli, or first Lunar day of the Luni-solar year 4924 [current] "fell on the 13th Chitra, . . . . . as was exemplified in the Kalendar exhibited at page 67." As only the apparent tithis are entered in the calendar, the pratham titli referred to here is apparent. Again he says (Chro. Tables, p. xiv.) "it is almost needless to add, that when the true time of Sun rising is referred to, as it occurs in any Latitude or Longitude arbitrarily proposed, the precise Solar date of the Anamasya, and Prathamam Titthi . . . . . may vary from what it is computed for Lania in the Chronological Table. But as this difference can only occur when the last conjunction falls very near the time of Sun rising, the case is a rare one." From these two quotations Warren's intention seems to have been, to give the day of the apparent conjunction; but the contrary has been the case. It is rather surprising that Warren, while noticing in the latter quotation the trifling difference of some palas or of a ghatikta or two, arising from the actual time of sunrise in a place away from the first meridian and equator, forgot the difference, which sometimes amounts to 25 ghatiktas. If it be kept in mind that the entries in the said columns of the Second Chronological Table are for the last mean conjunction of the year, they will be useful for calculating the apparent conjunction and any other apparent tithi in the ensuing year; subject, however, to another error, which I will now point out.

In calculations strictly according to the Surya-Siddhanta, the ahargya from the beginning of the Kaliyuga is to be calculated from midnight on (the Hindu) Thursday; and in those according to the Arya-Siddhanta, it is to be calculated from the next following morning, i.e. from sunrise on the Friday. This distinction, though sometimes observed (p. 90), is lost sight of, often in the text, and wholly in preparing the Second Chronological Table. For instance, the luni-solar ahargya,

i.e. the ahargya for the end of the luni-solar year 4923 of the Kaliyuga (i.e. again for the beginning of Kaliyuga-Saivism 4924 current, or Saka-Saivism 1745 current) is computed as 1798147 days, 1 ghatikta, 40 vighatikta (palas), 55 paras (vishalas), 7 suras (pratiipalas) according to the Surya-Siddhanta, and as 1798146-39-24-28-53 according to the Arya-Siddhanta; and the difference of the two reckonings is given as 22 gh. 25 vi. 26 p. 14 s. (pages 243, 244 of the text, and p. 66 of the Tables). But, counting from the Thursday midnight, the former, viz. the Surya-Siddhanta ahargya, brings us to 46 gh. 49 vi. 55 p. after sunrise on a Friday, and shows that the mean end of that luni-solar year occurred at that time on that day, and that its last Feria was Friday; and counting from the Friday sunrise, the latter, viz. the Arya-Siddhanta ahargya, brings us to 39 gh. 24 vi. on the same day; the real difference between the two being only 7 gh. 25 vi. My assertion that the mean end of the luni-solar year 4923 of the Kaliyuga, i.e. the end of its last mean omadesya, occurred at 46 gh. 49 vi. 55 p. (= nearly 46 gh. 50 vi.) after sunrise on the Friday according to the Surya-Siddhanta, can be shewn to be correct from Warren's calculations themselves. He has calculated the same tithi on pages 82 to 90. The mean places of the sun and moon calculated for that purpose are 11° 9' 26' 38' 37°" and 11° 21° 15° 34' 24° 24" respectively (see p. 83 or 88). They are, as is evident from the number of days used in the first proportions in article 6, page 83, according to the Surya-Siddhanta; and from the remarks in lines 6 to 3 from the bottom of page 82, and from the first two lines of the 13th operation on page 90, it will be seen that they are for the midnight on Saturday, 12th Poongoni (the Bengal Solar Chaitra). And from these places it is seen at once that the mean conjunction had already happened, and that the moon was, that at midnight, 11° 48' 57' 47° in advance of the sun. Calculating from this distance and from the mean daily motions of the sun and moon, we find that the mean omadesya occurred 58 gh. 10 vi. before the Saturday midnight, i.e. at 46 gh. 50 vi. after mean sunrise on the Friday, i.e. again exactly at the time which I have given above.

It must be stated here, first, that Warren, in finding the week-day from the luni-solar ahargya as calculated from the Tables, neglects

---

3 The apparent conjunction took place on that day; but the mean conjunction on the previous day, as will be shown further on.

4 This difference is given as 22-24-31 on page 126, which seems to be a slight mistake.

5 This date is taken for calculation, in consequence of thinking, erroneously, that the mean conjunction happened on that day. The 11th Poongoni ought to have been taken. But it is immaterial for the ultimate result, in calculating a tithi as worked out here by Warren.
the fraction (ghaftis, palae), and adds one to the complete number, and counts from Thursday as zero (and Friday as one; see the above example of the luni-solar shargaṇa worked out on page 234 of the text and p. 66 of the Tables); while, in finding the week from the solar shargaṇa, he neglects the fraction, does not add one to it, and counts from Friday as zero (see the example on p. 240 of the text and p. 65 of the Tables). To add one in the former case, amounts to the same thing as not to add one and to count from the Friday as zero. To the luni-solar shargaṇa of both the Sūrya and Ārya-Siddhānta, he applied one and the same method, and evidently forgot that the former shargaṇa is to be counted from Thursday midnight. In the above example (worked on page 243) the complete number of the shargaṇa according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta is 1,798,147; adding one to it, he obtained 1,798,148, which, being divided by seven, gives 2 as the remainder; and counting from Thursday as zero, he gave Saturday as the ‘sootadina’ or last day of that mean luni-solar year, according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta; while, adding one to 1,798,146, which is the complete number of the shargaṇa according to the Ārya-Siddhānta, and counting from the Thursday as zero, he gave Friday as the ‘sootadina’ according to the Ārya-Siddhānta. In the Second Chronological Table, against the Kaliyugan year 4923, he gave 1,798,148 as the luni-solar shargaṇa in column X., and Saturday as the last feria in column IV. In this, he evidently followed the Sūrya-Siddhānta. But I have just shown that, even according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta, the last feria is Friday, and not Saturday. The luni-solar shargaṇa according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta is to be counted from the Thursday midnight; but in order to count it as Warren did, from the Thursday as zero (Friday as one), 15 ghaftis should first be subtracted from it, and then one (day) added, to the complete number of it. In the above example, the luni-solar shargaṇa according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta is 1798147-1-49, &c.; subtracting 15 ghaftis from it, and then adding one (day) to the complete number, we get 1,798,147, which ought to have been given in column X. of the Second Chronological Table against Kaliyugan year 4923; but Warren gave one more, viz. 1,798,148, which is wrong. In his explanation of the Second Chronological Table, Warren omitted to specify the Sūrya-Siddhānta to which the luni-solar shargaṇa in its tenth column belongs. But from the above example it is clear that it is the Sūrya-Siddhānta; and from several other examples I have fully satisfied myself that it is according to the Sūrya, and not the Ārya-Siddhānta. Whenever the fraction in the luni-solar shargaṇa is less than 15 ghaftis, the entries in the columns X. and IV. must be wrong; and from several actual calculations, I have ascertained that they are wrong. The English dates in column V. are, as Warren himself stated (p. xii. of the Chronological Tables), derived from the shargaṇa inserted in column X.; and consequently they also are wrong. For instance, against the Kaliyugan year 4923 current, the English date of the last mean conjunction is given as the 23rd March (A. D. 1822). But it should be the 22nd March. And from any English Tables, we can see that the 22nd March, A. D. 1822, was a Friday, which is the correct last feria of that luni-solar year. In column VI. of the same Table, the sidereal date, in the solar Chaitra (the Tamil Poongon) for the last conjunction, is given; and to get it, the same wrong luni-solar shargaṇa was again used, as will be seen from a note on page xii. f. of the Chronological Tables. Consequently, the entries in column VI. must be wrong. In the above example, the sidereal date is not the 13th but the 12th, and the civil date is the 11th of the solar Chaitra (the Tamil Poongon). Thus, columns IV., V., VI., and X. of the Second Chronological Table are wrong. It is true that the fraction in the luni-solar shargaṇa does not every year amount to less than 15 ghaftis; but, as the fraction is not given in the Table, there are no means of determining in what years the results are right, and in what years they are wrong; and to provide these means now, would amount to preparing a fresh Table. The mistake, however, is not more than one day, one way or the other.

To use, as Warren did, the solar shargaṇa from one authority and the luni-solar from another in the same Table, is unsystematic, and the more so, because the luni-solar shargaṇas from the Sūrya and the Ārya-Siddhāntas differ from each other, and have different starting-points. Warren said that “the Tamil astronomers, though computing in solar time, use in preference the luni-solar shargaṇa according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta, and for the solar the Ārya-Siddhānta” (see pages 64 and 65 of the Tables, and p. 244, para. 2, of the text). But this cannot be a fact.

* I do not know why Warren made such a nominal distinction between the solar and luni-solar shargaṇas. It would have been more convenient to follow one and the same course in both the cases.

* If counted from Friday as zero, the one day need not be added.

* This is for the end of the mean awadāyaka. The apparent awadāyaka ended on the 13th Poongon, civil account (see p. 90); but the correct result is only accidental.
As far as my knowledge goes, the Hindu astronomers never use the luni-solar ahargana in the sense and manner in which Warren used it. He seems to have been led into this misunderstanding by the rule that the number of the moon’s revolutions in a Mahāyuga is the same in both the Śārya and the Ārya-Siddhāntas. Probably he found Tamil astronomers, — the followers of the Ārya-Siddhanta, — using that number of the moon’s revolutions, counting their ahargana from sunrise, according to the rule of their authority; and thus he seems to have fallen into the error of giving, in the Second Chronological Table, the luni-solar ahargana from the Śārya-Siddhānta, and making it count from sunrise.

There seems also another reason of this. The ahargana (index) for about the end of the luni-solar Kaliyuga-Saṅvat 4923 current, according to Vavilala Cuchinna’s work, is computed on pages 153–154; it is 191389, which, after division by 7, gives 2; and, in that work, as it is counted from Thursday, noon, the result is Saturday, noon; and this must have co-operated in inducing Warren to give Saturday as the last feria of the year 4923, and must have helped to lead him to the general mistake in the Second Chronological Table. Now, the ahargana according to Vavilala Cuchinna’s work, is not exactly for the time of the last conjunction; the mere fact that it is always for noon proves this; and the further calculations required to find the mean new-moon, stated in article 3, page 172, leave no doubt about this. Saturday, in fact, as shown above by me, was not the last feria of the year in question.

I find that the real difference between the luni-solar ahargana of the Śārya-Siddhānta and that of the first Ārya-Siddhāntas was nil in Saka-Saṅvat: 421 expired (A. D. 499). It was 6 ghafite, 24 vigafite, 56 paras, in A. D. 1900. And it will be 7 gh. 46 vi. 59 pa. in A. D. 1900. And when the mean avadasya, according to the Śārya-Siddhānta, ends within this time after sunrise, it will end on the previous week-day according to the first Ārya-Siddhānta.

The difference between the solar aharganas of the two authorities is also the same. In finding the week-day and other elements also from the solar ahargana calculated from the Śārya-Siddhānta, the same mistake may occur. For instance, see page 65 of the Table, line 7 from the bottom, where the feria of the first civil day in the Kaliyuga year 7924 current is said to be Friday by the Śārya-Siddhānta; this is a mistake; it ought to be Thursday. Also see p. 82, line 7 from the bottom, where the civil month is wrongly said to be of 31 days, instead of 29. But fortunately, in the two Chronological Tables Warren gave the solar ahargana from the Ārya-Siddhānta, and thus avoided a repetition of the mistake.

The time of the apparent or the mean Mēsha-Saṅkranti is the time when the sun’s apparent or mean longitude amounts to nil. According to the first Ārya-Siddhānta, the apparent (sphaṣta) Mēsha-Saṅkranti takes place about 2 days, 8 gh. 51 palas, 15 vipalas, before the mean (saṃhyam) Mēsha-Saṅkranti, and this difference is called śāhyam in Warren’s work. This quantity varies according to different authorities. According to the present Śārya-Siddhānta, it is about 2 days, 10 ghafite, 12 palas. But Warren used the Śāhyam according to the first Ārya-Siddhānta, even in calculations according to the Śārya-Siddhānta. Such a process, of course, is not right, and may frequently lead to mistakes.

In the third Memoir Warren gives, according to the present Śārya-Siddhānta and the Jyotishaṭattva, the method of computing the time of the commencement of a saṅvatara of the Sixty-Year Cycle of Jupiter which is in use at present in Northern India. But the time arrived at by his process is always earlier than what is derived actually according to those two authorities, by about 2 days, 8 ghafite, 51 palas, 15 vipalas, in the case of the latter authority, and by that amount plus the difference between the time of the mean Mēsha-Saṅkranti of the Śārya and Ārya-Siddhāntas in the case of the former. A little misunderstanding, noticed in note 9 above, causes this mistake. A saṅvatara of the Sixty-Year Cycle as described by Warren, — which I have named the Sixty-Year Cycle of the mean-sign-system, — commences when Jupiter’s mean longitude amounts to a complete sign. This is clear from Warren’s description of it, as well as from verse 55 of the first chapter of the Śārya-Siddhānta, a translation of which is given by him on page 200. The Jyotishaṭattva rule is based on the first Ārya-Siddhānta; and according to that Siddhānta and the Śārya-Siddhānta, Jupiter’s mean longitude was nil, or, in other words, he was at the beginning of Mēsha, at the commence-

---

9 It is not properly defined in the Glossary (p. 382). Warren does not seem to have clearly understood, much less to have always kept in view, this distinction; and this seems to be at the root of most of his mistakes.

10 Warren writes this name as Jyotishścara throughout.
ment of the Kaliyuga, i.e. at the time of the mean, not apparent, Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī of Kaliyuga Sanvīkta 1 current (0 expired), i.e., again, at Thursday midnight on the 17-18th February, B.C. 3102, according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta, and at sunrise on Friday, 18th February, B.C. 3102, according to the first Ārya-Siddhānta (see my paper on the Original Sūrya-Siddhānta; also Burgess and Whitney’s Translation of the Sūrya-Siddhānta, Chapter I). And consequently, the longitude for the commencement of a solar year, computed either by actual proportion as worked out by Warren on page 200 or from his Tables X and XI, is not for the apparent, but for the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī; and evidently the time-equivalent of the expired portion of the current sign of Jupiter at the commencement of the solar year, should be subtracted from the time of the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī. But Warren subtracted it from the time of the Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī, either as derived from Table XLVIII. Part II. (p. 61), after deducting the kōdhya (2 days, 3 gh. 51 ps. 15 vīpa), or as given in his First Chronological Table; and this is the time of the apparent Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī. To show the correctness of this assertion of mine, I cannot well refer the reader to Warren’s description of Table XLVIII (p. 239 ff.) and to his remarks elsewhere about the epoch of the Kaliyuga; for the reason that an ordinary reader is only likely to be confused by them. But even from them, any one who has a practical direct knowledge of the Hindu or European astronomy, will see at once the truth of what I say. Suffice it to say that the time computed from Warren’s Table XLVIII. is the time of the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī; and the subtraction of the kōdhya from it gives the time of the apparent Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī.11

I will prove, however, in another way, that the longitude of Jupiter computed by Warren for the commencement of a solar year, is not for the apparent, but for the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī. Take the first example, given by Warren on page 200. There he computed the longitude of Jupiter for the commencement of A.C. i.e. Kaliyuga-Sanvīkta 4871 current (4870 expired), according to the present Sūrya-Siddhānta, from which it is found, without bhūja, to be 7 signs, 2 degrees, 37 minutes. It is seen from the Appendix to the Second Memoir (and I have also fully satisfied myself) that the mean places and motions of the planets according to Vavilala Cuchinna’s Karaṇa-work, exactly correspond with those of the present Sūrya-Siddhānta. Let us now compute the same longitude from that Karaṇa-work. The index, i.e. the ahargana according to that Karaṇa, at about the beginning of the lunisolar year Kaliyuga 4871 current (Saka-Sanvīkta 1691 expired), calculated by the rule on page 155 f., is 172046, which divided by 7 leaves no remainder; and as the ahargana in that Karaṇa is to be counted from Thursday noon, this ahargana brings us to Thursday noon. Calculating from the Sūrya-Siddhānta, and also from Warren’s Table XLVIII. Part I., and Table XLIX. Part I, I find that the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī of that year occurred on a Tuesday, at 53 gh. 38 ps. 38 vīpa, after mean sunrise (38 gh. 38 ps. 38 vīpa, after mean noon), and that it took place some ghatikās more than 5 days after its previous amavasya. Therefore, adding 5 days, 38 gh. 38 ps. 38 vīpa to 172046, the above-found index, we find that the index (the ahargana) for the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī, according to Vavilala Cuchinna’s work, is 172051 days, 38 gh. 38 ps. 38 vīpa. Counted from Thursday noon, this gives Tuesday, and shews that it is correct. Then, calculating, with this index, Jupiter’s mean longitude from Table XLIII. (p. 55), we get 7 signs, 2 degrees, 37 minutes, 9 seconds, which is exactly the same as given by Warren.

It is clear, therefore, that the time of the commencement of a sanvātasa found by Warren’s method is wrong. In the case of the Jyotiṣhabhātta-rāja, it is earlier by 2 days, 8 gh. 51 ps. 15 vīpa, which is the kōdhya according to the first Ārya-Siddhānta on which the rule is based. If we use the First Chronological Table for the Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī, the amount of the kōdhya must be added; and if we compute the Mēsha-Saṅkrāntī from Table XLVIII. Part II., that amount should not be subtracted; and thus the mistake can be avoided. In the case of the Sūrya-Siddhānta rule, Warren takes the mean motion of Jupiter from that Siddhānta, but uses the Mēsha-Saṅkrānti of the Ārya-Siddhānta. But the times of the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrāntis of these two authorities differ from each other, as I have stated above. Therefore, the mistake amounts to this difference, in addition to 2 days, 8 gh. 51 ps. 15 vīpa, which is the amount of the kōdhya. And to avoid the mistake, we must use the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrānti from Table XLVIII. Part I.

Jupiter’s year, i.e. the time in which his mean motion amounts to one sign (rāśi), according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta, corrected by bhūja, as given on pages 191, 201 note, 213, and as used as the basis in constructing Table XIII. (p. 16) and Table XVII. (p. 19), is slightly inaccurate. So also is the year according to the first Ārya-Siddhānta as

11 My above remarks, as to the time from which the ahargana is to be counted, should not be forgotten.
given in pages 206, 213. The real quantities, with extreme accuracy, are:—

By the present Sūrya-dasga 361 2 4 44-6298
Siddhānta, with bīja... 361 2 4 44-6298
By the first Aryan-
Siddhānta ........... 361 1 21 39-1170

If the object of Warren's Table XVIII. (p. 20) is to find only by inspection the year of an expunged saṅvatāra of the sixty-year cycle, and I do not find any other practical use of it, it is quite useless. Warren supposed the years entered in it to be expunged years (see column 3 of Table XIX. p. 23), but he was wrong. None of those years except the last four, are expunged years. He said (p. 207) that "85 years, 363 days, 1 daṇḍa (ghatī), 13 p., 13-3992 c., &c., of solar time," answer precisely to 87 years of Jupiter's, and the former quantity marks in solar time the period when one of Jupiter's years is to be expunged. The latter part of this assertion is wrong, because by that quantity the expiration may be due, as will also be seen from Table XVIII., at any time of the year; but, only when two saṅvatāras begin in the same year, is one of them expunged. And, as the length of the solar and Jupiter years is respectively 365 days, 15 gh., 31 1/4, and 361 days, 2 4 44-6298, according to the Sūrya-Siddhānta with the bīja, the omission takes place when one saṅvatāra begins within about 4 days, 13 gh., 27 pa., after the commencement of a solar year. Suppose, for instance, that a saṅvatāra was current at the beginning of a solar year, and another began within 4 days, 13 gh., after the beginning of that year; then a third must commence before the end of it, and the second saṅvatāra will be regarded as omitted. The interval of omission is generally 86, and sometimes 88 years. It cannot be always 86 years. But, as the quantity of 86 days, 363 days, 1 gh., 13 pa., 13 vi., which is very near to 86, "governs Table XVIII.," the Table is quite wrong. This is clear on the face of it; but I will give an example. Jupiter's longitude, corrected with bīja, for the commencement of three years, calculated by Tables XI. and XII., is given below:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Jupiter</th>
<th>Sura time</th>
<th>Solar time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Ghatikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the last equivalents, in solar time, in these two equations, were used in preparing Table XIX. (especially col. 6). Accordingly, the numbers of days &c. in this col. 6 are wrong throughout, except for the year Śaka-Sāṃvat 571 (expired). I give below the really accurate equations:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Jupiter</th>
<th>Sura time</th>
<th>Solar time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Days</td>
<td>Ghatikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 The figures are slightly inaccurate; the last quantity should be about 19-7938.

14 Warren's remark, "we have 86-867... and 87 years, which, however, must not be taken to be exactly 87 years of the Planet, as shall be shown presently" (p. 209, lines 5, 6 from the bottom), applies, it appears, to the note on p. 210. The equations in that note also are wrong.
The years, however, of the expunged \textit{sasvedsaras} in the Table are correct, and the error has no material effect on that point.

The short rule for finding the \textit{samsvatsaras} of the Sixty-Year Cycle given on pages 147, 214, of the text and page 22 of the Tables, requires assistance from Table XVIII. (p. 20); but this itself being wrong, the rule also must be incorrect. It will, however, give correct results with the Table as it stands, with some rare exceptions. It should be remembered, though, that the rule only gives the \textit{sasvedsara} which stands current at the commencement of a solar year.

Much might be said on Appendix II. (pp. 245-289), which describes "a method for expounding dates found in old inscriptions"; but to no particular purpose. Suffice it to say that there are inconsistencies throughout, in the comparisons made, and in the Hindu errors established there. The times of the Mēsha-Saṅkrānti are taken from the first \textit{Arya-Siddhānta}, while the ayānāsas are taken from the \textit{Sūrya-Siddhānta}; and the European longitudes are taken as mean, while those from the Hindu works are apparent. For an instance, see pages 277-79, where, in establishing the Hindu error as $3^\circ 54' 35'' 4''$, Warren has made gross errors; first, in subtracting from the sun's apparent longitude at the time of the apparent Mēsha-Saṅkrānti of the Kaliyuga-Samvat 2382 current (2381 expired) according to the \textit{Arya-Siddhānta}, the ayānāsas from the \textit{Sūrya-Siddhānta}; then in adding to it the sun's mean motion for nearly 12 days; and lastly, in comparing the sun's longitude, $11^\circ 29' 30' 37''$, thus found (whether tropical or sidereal, and whether apparent or mean, I do not know how to qualify it), with the same amount of European mean longitude.

Warren has mistaken (pages 19, 20, 74) the 27 yōgas, which are to be calculated from the addition of the apparent longitudes of the sun and moon, and of which he gives a list in page 74, for the yōga-tāras or principal stars of the 27 nakshatras. Vishkambha and other yōgas have no connection with γ or β Arietis, and other stars.

Tables I. and II. for finding the initial feria and sidereal beginning of any solar year according to the Tamil calendar, and the same of the solar years of the Ninety-Year Cycle called Grahasparīvṛtti, are said by Warren (p. 21) to be "the invention of Father Beschi." But I have seen a Table in accordance with the \textit{Brahma-Siddhānta}, corrected by a bīja, exactly similar to Table I. in the Karana \textit{Kamala-mārtanda}, a work of as early a date as Saka-Samvat 880 expired (A. D. 1058).

The epoch of Vavilala Cuchinna's work is said to be Friday, 14th March, A. D. 1298 (p. 172). But I find from actual calculations of the dhrusas or constants in it (p. 182), that they are for the mean noon at Ujjain of the \textit{samānta} Phālguna krīṣaṇa maṃvāya,\textsuperscript{14} Thursday, Saka-Samvat 1219 expired, = 13th March, A. D. 1298.

It is said on page 207 that Jupiter's motion for one solar year according to Vavilala Cuchinna's Table SLIX. (p. 56) amounts to $1^\circ 0' 21'' 6''$. But this is a mistake. Vavilala's Table for Jupiter, like his other Tables, exactly corresponds with the present \textit{Sūrya-Siddhānta} without the bīja. And by actual calculation of Jupiter's motion from that Table for as many as 471 years, I find that his yearly motion is $1^\circ 0' 21'' 6''$.

The sun's dhrusas entered below Table XXX. (p. 24) is wrong; it should be $11^\circ 15' 26'' 34' 23''$ (see p. 182). Also, the remark below it is misleading. Tables XX., XXI., XXII., XLIII., XLIV., and XLV. are from Vavilala Cuchinna's work; and, if the dhrusas in them, which are for about the end of the lunisolar year Kaliyuga 4399 current (beginning of 4399 expired), are to be used, the \textit{ahṛṣya} should be calculated according to his rule on pages 153 or 171; and the mean places, calculated with the dhrusas and the \textit{ahṛṣya}, will be for the mean noon, and not for the mean midnight. The word "midnight" in line 2 from the bottom, page 24 of the Tables, is so far wrong. The Tables, however, exactly correspond with the \textit{Sūrya-Siddhānta} (without bīja), and are useful in making calculations according to that Siddhānta; in which case the places will be for midnight.

The Dhrusas in Table I. is for the apparent, while those in Tables XI. and XII. are for the mean Mēsha-Saṅkrānti.

Tables XXIV. and XXV., for the solar and

\textsuperscript{14} I find that this ashtadha, as a mean tithi, on the Friday, at 2 gh., 24 pous, 32' vāyu, after mean sunrise for Ujjain; and thus it will be seen that the epoch of the work is not the time of the mean last conjunction in the year.
lunar equations, belong to Makaranda, which name is wrongly written as Manacanda.

In constructing the Table XXIX., for finding the epochs of mean intercalations of lunisolar months from Kaliyuga-Saṅvat 4923 expired, actually by the Śārva-Siddhānta rule, as worked out on page 150, is later by 3 gh. 50 palas than that obtained from the Table, viz. 8 months, 14 days, 32 gh. 40 viṅgahats, and this very difference seems to have led to the invention of an additive equation (kṣhōpa) of the same amount, viz. 3 gh. 50 palas, which is entered below the Table. In working the example, there is a slight mistake, the remainder (page 150, line 19 from the bottom) should be 38,317,336, with the result of 8 months, 14 days, 36 gh. 23 50213 9388 palas, which is greater by 3 gh. 43 50213 9388 pā. than the result from the Table. This difference is exactly equal to the neglected quantity (9388, of a pala), multiplied by 1816, the number of intercalations in the example. The error amounted to this quantity in about 4923 years, and it would be absurd to add the kṣhōpa in every example. It is rather surprising that Warren, knowing of the omission of 7-39 paras in the construction of the Table, had to adopt the expedient of an additive equation, which, moreover, he could not explain (see p. 151). The Table could have been constructed most accurately, without increasing its bulk, and without having recourse to a ājā.

In the tithi table XXXVII. (p. 48), the equation against the index 61 should be 24-7. In the yōga table XXXIX. (p. 49), that for the indexes 35 and 37 should be 11-4 and 8-29, respectively. And in the solar table XL. (p. 50), it should be 6-47 for the index 368.

In Table XLIX., for the lunisolar ahārāgana from the beginning of the Kaliyuga, in the first part, the time of one year is slightly mistaken; the last figures, the decimals -14, have been taken by an oversight from those opposite 13 lunaions, instead of from those opposite 12, which are -36, but should be -37. The error amounts to about 39 paras (vipalas) in 10,000 years of the Table, in the last figures for which we should have 12 viṅgahats, 42 p. 10-7 s. Similarly, in the second part of the Table, the last quantity for one year is properly 2 visuras (prativipalas), and that for 10,000 years is properly 0 viṅgahats, 52 p. 31 s. The error, however, is immaterial.

Some individual mistakes, which attract attention, are as follows: — In example II., p. 202, the first fraction is not - 873 but 242, which reduced into time is equal to 46 days, 27 gh., 50-4 palas, of the saura, and to 47 days, 8 gh., 53-9 pā., of the solar time. Subtracting the last quantity from the time of the mean Mēṣa-Saṅkrānti according to the first Arya-Siddhānta, viz. 46 gh. 27-5 p. after sunrise on Thursday, 11th April, A. D. 1769, the Śārvarin saṅvatara commenced on the 23rd February, A. D. 1769, at 37 gh. 53 p., and not on the 21st October A. D. 1768.

On page 208 (line 12) the number 4370688 is given as the revolutions of Jupiter; but it is that of the āsī, or revolutions, multiplied by 12. On page 241, line 11, we should read "solar revolutions" for "solar days."

In a marginal note in Appendix II., p. 276, Warren supposed the eclipse of the 19th March, B. C. 720, recorded by the Babylonians, to be one of the sun. In saying (p. 280) that "the time occurring during the night, the eclipse could not have occurred (in India)," he overlooked the fact that, if the eclipse had been one of the sun, it could not have been visible in Babylonia itself, because even there the time of its occurrence would be during the night. It was in fact a lunar eclipse (see Chamber's Descriptive Astronomy, 1877, page 227, and von Oppolzer's Canon der Finsternisse, p. 332.) In computing this same eclipse, what is said to be the sun's longitude (on the lower part of p. 279) is in fact the longitude of the earth's shadow.

In writing the note to Table XLVIII. p. 63, and on the word Arya-Siddhānta in the Glossary (p. 355), Warren plainly did not know that there are two different Arya-Siddhāntas (see my note, ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 312).

The mistakes noted above, particularly those in the Tables and the individual mistakes, can by no means be exhaustive, as I have not examined every figure in the book under notice. I can, however, say about the Tables that they are creditably correct.

Were there not proofs of the ability and originality of Warren, one would be inclined to question them, from the errors in Tables XVIII., XIX., XXIX., in Appendix II., and in the Second Chronological Table. There is no doubt of the competency of the author for the work taken in hand by him; and I attribute the material mistakes noticed above to the fact, which he admits, that he was "totally ignorant of the
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A. HOUTUM-SCHINDLER.


FIRST NOTICE.

These goodly volumes are a notable addition to the knowledge of folklore and the meaning of its phenomena. Mr. Frazer has been for some time engaged in preparing a general work on primitive superstition and religion, and the present book is an excursion on a particular point of great interest.

The object of the book is to explain the "rule of the Arcian priesthood," and in order to propound a theory regarding it, Mr. Frazer has found it necessary to minutely examine the popular festivals observed by European and other peasants in spring, at midsummer and at harvest. Hence the absorbing interest of this work to students of folklore.

Near the village of Nemi, in Italy, stood in ancient times the grove and sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis or Diana of the Wood. It was more widely known as the Arcian Grove, and its priests as the Arcian priests, though the town of Arcia, the modern La Ricia, is three miles distant. The rule of succession to the priesthood was that each priest was by craft or force to murder his predecessor and to hold the succession till he himself was in the same way murdered. It is to explain this unparalleled custom in classical antiquity, that Mr. Frazer has compiled these two laborious and intensely interesting volumes.

Mr. Frazer's method is best explained in his own words: — "if we can shew that a barbarous custom, like that of the priesthood of Nemi, has existed elsewhere; if we can detect the motives which led to its institution; if we can prove that these motives have operated widely, perhaps universally in human society, producing in various circumstances a variety of institutions specifically different but generically alike; if we can shew lastly that these very motives, with some of their derivative institutions were actually at work in
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Sanskrit language" (p. 351). Being so, he cannot have had a direct knowledge of the Hindu astronomy, and must have been obliged to depend on second-hand and oral information; the results may be taken as an example by those who may wish to work in the same direction. Considering all the difficulties under which Warren must have laboured, the work is creditable to him, though to those who are ignorant of practical astronomy, it is not in itself a safe guide for Hindu astronony.

SHANKAR BALKRISHNA DIESHIT.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

The word sertip, now used in Persia, with three different classes, for 'Colonel' and 'General,' has by some writers been wrongly derived from the Greek word satrapes, which means 'governor of a province.' The word satrap is either the old Pers. kshathra-pati (Zend. shathra-paiti) 'master, or lord, of the country, or province,' or, less probably, the old Pers. kshathra-paeav, 'protector or lord of the country.' The word pati is preserved in later Persian, shahr-bad (same as kshathra-pati) and ispeh-bad, 'lord of the army, commander-in-chief,' and in the modern Persian pahlevi (Zend. paiti-kshathra) 'lord of the kingdom.' The word paeav is the later Persian pān, as in shahr-bān, marz-bān, 'lord of the province, lord of the march.'

But sertip is sar + tāp, tāp meaning 'an assembly of men, a body of men, troops.' I do not know whether it is Turkish or Persian; my Persian dictionaries do not give it. I heard it used once for a body of armed men in the phrase tāp-i-mu'labar bā ham bastānd, "(the authorities) got together a considerable body of men," — and another time for a crowd come to the scene of an explosion at Tehrān, tāp-i-azmai jam' shud — "a great crowd collected." Sar meaning 'head,' sertip, generally pronounced sertip, is thus 'a commander of a body of men.' In the same way we have sarājān, sarājān (now 'a corporal') 'a commander of a jāgr, a small body of men; sarhān, generally pronounced sarhān, correctly sarhān, 'head (leader) of an army in) battle array, leader of a line or series (of soldiers);' and sarkār, 'head of the work, a lord, a Government' (as in India). Sardār is 'the man who has the head or lead, and is a leader.' Sertip for 'general or leader of troops' seems to be quite a modern word; I do not recollect having met with it in Persian histories written before the end of the last century; sarhān was in use several centuries before that.
to slay his predecessor?, and second, why before he slew him had he to pluck the Golden Bough?"

Going into details Mr. Frazer begins by asking the questions: — "why was the priest called King of the Wood? why was his office spoken of as a kingdom?" In answer he first shews that a royal title with priestly duties was common in Italy and Greece, and then that all over the primitive world king and priest are functionaries combined in the same personage, often as the man-god, whose duties lie chiefly in the performance of sympathetic magic. The underlying principle of this class of magic is what in medicine is called homoeopathy, i.e. that like cures or, more strictly, produces like, leading to the world-wide practice of sticking injurious articles into an effigy in order to injure the person in whose likeness it is made, and to a thousand allied customs. This arose from the belief of primitive man that he could rule the elements, which, however ludicrous it may be to us, is to all savages a self-evident truth.

The nature-compelling king-priest, then, is merely a man-god endowed with more than usual supernatural power, because to the savage anyone can perform certain of the nature-compelling charms; but there is, and always has been, another kind of man-god, — he in whom a divinity is permanently or temporarily lodged. The two are, however, much mixed up in the ideas of primitive man in his various stages of development, before the conception of the gods as beings controlling the forces of nature outside mankind has become developed, and it is always difficult in practice to dissociate the worker of magic from the divine man. For practical purposes both are gods in human form. The medicine-man is the type of the former, and the inspired or possessed individual and the miracle-worker, of the latter: possession indicating temporary incarnation, and miracle-working permanent incarnation, of the divinity.

Manifestations of possession are familiar to all students of folklore in the forms of devil-dancing, divination, oracle-speaking, ecstasy, second-sight, and so on. Those of permanent incarnation are much more interesting. The supreme ldmas of Tibet and the female rulers of Tibetan monasteries will occur to most of our readers in this connexion; but the idea is widespread throughout savage life, and men, who are gods, exist all over the world. Some are merely priests, and some kings as well. The Emperor of China is the great living example of the latter class.
So far we have been dealing with the rule over nature as a whole, but there are numerous instances among savage tribes where man-gods are kings merely of departments in nature, as of rain, fire, water, and so on. The best examples of this are the Fire and Water Kings of Cambodia, respected not only by the people, but by the de facto king of the country himself.

To come nearer to the Priest-king of the Wood at Nemi we must look into the question of tree-worship. It is hardly necessary here to establish its prevalence in Asia and Europe. It will be sufficient to remark on its basis. The main idea is that, as all the world is animate, trees like other growths of nature have souls and must be treated accordingly. This notion is universal and leads to innumerable most interesting customs and practices: tree-marriage, tree-pregnancy, wailing and bleeding of trees when cut, shutting up in trees and tree-incarnation, leading up to the world-wide beliefs in tree-spirits and tree-worship. Hence the common belief in spirit-haunted and sacred groves, which it is advisable and proper to worship and dangerous to injure.

The belief underlying such customs as tree-marriage, tree-pregnancy and the wailing and bleeding of trees, is based on animism pure and simple, but the belief in tree-spirits is an advance in thought. The tree is no longer an animated being, but a mere haunt for spirits and gods. Hence the nymphs, dryads and the host of other sylvan deities all the world over.

Now, the powers of the sylvan deities can be shown to be identical with those of the man-gods already mentioned, and what is more, the sylvan deities themselves have been man-gods without change of powers. They have made the rain to fall, the sun to shine, the flocks and herds to multiply, and women to bring forth easily, and these beliefs are spread all over the world. The Harvest-May of Europe is a survival of the belief in the tree-spirit that made the crops to grow, and there is more than reason to suppose that the May-pole and the observances of May-day have reference to the easy parturition of women and cattle. Observances among the peasants of all parts of Europe at Midsummer, Whitsuntide, St. John's Eve, Lenton and so on, point emphatically in the same direction. The sweet Queen of the May herself, despite all the innocence of her young heart, is nothing but the representation of the spirit of female fecundity. All over Europe innumerable pretty and quaint customs have had origin in the same idea: May-king, Father-May, Lady of the May varied as the Whitsuntide-Queen, Whitsuntide-Flower, Little May Rose, and so on; the leaf-clad child varied as the Walber, Green George, Little Leaf-man, Jack-in-the-Green, Lazy-man, Grass-king, &c. It is emphasized when a boy and a girl are May-Lord and Lady in England, when they play more seriously le fiancé du mois de Mai in France, and when the peasants deck out the Whitsuntide-Bride and La Mariée in other parts of Europe. In Orissa again there is a custom closely corresponding to those of Europe; so the idea is not at all confined to Europe alone.

In ancient Rome and Greece were representatives of the modern May-day and its congers, shewing that neither the ceremonies nor the ideas underlying them are modern developments. The ceremonies of the Great and Little Dedala, the story of the nymph Platea, the custom of the marriage of "the Queen" to Dionysus at Athens, and the story of Dionysus and Ariadne, attest this.

Diana of Nemi, it will be seen from what has been already said, was emphatically a sylvan deity, her function was to help women in travail, and to protect cattle, and presumably to make the rain to fall and the sun to shine, and her priest was her living representative, the King of the Wood. He dwelt in her sacred grove, safe from assault, so long as the special manifestation of its divine life, the Golden Bough on the sacred tree, remained intact. His life was in fact bound up with that of the tree, an idea familiar to the Indian and European peasant alike to the present day.

We now see how the idea of the King of the Wood arose, and in that expressed at the close of the preceding sentence we get a clue as to the answer to the second question: — why should the would-be successor of the King of the Wood have to pluck the Golden Bough before he could venture to slay him? The answer to this requires a much more intricate enquiry than in the previous case.

Over most of what may be called the savage and semi-barbarous worlds, and in many an interesting relic in the civilized world, is to be found in one shape or another the doctrine of tabu. This is nothing more nor less in origin than a means of protecting the man-god, whether king or priest or both, from the terrible calamities which would happen to the people who looked up to him, through the elements or the natural forces he controlled, in case any mischance befell him or caused his death or removal from them. The elaborate precautions to protect the Mikado of Japan, the Chitomé of the
Congo, and the high pontiff of the Zapotes in South Mexico, all divine kings with supernatural powers, are samples of this kind of *tabu*. These precautions go so far as to regulate every detail in the life of such unfortunate rulers, for fear of the trouble that might be caused to the world if any irregularity were to occur. In this way the lives of the kings of Loango and of ancient Egypt were rendered a trouble to them. The *tabus* imposed on the priest-king were, of course, extended to the man-god-priest: witness the rules of life observed by the Flamen Dialis at Rome, whose life must have been a continuous misery.

The effect of these customs in many instances has been notable. No one has wanted to be a high priest or supernatural king, or the holders have been religious recluses leaving the real power to men of action. In Savage Island the kingship ceased to exist because no one would take it. In Cambodia the Kings of Fire and Water had to be forced into office. In parts of Africa they are chosen in secret council. On the other hand, the rise of the Tycoons of Japan, of the Chivas of Tongking, and of the Ministers of Népál and Bhútán, are instances of the separation of royal and political functions.

The object of the *tabu* being to preserve the life of the man-god, the question is: — *What does the savage understand by this life? What by the soul? What by death? What is the danger he wishes to guard against by *tabu*?*

Now, the savage understands the living and moving of an animal to be the result of the action of a smaller animal within it, just as he understands a force of nature to be the result of the action of a living being behind it. This man inside the man is the soul, and it is to protect the soul, to prevent its absence, i.e., death, and to secure its return if temporarily absent, that he sets up the machinery of *tabu*.

Many, indeed very many, savage customs illustrate the belief above stated. Any number of death, birth, and sleep customs turn on the liability of the soul to fly from the body, — some to try and prevent the flight, and others, as in Christian lands, — *e.g.*, the opening of the windows when a person has died in Cornwall to this day, — to aid it in its flight. The “passing bell” is an instance of the survival of the belief in custom.

The theory of witches, sorcerers, ghosts, demons, and so on, is partly based on the supposition that man-gods in various degenerated forms can force or induce the soul to quit its tenement, and hence innumerable practices to protect it from this danger. So, sickness is frequently attributed by savages to a temporary absence or snatching away of the soul, and many and curious are the customs connected with its recapture and restoration to its owner, and equally curious are the “things” into which it is supposed to have escaped, — butterflies, dolls, effigies, head-dresses, corpses, devils, cloths, and so on.

The above may be called the spiritual dangers to which the soul is liable, but the physical dangers are equally numerous and terrible. For instance, it is a common belief that the shadow or the reflection of the human being is his soul, and accidents to either are a danger to the life of the owner. This has led to all kinds of superstitions in every part of the world, from stabbing an enemy’s shadow in order to kill him, to covering up the mirrors in a house after a death for fear that the soul of the dead man reflected therein should be carried off by his ghost. The most curious of all of which customs is perhaps the objection to being photographed, which still exists in the west of Scotland for fear of sickness resulting therefrom!

Such being the nature of the soul to the savage and semi-civilized imagination, and the dangers to which it is exposed, the special objects of *tabu* become clear, and an examination of the methods used in *tabu* will show that it has been instituted with a view to protecting the souls of mankind, generally of kings and priests in particular.

The king must be isolated from danger, hence it is common among many savages to safeguard him and his kingdom from the presence of strangers, because strangers are specially credited with powers of magic and witchcraft. An instance of this was experienced by the Afghan Boundary Commission, which was frequently met with fire and incense when passing villages. Sometimes the superstitious dread is so great as to prevent all intercourse, as when Speke was once refused entrance to a village for fear that his tin boxes contained enemies transformed into demons!

The stranger is as often afraid of the village he enters as the village is of him, hence purificatory ceremonies before and after a journey observed even in ancient Greece and in modern Hindustán. The dread of the *kálá pásåf* and the ceremonies connected with “receiving back into caste” and excommunication from *kárd pásåf*, or outcasting, are nothing but instances of a creed held in common with the roughest savages.

At the times of eating and drinking, the soul is especially liable to escape, hence the customs prevalent among many savages of shutting up the house while feeding, of feeding in
private of feeding and cooking alone. This last custom is in common use among Hindus of the present day. The veiling of men, when royal or undergoing ceremonies, is also due to a fear of substances entering the body and injuring the soul within. The confinement of the king to his palace or abode is another instance of the fear of the baneful influence of strangers and strange substances, and was to be seen in Burma until a few years ago in the custom of sticking up *sallthats*, or lattices, along the streets, behind which the people hid until the king had passed. In the more thoroughly Burman portions of Mandalay the streets were deserted and the people almost entirely hidden behind *sallthats* of voluntary construction when the Duke of Clarence and Avondale passed along them in 1889, because it was known that he was heir to the English throne.

It will be seen, therefore, that food may easily injure the soul, and that care must be exercised as to what is eaten and from whose hand. It is hardly necessary to give instances of this to Indian readers, but it may be as well to point out that *tabu* as applied to the food and even the belongings of royalty in New Zealand among the Maoris is infinitely stronger than among the most exclusive Brâhmanas.

The remains of food after eating may injure because an enemy may get hold of them and make them, by magic, grow inside the eater and kill him. Hence the burying of the remains of food after a meal in many places, and the terror inspired by the accidental devouring of the food left by the magic-working man-god, giving rise to such customs as the daily breaking of the dishes of the Mikado.

Thus also arises the tabued person: the living divinity whose every belonging is dangerous to the common herd, or he whose condition, i.e., uncleanness, is a dangerous. Hence the dread of the *tabu* of a Maori chief in New Zealand, and the avoidance of persons who are ceremonially unclean, as menstruating women, persons who handle the dead, and so on.

From dangerous persons and their belongings we come to especially dangerous things. As regards kings and priests and at times of ceremonies, iron is all over the world a tabued object. This may be a survival of the superstitious dread of all things new, as in the case of Speke and his tin boxes, for when bad harvests followed on the introduction of iron ploughshares into Poland they were attributed to the iron in the ploughshares, which were therefore discarded. But it also clearly arises from the notion that iron is obnoxious to the gods as furnishing weapons that may be turned against them by man. Hence the common use of iron charms to ward off evil spirits, and the numerous and universal charms used at deaths under the impression that spirits are wounded by sharp instruments, many of which are specially aimed at preventing the wounding of the soul after departure.

Blood, and its concomitant raw flesh, are also almost universally tabued, being both dangerous to consume and in the case of royalties and priests dangerous to shed. The Siamese, the Mongols, the Tartars, and the Malagasy will not shed the blood of royal or noble personages. The late King of Burma's relatives in 1878 were slaughtered by being beaten across the throat with a bamboo for the same reason. The objection to shedding blood is frequently extended to spilling it, even in the case of animals slaughtered for food. The reason of the superstition is explained by the belief, shared alike by the Romans, Arabs, Ethnians, North American Indians and Papuans, that blood contains the soul. The belief has been widely extended to the red juice of plants, especially seen in the notion that wine is the blood of the vine and must be therefore eschewed. The Aztecs punished any one who insulted a drunken man, and inspiration is frequently sought by drinking blood. In both cases the idea is that a foreign soul has entered the drinker by means of blood.

The blood of tabued persons is especially dangerous, notably of women, hence the danger of seeing blood, believed in very widely throughout the world, and also the curious custom of fearing to dwell or pass under another person, in case his, or worse her, blood should fall and injure. The Flamen Dialis could not pass under a trellised vine, as it was a bleeding plant. In Burma and all over Further India no man will dwell under another if he can help it. Keeping the head high, and, conversely, lowering the head below that of a high personage, so puzzling to newly arrived Europeans in Burma and kindred countries, is explainable partly in this way, and partly by the belief expressed by the Karens and Siamese that the head contains the soul. In Polynesia the head is so sacred that it may not be touched, and elsewhere also even the owner of the head cannot touch it under certain circumstances.

The sanctity of the head has passed into the hair and even into the nails, which all the world over it has been either dangerous to cut, as amongst the Sikhs, or which may be cut with ceremonies and precautions only. Hence also the many customs connected with depositing
shorn hair or nails in a place of safety to prevent them from rotting and destroying the soul of the owner, and burning or burying them to prevent sorcerers getting possession of them. Shaving children as tabued persons arises from the same cause. The child being in a tabued or dangerous state, all the separate parts of its body are specially dangerous to others and must be removed.

The idea then at the bottom of the breaking of the Golden Bough was that it represented the soul of the Rex Nemorensis and was tabued to him; so not only would it be dangerous to try to kill him until it was in his enemy's possession, but it would be an actual danger before and after his death to the slayer, if left intact on the tree and able to do mischief.

We thus see why it was necessary to go through certain forms before the god could be killed. But why should the god be killed? Can gods die?

To primitive man all the world over, immortality is inconceivable; all his gods die. This can be proved by the beliefs of the Greenlanders, the North American Indians, the Philippine Islanders, the Hottentots, and notably of the ancient and cultivated Greeks in many instances. Zeus, Dionysus, Apollo, Cronus, Hermes, Aphrodite, Ares, all died and were buried. The great invisible gods being thus mortal, it is clear that the man-gods are mortal too, and the notion of the importance of killing the latter arose out of the idea that by so doing his soul could be transferred to a successor, and thus the calamities inevitable on his natural death were averted. We have already seen that natural death involved the departure of the soul and its refusal to return, and that the welfare of the world was immensely interested in the welfare of the man-god. Now, if the god were killed while still vigorous, and before his soul left his body, it would be easy to make sure of catching and transferring it to another and more vigorous body. A feeble body means a feeble soul, hence the importance of preventing decay from overtaking the man-god. This last notion has led to a general custom of suicide among the old in Fiji, and to religious murder in the New Hebrides and in Abyssinia.

Killing the divine king or man-god, is both universal and old! On the Congo the pontiff is killed by his successor whenever he gets very ill and likely to die. The god-kings of many peoples have been killed on the approach of old age or for any manifest disease or bodily deformity, a custom which has been attenuated in some instances into the absurd farce of the whole Court doing whatever the king did. If his hair was cut every one's hair was cut; if he had a cold every one pretended to have a cold; if his body was injured all bodies were injured in the same place. A more serious and unpleasant variant of the custom has been to fix the term of the reign to make things quite safe, — whether or not signs of failing health were apparent. According to old historians this was largely prevalent in South India, and in the case of the Zamorins of Calicut was modified into a ceremonial attempt to kill the king after he had reigned twelve years. Indeed it is clear that so outrageous a custom would become modified everywhere sooner or later, and in ancient Babylon the king was annually represented by a condemned criminal allowed to reign for five days and then slain. In Cambodia and Siam the king abdicates for a few days annually. In Upper Egypt the Governor is superseded for three days annually, and in the Himalayas a Brahman nominally supersedes a new Raja upon succession, for a year. All these are of course, great modifications of the original cruel custom.

In all the above cases we have substitutes for the king when he came to his turn to die as a god. These substitutes were temporary man-gods, and the nearer they were related to the king the better, and this has led to the sacrifice of the king's son in time of national danger, and among some savages to a general custom of sacrificing the first-born.

From killing the man-god to killing the King of the Wood is but a small transition, the reason being in both cases that violent death was the only means of preserving him from that decay, which was so dangerous to the community at large. The custom, as we now have it in the case of the Rex Nemorensis, is probably not the original custom, such as we have seen in the instances of the divine king, and there are many survivals of old customs still existing to show that the King of the Wood was originally killed on the expiry of a set term. All over Northern Europe, closely allied to the May-day and Whit sunday customs already alluded to, are another set held at Whitsundays and Shrovetide, in which the chief actor, under such names as the May-bearer, Wild-man, the Pfingstli, the Whit-Monday King, clearly represents the tree-spirit, who is beheaded in mimicry or effigy before the play is over, and in one instructive instance in Bohemia is allowed to be king for another year if he can escape from the crowd after his substituted, a frog, has been decapitated. This killing in effigy as a custom in memory of real human sacrifice has
counters all over the world, the strongest instance of which is in the case of the Indians of Arizona, who, when prevented by the Mexicans from continuing human sacrifices at their Feast of Fire, continued in secret a sham sacrifice in which they did not go further than drawing blood.

The killing of the god was not confined in primitive times to the human representatives of the gods who were worshipped the vegetable kingdom; it can be shown, by a consideration of modern folk-customs, to have existed amongst those whose gods were animals.

In German and Slavonic villages, closely connected and indeed mixed up with the customs of May-day and killing the King of the Wood, is the custom of Burying the Carnival in Lent. Straw effigies representing a man, known as the Carnival Bear or the Carnival Fool, are slain and buried in various ways, and in Swabia the custom has dwindled into ducking a live person in a stream. As in the case of the effigies or representatives of the King of the Wood, Doctor Ironbeard's services are called in to reanimate the slain Carnival, and the reviving of slain death is a conspicuous part of all these ceremonies. In the Harz mountains, the Carnival is finally represented by a bottle of brandy, which is buried and dug up the following year and drunk "because it has come to life again."

Closely connected with Burying the Carnival is the custom of Carrying out Death, that is, throwing him away. He is generally drowned on a Sunday in Lent, known as Dead Sunday. In the Latin Countries generally and in Spain, Italy, and Sicily, this was varied as Sawing the Old Woman, and still survives in the paper saws of Naples and the sawing and burning of wooden billets at Barcelona in Mid Lent. It remains in the most interesting manner in North Slavonia, in the expression "Sawing the Old Wife" for Mid Lent. In India, a reference to "Publib Notes and Queries" will give several instances of the practice of carrying out death and disease from the boundaries of one village to another.

Carrying out death is always more or less directly connected with Bringing in Summer, Spring or Life, often as not in the form of death resuscitated. That the modern ceremonies connected with abstractions such as Death, Summer, Spring and Life are survivals of others relating to more concrete conceptions, we have a most interesting proof from Russia, where the images buried and revived represent Kostrobanko, Kostroma, Kupalo, Lada and Yarilo, unques-

1 As some have taken Adonis for the sun, Mr. Frater shews in the most interesting manner that he was a

tionable representatives of pre-Christian gods. In Silesia, too, they bury the Deathstone, and in Albania the effigy of a malignant sprite named Kore. The drowning of Bulls or images of Siva and Pārībāti in the Kāngrā district of the Himalayas is an instructive parallel to these burials of the gods of fertilization. In ancient Europe the marriage of Adonis and Aphrodite (= the Semitic Adon and Istar) and the death and resuscitation of Adonis plainly point out the prevalence then of the modern customs just alluded to. As also do the customs connected with his Syrian prototype Thammuz or Taurus, while those of the closely connected Attis and Cybele of Pherigia seem in certain points to have given rise to the existing customs in connection with the Maypole, Wildman, the King of the May, and so on. Again assuming that Osiris and Isis, or at least one or some of the gods and goddesses of which these great Egyptian deities were originally compounded, were god and goddess of the corn, the death, burial, and resuscitation of Osiris point to a very ancient existence of the same class of ideas in old Egypt. Our jovial old friend Dionysus or Bacchus, in his more legitimate form of god of vegetation, by his violent death and revivification proves that similar notions were prevalent in ancient Greece. But Dionysus was also a god of the animal kingdom, and in this form was slain periodically as a bull, a goat, and even as a human being.

The myth of Proserpine and Demeter belongs to the same category, except that this pair are daughter and mother, instead of husband and wife or goddess and lover. And if we take Demeter to mean Barley-mother (and not Earth-mother as usual) there are any number of harvest customs all over Europe referring to her, chiefly connected with the reaping of the last, but sometimes of the first, sheaf, which appear in the Corn-mother, Rye-mother, Pea-mother, Wheat-mother, Oats-mother, Barley-mother, varied as the Corn-woman, Rye-woman, and so on. In Germany, connected with which are the Ceres (a return to classicism this) and the Mother-sheaf of France, the Harvest-mother, Great-mother and Grand-mother of Germany, and curiously the Granny of Belfast. In Germany, too, she appears as the Old-woman, and in effigy as the Carlina of Scotland and the Carley of Antrim, which are precisely the same thing as the Baba of Poland and the Baba of Lithuania. The frequent wrapping up of a woman as the Cornmother, under her various names, in the last sheaf

"corn-spirits," using the universal custom, in one form or another, of "the Gardens of Adonis" for his purpose.
shews the reference of the custom to the goddess of fertility: a custom still performed in effigy in the ceremony of the Corn-queen of Bulgaria and formerly of the Harvest-queen of Northumberland. These are all harvest customs, but they are with little alterations to be found connected with the threshing-floor in several parts of Europe.

In all the above cases, ripe corn is regarded as matured and old, but it is also conceived of as young or as a child separated from its mother by the sickle. Hence the custom of turning the last sheaf into the Bastard in West Prussia, and the customs of the Harvest Child in North Germany, the Kern Baby, the Ivy Girl and the Maiden in England and Scotland. Hence also the names of the Bride, Oats-bride and Wheat-bride for the last sheaf and the woman who binds it, and, more suggestively, of the Oats-bride and Oats-bridegroom, and Oatswife and Oatsman.

These ideas and habits are not confined to Europe, for we have the Maize-mother, the Quinoa-mother, the Cocoa-mother and the Potato-mother of Peru. The harvest customs of the Zapotees of Mexico, and of parts of the Patjau, cf. preserving the "soul of the rice" by the Dyaks of North Borneo and the Kares of Burma, and of the Rice-bride and Rice-bridegroom of Java, all turn on the same notions.

All over the world then we have the spirit of the vegetable kingdom conceived as mother or maiden, from which idea the conception of Demeter and Persephone as Corn-mother and Corn-child probably sprang.

There is yet another set of universal customs connected with these and explanatory of their general tenor. In ancient Egypt, the reapers lamented when the first sheaf was cut, by a song to which the Greeks gave the name of Maneros, alleging that Maneros was a youth who invented agriculture and died an untimely death, but it seems that Maneros was a misunderstanding of the opening words of the dirge mdd-ne-hra, "come thou back." In Phoenicia a similar ancient dirge was sung at the vintage, called by the Greeks Limus or Alians, and explained as above, but which really was a misunderstanding of ai lava, "woe to us." Again, in Ethyria a similar reaping dirge was called Bornus or Borinus, and explained as above. In Phrygia was a corresponding song, sung at reaping and threshing, called Lityerces, and connected with it is a legend of great interest. Briefly, Lityerces was a bastard son of Midas who used to make any strange passer-by reap against him; if he beat him, he wrapped him in a sheaf, cut off his head and threw him into the Meander, but one day he met Hercules who slew him. Now the reaping match is still preserved all over North Europe and it is exceedingly unlucky to be the binder of the last sheaf, leading to the many Old Man customs, the swathing of the woman unfortunate enough to bind the last sheaf in the Old Man and her subsequent rough treatment. The killing of the corn-spirit shown in the second part of the Lityerces legend is also still largely alive in the many customs attached to the threshing-floor known variously as the Killing of the Old Hay-man, Corn-man, Oats-man, Wheat-man, of the Boba, the Old-woman, and the Old Rye-woman, which mean chiefly threshing the last sheaf and frequently wind up with dueling the "killer" in a stream or with a jug of water. Treating the strangers of the Lityerces tale as the embodiments of the spirit of the corn, we find his ill-treatment of them surviving in the existing customs of making chance passers-by at the harvest pay forfeit both in Norway and France; and in Germany the reapers first pretend to make ready to kill him! Strangers at the threshing-floor in Denmark and Sweden are treated in a similar fashion.

In Europe, of course, the corn-spirit in his multiform shapes is killed only in mimicry in the harvest-field and on the threshing-floor, but in ruder societies the killing of the corn-spirit has been represented by human sacrifice, as witnessed by the cruel proceedings of the Indians of Ecuador and Mexico, the Pawnees of North America, and of course all over wild Africa. The well-known Moria sacrifices of India were made to the same end, and it is interesting to note that on the suppression of these sacrifices the human victim has been supplanted by a goat.

Lastly, to show that the dirges out of which the Lityerces, Maneros, Ailin and other legends arose had an origin in ancient custom, may be quoted the existing customs of Crying the Neck in Devonshire and Cornwall, described by a native as "only the people making their games, as they always did, to the spirit of the harvest," and of the Waul-rye of Germany, now being the cry of the reapers at the cutting of the last corn. The names, for a special bunch of ears containing the corn-spirit, of "the neck" and "the gander's neck" in England, "the goat's neck" in France, and "the head" in Scotland, varied as "the hare's tail" in Friesland, "the cat's tail" and "the fox's tail" in France, all of which have to be cut off by some ceremony, attest the universality of the old-world custom of killing the corn-spirit.
SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION.

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal for Sanskrit and Kanarese, (and, for the sake of uniformity, submitted for adoption, as far as possible, in the case of other languages,) — except in respect of modern Hindustani personal names, in which absolute purism is undesirable, and in respect of a few Anglicised corruptions of names of places, sanctioned by long usage, — is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>jha</td>
<td>jha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>जा</td>
<td>jn</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>jha</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>झा</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>झू</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>झृ</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>झूं</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋू</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>झृं</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋूं</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>झृंं</td>
<td>jh</td>
<td>jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ञ</td>
<td>nh</td>
<td>nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ञ्चां</td>
<td>nh</td>
<td>nh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऒ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>घ</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>घा</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>घूं</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>घृं</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व्य</td>
<td>vy</td>
<td>vy</td>
<td>घृंं</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>भ</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>भा</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>म</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>भू</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>य</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>भूं</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>र</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>भृं</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ल</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>भृंं</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>घ</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श</td>
<td>sha</td>
<td>sha</td>
<td>घा</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष</td>
<td>sha</td>
<td>sha</td>
<td>घूं</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्त</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>घृं</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष्ट</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>st</td>
<td>घृंं</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visarga

\[\text{अ, आ, इ, ई, उ, ऊ, ऋ, ऋू, ए, ऐ, ऒ, ओ, औ} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visarga</th>
<th>Visarga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ब</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भा</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भू</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भूं</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भृं</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भृंं</td>
<td>bh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घ</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घा</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घूं</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घृं</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घृंं</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jhādūla or old Visarga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jhādūla, or old Visarga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>बा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भूं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घृं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>घृंं</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upadhyāna or old Visarga before \(\text{प} \) and \(\text{ख} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upadhyāna, or old Visarga before (\text{प} ) and (\text{ख} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पा</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anuvṛddha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anuvṛddha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>नात्ता</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ना</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न्न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न्न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न्न</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न्न</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anuvṛddha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anuvṛddha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>का</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>का</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>का</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>का</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>का</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>का</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single hyphen is used to separate words in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen is only used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, as divided in the original Text, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line; intermediate divisions, rendered unavoidable here and there by printing necessities, are made only where absolutely necessary for neatness in the arrangement of the Texts.

A double hyphen is used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the euphonic rules of \textit{samākhyś}. Where this double hyphen is used, it is to be understood that a final consonant, and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel, are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it is to be understood that the orthography of the original, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the final consonant has the modified broken form, which, in the oldest stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the śrīmāna attached to it; and that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form. In the transcription of ordinary texts, the double hyphen is probably unnecessary; except where there is the \textit{samākhyś} of final and initial vowels. But, in the transcription of epigraphical records, the use of this sign is unavoidable, for the purpose of indicating exactly the palaeographical standard of the original texts.

The \textit{avagraha}, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial a, is but rarely to be met with in inscriptions. Where it does occur, it is most conveniently represented by its own Devanāgarī sign.

So also practice has shown that it is more convenient to use the ordinary Devanāgarī marks of punctuation than to substitute the English signs for them.

Ordinary brackets are used for corrections and doubtful points; and square brackets, for letters which are damaged and partially illegible in the original, or which, being wholly illegible, can be supplied with certainty. An asterisk attached to letters or marks of punctuation in square brackets, indicates that those letters or marks of punctuation were omitted altogether in the original. As a rule, it is more convenient to use the brackets than to have recourse to footnotes; as the points to which attention is to be drawn attract notice far more readily. But notes are given instead, when there would be so many brackets, close together, as to encumber the text and render it inconvenient to read. When any letters in the original are wholly illegible and cannot be supplied, they are represented, in metrical passages, by the sign for a long or a short syllable, as the case may be; and in prose passages, by points, at the rate, usually, of two for each \textit{akṣara} or syllable.
NOTES ON THE BURMESE SYSTEM OF ARITHMETIC.

BY MAJOR R. C. TEMPLE.

PART I.

SOME time back, when enquiring into the methods adopted by the Burmese in Upper Burma in working out their horoscopes and astrological calculations, which are essentially Hindu in every feature, I was led to learn their ideas of arithmetic, and as the subject appears to me to be likely to lead to an interesting series of investigations, I give my notes on it now. I should mention that the system now under discussion is that of the Phongyis or Burmese Buddhist priests, and of the astrologers, who are called Ponnas, i.e., Punyas or Brahmas, and are usually considered to have emigrated from Manipur.¹

It seems to be certain that the Burmese obtained what mathematical knowledge they possess from their priests and astrologers with their religion and civilization generally, and that it is directly of Hindu origin, whether it came from Ceylon or through the hills about Manipur. They have words of their own, of non-Hindu origin, to express numerals, but in their arithmetic they are taught a series of words which are corruptions of the Pali numerals, and it may be noted that, in ordinary life, for ordinals, so far as they express them at all, they adopt Pali derivatives of a like nature. I have observed also that as surely as a Burman, not filled with European school learning, is given a problem to do that at all puzzles him, he will, while doing it in his head, mutter to himself these Pali derivatives and not his indigenous numerals.

Now Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit informs me that a system of arithmetic nearly corresponding to that of the Burmans is still, he believes, in vogue all over India among Hindu astrologers. A similar system is, he says, at any rate, employed by them in the districts of the Koikap, Daklap, Gujarat and Karssat. At the same time, for mercantile and general purposes a system corresponding to the European has been in use among Hindus from a time long anterior to the era of British rule. On the other hand, nothing of the nature of the Hindu astrologers' method of arithmetic has, so far as I know, ever been adopted in Europe.²

In Burma, however, the method of the astrologers was, I believe, the only one known, until the arrival of the Christian Missionaries and the establishment of a Government Educational Department. If this belief is correct, the Burmese did not share the advance in mathematical science made by the Hindus, when they adopted for secular purposes what we may call the European system of arithmetic, whatever the date of the adoption may have been.

Precisely the same thing appears to have happened in Tibet; for, whatever the truth or the real date may be, there appears to be no doubt that the Tibetans claim to have received their mathematical knowledge directly from India with their religion in the second century B.C., and, when I was, about a year ago, explaining the Burmese arithmetic to a blackboard before the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta, Babu Sarat Chandra Das, C. I. E., the Tibetan scholar, at once recognized portions of the Burmese system as still current in Tibet. With the Babu was a Lama, who further shewed on the board that the system taught him in the indigenous monastic schools in Tibet was much the same.³

¹ Some Ponnas communities in Mandalay Town still keep up an annual communication with Manipur through members of their race, who travel backwards and forwards. They are very particular in retaining purity of blood and family connections.
² Mr. Dikshit has been kind enough to favour me with several comparative notes to this paper. These will be found in the footnotes with his initials attached to them.
³ The absence of any but the astrologers' system in Burma may prove to be an exceedingly interesting point, because it may be discovered that the Burmans procured their arithmetic from India at a date anterior to the secular system now in use, and it is not likely that their knowledge of arithmetic is older than their other knowledge imported from India, i.e., it is not likely to be older than the seventh century A.D. If this should turn out to be the truth it would fix a date before which the adoption of the secular system of the Hindus could not have taken place.
To trace out the origin of the dual system of arithmetic found among the Hindus, and the
time at which each part of it was adopted, would be a most interesting subject for enquiry, rendered all the more so from the fact that everything about the astrologers' system points to great antiquity. It is essentially a system adapted to mental and not clerical processes: it is not, as used, capable of undergoing checks as the calculations proceed nor when they are completed: it is not adapted to the calculation of fractions: it works out easily by adopting, not the decimal notation, but the natural one of setting down numbers as they are spoken, and it demands the least mental exertion compatible with calculating at all. For instance, under this system it is not necessary to learn by rote to multiply beyond nine times nine, and in the Burmese monastic schools, and I am told in Tibet also, children are not taught to multiply by heart beyond that point. To the present day, the very crudest notions of arithmetical notation largely prevail in Burma, and, even in Rangoon, carts, bags and other things containing articles in quantities may be seen marked thus: — 1000108309 to represent one thousand one hundred and thirty nine, = 1139. In upper Burma mercantile accounts are frequently kept by the ordinary people in this way.

To explain, except by ocular demonstration, such a matter as a method of arithmetic is an exceedingly difficult thing, and it may be that I have failed to make myself plain in the following pages. At the same time, it would seem that the best mode of explanation is by taking typical problems in arithmetic and working them out step by step with notes, and this plan I have adopted. The difficulties in the way, however, have been rendered all the greater by the Burmese methods of working in practice. They invariably rub out the results of each step as they proceed in their calculations, and shew only the final one, just as a European child works on a slate. Indeed, their system is not adapted to any other way of setting to work. However, for the present purpose, I have been obliged to devise a plan whereby each step gone through can be shewn on paper.

The Burman does his calculations either on the ground in the dust, or on black parabaik. Parabaik is a thick coarse indigenous paper with a smooth greasy surface on which characters are written with a soft soapstone style. This leaves a white mark which is easily rubbed out with the fingers. In either case each calculation is erased when it is no longer required.

The Burmans have various names for arithmetical books, but all refer astrological calculations to simple arithmetic, or to rule of thumb. The rules are embodied in ñóken or sátras, of which I hope some day to give renderings and explanations. They do not seem to be at all easy to procure.

A small palm-leaf MS. procured from a Mandalay monastery contains five “books” on arithmetic:

1. Khawng, multiplication, lit. drawing out nine, i. e., ascending to nine times nine.
2. Bōiñam, astrological verses: bō (written bōi) is one of the six rules of astrology.
4. Nāyik, the revolution of the hours: nāyik, spelt nāri, = nādi, ghāsi or gañikā, the Indian hour of twenty-four minutes.
5. Sāñad, calculating fortune (by astrology).

4. It is to be feared that the indigenous mathematical writings will not throw much light on the enquiry, because in Burmese astrological works and in the old Hindu works and MSS. on Mathematics we have set down for us in various forms of notation the results of calculations merely, and, so far as I am aware, we do not know how the calculators arrived at these results. In other words, we do not know what the mental processes were by which they arrived at the results they set down on paper. We do not know in fact why, when an ancient mathematician tells us that 56 multiplied by 66 equals 3636, he knew the result to be correct, or how he set to work on the multiplication.

5. This custom we seem to have a plain remnant of the old Hindu numerical-symbol method of notation.

6. So do the Hindu astrologers. — S. B. D.

1. Hindu astrologers use a wooden plank, which they cover with dust. This plank is called pāti, hence arithmetic is called pātiṃpana by Bhaskaracharya and others. Nowadays a slate, also called pāti, is also used. — S. B. D.
An application to a well known monastic calculator in Mandalay produced the following, written on black para/sik:

(1) Kjyaungkjaigd, multiplication verses.
(2) Blijigd, astrological verses.

The enumeration of these "books" is sufficient to show the extent and nature of Burmese mathematical science. They do not, in fact, reduce their rules of thumb to writing as a general practice, but hand them down orally and by ocular demonstration on the sand or in the dust about the monasteries.9

It has been said above that the Burmese system of arithmetic is especially adapted to mental processes. Now, in adding 325 to 896, Europeans and Indians begin on paper with the units and work on to the tens and hundreds. This is the most convenient way, because each unit cipher of the calculation is discarded from the memory as it is jotted down. Thus 6 and 5 are 11, put down 1 and carry 1; 1 and 9 are 10, 10 and 2 are 12, put down 2 and carry 1; 1 and 8 are 9, 9 and 3 are 12, put down 12: result 1221. In each of the above processes the mind is not troubled with anything beyond the cipher to be carried forward. But the Burmese reverses the process and commences by adding the hundreds, then the tens and lastly the units. He proceeds thus: 3 and 8 are 11, rub out 3 and 8 and put down 11. 2 and 9 are 11, rub out 2 and 9 and put down 1 for 9, and the 1 carried forward under the unit of 11, thus 1116; then add the two 1 together, 1 and 1 are 2, rub them out and put down 2 for the unit of 11, thus 1216: 5 and 6 are 11, rub out 5 and 6, and substitute as before, thus 1211; then add the two 1 as before and substitute, 1221. Q. E. D.

Now, for a paper process, this is awkward; but it requires less mental effort than the European method, and it is that in use in mental addition all the world over. Rapid mental calculations in Europe and Indian mental arithmetic are both done in this way. Thus a man in rapidly working out the above problem in his head will commence 300 and 800 = 1100; 20 and 90 = 110, total 1210: 5 and 6 = 11, total 1221. The very rapid addition of account columns common in banks is really achieved in the same way: the pounds first, then the shillings, and lastly the pence are calculated out. Thus to add mentally—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1240</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The operator will proceed thus: £ 6 + 2 + 3 = 11; 7 + 4 + 1 = 12, 122; 8 + 1 + 9 = 18, 1238; s. 14 + 7 + 17 = 38, £ 1-18, £ 1239-18; d. 5 + 11 + 9 = 25, 2s. 1 d., £ 1239 + £ 1 + 1 d., £ 1240-0-1. He then puts the result down, appearing to be able to calculate all three columns at once, but, of course, he does nothing of the kind in reality.

All the Burmese processes are worked in the same way. They begin with the large figures and go on to the units, rubbing out and substituting as they proceed.

---

9 I have a small book of 86 pages printed at the Haithawaddy (Hansawaddy) Press, Rangoon, in 1889, and bearing the high-sounding title of Ta.shamada/bapi Bhia/naka/yd, which I take to mean "Astronomical Writings Illuminating the Multitude." Bija/naka/yd is Burmese meaning 'writings.' Bhia/naka = Veda, which in Burma means an astronomical, or, more strictly, an astrological, work. The rest of the title represents the Pali Sam dividinga. This book contains a large number of rules and methods for many sorts of calculations, including the Kjyaungkjaigd, Blijigd, &c., noticed above. It would probably be well worth a detailed examination.

10 It being remembered that he always works by a process of erasing the steps of his calculation as he proceeds.
The subtracting process is a curious reversal of the accepted European method. Thus, take 78 from 95:— 70 out of 90 leaves 20 in my hand; 8 out of 5 I cannot take, so I take 10 out of the 20 in my hand; 8 out of the 10 I have taken leaves 2 in my hand, I add the 2 to the 5 which makes 7, so I have 17 in my hand. — Q. E. D.

Multiplication is to be the average Burman a science requiring much exertion of the brain. In its simplest form the principle adopted may be said to be the multiplication of each cipher of the multiplicand separately, from the large figures to the units, and adding up the results. Here we see the play of mental arithmetic again. Thus in multiplying 391 by 65 he multiplies 300 by 60 which gives him 18,000, then 30 by 5 which gives 1,500, adding the results he gets 19,500. Next he multiplies 90 by 60 = 5,400, and 90 by 5 = 450, total 5,850; this added to 19,500 = 25,350. Then 1 x 60 = 60 and 1 x 5 = 5 which added together = 65, and this added to 25,350 = 25,415. A multiplication of the two sums in European fashion will shew this result to be correct: thus

\[
\begin{array}{c}
391 \\
65 \\
1955 \\
2346 \\
25415
\end{array}
\]

The above explains the mental process only. The Burman in practice keeps the untouched ciphers of the multiplicand constantly before him, which obliges him to adopt the rules of thumb shewn on pages 60 ff. infra.

In applying the principle of working from the large figures to the units for division, the Burmese arrive at a complicated process, but it has the advantage over all the rest of checking the calculation as it proceeds.

Suppose you are given 589 to divide by 27. In this problem to find the first cipher of the product, which must needs be a multiple of 10, you can take 2 tens of the 20 of the divisor out of the 500 of the dividend; and then as the full dividend is 589 and the full divisor 27, you can find your true remainder by multiplying 27 by 20 (the quotient just reached) and subtracting the product of this multiplication from the dividend; thus 589 - 540 = 49. This is the remainder after the first division. You have now to divide 49 by 20 to find the second cipher of the final quotient, and as this must needs be a unit you can take 2 units of the 20 of the divisor out of the 40 of the dividend; and then as the full dividend is 49 and the full divisor is 27, you can find your true remainder by multiplying 27 by 2 = 54. But 54 cannot be subtracted from 49, and this shews you that you cannot take 2 units of 27 out of 49: you can, however, take 1 unit, leaving a remainder of 22. Your two quotients then are 20 and 1 with 22 over, which gives 21 with 22 over as the final quotient of the division. This result is correct, as division by the European method will shew; thus

\[
\begin{array}{c}
27 ) 589 \ ( 21 \\
54 \\
49 \\
27 \\
22
\end{array}
\]

The above again shews the process of reasoning only. The practice is given below at pages 63 ff. infra.

---

10 As the Burman reasons.
11 Of course, all the additions are done by the Burman in Burmese fashion.
12 The Burman, of course, goes through every addition, subtraction and multiplication, in his own fashion.
Now the Burman writes the result of a division exactly as we do; thus, $21\frac{2}{3}$. He has, however, so far as I could ascertain, no notion of using fractions, except that he can by rule of thumb add $\frac{1}{4}$ and $\frac{1}{4}$, or subtract $\frac{1}{4}$ from $\frac{1}{4}$, and work simple problems like these. But as to adding $\frac{1}{3}$ to $\frac{1}{3}$, multiplying $\frac{1}{3}$ by $\frac{1}{3}$, or dividing $\frac{1}{3}$ by $\frac{1}{3}$, or telling how much greater $\frac{1}{3}$ are than $\frac{1}{3}$, these are problems quite beyond his powers. His expressions for fractions reveal his conception of them: thong bong 'ta bong', (of) three parts one part, le bong thong bong, (of) four parts three parts.

So far as relates to concrete matters, such as money calculations, division of property or land, and so on, the Burmans I found could work out simple calculations in proportion, but abstract questions seemed to puzzle them at once. I regret that I have not so far found any leisure to enquire into their processes.

The following pages purport to exhibit by examples the actual arithmetical processes employed by the Burmese by rule of thumb, so far as they can be shewn on paper.

PART II.

A. ADDITION.

Example I. Add 326 to 325.

To add 326 to 325, place the sums one under the other; units under units, tens under tens, and so on: thus, 326 + 325 = 651.

Now commence by adding the first ciphers together in the head; thus, $2 + 3 = 5$: and substitute the sum for the upper cipher of the addition; thus: 525.

Now proceed in the same way with the second cipher, because $2 + 3 = 5$, thus: 555.

Now proceed in the same way with the third cipher, but because $5 + 6 = 11$, i.e., more than ten, substitute thus: 511.

Now, because $5 + 1 = 6$, add the remainder and substitute thus: 561.

Demonstration by the European method is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{r}
325 \\
236 \\
\hline
561
\end{array}
\]

In the Burmese method on the sand, parabaik or slate, the processes actually shewn would be as follows: $\frac{325}{236}$. In the Burmese method, the processes actually shewn would be as follows: 325, 236, 561. That is, they are 5 in number. There is no check at all by the Burmese method.

Example 2. Add 485 to 897.

Proceeding as before in the case of the sums of any two ciphers which exceed 10, we get 6 processes, as shewn by the Burmese method; thus:

(a) 897, (b) 1297, (c) 1357, (d) 1357, (e) 1352, (f) 1362.

Demonstration by European method: 897

\[
\begin{array}{r}
465 \\
562 \\
\hline
962
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{The Hindu processes are identical, except that the ciphers of the upper sum only are rubbed out as the calculation proceeds. In addition and subtraction, the Hindu astrologers commence from units. -- B. D.}\]
Example 3. Add: 418
974
645
723

Add in the head as before and substitute the result of each row of ciphers for the uppermost cipher of the addition: thus, because $7 + 6 = 13$; $13 + 9 = 22$; $22 + 4 = 26$, write

\[ 2618 \]
\[ 74 \]
\[ 45 \]
\[ 23 \]

Then because $4 + 2 = 6$; $6 + 7 = 13$; $13 + 1 = 14$, write

\[ 2648 \]
\[ 14 \]
\[ 5 \]
\[ 3 \]

Now, because $1 + 6 = 7$, write

\[ 2748 \]
\[ 4 \]
\[ 5 \]
\[ 3 \]

Then, because $3 + 5 = 8$; $8 + 4 = 12$; $12 + 8 = 20$, write

\[ 2740 \]
\[ 2 \]

Then add remainder and write 2760.

Demonstration by the European method is as follows:

\[ 418 \]
\[ 974 \]
\[ 645 \]
\[ 723 \]

\[ 2760. \]

The Burmese processes,\(^{14}\) which are 6 in number, are

\((a)\) 418, \((b)\) 2618, \((c)\) 2648, \((d)\) 2748, \((e)\) 2740, \((f)\) 2760.

\[ \begin{array}{cccccc}
974 & 74 & 14 & 4 & 2 \\
645 & 45 & 5 & 5 \\
723 & 23 & 3 & 3 \\
\end{array} \]

B. SUBTRACTION.

Example 1. Subtract 78 from 95.

To subtract 78 from 95, place the subtractor below the integer: tens under tens, units under units, and so on: thus, 95

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
95 & \]
\[ 78 \]

Then subtract the first cipher of the subtractor from the cipher of the integer immediately above it in the head, and substitute the remainder for the first cipher of the integer: thus: 25: because $9 - 7 = 2$.

\[ 78 \]

\(^{14}\) In cases where more than two sums are to be added together, the Hindus do not quite follow the process here described. They add the two lowest sums together and then the result to the sum immediately above it and so on.—S. B. D.
Now subtract the second cipher of the subtractor from the cipher of the integer immediately above it. But 8 cannot be subtracted from 5, so borrow 10 from the 20 of 25, and substitute thus: 15.

78

Now subtract in the head the second cipher from the sum thus borrowed and, because 10 — 8 = 2, set down the remainder below the cipher of the integer immediately above it: thus: 15.

2
78

Now add the remainder to that cipher of the integer and substitute the result thus: 17

78.

Answer: 17.

Demonstration by the European method:

95
78
____
17.

The Burmese processes, as shown successively on the slate, sand or parabalik, are as follows: — (a) 95, (b) 25, (c) 15, (d) 15, (e) 17, (f) 17. Thus 6 processes are gone through before the result is arrived at.15

Example 2. Subtract 9 from 22.

The process just explained is always observed when the cipher of the subtractor is greater than the cipher of the integer immediately above it. Thus, in taking 9 from 22, as 9 will not subtract from 2, borrow 10 from the 20 of 22 and substitute thus: 12. Then subtract 9 from 9 the 10 thus borrowed and set remainder below the 2: thus 12. Now add this remainder to 2

1
9

and substitute thus: 13.

9

Answer: 13.

Example 3. Subtract 95 from 221.

In this case by observing the above rules the Burmese processes as set down successively are 8 in number, and as follows: — (a) 221, (b) 121, (c) 121, (d) 121, (e) 121, (f) 121, (g) 125. 95 95 1 95 95 5 95

95
95
5

Answer: 126.

Demonstration by the European method:

221
95
____
126

15 The Hindus place the subtractor above the integer and proceed to see all the places where "one will have to be carried," as the English would phrase it, marking each with the symbol 5. Thus take 188 from 482: write 188. Now 6

482
will not take from 2, and 8 will not take from 3, so write 188, and in the calculation add 1 to the 1 and 8 thus marked.

483

The substitution of the results of the calculation for the figures of the integer are made in the same way as in the Burmese system, and the process is otherwise the same. — S. B. D.
Example 4. Subtract 49 from 650.
Proceeding as before the processes are: 
(a) 650, (b) 610, (c) 600, (d) 600, (e) 601, (f) 601.
59 \ 49 \ 49 \ 1 \ 49 \ 49
There have been thus 6 processes.

Demonstration by the European method:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
650 \\
- 49 \\
\hline
601
\end{array}
\]

**C. MULTIPLICATION.**

Example 1. Multiply 391 by 55.

To multiply 391 by 55 the sums are set down thus: 391

\[
\begin{array}{c}
55
\end{array}
\]

The rule is to set down the last cipher of the multiplier under the first cipher of the multiplicand, and the other ciphers of the multiplier in front of the last one.

First stage: multiplying the first cipher of the multiplicand.

First process: multiply the first cipher of the multiplicand by the first of the multiplier, setting down the result before the first cipher of the multiplicand. \(^{14}\) thus 15391.\(^{15}\)

55

The real rule is: — The ciphers of the result must be set down so that the last cipher of the result is placed immediately above the multiplying cipher. The above process merely shews the resultant rule of thumb.

Second process: multiply the first cipher of the multiplicand by the second of the multiplier, setting down the result thus\(^{18}\): 15391.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
15 \\
55
\end{array}
\]

Observe that the rule as to placing the result above the multiplier still holds good.

Third process: substitute the last cipher of the result for the first cipher of the multiplicand: add the first cipher of the result to the cipher above it and substitute thus: \(16591.\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
55
\end{array}
\]

Now push the multiplier forward one point and you are ready for the second stage: thus: \(16591.\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
55
\end{array}
\]

Second stage: multiplying the second cipher of the multiplicand.

First process: multiply the second cipher of the multiplicand by the first cipher of the multiplier, setting down the result\(^{19}\) thus: \(16591.\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
45 \\
55
\end{array}
\]

\(^{14}\) The Hindu method of multiplication is practically identical with that of the Burmese. — S. B. D.

\(^{15}\) In this case the Hindus would keep the 15 separate from the 391 to avoid confusion. — S. B. D. The Burmese, as far as I have seen them at work, however, write as I have shown in the text. — R. C. T.

\(^{16}\) The Hindus would not set down the second result in this fashion, but would add it to the first result, keeping in mind the proper places of the figures. Thus in this case: second result 15; first result 15; total 165, keeping it again separate from other figures. — S. B. D.

\(^{17}\) Here again the Hindus would add the result at once in the head without setting down any intermediate process. — S. B. D.

\(^{18}\) Here also the Hindus would keep the 165 separate from the 91. — S. B. D.
Observe that the rule as to placing the cipher of the result over the multiplier still holds good. It will always do so.

Second process: add the result to the ciphers immediately above them separately, and substitute thus: (a) 18091, (b) 11091, (c) 21091.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
5 & 1 & 55 \\
55 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

Third process: multiply the second cipher of the multiplicand by the second cipher of the multiplier, setting down the result thus: 21091.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
45 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

Fourth process: substitute the last cipher of the result for the second cipher of the multiplicand: add the first cipher of the result to the cipher above it, and substitute thus: 21451.

\[
55
\]

Now push the multiplier forward one point and you are ready for the third stage, thus:

\[
21451.
\]

Third stage: multiplying the third cipher of the multiplicand.

First process: multiply the third cipher of the multiplicand by the first cipher of the multiplier, setting down the result thus: 21451.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
5 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

Second process: add the result to the cipher immediately above it and substitute thus: (a) 21401, (b) 21501.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

Third process: multiply the third cipher of the multiplicand by the second cipher of the multiplier, setting down the result thus: 21501.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
5 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

Fourth process: substitute the cipher of result for the third cipher of the multiplicand, thus: 21505.

\[
55
\]

Final Result: 21505.

Demonstration by the European method:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
391 \\
55
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1955 \\
1955
\end{array}
\]

\[
21505.
\]

In going through the above calculation the processes actually shown successively on the slate, sand, paraphik or other material by a Burman would be as follows:

(a) 391, (b) 15391, (c) 15391, (d) 15891, (e) 16591, (f) 16591, (g) 16091, (h) 11091,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
55 & 15 & 55 \\
55 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

(i) 21091, (j) 21091, (k) 21451, (l) 21451, (m) 21451, (n) 21401, (o) 21401,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
5 & 55 & 55 \\
55 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

(p) 21501, (q) 21505, (r) 21505.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
5 & 55 & 55
\end{array}
\]

Thus he would have to go through 18 alterations of the ciphers before arriving at the result.
Example 2. Multiply 789 by 69.

By following out the processes explained above, in this case the processes, which would be actually shown by a Burman in succession, would be as follows:—

(a) 789, (b) 42789, (c) 42789, (d) 48389, (e) 48389, (f) 48389, (g) 42389, (h) 52389,

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>53189, (j)</td>
<td>53189, (k)</td>
<td>53189, (l)</td>
<td>53329, (m)</td>
<td>53329, (n)</td>
<td>53329, (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>54329, (q)</td>
<td>54369, (r)</td>
<td>54369, (s)</td>
<td>54341, (t)</td>
<td>54441, (u)</td>
<td>54441,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here then are 21 alterations of the ciphers before the result is arrived at.

Demonstration by the European method:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
789 \\
69 \\
\hline
7101 \\
4784 \\
\hline
54441.
\end{array}
\]

Example 3. Multiply 748 by 974.

The processes gone through are precisely those explained above, but care must be taken to observe the rule that the last cipher of the result must be set down immediately above the multiplying cipher. Thus in commencing, the first process is shown thus: (a) 56 748, and the successive steps of the second process, thus: (b) 569748, (c) 509748, 874

\[
\begin{array}{c}
4 \\
1 \\
\hline
874 \\
874 \\
\hline
874.
\end{array}
\]

(d) 609748; and those of the third process thus: (e) 609748, (f) 609848, (g) 601848, 874

\[
\begin{array}{c}
28 \\
2 \\
1 \\
\hline
874 \\
874 \\
874.
\end{array}
\]

(h) 611848.

874

Similarly the remaining processes are shown thus: (i) 611848, (j) 611848, (k) 643848, 874

\[
\begin{array}{c}
32 \\
874 \\
\hline
874.
\end{array}
\]

(l) 643848, (m) 643648, (n) 646648, (o) 646448, (p) 646768, (q) 646768, (r) 646768, 874

\[
\begin{array}{c}
16 \\
874 \\
\hline
874 \\
874 \\
874.
\end{array}
\]

(c) 646168, (d) 643168, (u) 653168, (v) 653168, (w) 653168, (x) 65328, (y) 65328, 874

\[
\begin{array}{c}
56 \\
6 \\
32 \\
\hline
874 \\
874 \\
874.
\end{array}
\]

(r) 653752, (sa) 653752.

874

Thus 27 alterations of the ciphers have to be gone through before the final result is arrived at.

Demonstration by the European method:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
748 \\
874 \\
\hline
2992 \\
5236 \\
5984 \\
\hline
653752.
\end{array}
\]
Example 4. Multiply 391 by 555.

In this case the alterations in the processes amount to 19 thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & 15 & 391, & (b) & 165391, & (c) & 165391, & (d) & 166591, & (e) & 166591, & (f) & 166591, \\
555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 45 & 555 & 555 \\
(g) & 161591, & (h) & 111591, & (i) & 211591, & (j) & 211901, & (k) & 216451, & & \\
5 & 1 & 45 & 5 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & & \\
(m) & 216451, & (n) & 216541, & (o) & 216951, & (p) & 216901, & (q) & 217001, & (r) & 217005 \\
555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & 555 & & \\
(s) & 217005. & & & & & & & & & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Demonstration by the European method is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
391 \\
555 \\
\hline
1955 \\
1955 \\
1955 \\
\hline
217005.
\end{align*}
\]

Example 5. Multiply 12 by 12.

Precisely the same processes are followed as in simple multiplication. Thus in multiplying 12 by 12 the successive steps would be shown thus:

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & 112, & (b) & 112, & (c) & 122, & (d) & 122, & (e) & 122, & (f) & 142, & (g) & 144, & (h) & 144. \\
12 & 2 & 12 & 12 & 2 & 2 & 4 & 12 & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{align*}
\]

Here 8 successive steps are required.


With a single multiplier as above the steps would be as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & 54 & 56759, & (b) & 45 & 56759, & (c) & 40 & 4759, & (d) & 50 & 749, & (e) & 50 & 479, & (f) & 50 & 0389, \\
9 & 54 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 \\
\hline
510389, & (h) & 510389, & (i) & 510029, & (j) & 511001, & (k) & 511001, & (l) & 511101, & (m) & 511101. \\
9 & 72 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 & 9 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Here the Burmese process requires 13 steps before it arrives at completion.

D. Division.

Example 1. Divide 689 by 27.

To divide 689 by 27, set the first cipher of the divisor beneath the first cipher of the dividend and the subsequent ciphers after it, thus: — 689.

27

Then divide the first cipher of the dividend by the first cipher of the divisor in the head, and because 6 ÷ 2 = 3, set the quotient over that cipher of the dividend which is immediately above the last cipher of the divisor, thus: — 3.

\[
\begin{align*}
689 \\
27 \\
\hline
3 \\
\end{align*}
\]

21 The Hindu processes of division are substantially the same as the Burmese. — S. B. D.

22 Hindus usually learn by heart to multiply from 1 to 39, and even to 49, by 1 to 10; that is, a Hindu can at once give the answer to 29 × 9. So no Hindu would in a case like that in the text proceed to divide 6 by 2, but would at once divide 67 by 27 and so arrive at the first cipher of the quotient. Of course, when the divisor is composed of more than two figures in dividing large sums the correct first cipher in the quotient is not always found at once. — S. B. D.
Now *multiply* in the head the quotient with the first cipher of the divisor and subtract the result from the first cipher of the dividend, and then, because \(3 \times 2 = 6\) and \(6 - 6 = 0\), substitute the remainder for the first cipher of the dividend; thus: — 3

\[
089.
\]

27

Then, to ascertain if the above quotient is the true first cipher of the final quotient, multiply it by the subsequent ciphers of the divisor and subtract the result from the ciphers of the dividend immediately over them in the head, and then if there is a remainder substitute it for the cipher of the dividend affected by the process; but if there can be no remainder, i.e., if the result exceeds the cipher for which it should be substituted, then the quotient is wrong and must be lessened. E.g., in this case \(3 \times 7 = 21\), which cannot be subtracted from 08, and so 3 cannot be the true first cipher of the final quotient and must be lessened.

Begin again and try 2. Then the ciphers to be set down are

\[
689.
\]

27

Then, because \(2 \times 2 = 4\) and \(6 - 4 = 2\), after multiplication with the first cipher of the divisor by the revised quotient, by subtracting the result from the first cipher of the dividend and substituting the remainder for the first cipher of the dividend, we have

\[
289.
\]

27

Next, the result of multiplying the revised quotient with the remaining ciphers of the divisor is \(2 \times 7 = 14\), which is capable of subtraction from the ciphers of the dividend affected by the process; i.e., \(28 - 14 = 14\). So substitute the remainder for the said cipher thus:

\[
149.
\]

27

So 2 is the true first cipher of the final quotient.

Now set forward the divisor a point, thus:

\[
149.
\]

27

and proceed as before, dividing the ciphers of the dividend immediately over the first cipher of the divisor; thus:

\[
14 + 2 = 7.
\]

Set down as follows:

\[
27
\]

149.

27

Now multiply the first cipher of the divisor with the quotient thus obtained as before, and substitute the remainder after subtracting it from the ciphers of the dividend affected, and, because \(2 \times 7 = 14\) and \(14 - 14 = 0\), set-down

\[
09.
\]

27

Next proceed as before, to ascertain if 7 is the true second cipher of the final quotient of the division, by multiplying it with the second cipher of the divisor and subtracting the result from the ciphers of the dividend affected by the process; thus \(7 \times 7 = 49\), which cannot be subtracted from 09. So 7 is wrong, therefore try 5.

Set down and proceed as before; thus:

\[
25
\]

149.

27
Now, proceeding as before, $2 \times 5 = 10$, and $14 - 10 = 4$. So substitute 4 for 14, and set down 25
49
27

Then proceeding as before, $5 \times 7 = 35$, and $49 - 35 = 14$. So substitute 14 for 49, and set down 25
14
27

**Answer:** $25 \frac{14}{27}$

**Demonstration by the European method:**

```
27) 689 (25
    54
    149
    135
    14

**Answer:** $25 \frac{14}{27}$
```

Check is practised in the Burmese method in the same way as in the European, viz. by multiplying out the quotient.

The processes shown in succession on the Burmese slate or sand or parabaik would therefore be:

```
(a) 689, (b) 689, (c) 099, (d) 690, (e) 290, (f) 149, (g) 149, (h) 09, (i) 149,
  27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 27
(j) 49, (k) 14, (l) 25
  27 27

**That is, 13 processes are necessary before the result is arrived at.**
```

**Example 2.** Divide 3965 by 172.

Proceeding as before, the processes gone through would be set down by a Burman as follows:

```
(a) 3965, (b) 3965, (c) 0965, (d) 3965, (e) 1965, (f) 565, (g) 525, (h) 525, (i) 525, (j) 025
  172 172 172 172 172 172 172 172 172
(k) 525, (l) 225, (m) 15, (n) 9, (o) 2
  172 172 172 172

**Answer:** $23 \frac{9}{172}$
```

**Demonstration by the European method:**

```
172) 3965 (23 \frac{9}{172}
    344
    525
    516
    9
```
Example 3. Divide 703 by 95.

Here the processes would be as follows: 

(a) 703, (b) 703, (c) 703, (d) 78, (e) 38, (f) 38

Answer: 7 8

Demonstration by the European method:

95) 703 (7 8
 665
 38

PART III.

A METHOD OF CHECKING BURMESE MULTIPLICATION.

In practice the Burmese do not check their multiplication, but it is capable of being checked on paper according to their system of ciphering, by shewing the processes as in the following tables, instead of in the manner given in the above examples. The figures shown in italics are those that are struck out in each stage of the process of multiplication.

Example 1. \(391 \times 55\).

**First Stage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>16591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier and 1st multiplication</td>
<td>15391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Stage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>21451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier and 1st multiplication</td>
<td>16591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Stage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>21505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier and 1st multiplication</td>
<td>21451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 2. \(789 \times 69\).

**First Stage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>48389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier and 1st multiplication</td>
<td>42879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Third Stage.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>53839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier and 1st multiplication</td>
<td>48389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 3. $748 \times 874$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Stage</th>
<th>Second Stage</th>
<th>Third Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>611843</td>
<td>643733</td>
<td>653752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 3rd multiplication</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicand</td>
<td>611843</td>
<td>611843</td>
<td>646763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 3rd multiplication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 4. $391 \times 555$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Stage</th>
<th>Second Stage</th>
<th>Third Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>166591</td>
<td>216451</td>
<td>217005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 3rd multiplication</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicand</td>
<td>166591</td>
<td>166591</td>
<td>216451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 3rd multiplication</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 5. $12 \times 12$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Stage</th>
<th>2nd Stage</th>
<th>3rd Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final result</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of 2nd multiplication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplicand and 1st multiplication</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of 1st multiplication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiplier</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART IV.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE ORIGIN OF THE BURMESE ARITHMETICAL METHOD.

It is explained, on page 54 above, that the ordinary Burman still writes his numbers as he speaks them. Thus he will write 1000100309 for 1139.
This peculiarity yields a possible explanation of his system of arithmetic, which would appear to have arisen from this method of notation.

Let us take one of the addition problems already explained: add 325 to 896. These sums he would write as follows: 300208 and 80906. Then we get, putting the naughts which are meaningless according to the decimal notation, in italics for clearness:

\[
\begin{align*}
800 + 300 &= 1000100 \\
90 + 20 &= 10010 \\
\text{Added total} &= 100020010 \\
6 + 5 &= 101 \\
\text{Added total} &= 1000200201 (= 1221) 
\end{align*}
\]

In this way we see that even on paper the problem works out naturally in the Burmese fashion.

Now let us subtract 78 from 95, writing the sums as 708 and 905. Then we have

\[
\begin{align*}
90 - 70 &= 20 \\
20 - 10 \text{ (borrowed)} &= 10 \\
5 + 2 &= 7 \\
\text{added total of last two items} &= 107 (= 17) \text{.} \quad 22
\end{align*}
\]

Here again it will be seen that the Burmese method of subtraction works out naturally.

Turning to multiplication we have to multiply 391 by 65, written 300901 and 605. Then

\[
\begin{align*}
300 \times 60 &= 108000 \\
300 \times 5 &= 1000500 \\
\text{added total} &= 109000500 \\
90 \times 60 &= 5000400 \\
90 \times 5 &= 40050 \\
\text{total of first and second stages...} &= 20500030050 \\
1 \times 60 &= 60 \\
1 + 5 &= 5 \\
\text{total of second and third stages.} &= 205000400105
\end{align*}
\]

Or, in decimal notation, 23415. Thus it will be seen that the multiplication system is merely the logical result of what may be called Natural Notation.

Lastly for division, let us divide 589 by 27, written as 500809 and 207. Then

\[
\begin{align*}
20 \text{ into 500 in terms of ten} &= 20: \\
\text{then } 207 \times 20 &= 50040: \\
\text{and } 50040 \text{ from } 500809 &= 409: \\
20 \text{ into 40 in terms of ten} &= 2: \\
\text{then } 207 \times 2 &= 504: \\
\text{and } 504 \text{ will not subtract form 409:} \\
\text{so 2 is wrong and we must work with 1:} \\
\text{Therefore } 20 \text{ into 40 in terms of ten} &= 1: \\
\text{then } 207 \times 1 &= 207: \\
\text{and } 207 \text{ from } 409 &= 202 \\
\text{Therefore the answer is obtained by} \\
20 + 1 &= 201 \text{ with 202 over} \quad \text{fourth stage.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[22 \text{ We are now following the Burmese method of subtraction explained on page 56, supra.}\]
Or, in the decimal notation, $21 \frac{22}{27}$. Here again the Burmese method works out naturally and clearly.

This argument seems to show us how the system arose naturally out of a system of notation which was merely one of writing numbers as they were spoken. If this be the fact, its antiquity is beyond doubt, and we are thus brought face to face with what may be a genuine sample of primitive mathematics.

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

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

No. 194. — An Old-Kanarese Inscription at Kotur.

Kotur is a village about twenty miles in a north-westerly direction from Saundatti, the chief town of the Parasaq Tâlûkâ or Sub-Division of the Belgaum District, Bombay Presidency. It is entered in the map, Indian Atlas Sheet No. 41, as ‘Kotoor,’ in Lat. 16° 1', Long. 75° 2'. The present inscription, now brought to notice for the first time, is on a stone tablet on the south side of a temple or shrine of the god Paramânanda in a field, Survey No. 6, of this village. I edit it from an ink-impression made by my own man.

The surface covered by the writing is irregular in shape; the extreme measures are about 2' 5" square. There are no sculptures on the stone. — The characters belong to the transitional period of the so-called Old-Kanarese alphabet; and may be allotted, approximately, to the ninth century A.D. The size of the letters varies from $\frac{1}{4}$" to $\frac{1}{2}$". The engraving is bold and excellent. It may be noted that the $j$ is formed in two ways; see, for instance, $\text{jaya}$ and $\text{râja}$, line 1; so also the $m$, see, for instance, $\text{mati}$ and $\text{mana}$, line 2. Also, in several instances a distinct form of the lingual $g$ is used, as compared with the dental $d$; see, for instance, $\text{nâgâdu}$, line 3. — The language is Old-Kanarese; and the record is in verse throughout. — In respect of orthography, the only point that calls for notice is the use of $b$ for $v$ in the Sanskrit word $\text{vira}$, lines 4 and 9; though the $v$ is preserved in $\text{vishā}$, line 1, and $\text{vīryāta}$, line 2. The other peculiarities, — e.g., $\text{sambu}$ for $\text{sambât}$ or $\text{sambhu}$, throughout, except perhaps where it is used in line 8 as a name of $\text{Siva}$; $\text{nij-èchbe}$ for $\text{nij-èchbe}$, line 5; $\text{nivirîti}$ for $\text{niyirîti}$, line 13; and $\text{sambhe}$ for $\text{sambhe}$, line 16, — are linguistic, rather than orthographical; and are customary in the adaptation of Sanskrit words in Old-Kanarese.

The inscription belongs to the class of $\text{vīgals}$ or $\text{vīra-kallus}$, ‘monumental slabs of heroes.’ It describes how a Saiva ascetic named Sambu, i.e., Sambhu, performed the ceremony of walking through the fire, and then stood in it till he was burnt to death. It mentions a Chalukya prince named Parahitârâja; in which word we have, of course, a biruda, rather than a proper name. It is not dated; and the name of this prince is not known from any other record. But the inscription is to be referred, on paleographical grounds, to about the ninth century A.D.; and Parahitârâja was doubtless one of the Chalukya chieftains who must have survived, and would probably be entrusted with subordinate authority, during the period of the Râshtrakûta supremacy in this part of the country.

TEXT.

1 $\text{Sri-jaya-yutaânga}$ Parahita-râjainge Chalukya-vahhahâtaânga \text{lsaa}.
2 [d-râjâjia-gupaânga Sambu virâj[ri]ta-mati-vële-gopdu bhaya-rabita-manâma \text{[m]}.
3 Jadi rajâtâraad-vâkade taça-daçisade nàgadu dahanana[tr] vola-gônd-b.
4 gaçisade chintiasi manadol-Mridâna nagumvâge pâyda Sambuvo birâm \text{[m].}
5 Kichchhina-olâg-iuldu Sambu nij-èchbheyn-oilââr-ivârîm=mand-ananayadîn
6 bichchhâjîke-verisi manadol=mechchî Mahâvâranas-alli chintisat-iuldu \text{[m].}
7 Pogalâl=râmbam-app=olluguljane tanag-avane sâ(sâ)jâvatin-phîdî dhaga-

\text{[1] The form of $m$ that is used in this word, is the one that is liable to be mistaken for $n$ or sometimes $m$; see vol. \text{[XIX]. p. 431, note 53.}

\text{[2] From the ink-impression.}

\text{[3] Metre, Kanda; throughout.}
Having declared (his) resplendent determination to the king Parahitatakṣa, who is endowed with fortune and victory; who is of the Chalukya lineage; (and) who is possessed of pleasing and splendid virtues, — Sambu (became) free from apprehension in (his) mind.

(Line 3) — A brave man indeed (says) Sambu, who, fearing not the shower of the fire,7 delayed not, but ran up and fanned the flame; and then without any hesitation, having thought on the god Mṛda8 in (his) mind, with smiles passed through (it).

(L. 5) — When Sambu of his own free will was in the fire, (the people) expressed disapprobation, saying, in sympathy, (to the flames), “Be quenched;”9 (but), with great happiness in (his) mind, there he remained, thinking of (the god) Mahēśvara.

(L. 7) — When the crackling fire, having appropriated to itself, once and for ever, those good qualities (of his) which were too great to be enumerated, began to acquire heat, — with a smiling face,10 Sambu continued to think upon (the god) Sambhu.

(L. 9) — When it is considered how inconceivable were the virtues of Sambu . . . . . . .

this heroic deed, — who, on the surface of the earth surrounded by the oceans, could foretell and describe Sambu?

(L. 11) — Verily, neither those who have lived in days of fame gone by,11 nor those who shall be in the future, nor those of the present time, — (even) if they were to think (of it), — could say12 “(This deed is) thine, (or) thine, (or) thine;” (for), art not thou indeed, O Sambu!, the (only) standard of comparison for thyself?

(L. 13) — (The whole of) this world, — struck with amazement at the fact that, when the virtues of (the god) Bhava, headed by concentration of the mind in deliberation,11 developed to (such) eminence in him, Sambu thus completely entered into the fire, — will for ever be talking of it.

* Letters representing two short-syllable instants, are illegible here. As a matter of fact, there is room for four or five syllables; and there was probably a break in the writing, owing to some fault in the stone, as, for instance, between the last two akṣaras of line 12.

* This ia was at first omitted, and then was inserted, rather small, on the top line of the writing.

* The prāṇa is not quite perfect here, owing to the r in the second akṣara. But the composers of ancient poetry do not seem to have been altogether so particular in this respect as those of subsequent times.

* I cannot find any dictionary authority for rendering rajadāra, lit., ‘silver-belly,’ by ‘fire;’ but I do not see what other meaning can be given to the word. — Jātā seems to be the Kanaarese jātī, jātī-māle, ‘incessant rain, small rain.’ Strictly, it ought to have an accusative ending, instead of being in the crude form.

* i. e. Śiva. He is called Mahēśvara in lines 6 and 15-16, Sambhu in line 8, and Bhava in line 13.

* I do not see how to render the word re, ‘these’ (nom. pl.), in this sentence. lit., “smiling with (his) face.”

* In veṣuvaḍharmam, we must have the suffix ica, ‘one who is born, or lives at’ (see Nāgavarman’s Kavidhāna-bhadābhādāhān, sūtra 75, and Kēśīṣa’s Sadbhāsādaraṇa, sūtra 209; in both of which, however, it is attached only to names of places, except in the word alīchā, ‘born or living in the water-lily, i. e. Brahman’). But I do not see how to explain the syllables vāda; unless the suffix is in reality attached, in some instances, to the genitive case, and we have here a genitive form veṣuva, instead of veṣa, analogous to bhāvāveda for bhāvāveda (see ante, Vol. XIX, p. 145, note 8, which illustrates also a locative case formed in the same way).

* lit., “indeed they do not say.”

* Or, instead of charcha-ādyam, perhaps we should read ‘ādhyam, i. e. ‘ādhyam, and translate ‘the unfathomable virtues of (the god) Bhava’.
Old-Kanarese Inscription at Kotur.
A NOTICE OF THE GULABNAMA.

BY E. BEHATSEK.

(Continued from Vol. XIX. p. 363.)

The Rājās Suchēt Śiṅgh and Hirā Śiṅgh, who worked in perfect union in punishing the rebels, now raised Dalip Śiṅgh to the throne, with Hirā Śiṅgh for his prime minister, but in a few days the old discord between uncle and nephew broke out again. Their quarrel had originally arisen thus. The Rājā Suchēt Śiṅgh rented the 'ūlqā of Jasrotā from the government, while the Rājā Hirā Śiṅgh had been presented with it as a jāqīr. The late Dhyān Śiṅgh had, however, succeeded in keeping peace between them, but they now came to open hostilities and bloodshed, the chief reason for which was, that the Rājā Hirā Śiṅgh had entrusted Paṇḍit Jallā with the administration of most of the political and financial affairs and the Paṇḍit had demurred to the wish of the Rājā Suchēt Śiṅgh to increase Rāi Kēśrī Śiṅgh’s jāqīr. The Rājā Suchēt Śiṅgh was further displeased because Paṇḍit Jallā had captured and slain Bhāi Gūrmukhā Śiṅgh and Misr Bēl Rām, the accomplices of Ajī Śiṅgh in the murder of the Rājā Dhyān Śiṅgh, as he foresaw the danger entailed by such an act. He, however, strangely enough, put aside all the ill-feeling he entertained towards the adherents of the Sardār Lāhē Śiṅgh and associated with them, which behaviour disgusted Hirā Śiṅgh.

Gulāb Śiṅgh, informed of this discord, left Jammū, and started for Lāhōr. When he arrived and halted near Shāhdāra, the Rājās Hirā Śiṅgh and Suchēt Śiṅgh, and all the notable Sardārs came from the city to meet him. In Lāhōr he attempted to effect the supersession of Hirā Śiṅgh, by inducing the Sardārs and Rājās to entrust Suchēt Śiṅgh with the administration of the government, but they almost unanimously, although politely, refused to comply. He then departed with Suchēt Śiṅgh to Jammū, having no doubt during his brief sojourn in Lāhōr became fully acquainted with the critical state of affairs, and prognosticated therefrom that new contests might soon arise from which it would be best to keep aloof. Having no offspring, and no hopes of obtaining any, Gulāb Śiṅgh adopted shortly after his return to Jammū, Ranbir Śiṅgh as his son. Meanwhile the Rājā Hirā Śiṅgh not only refrained from allowing the young Maharājā Dalip Śiṅgh to acquire any influence whatever, but made Paṇḍit Jallā his chief councillor. This man incurred great hatred by his tyrannical measures, in consequence of which two of the chief officials of the administration, who foresaw that disturbances would arise, retired from it. These were Faqīr Ānsū‘uddin, who, leading the life of a recluse, ceased to associate with any one, and Sardār Lāhē Śiṅgh, who abandoned his position and departed to Benares.

Meanwhile the troops of Gulāb Śiṅgh, commanded by Dīwān Hari Chand, remained encamped in Shāhdāra, to be employed in case of need by the Rājā Hirā Śiṅgh. But as Phēshōra Śiṅgh, son of Ranjit Śiṅgh, entertained rebellious designs and had occupied the fort of Siālkot, Gulāb Śiṅgh besieged it, with the aid of the Dīwān Hari Chand, and the prince fell into their power. Rājā Suchēt Śiṅgh, who aspired to supremacy, had meanwhile been corresponding with the officers of the Khālsē army. The Dīwān Jawahir Śiṅgh at Lāhōr aided him in this matter, which ended in the officers secretly inviting Suchēt Śiṅgh to come to the capital. Accordingly he prepared to do so with his intimate friends, Rāi Kēśrī Śiṅgh and others, in spite of the remonstrances of Gulāb Śiṅgh, who at last besought and entreated him in a private conversation not to venture upon so dangerous an undertaking, which must in all probability terminate fatally, and taking off his own turban, placed it before him, but all to no purpose. Suchēt Śiṅgh mounted a fleet charger on the pretence of going hunting, but was overtaken by Mān Ranbir Śiṅgh and the Dīwān Hari Chand, who both endeavoured in vain to persuade him.
to return. He reached Sāmbā in three hours, which is six farsangs distant from Jammū. There he took leave of his karam, and coming out of it received a letter from Jawāhir Singh to the purport that he had succeeded in bringing over the whole Khalsa army to their side. This letter so re-assured the Rājā, that losing all caution he left his forces, which amounted to between three and four thousand men on the road, and hastened with only a few troopers to Lāhār. When, however, he arrived in the vicinity of the capital with a retinue of 45 men, some of whom were armed and some not, he was informed that the Khalsa troops, greedy for money, desired to attack him, and that he ought to turn back. But he replied that it is not the part of a brave man to retreat from a battle-field, whereon Rāi Kesṛi Singh suggested that it would perhaps be better to fall back in the direction of Firōzpūr, and there to prepare for the struggle, or to go to the Shālimār garden at Lāhār, and wait for the arrival of his troops. But he stoutly refused, and at last halted in Dērā Miān, where Jawāhir Mall made his appearance and went away after conversing on various topics. Next morning the Khalsa army, amounting to more than 60,000 men and numerous artillery, came up and surrounded the locality on three sides. Thereon Rājā Suchēt Singh prepared to sacrifice his life, performed his ablutions, put on new clothes, and adorned himself with costly jewellery: and as the gardener happened to come up with a basket full of beautiful flowers, he took one for himself and presented with his own hands one to Kesṛi Singh and one to Dīwān Bhīm Sēn. Shortly afterwards the fire of the Khalsa troops began, and the roof of the building in which Suchēt Singh happened to be with his companions gave way. His swift charger was then brought to him, but he refused to mount it, and preferred to die fighting on the spot. Kesṛi Singh was cut down by a sword, Dīwān Bhīm Sēn fell shot by a gun, Nihāl Singh being afraid of his life ran away, and the Rājā Suchēt Singh valiantly defended himself with his sabre, killing several of his Khalsa assailants, but at last succumbed. In this catastrophe, says our author, Suchēt Singh left a record of his name to be for ever remembered with praise, and Hīrā Singh’s with reprobation. As to Panḍit Jallā he proved ever ungrateful and dishonest towards Suchēt Singh, not only whilst alive by plotting to compass his ruin, but also by preventing Hīrā Singh after his death from observing the usual ceremonies of mourning for him. It is also alleged that when in the last emergency the artillery had been drawn up, and Colonel Ilāhī Bakhsh, the commandant, asked for orders, Hīrā Singh remained silent, but Panḍit Jallā insisted that it should fire, in spite of the remonstrances of the Colonel, Dīwān Ājudhīa Nāth, Sādhu Singh, and others.

When Gulāb Singh was informed of what had taken place, he bewailed the death of Suchēt Singh, the ladies of whose karam at Jammū, Sāmbā, and Rāmnagar immolated themselves. The Rājā was born in St. 1858 and killed in St. 1901, and so was 43 years old when he bade farewell to the world. Panḍit Jallā advised Hīrā Singh to confiscate his jāgīra, but his Rānis, who were his heiresses, had at the time of undergoing satt bequeathed them all to Gulāb Singh, whom their husband had in his life-time cherished and considered as his adopted son, and intended to be his heir. Gulāb Singh, foreseeing that troubles would arise on this subject between himself and the Rājā Hīrā Singh, therefore at once despatched the author’s father with Panḍit Charan Dās to Lāhār, to arrange matters by claiming from the darbār, Sāmbā, Suchētgarh, and the districts rented to the late Rājā. Panḍit Charan Dās who was an elder brother of Panḍit Jallā did his best to persuade him to consent to the proposal, but he obstinately refused, and as Hīrā Singh had entrusted him with the management of affairs, no impression could be made upon the Rājā, whilst other notables who were favourable to the claim dared not open their mouths for fear of Jallā. So the two envoys returned without effecting anything. Some time afterwards, however, the Rājā Hīrā Singh thought proper to send Rājā Dinā Nāth, Bhāi Rām Singh, and Imāmuddīn as envoys to negotiate on this business with Gulāb Singh. At one of their meetings Rājā Dinā Nāth happened to mention the way in which the Emperor Aurangzēb Ḍālamgīr had treated his father Shāh Jahan, and

---

1 In Ch. 43 of the Faformama, this locality is called Shēkh Kallāh, and is said to contain the tomb of a certain Shēkh Iṣa’lī, known as Miān Kallāh.

2 A. D. 1844.
said that the Raja Hirá Singh stood in the position of father towards Gulab Singh, whereas the latter rejoined that in this affair there was no analogy with Sháh Jaháh, and compared Hira Singh te Suchét Singh, who, he said, possessed no experience of the world. Moreover, he said that if Hira Singh should think proper to attack him, he would find him quite ready to defend his possessions with the sword. The envoys, disappointed and frightened by this reply, left Jammú and returned to Lahor. Raja Hira Singh, with the view of confiscating the districts of Gujrat, Jallápkur, Piúd Dádan Khán, &c., which had been rented to Gulab Singh, and were in charge of his officials, and also of depriving him of all his possessions in the Pathjáb territories, despatched his army thither, some Sultans of which encamped at Eminiábád, with the intention of attacking and plundering Jammú. Accordingly Gulab Singh collected his army of brave Rajputs and issued proclamations that all persons desiring to enlist would be welcome. The result was that his forces increased considerably, and that even from Lahor many patriotic Rajputs preferring to defend their homesteads rather than to gain money, joined them. This army, under the command of Randhir Singh, and Diwan Hari Chand, encamped near the city of Jammú. However, the Raja Jawahir Singh negotiated with Hira Singh, and induced him to accept the districts of Sambá, Suchétgarh, &c., and one-half of the property left by Suchét Singh, leaving the rest, and the rented districts to Gulab Singh, who thereupon sent Randhir Singh, a youthful candidate for glory and dignity, to Lahor, where the bond of peace between Gulab Singh and Hira Singh was cemented.

At last the seed of evil, sown by Pandit Jallá, ripened into fruit to his own destruction. He had kept under surveillance Sardar Jawahir Singh, the brother of the Bibi Sahiba Chandán who took the first opportunity she could to apprise the officers of the Khalsa army that Jallá had exceeded all bounds of propriety. Lal Singh, too, although indebted for his high position to Hira Singh, seconded her proposals, and presented himself with her, Dalip Singh and Jawahir Singh before the Khalsa army, adorning it to destroy Pañhit Jallá. Accordingly the Khalsa troops desired that Pandit Jallá should be surrendered to them by Hira Singh, who, unwilling to comply, preferred to mount a fleet charger and to depart from Lahor, despite the warnings of several persons not to do so. Hira Singh and Randhir Singh were, with a small number of followers, overtaken at a distance of only a few farangs from Lahor, and were slain fighting, and the head of the much dreaded and execrated Pandit Jallá, who was also one of the fugitives, became a trophy with which the Khalsa troops marched back to Lahor. This event took place in St. 1901, on the 8th month (dwádas) of the month Pús. When Gulab Singh obtained information of what had taken place, he was greatly shocked, and when Baghá Singh arrived from Lahor, bringing the head of that hopeful youth, his grief was augmented. He refrained from communicating the sad tidings to the Maharani, the mother of Randhir, who had not yet forgotten the death of Míhá Udham Singh.

Whilst still mourning for the loss he had sustained, Gulab Singh received information that Hira Singh had, some time before his death, sent Bham Singh and Lal Singh to conquer Jassóm and other districts. At the same time too Lalá Ratan Chand Dugal and Bábá Míhá Singh arrived from Lahor, bringing a message from Bibi Chandán and Jawahir Singh, reminding Gulab Singh of what he and the late Raja Suchét Singh had endured from the iniquities of the Raja Hira Singh and Pandit Jallá. They were also held guilty of Míhá Randhir’s death, because having, like a youthful Cypress tree, not yet attained the age of maturity, he would not listen to the Bibi’s advice, and separated himself from Hira Singh. She proposed that whatever Raja Hira Singh had possessed, with one half of the property left by Raja Suchét Singh, should be surrendered to her, but that Gulab Singh should retain the districts and jágirs he held with

---

3 This is the first time the late, and father of the present, Maháráj appears to have entered public life prominently.
4 This individual, as will be seen further on, was killed with Raja Hira Singh, but is at the end of Ch. 43 of the Żafáránáma, where the episode is also narrated, called Sháhu, the young son of Gulab Singh.
5 A. D. 1844.
6 The literal meaning is “of that young cypress;” and Randhir is unpost
the sanction of the preceding government. Gulab Singh feigned to comply with the demands of the envoys, but resorted to the stratagem of bribing the Sikh troops stationed at Jassati by the late Hirá Singh for the impending conquest of Chamba, and enlisting them in his own cause. He ordered also Raptur Singh, who resided at that time in Ramnagar as the successor of Suchet Singh, to prepare his forces for a campaign, and many other chiefs received similar instructions. The expected storm soon broke, and when the death of Hirá Singh became generally known disturbances took place in all directions. Some Khalsa troops invaded the possessions of the Maharaja Gulab Singh, and even besieged Jamnán, but were at last repelled. Negotiations then took place and Gulab Singh induced them by presenting every man with five rupees to march back with him to Láhóor. To their commander, General Mewá Singh, he paid Rs. 25,000 in cash, and presented him also with a horse and golden saddle.

As the army was gradually approaching Láhóor, several messages arrived from the Bibi Safíba and the Sardár Jatáhir Singh, expressing their displeasure, that, contrary to their wishes, the army had allowed Gulab Singh to accompany it. This became an occasion for quarrelling, and when the Khalsa army arrived near Láhóor at Shádkara it was split into two factions, one of which continued to side with Gulab Singh, and the other spurned all connection with him. Gulab Singh now mounted elephants with some of his friends, intending to enter the city; but a letter arrived from the notables of the court with orders to convey him to Láhóor under a strong guard, and not to allow any of his friends to accompany him. The ignorant and simple-minded troopers, entrusted with the letter, gave it to the uncle of the author, Dwán Nihál Chand, who read it out to the troops in this fashion:— "The Bibi Safíba and the Maharaja Dalip Singh strictly enjoined the troops to convey the Maharaja Gulab Singh into the city with demonstrations of honour." When, therefore, Gulab Singh made his entrance into Láhóor with great pomp, the inhabitants crowded the streets and doors of their houses, many expressing fervent wishes that nothing untoward might befall him, as he had already to deplore the loss of many of his relatives. He was taken to the house of the late prince Nau Nihál Singh, where he found a strong guard to watch him. It happened to consist of men from a regiment that had, on a former occasion, been disgracefully routed by his own troops in Kasmi. This guard had orders not to allow any one to approach him except his Dwán. As soon as the party had alighted the Dwán, who was the author's father, attempted to draw water from a well, and, having been unsuccessful in the attempt, was relieved by a woman who had observed him from a distance. She procured not only water, but also food for the Maharaja Gulab Singh. The Dwán then went in haste to the court of the Bibi Safíba, and represented that it was usual to supply even a convicted criminal with food and drink, but that Gulab Singh, who was only under surveillance, had been provided neither with food, nor even with a bed to rest himself upon. Accordingly orders were immediately issued to supply him with all necessaries. The members of the court were unfriendly to Gulab Singh and desired his ruin, but were also apprehensive that a faction of the Khalsa troops might raise disturbances, in case any harm should befall him. His favourite Dwán did the best he could to discover any intrigues which might be carried on, and narrated every evening to Gulab Singh all that he had ascertained during the day. One day he brought news that the court people intended to put the Dwán and the Wazir Zóráwar Singh to torture to force them to reveal where Gulab Singh kept his treasure, whereas the latter at once sent his wazír out of the way back to Jamnán, and the Dwán promised rather to sacrifice his life than to divulge where the treasures were. On another occasion the court proposed to extort such a confession from Gulab Singh himself. Their evil intentions were brought to the notice of the Khalsa troops, and they manifested their displeasure, and Ratan Singh advised the Rajá Lal Singh to release Gulab Singh somehow, or else they would certainly raise a disturbance. The Dwán Dwán Náth reported that they were already threatening to use violent measures in case of non-compliance with their wishes. These rumours disquieted the court, and in order to propitiate the army, the Sardár Jatáhir Singh next day took the Maharaja

---

*His adopted son, the late Maharaja Raptur Singh, who died in 1885.*
Dalip Singh to be present at a review of the troops, which had been arranged to take place in the plain of Mau Mir. On that occasion, however, the troops demanded that the Maharaja Gulab Singh, to whom they had pledged their honour, and had promised safety when they brought him, should forthwith be allowed to return to Jammu; and as they threatened to kill Jawahir Singh on the spot, and to pull Dalip Singh down from his elephant, it became necessary to withdraw the guard, which had kept Gulab Singh prisoner, and to allow him to make his appearance next day at the Court of the Maharaja Dalip Singh, where he was questioned about the gold and property of the Rajah Hira Singh and the possessions of Raja Suchet Singh. The court, however, continued to plot mischief against him, as well as others whose affection he had won by his affability, kept him informed of what was brewing against him, and also of the presence of musketeers in the darbar, who might shoot him at any time, from their ambush behind a curtain, at a given signal. This put him on his mettle, and accordingly he one day bathed in the river at sunrise, placed a saffron mark on his forehead, armed himself with a salve and gun, and proceeded to the court where he found some nobles assembled, including Sardar Jawahir Singh, Lal Singh, Shams Singh and others, each of whom, elated by his own importance, had armed retainers by his side. They were surprised when he made his appearance among them, and still more at the manner in which he addressed them, stating that he had long served under the late Mirahaj Rajjit Singh, and had fought in many battles, but as fate had not willed it, no harm had come to him. Now, however, as they had, with the intention of destroying him, placed men in ambush to shoot him, after the manner of brigands, he challenged any brave and honourable man in the assembly, desirous of shedding his blood, to step forth and to fight him; and if no one felt able he would accept any two antagonists, and dye the floor of the court with their blood, till he had slain every one in the assembly. The bravery of Gulab Singh being well known, and the Sardars, not daring to accept his challenge, remained silent. Not even Sardar Shams Singh, who was distinguished for his valour, would fight, and became very red in the face. The fire of Gulab Singh's ire was thereon quenched by the limpid water of apology, as every one in the Darbar swore to be most amicably disposed towards him.

Some time afterwards an attempt was made to poison Gulab Singh, by throwing pulverised diamonds into some snow and sugar-cane juice, which it was expected he would drink, but having been warned by friends, he abstained from mixing the sugar with the snow, saying that he could enjoy the snow alone as he was a mountaineer. On another occasion the court ordered Rajanulla Khum of Rajacel, and Faiz Taalab, the son of Sultan Khum, to wait on the road against the return of Gulab Singh from the court and shoot him. They prepared for this deed by taking up a position, one very dark night with 200 men, on the road, which they knew that their intended victim must pass. It so happened, however, that after the rising of the court, Gulab Singh went to the abode of a celebrated ascetic, and conversed with him for so long a time, that his Diwan went home by another road. The miscreants, having got tired of waiting any longer, departed in single file with the matches of their firelocks still burning, when the Maharaja Gulab Singh at last passed with his retinue, whereon they quickly took to their heels; but he had some of them captured, and these revealed the whole plot after the application of some pressure. Next morning Gulab Singh sent his Diwan to the darbar with the captives as witnesses, but when the Diwan made his statement, the members of it pretended to be ignorant of the plot they had themselves devised. They complied, however, at his request, to remove the prisoners to some distance, in order to set at rest the apprehensions of Gulab Singh, and they were accordingly deported in chains to Gobindgarh.

Dissensions having arisen between the Sardar Jawahir Singh and the Raja Lal Singh, most people concluded that if Gulab Singh, whose bravery was well known, were to favour the claims of one of the disputants, it would be very difficult to settle their differences. The Sardar Muhammad Khum, who was well disposed towards Gulab Singh, took the opportunity of reminding the Raja Lal Singh, that Gulab Singh — of whose ambition and prudence he was aware, as well
as of his having gained the favour of the Khālīṣa troops by his affable manners and liberality—had been long sojourning in Lāhōr, and that as disturbances might ensue in consequence, it would be best to give him leave to depart to Jammū. Accordingly he was allowed to depart, but he refused to budge one step before the court had restored to him the districts he had been deprived of, and had granted him pargānas to that effect. His arrival at Jammū was hailed with joy by the population, but whilst he had been in Lāhōr under surveillance, malcontents had profited by his absence, and disturbed the peace in his dominions. The zamindārs of Kishwār, instigated by the officials of Kālāīn, had prepared the population for rebellion. Yūsuf Khān, who was under many obligations to Gulāb Siṅgh, ungratefully disregarded them, and Dilawar Siṅgh, the disloyal son of Tēgh Siṅgh, the preceding Rājā of Kishwār, not caring for the troops of Gulāb Siṅgh, joined him, and they conjointly besieged the garrison of the latter in the fort of Dūhā, but were at last driven away. Raḥib Siṅgh was attacked at Rāmnagar, which he had garrisoned, by Nihāl Siṅgh, vazīr of the late Suchēt Siṅgh, with his Khālīṣa troops. In the fort of Pūcchh, the Diwān Karam Chand had to stand a siege from the rebels, whilst the district of Jāsrātī had already before fallen into their grasp. In fact it appears that certain chiefs of the Sikhs attempted to deprive Gulāb Siṅgh, whilst he was under surveillance at Lāhōr, of every portion of his dominions, nearly all of which they invaded.

The Paṇjāb army had, however, become demoralized by the machinations of ambitious Sardārs, who strove to attain supreme power with the aid of the troops, and bribed them by turn. This is evident from the narrative of the struggles of the Sindhī wālīs Sardārs, the Rājā Suchēt Siṅgh and the Rājā Hīrā Siṅgh. The prince Peshārī Siṅgh, a son of the late Māhārājā Raṇjit Siṅgh, now once more appeared upon the scene as a pretender, and not being successful in raising disturbances at Siālātā, proceeded to Aṭāk, of which he took possession. He was, however, induced to leave the fort by a stratagem devised by Chhatar Siṅgh and Fateh Khān, who swore that they would do him no harm. They slew him nevertheless by order of Jawāhīr Siṅgh. When the Khālīṣa troops were apprised of this murder, they determined to kill Jawāhīr Siṅgh, and forthwith took the Rājā Lāl Siṅgh, the Rājā Dinā Nāh and the Bakhshī Bhagat Rām into custody. The Sardār Jawāhīr Siṅgh was several days on his guard, but at last trusted the regiment of Avitabile, which pretended to be faithful to him. Accordingly he took it as an escort and went with the Māhārājā Dalāp Siṅgh to Mīān Mīr, probably to witness a review of the troops, but they pulled the Māhārājā off from his elephant, and stabbed Jawāhīr Siṅgh to death with their knives.

After the above event the Khālīṣa army despatched one courier after another from Lāhōr to Jammū inviting the Māhārājā Gulāb Siṅgh to the capital, but he found various pretences and excused himself. The Lāhōr Court was now in great fear of the troops, because the Bibi Sāhibā Chandā, breathing vengeance for the assassination of her brother, had instigated them to clamour for an increase of pay and other emoluments, and told them that the English intended to make a conquest on the Paṇjāb side of the Satluj. The Khālīṣa troops, therefore, puffed up with pride and believing themselves to be invincible, left their cantonments and encamped at Mīān Mīr, whilst their officers held a council in the Shālābāgh and determined to march to the frontier. The Rājā Lāl Siṅgh also consented to this campaign, but many others, considering it to be a breach of faith towards the English, remonstrated. Nevertheless, the army marched and began the campaign by plundering its own country, and finally reached the banks of the Satluj. The Bibi Sāhibā wrote, in conformity with the intrigues she was plotting, to the Māhārājā Gulāb Siṅgh to proceed to the Peshāwar in order to regulate the administration of that district, whereon he sent a reply, warning her by no means to break the treaty of friendship with the English, and never to invade their territory, for fear of the gravest consequences.

---

8 This general's name is in various passages of our Persian text spelt ہیرا, but in the present instance ہیرا.

9 These events are narrated also in Ch. 44 of the Jafarwīma.
The Bibi Ṣāhibā then sent a plausible answer, and also issued a proclamation to the Khālsā officers, that as the English authorities had in no way infringed the treaty of peace, it would be unjust to attack them without a cause. The Sikhs, who were ambitious and foolhardy, paid no attention to this late admonition and crossed the Satluj. On being informed that an English force had marched from Lūḍhīāna to defend Firāzpūr, they determined to forestall it. Mr. [Major] Broadfoot, Agent to the Governor-General, Lord Hardinge, informed him of this state of affairs, whereon he ordered an army under Lord Gough to march, which encountered the Sikhs at Mādhī, where an action was fought on the 8th of the month Pūh, St. 1902. The Sikhs behaved gallantly, but were routed, abandoning all their baggage, and their Commander-in-Chief the Rājā Lāl Śīṅgh fled, no one knew whither. After this defeat the Khālsā officers held a consultation, and some of them went to Jammū to ask Gulāb Śīṅgh for advice, and he told them to keep the army stationary on the spot where it was, there being no occasion for restlessness in the present state of affairs. No attention being paid to this advice, a bridge was constructed, which the troops crossed, and encamped on the other bank of the river. The Sardār Raṃchhōḍ Śīṅgh, who had been collecting troops in the Dōāb, also arrived and pitched his camp at Phillaur on the banks of the Satluj. The Khālsā troops also marched in a fit of bravery to Lūḍhīāna and burnt the cantonment with everything it contained. The Rājā of Lūḍhīāna, with his forces and seven pieces of artillery also joined the Rājā (Sardār) Raṃchhōḍ Śīṅgh. The English, who were vexed by what had taken place at Lūḍhīāna, were joined by the forces of the Mahārājā of Paṭālīā. On the other hand Lāl Śīṅgh Murārī, who had on behalf of the Lāhūr government been regulating the administration of the district of Jaṅgūtā, joined the Khālsā army by order of the court with a few troops he had, and the Sardār Tējā Śīṅgh, who commanded the regiment of Avātabīlī did the same. Also the Rājā Lāl Śīṅgh, who had fled from the battlefield, and being ashamed had remained for some time in the Dōāb, was ordered to rejoin the army, and obeyed.

Several officers of the army, — as already mentioned, — had arrived at Jammū desiring the personal presence of Gulāb Śīṅgh at the seat of war to direct operations and to give advice. One day these officers, who were full of bombast and ignorance, quoted a hemistich in the Paṅjabi language, in which one of their ancestors had predicted that the Khālsā army would sit on the throne of Dēhil, whereon Gulāb Śīṅgh remarked that he could not understand how the prophecy was to be fulfilled, the throne being very small, and the Khālsā army amounting to nearly 100,000 men; and all present in the assembly smiled. Gulāb Śīṅgh entertained the envoys most hospitably on the best of food, but delayed on various pretexts to comply with their invitation, and leaving his Dīwān at Jammū to entertain his guests, went occasionally to Rūsī in a pretence of performing his devotions at the shrine of Bhūgavatī, or alleging that the auspicious time for departure had not yet arrived, or spending some time at Pūrmanjālī. In fact, Gulāb Śīṅgh was not willing to join the Khālsā army without receiving an invitation from the Bibi Ṣāhibā, which, however, at last arrived, having been brought by Bābā Mahārāj Śīṅgh and Dīwān Śīṅgh. The Mahārājā Gulāb Śīṅgh also had written a letter from Jammū to Edward Lake Ṣāhib, who sent no reply beyond a verbal message that "whoever wishes to ascend a high mountain must begin to climb early in the morning." Accordingly Gulāb Śīṅgh marched with his forces, commanded by the author's father, Dīwān Hari Chand, after sending a parvāna to the officers of the Khālsā army, advising them to keep it stationary, and arrived in Lāhūr, where he pitched his camp on the banks of the Rāvī. There Bhāī Rām Śīṅgh, Rājā Dīnā Nāth, and other Sardārs who happened at that time to be in Lāhūr, received him on behalf of the government, and he made his appearance at court on the 19th of the month Māgh, to be invested by the pēshkarī of the Bibi Ṣāhibā with a costly robe of honour and the dignity of wazīr. Then Gulāb Śīṅgh despatched parvānas to the officers of the army to cease hostilities; but fate had decreed otherwise, for the Sardār Raṃchhōḍ Śīṅgh Maṅjīrī Ṣāhib crossed the river and a battle ensued, in which many of the combatants perished on 10 A. D. 1845.
both sides, and although the Sikhs were defeated they made nineteen Europeans prisoners. Gulab Singh now wrote a letter of apology to the British officers, assuring them that the attack had been made in consequence of the Mahârâja Dalip Singh's minority, and that according to the treaty of friendship with the late Mahârâja Ranjit Singh, peace ought to prevail. The letter having been delivered by Lâlâ Chhânâ Lal Harâkâbhâshâ and Lâlâ Amaânt Râm to Sir Henry Lawrence, who wrote a reply from the cantonment of Firozpur, dated the 11th February 1846, informing Gulab Singh that it was not the intention of the Honourable East India Company to destroy the Sikh government, but only to repress the unwarranted hostilities which had not yet ceased, although the Sikhs had been defeated in four battles; and that if it should hereafter become necessary to punish the rebels further, the Court would be held responsible. Before, however, the envoys had even spoken, or this letter was written, the English forces attacked the Sikhs at daybreak, entering their trenches unawares, and a sanguinary contest ensued. When Tejâ Singh, the commander of the Sikhs, perceived that they were beginning to yield, he destroyed the bridge across the river to cut off their retreat, but many of the fugitives leaped into the water and perished, as well as the Sardar Shám Singh Atatürkâla, who, however, fell on the battle field fighting bravely, while the Râjâ Lal Singh, who had before heard the roar of the English artillery, did not venture into the fray, but remained quietly sitting esceded in a corner. On that occasion Major (Sir Henry) Lawrence sent a few lines, dated the 13th February 1846, to Gulab Singh, to inform him that he desired to have a private interview with him, and urgently requesting him to make the necessary arrangements for that purpose.

(To be concluded.)

FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY PANDIT NATESA SASTRI, M.F.L.S.

No. 35. — The Komati (Komatii) that suits the Stake.

In the city of Punyanâr there lived a merchant, of the Komati caste, named Aikusetti. He had been very rich, but, having lost all his wealth in speculative transactions, he was in very reduced circumstances at the time that our story commences. He was, however, still the owner of a big house, which he had, when affluent, built to live in.

In those good old days lime and mortar were unknown, and houses were generally built of mud, and Aikusetti's mansion was no exception to the rule, and in an unusually severe winter a great portion of the back of it had fallen down. Weeping much over the damages that the rains had done, and true to his love for the only property left to him in this world, he gave orders for its repair. In those days, when labour was very cheap and the cost of materials extremely low, repairing a house was not a difficult undertaking. Half a dozen coolies mixed some water and clay and made some balls of mud, and, heaping these one over the other, soon patched up the gaps.

Now Aikusetti's house was a large one, and a thief, who had no idea of the real state of Aikusetti's wealth, was led astray by the size of his mansion, and so on a certain night, soon after the repairs had been made, he bored a hole into the back wall. But unfortunately for the scoundrel, the weight of the still undried mud of the repaired part of the wall descended upon him just as he was putting his head in, and before he could withdraw it, the weight of the whole wall was on his neck, and he died without a struggle. As this took place in a corner at the back of the house, the inmates knew nothing of it till their attention was called to it in the following manner:

The thief had spoken about his intended adventure to a comrade, who, missing him and suspecting something wrong, had been searching for him for nearly two days when he discovered

11 His death is mentioned in Ch. 45 of the Žafarnâma, where these events are likewise recorded.
the body sticking out of the wall of Ankuṣṭhī's house. He at once preferred a complaint before the king, that Ankuṣṭhī had killed his comrade. At that time an extremely stupid king, named Mahāṃudha ('great fool'), reigned over the kingdom of Puṣgālinir, who was surrounded by equally stupid ministers; and as soon as the complaint was made, he ordered his servants to arrest Ankuṣṭhī at once, and in due course the poor merchant stood before the king! Said the king: — "Why did you raise up a wet wall, and thereby kill a thief?"

"Your excellent Majesty!" said the poor merchant. "It was not my mistake. The cooly whom I engaged for the repairs built the wall. He must account for it.

The cooly was at once summoned and questioned. Said the king: — "Why did you, O cooly, make the wall wet, and thereby cause the death of a man?"

Said the cooly: — "Most gracious king! It was not my mistake. The cooly who handed me the mud for raising the wall, gave it me mixed with more than the usual quantity of water."

At once the second cooly too was summoned. Said the king: — "Why did you give mud mixed with an unusual quantity of water, and thereby cause the death of a human being?"

Said the second cooly: — "Most mighty sovereign! It was not my mistake. The pot from which I was using the water, had a wide mouth, and so while I was engaged in my business, more than the proper quantity fell out and made the mud watery. So the potter who made the pot, is responsible for the mistake."

The potter was at once sent for and questioned. Said the king: — "Potter! Why did you make the mouth of the pot wide, and thereby cause the death of a human being?"

Said the potter: — "Most supreme sovereign! It was not my mistake that the mouth of the pot was so wide. The day on which I was shaping that pot on my wheel, I noticed a dancing-girl passing along the street. My attention was thus diverted. Though my hand was engaged in the work, my mind was absent from it, and the mouth of the pot became wide. So she is responsible for the mistake."

The dancing-girl was at once summoned. There was some difficulty at first in finding out the exact girl, but the potter, who had observed her minutely, gave a complete description of her, and she stood before His Majesty. But she had taken care previously to attire herself in her best clothes, and to wear her choicest jewels. Said the king: — "Why did you, vile woman, pass by the potter on the day on which he was shaping his pots, and divert his attention, which made the mouth of the pot wide, and thereby indirectly you caused the death of the thief?"

Said the dancing-girl: — "Most beautiful king! I had given a jewel to be set by a goldsmith, and I was proceeding to demand it from him. Had he returned it in time, I would never have left my house. So he is the cause of the death!

The king, who was already pleased by her address, now summoned the goldsmith for his explanation. The goldsmith argued that a small quantity of gold was wanting for the jewel he was resetting, and that he had been very careful to demand it often and often from a Komaṭṭi who traded in the higher metals. As he refused to give it in time, he was delayed in preparing the jewel. The Komaṭṭi was at once summoned, and as he belonged to a class of people not generally intelligent, he had no excuse. The king and his ministers at once set him down as the person responsible for causing the death of the thief, and passed orders that he should be driven to the stake, and impaled, for causing the death of the thief!

Thus usually ends the story, to which is generally attached the moral: — "Never live in the Kingdom of the Tughlaqs." It is also said that the ministers commented upon the Komaṭṭi's stoutness, a peculiarity of the class brought on by want of exercise and sedentary habits, and said that that also showed he was the proper person for the stake; hence the proverb, — Kalaurukkettu Komaṭṭi, — "the Komaṭṭi that suits the stake."
To the above story, the ingenuity of Southern Indian story-tellers has given a clever additional point, to bring into prominence the king's extreme stupidity.

When the innocent Komasthi, who had failed to give the gold in time, was ordered to the stake, no one thought the punishment unjust except two men, for such was the supreme stupidity that reigned throughout that whole kingdom of Puñganur! These two were the greatest of rogues, but for all their bad character they pitied the innocent victim of Puñganur logic, which argued that the fittest person for capital punishment was the most rotund of body! So they picked up a sham quarrel between themselves, in the hope of averting the evil fate of the innocent Komasthi jeweller, and purposely made so much noise as to attract the attention of the king and his officers.

Said the king: — "What are you fools making all this noise for on such an occasion?"

Said the first rogue: — "Most Gracious Majesty! It has been pronounced by eminent astrologers that whoever gives up his life at the stake on this occasion, is destined to be re-born as the king of Puñganur! I want to go to the stake, but this wretched fellow won't let me, as he is so anxious to go himself."

Then turning to the second rogue, he continued. "Out upon you, you fool, you shall not forestall me. I am stronger than you!"

Said the second rogue, pretending to disregard the presence of the king: — "If you think that I am weak, there is my sovereign to support me."

Then turning towards the king, he said: — "Most Gracious Majesty! Let me be driven to the stake meant for the Komasthi; for then I shall be re-born as a king. What is the use of being for ever poor and miserable? Better give up life with a cheerful countenance, than bear all the miseries of poverty. Death is troublesome only for a moment; but poverty is troublesome for the whole term of life. So, I appeal to your graciousness to order this person to be taken away to prison for assaulting me, and to permit me to proceed to the stake in the place of the Komasthi."

Letting the rogues go on fighting with each other, the king deliberated for a while and then broke silence: — "None of you wretches shall usurp my kingdom! What! Are you fools, that you attempt such impossibilities? I will never have my throne occupied by such paupers as you! Let the Komasthi be released! I shall myself proceed to the stake, and be re-born again as the king of my own country."

So saying, the king gladly had himself impaled, while his stupid ministers cheered! Thus the foolish king gave up his life, and the rogues, who by their tricks could bend his subjects to any of their whims, easily got possession of the kingdom, and reigned as king and minister!

FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. FR. D'PENHA.

No. 6. — The Children of Vows.

There was once a baker who used to supply the king of the country with bread and confectionery, and amassed a large fortune. One day the king, who had no children, asked the baker how many children he had. The baker answered: — "Sire, like yourself I have none."

"Then, what will you do with all the wealth you are accumulating?" said the king.

"Come, let us both go to Church, and make a vow in order to obtain children. Should a daughter be born to you, and a son to me, you must give your daughter in marriage to my son; if, again, a daughter is born to me, and a son to you, I will give my daughter in marriage to your son." The baker, of course, did not like to offend the king, and so he gave his assent to the king's proposal.
Accordingly one day they both went to Church, and made a vow, each promising to give his child in marriage to the other, in case the sexes differed. Some time after this, the queen, and also the baker's wife, became pregnant. The baker's wife was confined first, and brought forth a boy. The baker, greatly rejoiced at his good fortune, at once made off to the palace, and informed the king that a son was born to him. Two or three days later, the queen was confined of a girl, to the great regret of the king, who did not even inform the baker of the occurrence. But on the day of the queen's confinement there was a great bustle in the palace, which made the baker suspect something, and so he asked one of the maids what was the matter, and she frankly told him that the queen had been confined of a girl.

When the boy was old enough, the baker sent him to school, and spared neither pains nor money to give him a fitting education, and he was the pride of his parents. Many years passed, and the king's daughter became marriageable, but the idea of giving a king's daughter in marriage to even a wealthy baker's son preyed upon the mind of the king, and he determined by some means or other to get out of it. With this object, one day he said to the baker:—

"I believe your son is now well grown, and it will be interesting to know if he is being educated." "Yes, sire," replied the baker; "the boy goes to school, and I spare neither pains nor money to educate him well." "But," interrupted the king; "that sort of education will not do. You must fit out a ship, and send him to a distant country with merchandise, and see how he succeeds. That is the sort of education you must give, for it will make a man of him."

"Very well," said the baker; "I will act up to your advice."

Going home, the baker at once set to work to build a ship. He hired numerous workmen, and a job that usually takes some months to complete, he got done in a few days. He then loaded the ship with costly merchandise, and ordered his son to go to a certain country, and there to trade at what profit he could. The son, always obedient to his father, at once embarked on board the ship and set sail. When he arrived at his destination, he did business at an immense profit for two or three years, and then returned home with every expectation of marrying the king's daughter. Before leaving the place he bought some rarities, in the way of clothes, jewellery, and such like, for his intended wife, which he packed in a box. Half-way home he received information that his intended bride had been married to another person, a king's son. This so disheartened him that he had a mind to throw the box of presents overboard, but when he reached his native shore he opened the box, and to his great astonishment discovered that everything had disappeared! He only found in it a very small packet of paper, which he took up and put in his pocket, without even looking at its contents! On his arrival home, his parents welcomed him with great kindness, and told him how the king had violated his vow, but he pretended not to pay heed to what they said. After his arrival he never stayed at home a single hour, but daily visited his old friends and acquaintances, with whom he spent the day, and came home late in the evening.

One day he paid a visit to his promised wife, the princess, at her house, and remembered all the rarities he had brought for her, which had been miraculously changed into the small packet he still had in his pocket. He thought to himself: — "I brought all those rarities to give to her. What can I do with them now? What use are they to me? I will give her their substitute."

So thinking, he pulled out the packet and handed it to her, and she, thinking it contained only sweets or something of the kind, laid it aside. They sat and conversed together for a long time, till it was very nearly time for her husband to return. The baker's son then rose to bid her good-bye, and as he was about to shake hands with her, he fell on her neck and died! She was at a loss to know what to do, and how to dispose of the corpse. She, however, dragged it to her room, and covered it up on a cot.

Now, the princess had an express order from her husband that, as soon as she had finished her domestic duties, she was to dress herself up in her jewellery against his arrival. But on this
day, as most of her time had been taken up in conversation with the baker's son, she could not obey her husband's orders promptly. She now hurried through her work, and whilst she was still arranging her toilet, her husband came home. He enquired how it was she was not ready to receive him as usual, and why she looked so full of anxiety. She did not know what to say, and looked quite confused. Her husband then said to her: — "Do not be afraid, but tell me what is the matter with you." Upon this she took heart, and said: — "Should a friend happen to come and see me, am I not supposed to speak to him?" "Certainly, you are allowed to speak to your friend," said her husband; "what then? Tell me everything." She was further encouraged to speak, and told her husband everything: how the baker's son had come to visit her, how when he was wishing her good-bye he fell on her neck and died, and how, being unable to carry the corpse, she dragged it to the cot, where it still was. Her husband then said: — "Is this what you were afraid of to tell me? Get an empty box, and leave the rest to me. I will dispose of the corpse with little trouble."

Late at night, her husband, putting the body of the baker's son in the box, carried it to the baker's house. He then set the corpse up in a standing position against the door, and called out to the baker twice or thrice, addressing him as father, and then ran away. The baker, who had already gone to sleep, awoke, and, thinking that his son had called out, opened the door, upon which the corpse fell upon the floor. The poor baker saw his son was dead, and thought he himself had killed him, through his carelessness in opening the door. He and his wife burst into cries and tears which brought the neighbours to their house, and at dawn preparations were made for the funeral of the baker's son.

Now, the princess, as her husband was going out, asked him if he was not going to attend the funeral. He said he had some urgent affairs which prevented him from doing so, but that she herself might attend. So when he had gone, the princess began arranging to go to the funeral. She now thought of the packet the baker's son had given her on the previous day, and determined to eat some of the sweets she thought it contained. So she went to the place where she had put it, but, to her utter astonishment, in place of the packet she found clothes and jewels of the rarest kind and of exceedingly high value. Looking over these things, she found a complete dress for a bride, and thought how great must have been his love for her, and that it must have been that love that killed him. She, therefore, determined to wear that bridal dress at the funeral. In this fashion she started for the baker's house.

When the neighbours, who had assembled for the funeral, saw her, they began to matter among themselves: — "Yes, these were the children of vows, but it was very unfortunate that the king violated his vow," and such like expressions. The princess went up to the corpse, and stooped to look in its face, and, with her head inclined on the breast of the baker's son, remained motionless for a very long time. The people thought she did this through grief, and so they told her to be more moderate in her sorrow, saying: — "Poor princess, how sorry she is for him. Enough, enough, good lady; such has been your fortune!" Still she would not lift up her head from the breast of the baker's son, and so they took her by the arm, but the princess was dead!

They then sent information to her father the king, and to her husband, who came in all haste. On all sides the talk was that they were the children of vows, and the people said one to another: — "No wonder that death has come to both in this manner! Are they not children of vows?" At last it was decided to bury them side by side; which done, everyone returned home.

Now, it happened that on the third night after the funeral the baker had a vision, in which he saw his son, who thus spoke to him: — "Father, have a grand feast celebrated in the Church at your expense. On the day of the festival, during the ceremonies at the Church, let my mother kneel on the grave of the princess, while you kneel on my grave."

In the morning the baker, thinking it was only a dream, did nothing; but he saw the same vision for several nights consecutively, and so suspected that there must be something in it. So he told some of his neighbours about it, who all advised him to celebrate the feast.
The idea of celebrating a feast, when scarcely a week had passed since his son's death, was highly repulsive to the baker's mind; but, owing to the repeated visions, and the instigation of his neighbours, he appointed a day for the feast. Grand preparations were made, both in the Church, in the way of decorations, music, and so forth, and also at his house, to entertain the innumerable guests who were invited. On the day fixed for the feast, hundreds of guests came, and all repaired to the Church to attend at the Holy Sacrifice of Mass, during which the baker knelt on his son's grave, while his wife knelt on that of the princess. The king and queen, and the husband of the late princess, were also present at the service.

When it was about half over, the graves opened, and all the multitude in the Church saw the baker's son and the princess issue forth from their graves, as lively as if nothing had happened to them. All the people were filled with wonder, and spoke with one voice: — "Are they not children of vows? See how they died, and now, behold! they have come to life again together! They truly deserve to be united in marriage."

All were of one opinion, and the king also gave his assent, and the late husband of the princess deferred to the people. They were, therefore, duly married on that very day, amid great rejoicings, and lived happily to a very old age!

---

**MISCELLANEA.**

**SOME NAMES AND DATES FROM UNPUBLISHED INSCRIPTIONS.**

Mr. Fleet has placed at my disposal several bundles of rough rabblings of inscriptions, which were handed over to him by Sir Alexander Cunningham. From the materials thus supplied to me, I have already edited in this Journal seventeen inscriptions, and have got ready for publication two others which, with Mr. Fleet's permission, will appear in the *Epigraphia Indica*. I shall now give a short account of some other inscriptions from the same collection, which the imperfect state of the rabblings prevents me from editing in full. The characters of all these inscriptions are Nagari, and the language of all is Sanskrit.

1. — An apparently well preserved inscription inside the east entrance of the great temple of Udaypur in Gwalior. Six lines. The writing covers a space of 1' 6½" broad by 11' high, and the size of the letters is 1¼". This inscription gives us for Udayaditya of Malava the date Vikrama 1137 = A. D. 1580.¹

2. — Another inscription inside the east entrance of the great temple of Udaypur in Gwalior. Fourteen lines. The writing covers a space of 1' 3½" broad by 1' 5¼" high, and the size of the letters is about 1¼". The rabbling is throughout exceedingly indistinct.

L. 1. [Om] saṁvat 1288 varṣe Kārtti- [ka^]-sudi
2. ... Su(sukra)  · dēva-ar[ī]-[Ū]ḍa[ś]- eva[śva]ra²
3. [sahmiṇḍhau] ............
4. āri-Dēvapāl[a]-kalyān-
5. na-vījāyāṇyē
3.— Another inscription inside the east entrance of the great temple of Udaypur in Gwalior. Fifteen lines. The writing covers a space of 1' broad by 1' 7½" high, and the size of the letters is about 1¼".

L. 1. [Om] saṁvat 1289[?9?] varṣe
2. Mārga-vadi 3 Gura[a][dy-ē]-
3. [ha U]dayapuré saṃasta-rajas-
4. vaṭ-ma[ś]-[al-ṅi]ta-pa[ramba]-
5. [t̄a]ra[ka]-mahāra[j]ahir-
6. ja-āri-Dēvapāl[ē]-

The Devapāladeva of this inscription and of the preceding one, is clearly the Devapāladeva of Dhāra, whom from the Harṣaṇī (or Charwā) inscription we know to have ruled in the Vikrama year 1275. See ante, Vol. XIX. p. 24, No. 11.

4. — An inscription inside the fort of Rāhatgadh in the Central Provinces (Archæol. Survey

of India, Vol. X. p. 31). Fourteen lines. The writing apparently is very rudely engraved, and covers a space of 2’ broad by 1’ 9’’ high. The size of the letters is about 1’’.


3. śrimad-Devāyāna mahārājādīśvara-śrīnayā Jaya[śiṁ]hādeva,


This inscription tells us that in the Vikrama year 1312 the Mahārajādīśvara, ruling at Dīhra, was Jaya[śiṁ]hādeva.3 The exact date corresponds to Monday, the 23th August, A.D. 1556.

5. — An inscription inside the east entrance of the great temple of Udaypur in Gwalior. Nine lines. The writing covers a space of 1’ 1’’ broad by 1’ 4’’ high, and the size of the letters is about 1’’.


This inscription, therefore, apparently is of the reign of another Mahārajādīśvara Jayasimhādeva, who was ruling over Udayapura (and probably Dīhra) in the Vikrama year 1366.

6. — Another (fragmentary) inscription inside the east entrance of the great temple of Udaypur in Gwalior. Portions of four lines. The writing covers a space of 9’’ broad by 5’ high, and the size of the letters is about 1’’.


It is impossible to say whether the Hari- rāja[dēva?] of this inscription was a royal personage, or a private individual.

7. — A fragmentary and apparently much damaged inscription, stated to be from Kūdā near Bachhauandgāth (Archaeol. Survey of India, Vol. VII. p. 211). Portions of twenty-five lines. The existing writing covers a space of about 2’ broad by 2’ high, and the size of the letters is about 1’’’. The inscription is in verse and has reference to the Kalachuri rulers of Ratnapur.

It is particularly interesting for the concluding words —

Kalachuri-saṅvatsara 893 rāja-ārimat Prithvīdeva-[rājya?] —

which, for Prithvīdeva II. of Ratnapur, gives us the new date Kalachuri 893 = A. D. 1141-42 (see ante, Vol. XVII. p. 138). Besides, I notice in the body of the inscription the following names: —

L. 1. . . . . Kalachuri-

2. . . . . Lāchhalla-dīvi mahāhi bha-bhava ;

3. . . . . śrī-Ra[tndēvaḥ?] 7. . . . . Vallabharāja-nāmā

8. — Another fragmentary inscription, stated to be from Akaltār (Archaeol. Survey of India, Vol. VII. p. 211). Portions of twenty-six lines. The existing writing covers a space of from 10’’ to 1’’ 5’’ broad by 2’ high, and the whole breadth of the inscribed surface must have been about 3’. The size of the letters is between 1’’ and 1’’. Like the preceding, the inscription is in verse and has reference to the Kalachuri rulers of Ratnapur. I notice the following names: —

L. 4. [Ra[r]tndēvas-tataḥ || 6. . . . Harigaṇa iti nāma tasya sūmṛ= babhava ||


20. . . . śrī-Prithvīdeva-diharanīpatayā .

21. [Ra[r]tndēvas-uripatiḥ .

23. . . . Jayasimhādeva .

The inscription was composed by Dēvapāni (line 25) and engraved by Pālāhaka (line 26).

9. — An inscription stated to be from Muham-madpur. Twenty-seven lines. The writing covers a space of about 2’ 1’’ broad by 1’ 5’’ high; the upper portion of it appears to have greatly suffered, but the lower (apparently historical) part seems to be fairly well preserved. The size of the letters is about 1’’’. This inscription also is in verse and has reference to the Kalachuri rulers of Ratnapur. The rubbing is so very indistinct that I can only here and there make out a few names.

inscription, unfortunately, is very indistinct in the rubbing, but it may have to be read —


which, by the pūraṇa’s reckoning, would correspond to Friday, 8th January, A. D. 1255.

19. ... śrīmān=Vallabharājaḥ ...
Prīthvīdeva ...

10. — A fragment of an inscription from Tewar, measuring about 10” broad by 7” high, and containing portions of eleven lines in characters of about the 12th century, has in —

L. 4. māhā-samundrāt=sārdhaṃ Šriyā sama-bhavad-buri Bhimapālaḥ!
7. ... Tripuriya-chatauhpāthā 1 ...
8. ... nivāsah śrī-Simhapuryyām ...

11. — An inscription stated to be at Chandere on the Sūn river, Rewa (Archaeol. Survey of India, Vol. XIII, p. 8). The rubbing is in two parts, and looks as if the inscription were on two separate slabs of stone. The writing of either part covers a space of 3° 2’’ broad by about 1° 4’’ high. The first part contains fourteen, the second part thirteen lines. The size of the letters is about 1/2. The inscription ends with a date which by Mr. Beglar was read ‘Samvat 324 Phālguṇa-sudi 6,’ and the year of which was altered by him to Samvat 1324. I read the date —

Samvat 724 Phālguṇa-sudi 6 —

and, referring it to the Kalachuri era, make the year equivalent to A. D. 972-3. The writing, in my opinion, undoubtedly belongs to the 10th or 11th century A. D.

The inscriptions is in verse. It apparently is of no historical importance, but refers to a line of sages which is mentioned also in the large Bhārhi inscription of the rulers of Cheddī, and a fuller account of some members of which is furnished by an inscription at Banā (or Narō) which has been edited in the Journal Beng. As. Soc., Vol. XVI, pp. 1080-88, and will be re-edited by myself in the Epigraphia Indica. So far as I can make out, the inscription records the building of a tank by a sage Praṣāntasiva, and its restoration by a disciple of the sage. In the rubbing before me, I notice the following names:

L. 5. ... Śrīman-Mattamayūra-santattir-iyah ... Purandara ...
6. ... Bīkhāśīvāḥ ... Tasman-Mahānūt-pātēḥ ...
7. ... Praṣāntasiva ...
8. ... Praṇātanī...
9. ... Būna-Nada-sangamē ... 

The inscription was composed by the poet Dhānsaṭa, the son of Jēśa and Amākī, and grandson of Mēkha (lines 24 and 25); and engraved by Dāmōdara, the son of Lakṣmīdhara and younger brother of Vāsudēva.

I may as well draw attention here to a note on page 5 of Archeol. Survey of India, Vol. XIII, according to which there is in the Asiatic Society's collection a rubbing of an inscription from Makundpur, which is near Chandre, dated in (apparently Cheddī) Samvat 792.

Göttingen.

F. KIELBORN.

PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP.

No. 22.

Journal of the Eastern Section of the Russian Archaeological Society.1

(a) PROCEEDINGS.


(b) ARTICLES.

(i) I. P. Minaye: Salvation according to the doctrine of later Buddhists. This is the first part of an article which contains the Sanskrit text of the Bōdhicharyavatārā of Sāntīdeva.2 The

1 Zapisy Vostochnoy Otdeleniiy Imperatorskoy Rossiyskoy Arkeologicheskoy Obchestva, Vol. IV, fasc. III. and IV, (2 plates).
2 This book has found a place in a compilation called Aiboksōninačīśa, which occupies the ninth chapter. Mś. of it are to be found also in Paris, Bibl. Nationale, D. 85, Born. 90; in Cambridge, Add. 889; in Calcutta (palm-leaf), cf. Hājīendirālī Mishra, Sansk. Budd. Lit. of Ṛṣāy, 47-48; and in Kāthmādi, cf. C. Bendall, A Journey in Nāpāl, p. 20. (old MS. of the

XIIIth and XIVth Centuries). A short commentary on this book and the Sikhāsamuchchaya by Vēṭtā is mentioned by Tārānātha (Waṣsilif, Buddhism, III, 229). We take the opportunity of rectifying a little misunderstanding in the last Notice of the Zapisy. Prof. Minaye quite agrees with Prof. Peterson in the identification of Chandragum with Chandragum. — [Zapisy = the Journal of the Imperial Russian Archaeological Society. — E. C. T.]
is based on an Arabic version, going back to a Pahlavi original. Some time afterwards I found in the British Museum a Persian MS., one of the many valuable acquisitions of Mr. Sidney Churchill, which gave a complete text of the non-Christian version. I wrote about it to Baron Rosen, quoting the first two lines of the MS., where the author's name was given. Baron Rosen wrote a notice of it, identifying Ibn Babawaih and Mubhammad Ibn Zakaria with the well-known Arabic authors of the Xth Century A. D., Al-Kummi and Al-Rafa'i. At his instigation I prepared an account of the MS. At the end of last year appeared the second part of Prof. Ahlwardt's Catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Berlin Library, which contained the work of Ibn Babawaih mentioned in the Persian version. Baron Rosen wrote about it to Prof. Hommel, who, having got the MS., found, in accordance with Rosen's indications, the original of the Persian version. Prof. Hommel now promises us an edition of the Arabic text, which will be most valuable for the history of this renowned Buddhist-Christian legend. (See also Prof. Rehatsch's translation in the Journal of the R. A. S.)

(iii) **D. Kobeko: On the Question of the Site of Saraj, the Capital of the Golden Horde.** A critical review of some old documents bearing on the question. The existence of two Sarajes seems very probable: — Old Saraj (Ak-Saraj) now the village Solotrganoje, and the New Saraj (great Saraj) near Zaravy Pody. The article is illustrated by a little map showing the sites of the two Sarajes.

(iv) **N. Ostroumov: Elegy on the Death of Urmán Bek (Text and translation, with introduction).** Urmán Bek was the fourth and favourite son of Khudáyár Kháán and his mother was the daughter of the Regent of Darváz. He was born in 1665, his mother dying shortly after his birth, and was educated by another of his father's wives, named Agacha-áan. In 1879 Urmán Bek went to Tashkand, where he died in 1883, aged 19 years. The author of this simple, but touching elegy is unknown.

(v) **Baron V. Tiesenhausen: Oriental Coins in N. P. Linevich's Collection.** This interesting collection belongs to Colonel N. P. Linevich, and was made in the environs of Merv, which seems to be a rich field for numismatical discoveries. The following dynasties are represented: — (1) Parthian: an inlaid drachma of probably Arsaces I., and two drachmas of Phraates II. (2) Sassanian: 2 silver coins of

---

Bahrám V. (3) Saffawi: a copper coin of Azádúddin Abd'ul-Muzaffar bin Harb; the coin is to be placed between 812 and 822 A. H. (4) Sámání: locs of Türkistan, Khwárizm Sháh, Ghaznávis, Ghüris, Saljuqs of Persia, Simjars, Changásis, Huláqis, Kerts, Timúris, Shaibánis, Khán of Khvá, Khán of Bukhárá, Sháh of Persia, Amirs of Afghanistan, and coins of Eastern Türkistan. Fifty of the specimens are inedited. Two plates and many cuts illustrate the article.

(vi) A. M. Pozdnejev: Kalmuck Tales (II. and III.). We must wait till the end of this publication to give a detailed account of these tales. It will suffice now to explain the way in which they were collected. In 1874 Prof. Pozdnejev was sent on a scientific mission to the steppe of the Kalmucks (Qalmáq) of Astarákhán, where he collected folktales, and in nine successive journeys completed a large collection. Of the 98 tales he collected, 35 belong to the Ulus of Málodberjetj, one to the Ulus of Ikitokhor, and two to Başazokhor. He got a Kalmuck to recite the tales, while another wrote them down. To his 38 tales, Prof. Pozdnejev adds four tales brought from the Kalmuck steppe by Prof. Golstunsky.

(c) Notes and News.

(i) W. P. Vassilief: Contributions to a Chronology of Changá Khán and his Successors. This gives some dates from the history of Buddhism in Tibet by Sumba Kutukhta from 1162-1296 A. D., the former date being the year of the birth of Changá.

(ii) W. P. Vassilief: Queries and Doubts. (1) The name Changá is a corruption of Tiansi, "given by Heaven." The name of the dynasty, Mongu, is Chinese, meaning "one who has received the restitution of old rights." (2) In the well known document from Darbamala written in the quadrangular Mongol character, we must, most probably, understand A-li-ke-un the Musulmán and not the Christians. (3) The Yasa of Changás is not a code of laws, but a collection of sayings of the emperor, such as were collected after the death of every Bögd Khan. These collections are incumbent on the scientific comity.

(iii) A. O. Ivanowski: On some Chinese objects in the Archaeological Museum of the University of Tomsk. This consists of some coins, medals, two mirrors, and some Buddhist bells from Kulja.

(iv) S. F. Oldenburg: Nepalese MSS. in the Petersburg Libraries. This is a List of ten (Sanskrit and Newari) MSS. (1) Arjánámásañgitika (2) Dharmakaushmínaváda. (3) Deyga-

(v) W. A. Shoukofsky: A Song of Násiri Khusrav. A delightful treasure of the famous Persian poet in text and translation.

(vi) S. F. Oldenburg: Mention of a Representation of a Buddhist Drama. A text from the Avadánakatala (Avadána 75) where a buddhánapájakam is mentioned.

(vii) N. J. Marr: On the Question of Barlaam and Joasaph, from the Armenian Geography attributed to Verdan. This geography mentions three capitals of the realm of Avenir and Joasaf: firstly, Sinapata (or Sinavatan), where they lived; secondly, Mindan (or Omndan); and thirdly, Bedar. The question of the date of the Armenian prose version of the Barlaam and Joasaf legend is far from being settled, and most probably it is earlier than the Xvth Century.

(viii) Baron V. Rosen: Additions to the question of Ibn-Bakraváth and Barlaam. — See above, p. 85.

(ix) Baron V. Rosen: Did the author of the Fihrist live in Constantinople in 988 A. D.? This notice corrects a misinterpretation of the text of the Fihrist, which seemed to prove that An-Nádim, the author of the Fihrist, was in Constantinople in 988 A. D. The confusion arose from taking Dár-ar-Rám to mean Constantinople. Baron Rosen proves Dár-ar-Rám to designate a certain locality in Bagdad.

(x) Baron D. Günsburg: "Les fils d'Aissou." Note on a passage in the work of Amédée in the Mémoires des Membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire, Vol. IV. The "fils d'Aissou" are the "sons of Esau."

(d) Reviews.


(ii) Abrandenko, G. A.: Leisure hours in Turkistán, 1874-1889. A collection of articles written between 1874 and 1889 by a high official in Turkistán. They deal with various questions of life and administration in Turkistán, and give most valuable information to everybody who wishes to know Central Asia.
(iii) David and Mher. Very interesting Armenian popular legends of the heroes of Sasun in the country of Mush.


(v) The Ethnographical Review, fasc. ii. (1889). Contains a very interesting and carefully compiled bibliography. To be noticed here are an article by W. F. Miller, Echoes of Iranian legends in the Caucasus, and an article by M. A. Khakhanof on “Persian epics in Georgian translations.” This last is quite unsatisfactory and untrustworthy.

(vi) Arkhangeysky. Muhammadan Cosmogony. (Forty questions put to Muhammad by Jewish scholars). This is a translation from the Turkish, and is far from being trustworthy. The reviewer gives some instances of very puzzling renderings of the original. The introduction is a useless compilation.

(vii) Kitab Kalilah wa Dimnah, translated from the Arabic text by M. Altayn and M. Biabini, with an introduction explaining the history of the book. The translation is on the whole trustworthy, but more accuracy, especially in the philosophical passages, is much to be desired. Corrected translations of many passages are given in the review.


(x) Collection of materials for a description of the countries and nations of the Caucasus, Vol. X., Tiflis, 1890. This is one of the many useful works on the Caucasus, published in Russia. In the first part of the book is a long article by M. Hahn: “Notions of Greek and Roman writers on the Caucasus, (pt. II.), Byzantine historians;” the second part of the volume contains many legends, songs and tales from different parts of the Caucasus.

(xi) Inscriptions de l’Énissei, Helsingfors, 1889. An edition of many of the enigmatic inscriptions in Siberia, the key to which is yet to be found. M. Yadrinzeif in his last journey to Karakorum found a good many of these inscriptions, and amongst them some that are bilingual, which will perhaps yield us the looked-for explanation.

(xii) Jacoub Artin. Pocha: L’Instruction Publique en Egypte. This is a very interesting publication.

(xiii) Recueil de textes et de traductions publié par les professeurs de l’École des langues Orientales vivantes. This forms one of the many interesting and useful publications of the well-known École des Langues Orientales Vivantes.


(xv) Th. Houtsma: Recueil de textes relatifs à l’histoire des Seljoucides, Vol. II., Histoire des Seljoucides de l’Iraq par al-Bunduri. Two most important publications by two well-known scholars. In noticing the second book the reviewer draws the attention to the word iji (page 133, 4-5) which with the signification of “elder brother” is to be found in the Calcutta Chughatai Dictionary.


(xvii) A. Mehren: Traité mystiques, &c. d’Avicenne, fasc. i. An interesting publication. The reviewer draws the attention of the editor to a MS. in the Asiatic Museum in St. Petersbourg, No. 842 a (cf. Mâl. Ar. IV. 37-39) where various tracts of Ibn-Sinâ are to be found.

(xviii) W. Pertsch: Verzeichniss der Türkischen Handschriften der Kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin. A valuable catalogue, edited with the well-known accuracy of Dr. Pertsch. Amongst other MSS. the reviewer mentions an interesting Tureco-Arabic and Mongol-Arabic glossary, of which he is preparing some extracts, collated with three Oxford MSS.

As these geographical publications are well known to the readers of the Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, we give only their titles here.
(xix) Riza Qouli Khan: Rids-al-'drif. An excellent taskirah full of important facts on the life and works of many writers. This is a posthumous work of the celebrated Persian scholar.

(xx) Weber: Ueber die Samyahlvakaamud. A very important question is raised by the author. The reviewer doubts the conclusions of the pamphlet. The Arabian Nights are not yet sufficiently known to allow of comparisons. To the episode of the wanderings of the king and his minister, some parallels in some versions of the Sīnūdandudattuvānīdī and the Prabandhachitūjanānī are adduced. In conclusion some parallels to the Arabian Nights are drawn from the Kitāb-i-Sindhūd and the Tūlīdundmān.

SERGIUS D'OLDENBURG.

St. Petersburg, May 1890.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

AN ORIENTAL STORY OF MOSES.

In Indian Notes and Queries, Note No. 789 in No. 45, Vol. IV., page 221, bears a remarkable resemblance to Sa'di's story of Moses in the Bustān; given also by Forbes amongst the stories in his Persian Grammar (Allen; Lond.; 1852, page 34 of the Persian App. 4, and pp. 153, 164 and 170 of the English portion). Briefly it is as follows:—One day Abraham espied a stranger in the desert, whose body was bent like a willow, and whose beard and head were white as snow with age. He invited him to his board, and as the B'lism'llah was muttered, it was found that the stranger was silent. Abraham enquired how it was that he had not joined in invoking God's blessing on the food, and was told that the stranger was a Zoroastrian. Abraham in zealous wrath expelled him from his tent. A voice, thereupon, came unto Abraham from on high, conveying this rebuke, "I have given him bread and life during a hundred years and you have not been able to bear with him for a moment," &c.

Dr. Forbes in pp. 164-70 of his Grammar seeks to trace in Sa'di's story the origin of Dr. Franklin's Imaginary Chapter of Genesis.

S. J. A. CHURCHILL.

CORRUPTIONS OF ENGLISH.

A—In Teluguāna.

In the Telugu country jānānuv is 'join from anywhere,' not necessarily 'from hospital.' That is rikāvarānu (recover). 'Discharge from hospital' is rikāvārabhāyī (imp.).

G. H. PRENDERGAST.

Masulipatam.

B—In Bombay.

The following are several of the corrupted English words now well imbedded in the ordinary Gujarātī language spoken by the Parsees and other Gujarātī-speaking people in this presidency.

1 See Pañjāb Notes and Queries, Vol. I., note 240.

2 The interchange of i and u is well known in North-India. Jālam-ashfīhmi for jānam-ashfīhmi is a good

kabīr, cupboard.

hāmult, harness.

kōt, court.

kōhī, school.

fālla, phaction.

brū-tāf, a bougham.

kārd, card.

pān-kārt, pack of cards.

dā-bāt, a steamer.

ispītal, hospital.

dākār, a doctor.

rākhī, railway.

nākēpēr, newspaper.

fēml, family.

hālī, hall.

rdā, reins.

nāt, note.

pālt, a party or gathering.

būltar, butler.

kōch, a couch.

kōcha, a coachman.

mānuṣ, man of war.

bhās, box.

pālīn, pantaloons.

wāskī, waistcoat.

kīst, kiss.

kīst-kātī, an embrace.

sākin, shake-hands.

kōhāl, a coquette.

rāsū, receipt.

gilī, gilt.

tawdī, towel.

pāltis, polish.

vīlōn, whalebone.

chīchākē, cheese-cake.

gērāp-shāt, grapeshot (meaning a lie or canard).

tārám, trunk.

shampīn, champagne.

trāp-sāgrī, a trooper.

tārī, trawl.

rījū, regiment.

hāndūkē, aide-de-camp.

dālī, a dole.

madām, an English lady (madam.)

jāīglā, an Englishman (a corruption from French anglaise).

thāsōn, station.

pīlā, playhouse.

matās, madhouse.

hīsētā, Inspector.

argīn, organ.

tōn-dāl, town-hall.

sāntī, sentry.

thāt-kīsī, third class.

gōvānd, governor.

C. M. O.

C—In the Pañjāb.

nīst, a list.

argīn, hurricane lamp.

sēptīl, a sherry and

bitter.

D—In Burma.

Hindustānīs say habitually:—

Rāmān, for Rangoon.

Bambō, for Bhamo.

(Bur. Yāngōn.)

(Bur. Bawmaw.)

Chināpādhr, for Chwetnāpā near Mandalay.

R. C. TEMPLE.

and common instance in the Himalayan Districts. — R. C. T.
SOCIAL CUSTOMS; MARRIAGE.

In China.

With reference to the following cutting regarding a Chinese legend as to the custom of throwing rice at weddings, is there any story or legend connected with the custom in India or Europe? —

The Chinese Times gives the following version of the origin of the custom of throwing rice at weddings: — In the days of the Shang dynasty, some 1,500 years before Christ, there lived in the province of Shansi a most famous sorcerer called Chao. It happened one day that one P'ang came to consult the oracle, and Chao, having divined by means of the tortoise diagram, informed the trembling P'ang that he had but six days to live. Now, however much we may trust the sagacity and skill of our family physician, we may be excused if, in a matter of life and death, we call in a second doctor for a consultation; and in such a strait, it is not to be wondered at that P'ang should repair to another source to make sure that there was no mistake. To the fair Peachblossom he went, a young lady who had acquired some reputation as a sorceress, and to the tender feminine heart unfolded the story of his woe. Her divination yielded the same result as Chao's; in six days P'ang should die, unless, by the exercise of her magical powers, she could avert the catastrophe. Her efforts were successful, and on the seventh day great was Chao's astonishment and still greater his mortification and rage, when he met P'ang taking his evening stroll and learned that there lived a greater magician than he. The story would soon get about, and unless he could quickly put an end to his fair rival's existence, his reputation would be ruined. And this was how Chao plotted against the life of Peachblossom. He sent a go-between to Peachblossom's parent to inquire if their daughter was still unmarried, and receiving a reply in the affirmative, he fooled the simple parents into believing that he had a son who was seeking a wife, and ultimately he induced them to engage Peachblossom to him in marriage. The marriage cards were duly interchanged; but the crafty Chao had chosen the most unlucky day he could select for the wedding, the day when the "Golden Pheasant" was in the ascendant. Surely as the bride entered the red chair, the spirit-bird would destroy her with his powerful beak. But the wise Peachblossom knew all these things, and feared not. "I will go," she said; "I will fight and defeat him." When the wedding morning came, she gave directions to have rice thrown out at the door, which the spirit-bird seeing, undue haste to devour, and while his attention was thus occupied, Peachblossom stepped into the bridal chair and passed on her way unharmed. And now the ingenious reader knows why he throws rice after the bride. If any interest has been engendered in his breast by this tale of the fair Peachblossom, let him listen to what befell her at the house of the magician. Arrived at Chao's house, no bridegroom was there, but an attendant was given her, and the two girls prepared to pass the night in the room assigned to them. Peachblossom was wakened, for she knew that, when the night passed, the "Golden Pheasant" would be succeeded by the evil star of the "White Tiger," whose power and ferocity who can tell? "Go you to bed first," she said to the maid. The girl was soon asleep, and still her mistress slept not, but continued to pace the room, and at midnight the tiger-spirit came and the morning light showed Peachblossom still pacing the room, while on the bed lay the lifeless body of the little maid. Thus were fought the magic battles of Peachblossom and Chao, and many more were there, until they took their flight to heaven, where now they reign as gods. And on earth the actors have not idols more prized than those of Peachblossom and Chao Kung.

R. C. Temple.

BOOK NOTICES.

The Kaushikasutra of the Atharvaveda, edited by

Students of Vedic literature will hail with delight this edition pronoce of the Kaushikasutra. A glance at the critical notes, which stand on every page of the beautifully printed text, will give the reader an idea how much patient labour was required in order to rescue this difficult book from oblivion and corruption. The Kaushikasutra occupies an almost unique place among the Vedic Sutras, as it treats chiefly of charms and omens. It is presupposed by the Vishnusutra, which is the Shrutasutra of the Atharvaveda; and though "a rather late product of the efforts to put into exact easily remembered form the traditional practices of the Atharvaveda," it contains a considerable amount of ancient Aryan superstitions, some of which can perhaps still be traced among the sister nations of Europe. It thus commands an international interest, besides its importance in the history of Indian language and literature. Professor Bloomfield's edition is based on eight MSS. and accompanied by extracts from the valuable commentary of
Dārila, the great-grandson of Vatsāsurman. In the existing MSS., this commentary goes only as far as about the first half of the text. Dārila and two other commentators, Rudra and Bhadra, are quoted in the paddhati of Kēśava. Extracts from this treatise on the ritual of the Kauśika-sītra are added in the Appendix (pages 307 to 372). Indices of proper names, technical terms, mantras and quotations, conclude the volume. A list of new contributions to the Vedic lexicon is included in the Introduction (pages xliii. to lvi.).

E. H.


We hasten to welcome this remarkably good addition to the periodical literature of the East, and to wish it every success. The names of its editors, Prof. Schlegel of Leiden and Cordier of Paris are indeed a guarantee of the excellence of its contents, and although periodicals dealing with matters Oriental are already numerous enough and a heavy burden on students with limited means, yet the papers in this first number of Toyng Pao show that it fills a vacant space and will supply us with information which we are not likely to meet with elsewhere.

It deals principally with China, but in this first number there are articles of great interest to Anglo-Indians, such as "The French in Burma in the Eighteenth Century," "To Yunnan via Tongking," and "Notes on a Journey to Yunnan."

The first of these articles is extremely interesting and most valuable at the present time, as it consists of "extracts from the log of the Royal Tender La Baleine, commanded by "le Sr. Flouest, Naval Lieutenant, from 12th February 1782 to 29th March 1788, with a description of the kingdom of Pegu, the manners, laws, religion, customs and commerce of the inhabitants of that country (paix)."

This journal is divided into two parts. The first consists of an account of the journey to and fro from Brest to Rangoon, and what may be called personal matters; and the second of a description of the country. With regard to these the author appears to have been so close an observer that we propose, if possible, to reproduce his remarks in full in the Indian Antiquary.

In the present number we are only taken as far as the arrival at Rangoon. Starting from Brest on 12th February 1782 with troops, M. Flouest sailed via Madeira and the Isle of France for India, sighting the Cocos Islands on 18th February 1783, and making the coast of Coromandel on 16th March, where he disembarked troops at Porto-novo.

The fleet, for in those days it was not safe for ships to travel alone, then made for Trincomalee (Tirukkōnamālai), but were chased en route by the "enemy," that is, a British Squadron! However, Trincomalee was safely reached on 11th April 1783.

After refitting, M. Flouest received orders to go to Pegu and left Trincomalee on the 11th August with troops for the coast of Coromandel. On the 12th September he left Pondicherry direct for Burma, passing the Andamans and the Cocos. On approaching Burma, he was much bothered by the currents and a want of knowledge of the coast, and goes into an elaborate description of "la manoeuvre qu'il faut faire pour monter" the River of Rangoon. He reached the mouth of the river on the 30th September, and the town of Rangoon at 11 a.m. on the 7th October.

The above outline of the journal is enough to show how instructive it will prove to readers at the present day.

The spelling of the place-names is interesting also, and shews how little it has changed in the century that has passed since he wrote. Thus we find Cocos, Achem (Acheen), Tranquevail, Madras, Porto Novo, Pegu (which shews that the French pronunciation of the name is nearer than ours), Adaman (Andamans), Chinabaker, Pointe de l'Elephant, and Rangon.

The notes on the journeys to Yunnan present quite a different point of interest. They consist of a letter from M. Leduc, dated 30th January 1890, and a reprint of an official report by M. Rocher, French Consul at Mongteze, published in "le journal officiel de la Republique Française" of 28th January 1890. This journal remarks on the commerce with Yunnan, the means of transport, the navigation of the Red River, the currency in use, the centres of trade, relations of the French with the people, communications with Tongking, and general observations.

Enough has now been said to shew how important are the contents of this new periodical, and while heartyly congratulating the editors on the literary success of their venture, we will only
further remark that the articles are accepted in French, English and German indifferently.


This little book is the embodiment of the observations of a very capable observer, made during a visit to the Mergui Archipelago in 1881 and 1882.

The first person to publish an account of the Archipelago was Capt. Thomas Forrest, in 1792, but he saw nothing of its very timid inhabitants. The first account of these people appeared in the official Calcutta Gazette in 1826, after the First Burmese War. They are there called 'Chalomes,' and their ill-treatment by their neighbours, the Malays, Burmese and Siamese, who used the Island as a hunting ground for slaves, is noticed.

Capt. Lloyd, who surveyed the Archipelago in 1838, gives an account of the 'Chillones,' a miserable, badly clothed and shy race, without agriculture, living in boats, in the open air and in temporary huts, on shell-fish, turtle and indigenous products, and doing a little barter for rice and coarse cloth. They are described, inaccurately of course, by the Rev. Mr. Kincade, a missionary whose attention was drawn to them at that time, as having no god and no religion. Dr. Hefter, who saw them in 1839 and calls them 'Selongs,' gives much the same account of them as Capt. Lloyd, and adds that they have a peculiar tongue. Broadfoot and Durand, both names famous in subsequent Indian History, tried up to as late as 1846 to do something for the poor 'Salones' and to turn them into Christians. In 1850 Mr. Logan wrote an account of them, and observed that they had nāt, spirits of the sea, land, air, trees and stones, which were offered to, but did not invoke or symbolise. It appears that they have always been taxed on their fishing operations, and that the Chinese, Malay, and other traders were allowed to first make them drunk and then rob them, up to 1881-82 at any rate.

So much for the history of the Selungs. In number they appear to be about 1,000. Their clothing is chiefly a loin-cloth, but coats cut in Burmese fashion are sometimes worn. Their dwellings are rickey leaf huts, built on low bamboo piles, of a type commoner in Burma than perhaps Dr. Anderson supposes from his description of them. Their boats are canoes, covered by peat thatched roofs, and have much the appearance of Burmese boats of the same class. Their diet is chiefly rice, when they can get it, but they frequently run out of their stock and take to what wild products they can gather. Their worship is exactly what one would expect in a people of their civilization, and the account given by Dr. Anderson of one ceremony he witnessed, is exceedingly interesting.

The industries and occupations of the Selungs are boat-building, harpooning the great devil-fish or eagle-ray, collecting biche-de-mer, molluscs, mother-of-pearl oysters and pearls, and "black coral" for barter and export. Honey and beeswax are also similarly collected; so are eagle-wood and edible birds' nests when procurable. The Selungs also keep dogs, their only domestic animal, with which they hunt the wild hogs of the Islands and barter the fat thus procured. The main occupation of the women is the making of the pandanus mats for which the Islands are famous.

Marriage is performed by consent of parents without much ceremony, and the young pair observe the common custom of dwelling with the parents of the bride till the birth of the first child. There is a ceremony at the naming of the child.

The health of the people seems to be fairly good, but small-pox and cholera make great gaps in their families. Sickness is ascribed to a malignant nāt, whom the medicine-man extracts from the sick person and takes into himself with liquor supplied him for the purpose. The nāt makes its exit by the arm and sometimes assumes the shape of a broken piece of glass. Here we have an instructive example of the world-wide savage belief in the external soul. The dead are exposed, not buried, either in their own boats or on a platform on an uninhabited island, and are apparently provided with clothing and other necessaries for the future life.

Physically, the people are probably a mixed race of Malay origin, the admixture being with Burmans and Karens. They are in no sense Negritos, as has been suggested. The average height is that of the Malays: 5 ft. 2 in. for the men, and 5 ft. for the women.

A Selung Language Primer was published at Maulmain by the missionaries in 1846, but nevertheless the study of the language seems to have been most limited. Their names for persons are derived from the Burmans, but otherwise their language seems to show no connection with Burmese. We have it, however, on the great authority of Dr. Rost, that it is a distinct Malayan tongue.

Lastly, we cordially agree with Dr. Anderson that any Deputy Commissioner of Mergui, who will take up the study, has a fine and almost unique field of research before him.
**SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION.**

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal for Sanskrit and Kanarese, (and, for the sake of uniformity, submitted for adoption, as far as possible, in the case of other languages), except in respect of modern Hindu personal names, in which absolute purism is undesirable, and in respect of a few Anglicised corruptions of names of places, sanctioned by long usage, is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>jha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ञ</td>
<td>ञ</td>
<td>nha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>ट</td>
<td>ट</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>uि</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>dha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>lि</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>थ</td>
<td>थ</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>घ</td>
<td>घ</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ङ</td>
<td>ङ</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ङ</td>
<td>ङ</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>च</td>
<td>च</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>छ</td>
<td>छ</td>
<td>cha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
<td>jna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>झ</td>
<td>झ</td>
<td>jha</td>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>dha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ञ</td>
<td>ञ</td>
<td>nha</td>
<td>ट</td>
<td>ट</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>tha</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>ड</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>ढ</td>
<td>dha</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>ण</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त</td>
<td>त</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>थ</td>
<td>थ</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>द</td>
<td>द</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>dha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>dha</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>न</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>प</td>
<td>प</td>
<td>pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>व</td>
<td>व</td>
<td>va</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भ</td>
<td>भ</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>म</td>
<td>ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ब्र</td>
<td>ब्र</td>
<td>bra</td>
<td>र</td>
<td>र</td>
<td>ra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>ल</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व</td>
<td>व</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>स</td>
<td>स</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श</td>
<td>श</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ष</td>
<td>ष</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>ठ</td>
<td>tha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ध</td>
<td>ध</td>
<td>dha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single hyphen is used to separate words in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen is only used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, as divided in the original Text, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line; intermediate divisions, rendered unavoidable here and there by printing necessities, are made only where absolutely necessary for neatness in the arrangement of the Texts.

A double hyphen is used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the euphonic rules of *sandhi*. Where this double hyphen is used, it is to be understood that a final consonant, and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel, are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it is to be understood of the orthography of the original, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the final consonant either has the modified broken form, which, in the oldest stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the *virda* attached to it; and that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form. In the transcription of ordinary texts, the double hyphen is probably unnecessary; except where there is the *sandhi* of final and initial vowels. But, in the transcription of epigraphical records, the use of this sign is unavoidable for the purpose of indicating exactly the palaeographical standard of the original texts.

The *avagraha*, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial a, is but rarely to be met with in inscriptions. Where it does occur, it is most conveniently represented by its own Devanagari sign.

So also practice has shown that it is more convenient to use the ordinary Devanagari marks of punctuation than to substitute the English signs for them.

Ordinary brackets are used for corrections and doubtful points; and square brackets, for letters which are damaged and partially illegible in the original, or which, being wholly illegible, can be supplied with certainty. An asterisk attached to letters or marks of punctuation were omitted altogether in the original. As a rule, it is more convenient to use the brackets than to have recourse to footnotes; as the points to which attention is to be drawn attract notice far more readily. But notes are given instead, when there would be so many brackets, close together, as to encumber the text and render it inconvenient to read. When any letters in the original are wholly illegible and cannot be supplied, they are represented, in metrical passages, by the sign for a long or a short syllable, as the case may be; and in prose passages, by points, at the rate, usually, of two for each *aksara* or syllable.
THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE EASTERN CHALUKYA KINGS.

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

(Continued from p. 15.)

VARIOUS passages, both in the Eastern Chalukya records and in those of some other dynasties, shew that, just as, after the period of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereignty, the later descendants of the Western Branch of the Chalukya family were specially known as "the lords of Kuntala," so the kings of the Eastern Branch were called distinctively "the lords of Veṅgi," from the territory which for so long a time formed the principal and favourite portion of their dominions. In the Eastern Chalukya records, that territory is called, sometimes, the Veṅgi or Veṅgi maṇḍala; sometimes, the Veṅgi dēsa; and sometimes, simply the land of Veṅgi (Veṅgi-mahā, and Veṅgi-bhū). One of the records (S.) mentions also a territorial division called the Veṅgināṇḍa vaiskaya; this, however, I should think, denotes, not the whole Veṅgi country, but a subdivision of it, lying round the town from which the kingdom took its name. In a Tamil inscription of the Chōla king Ko-Rājarāja-Rājakēśavarman, it is called the Veṅgi nācu (Hultzsch's South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. pp. 63, 65). The original boundaries of this tract of country appear to have been, towards the west, the Eastern Ghats, running from south-west to north-east; on the east, the sea-coast, running parallel to the Ghats; on the northern frontier, the river Gōdāvarī, running from north-west to south-east; and on the southern frontier, the river Kistna or Krishna, running almost parallel to the Gōdāvarī. The area thus enclosed would be roughly about eight thousand miles. And the proper Hindu name of this territory, — but perhaps of a larger area of which it only formed a part, — appears to be the Andhra or Andhra country. There are, however, indications that in subsequent times the Veṅgi country included a great portion of the territory on the north of the Gōdāvarī; the boundary line in that direction being then taken more in a straight line, almost due east, to the coast, from the place where the Gōdāvarī passes through the Ghats. On the north of Veṅgi lay the territory of the Gāṅgas of Kaliṅganagara; and on the south, that of the Pallavas of Kāṇchē; the more northern portions of whose dominions appear to have been rather quickly absorbed into the Eastern Chalukya country. On the west, the Eastern Chalukya dominions must have been coterminous with the territories that were held, first by their relations of the Western Branch, whose capital was Bādāmi; then by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkēś; and then by the Western Chalukyas of Kalyāṇ. As has been pointed out by previous writers, the name of Veṅgi, and probably an indication of the position of the original capital, is preserved in Veṅgi or Pedda-Vēṇgi, which is a village about seven miles north of Ellore (Elūru), the chief town of the Ellore Tāṅkē or Sub-Division of the Gōdāvarī District in the Madras Presidency, and about ten miles, to the north-west, from the Kāḷār or Kollēru lake, which would probably furnish, quite as well as any river, an ample water-supply for a city of size; it is shewn in the map, Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 94, as 'Pedavaigie,' in Lat. 16° 49', Long. 81° 10'. There is, however, another village close by, Chinna-Vēṇgi, — not entered in the map, — which, it seems, is just as likely to represent the ancient capital. Also, there are said to be extensive ruins and mounds, reaching from Pedda-Vēṇgi to Dēṇḍaḷūru, five miles to the south-east; and there is a tradition that Dēṇḍaḷūru once formed a part of the ancient city. Subsequently, the

---

1 The name occurs in both ways; with the long vowel ā, and also with the short vowel ē, in the second syllable; but it is most usually written with the long vowel. Dr. Burrell considered that the Tamil form, Veṅgi, indicates that properly the vowel is short; and that Veṅgi, like Kāṇchē, is a Sanskritised form.
2 maṇḍala and dēsa are technical territorial terms, evidently applied to rather extensive areas, and more or less synonymous; see Gupta Inscriptions, p. 32, note 7.
3 vaiskaya is another technical term, and seems to denote properly a subdivision of a maṇḍala or dēsa (loc. cit.)
4 nācu is the Drāvīdian equivalent of the Sanskrit dēsa. In composition, it occurs in the nasalised form of nācu; e.g. Veṅgiṇāṇḍa, and Valanāṇḍa. — Nāṭi, e. g. in Bengurunāṭi, seems to be another form of it.
5 See Dr. Burrell's South-Indian Palæography, second edition, p. 16, note, and Mr. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Madras, Vol. I. pp. 34, 36; also, for a small map of the Andhra country, Sir A. Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, p. 537. — The identification of Veṅgi with Pedda-Vēṇgi appears to be due to Sir Walter Elliot; but I am not able to refer to his paper on the subject.
capital was removed to Rājamandri or Rājamahendra Drapuram, on the north bank of the Gòdâvari, in Lat. 17°, Long. 81° 48', and about forty-five miles in a north-easterly direction from Pëdda-Vâgi; possibly this city was first occupied, under the Eastern Chalukyas, by Amma I., who held the birûla or secondary name of Râja-Mahâdra and was named after him.6 Dr. Burnell (loc. cit. note 6 above) tells us that in the Telugu Mahâbhârata, which belongs to the twelfth century A. D., Rājamahendra Drapuram is called the nāyaka-raina or "central gem" of the Veñgi country; this description of it supports, not only the removal of the capital, but also the inclusion before this time, in the original Veñgi country, of a good deal of the territory on the north of the Gòdâvari. The land of Veñgi, or the Andhra kingdom, was described by the Chinese pilgrim Huên Tsiang, in the seventh century A. D., under the name of An-to-lo; and it is supposed that he mentions Veñgi as its capital, by the name of Ping-ki-lo (Beal's Buddhist Records of the Western World, Vol. II. p. 217).7 The earliest epigraphical mention that we have of Veñgi, is in the Allahabad pillar inscription, in which the name of Hastivarman, king of Veñgi, occurs in the list of Samudragupta's conquests in Southern India (Gupta Inscriptions, p. 13); this reference belongs to the fourth century, A. D. And to some time between that date and the Eastern Chalukya period, we have to refer the mention of the town of Veñgitpurâ in the grant of the Silâkâyana Mahârâja Vîjayanandivarman, who issued his charter from that place (ante, Vol. V. p. 177). Also, to some date in the same interval belongs the grant of the Pallava Mahârâja Sihâhavarman, who, issuing his charter from the town of Daśamârapura, granted to some Brâhmaṇa the village of Mângadîr in Vêngorâshtra (ante, Vol. V. p. 157); this record seems to give a variant of the name of the Veñgi country, and to supply a link in its early history, before it passed into the hands of the Eastern Chalukyas. In the records of the Eastern Chalukyas themselves, the first use of the word Veñgi is in L., of the time of Amma I., which calls Vîjayaâditya II. "the lord of Veñgi (Veñgi-âna)"; and M., of the time of Chânâkya-Bhûma II., contains the first explicit statement, that the territory over which reigned Kûbja-Vishnûvardhana I. and his successors, was the Veñgi country.

The course of events which led to the establishment of the Eastern Branch of the Chalukya family in Veñgi, seems to have been this. Pulikâsin II. succeeded to the Chalukya sovereignty in A. D. 609 or 610 (see page 3 above). From Huên Tsiang's account (Buddh. Rec. West. World, Vol. II. p. 256, and Life, p. 146 f.) we know that he was at the head of a powerful and warlike nation. And from the Alhoje inscription (ante, Vol. VIII. p. 245) we learn that his conquests in Southern India extended right across the peninsula; he reduced the strong fortress of Pîşhâpurâ, which is the modern Pitâpuram in the Gòdâvari District, near the coast, and about eighty miles to the north-east of Pëdda-Vâgi; and he caused the leader of the Pallavas to shelter himself behind the ramparts of the city of Kânchî, which is the modern Conjeeveram, about forty miles south-west of Madras. In leading his armies so far away from home, he would need someone invested with authority to represent him fully in his own hereditary dominions. And for this purpose Vishnuvardhana I., his younger brother, was appointed Yuvâraja. This appointment was made in A. D. 615; and Vishnuvardhana I. was still holding the same post in A. D. 616 or 617. Probably during the campaign which included the conquest of Pitâpuram, and which must have taken place at this time, the Veñgi country was made a part of the Chalukya dominions; and the reference to the Pallavas, immediately after the mention of Pîşhâpurâ, has been understood as indicating that it was from their possession that Veñgi was taken. On the return of Pulikâsin II. to Bûlâmî, he would naturally depute Vishnuvardhana I. to administer the newly acquired

6 Mr. Sewell (loc. cit. p. 32) mentions two traditions about the origin of Râjamahendra Drapum: one connects it with Mahândrâla, son of Gántamadêra, a supposed early king of Orissa, and states that the city was then the southern capital of Orissa; the other connects it with a Chalukya king named Vîjayaâditya-Mahâandra.

7 Dr. Burnell (loc. cit.) considered that the last syllable is the Chinese representation of the name is "merely the locative suffix of the Telugu noun, naturally mistaken by the worthy Chinese pilgrim monk for a part of the word. So the Portuâuguese called Sâla-pas, — Chalâsita, using the inflected form of the name.

8 Viśiṭra, usually translated by "country," is another territorial term. It occurs also in Mahârâsha; and it seems to belong properly to only rather extensive areas.
territory, in the same capacity of Yuvardja. And then, — whether it came to pass through
a formal division of the kingdom by mutual consent, because it was too extensive to be
managed as a whole; or whether there was a distinct act of rebellion on the part of the
younger brother, — in no great length of time, — at any rate before A. D. 632, — Vishnu-
vardhana I. became established on the eastern coast as an independent sovereign, and founded
there the Eastern Branch of the family, which held that part of the country for five centuries
at least, and remained distinct from and independent of the Western Branch, down to the
latest times of both the dynasties.

The successive members of the Eastern Branch of the family, taken for the most
part in the order in which they followed each other on the throne, irrespective of their actual
places in the genealogy were as follows:—

1. — Vishnuvardhana I.; Kubja-Vishnuvardhana.

Eighteen years; A. D. 615 to 633.

He was a younger brother of the Western Chalukya king Satyavarman II.; his father
was Kirtivarman I. His name occurs as simply Vishnuvardhana in his own grants (A. and
B.), and in D. and E.; as Kubja-Vishnuvardhana, — (the word kubja means ‘hump-backed,’
also ‘a carved sword, a scimitar’), — in K. and all the subsequent grants, except in two (O. and
U.), in which he is called Kubja-Vishnu; and as Bitarasa, ‘king Biti or Bitta,’ on the seal of
A. Probably the latter, a Prakrit form, is the name that was given to him at his birth; and it
was expanded into its Sanskrit form, Vishnuvardhana, at the time of his installation as Yuvardja.9
He had the epithet of sripithivivallabha, ‘favourite of fortune and of the earth’ (in A.);
and the biruta of Vishamasthiti (in A. and B.), which is explained in B. as being due to his
achieving “success (vaidhi) against fortresses, difficult of access (vishama), on the plains,
in the water, in the woods, and on hill,” and which is used to denote him in C. His titles
were, at first Yuvardja (in A.), and afterwards Mahardaja; the latter, in addition to being
used in one of his own grants (B.), is attached to his name in D. and E.; for its value, in
this period, as a paramount title, see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 305 ff. K. and all the subsequent grants
agree in stating that he reigned for eighteen years; but M. is the first grant which specifically
states that the locality of his rule was the Vengi country. As we have seen from the
dates examined in the preceding portion of this paper, the initial point of his years,—
whether it is taken as being in the month Vaishakh, or as being the immediately preceding
Chaitra sukla 1, — lies in A. D. 615, in Saka-Saivat 538 current; and his regnal years run,
not from the date of his assumption of independent sovereignty, but from the earlier time when he was installed as Yuvardja by his elder brother (see page 5 above).

L. mentions a follower of his, named Kalakampa, of the Patavardhini family, who,
“with his permission,” killed in battle a king named Daddara, and seized his insignia.

Of his time we have two records:—

A. — A copper-plate grant from Satara in the Bombay Presidency; edited by me with
a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIX. p. 208. — It gives the name of the family as Chalikya;10 and
describes the members of the family as meditating on the feet of the god Svami-Mahishena

9 Speaking of Bita, otherwise called Vijayaditya V., a Godavari grant says, — Tujap-shechhatito yoshhudd Ananta-bhupala-nandanam kaaputhka-dyunatam-kaapakh jato Bita-mahishenath. This distinctly seems to imply that he was first
named Bita, — “he was born (as) Bita,” and so, that he received the name of Vijayaditya, when he was invested
with the kaaputhka. So also W. shows that Khilkutta-Chodajeda I. was first called Eridaya-Chodaj, and received the
name of Khilkutta-Chodajeda when he was appointed to the Chodaj sway. — The agreement must be the same in
the case of Amma I., otherwise called Vishnuvardhana I. of Chalikya-Chodajn, otherwise called Vishnuvardhana
V.; and in some other instances. — In some cases, e. g. those of Mahi-Yuvardja and Kokkili, we evidently have
only the personal names, conferred at birth.

10 The variants of the family-name in this series of documents, in the preamble of each, are, — Chalikya, here; Chalikya, in B., C., D., K., M., and S.; Chalajika, with the Dravidian j, in E., F., G., and H.; Chalikya, with the long vowel a in the first syllable, in J., N. to R., and T. to X.; and Chalajika, with the long a and the
Dravidian j, in I.
(Kārttikeya, the god of war); as belonging to the Māsurva gōtra; as being Hāritiputras or descendants of an original ancestress of the Hārtī gōtra;11 as being protected by the Mothers of mankind;12 and as having acquired the crest of a boar through the favour, when he had arisen from sleep, of him (the god Viṣṇu) whose conch is the ocean of milk. The genealogy commences with Pulikēśin I., who is spoken of by his brūdas of Rāṇavikrama and Satyāśraya; it mentions his son, Kṛtiśvarma I.; but it takes the line direct from the latter to Viṣṇuvardhana I., entirely passing over his elder brother, Pulikēśin II., in this passage, and only referring to him, as "the glorious Mahārāja," in the passage at the end which contains the date. Pulikēśin II. is similarly passed over in C. and E. The charter was issued by Viṣṇuvardhana I. himself, as Yuvarāja, from Kurumarthi (or Kurumarthatha); and it records the grant of the village of Alandātri, in the Srinīlaya bhūga. The village granted is probably the modern 'Alundah' of the map, about thirty-five miles north of Sāttarā. But, however this may be, the statement that it was on the south bank of the river Bhimarathi, is sufficient to show that the locality of the authority of Viṣṇuvardhana I., at this time, was to the west of Long. 77° 21'. where the Bhima flows into the Krīṣṇā, and was, therefore, within the radius of the Western Chalukya sovereignty. The grant was made on the full-moon day of Kārtika, in the eighth year of "the glorious Mahārāja," i.e., of Pulikēśin II.; and the corresponding English date lies in A. D. 616 or 617.

B. — A grant from Chilpurupalle in the Virupakṣam District, Madras Presidency; edited by me, page 15 above; for a lithograph, see Burnell's South-Indian Palaeography, second edition, Plate xxvii. — It gives the family-name as Chalukya. The genealogy commences with Pulikēśin II., who is mentioned as "the Mahārāja Satyāśraya, the favourite of fortune (śrīvaśīlaḥ);" and this grant expressly states that Viṣṇuvardhana I. was the younger of the two brothers. The charter was issued by Viṣṇuvardhana I. himself, as Mahārāja, from the village of Cherupura in the (?) Puki vishaya. Cherupura is probably an older form of the name of Chilpurupalle itself, where the plates were obtained. But, at any rate, there can be no doubt that the name of the Dimila vishaya has been preserved in the modern village of Dimile, in the Sarvasiddhi Taluk of the same District, fourteen miles towards the south-west from Chilpurupalle. And this identification is sufficient to establish the important point, that the sphere of the sovereignty of Viṣṇuvardhana I. now lay on the eastern coast, far away from the Western Chalukya dominions. The grant was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon in the month Sravaṇa, on the fifteenth day in the fourth month of the eighteenth year of Viṣṇuvardhana I. himself; the corresponding English date, as shown on page 41, above, is the 7th July, A. D. 632. The Dvāraka of the grant, i.e., the officer who conveyed the king's commands to the local officials by whom the charter was then drawn up and delivered, was Atavarditya, of the (?) Mataya family.

11 The variants of the first component of the word, in the preambles of the documents, are, — Hārtī, here, and in L., V., and perhaps W.; Hārūti, in C., F., H., and I.; Hārūti, in D., E., G., and J.; and Hārūti, in K., M. to U., and X. — In his Sanskrit Literature, p. 145, Prof. Max Müller gives Hārūti as one of the principal authorities quoted in the Tattvārūpa-Pṛatīkavāyikā. But the gōtra-name given by him, is Harīta; with the short vowel in both the first and the second syllables (id., p. 383). I should think, therefore, that the correct form of the name is Hārūtiputra, or more properly Hārūtiputra; with the short vowel i in the second syllable. The long vowel is the first syllable, points to there having been a Harīta gōtra as a later offshoot from the Harīta gōtra. In the same way, the Kāśyapa and Kauṇḍinya gōtras of epigraphical records, must be offshoots of the original Kāśyapa and Kauṇḍinya gōtras of Prof. Max Müller's list. Other similar instances also could be quoted. — The Western Chalukyas also were Hārūtiputras. But the name was not confined to this family. It applied also to the Early Kādambas (c. K., ante, Vol. VI. p. 31). And in earlier times there were Harūtaiputras or Hārūtiputras in Central India (see ante, Vol. IX. p. 121).

12 These are the divine mothers, or personified energies of the principal deities. They are usually taken as seven in number; viz., Brahmā or Brahmāṇī, Māhēśvarī, Kaumūḍī, Vaīṣṇavī, Vaīṣṇavī, Indraśī or Indraśī or Māheśvarī, and Chāmūṇḍā. They are closely connected with the worship of Śiva; and they attend on Kārttikeya, who was his son. — They must have some original connection with the Pleiades, when the principal stars of that group were seven in number. Kārttikēśa was fostered by the Pleiades (Kṛṣṇākāśī); and from this is derived one of his epithets, Śrīvaśīlā, 'having six mothers.'
2. — Jayasimha I.

Thirty years; A.D. 633 to 663.

He was the (eldest) son of No. 1, Vishnuvardhana I. His name occurs as simply Jayasimha in M. to U., and in X.; in his own grant (C.), and in D., E., K., L., V., and W., vallabha, 'the favourite,' is attached to it; and in F., it is written Jayasingha, with vallabha attached. The seal of his own grant gives him the biruda of Sarvasiddhi, which is explained in line 13 f. by the words 'he who acquired all (kinds of) success by the strength of his arm;' and it is used in an epithet applied to him in D. His title was Mahârâja; it occurs in his own grant, and it is prefixed to his name in D., E., and F. The grants K. to O., and Q. to W., say that he reigned for thirty-three years; while P. and X. say thirty years. I follow the latter statement, because, in spite of its not being the earlier one, and of its not being the statement of the majority, it must be the more correct of the two (see pages 10, 14 f., above).

Of his time we have one record:—

C. — A grant from Pedda-Maddi in the Kistna District, Madras Presidency; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 137. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya; and to the description of the Chalukyas as given in A., it adds the statement that they had had their bodies purified by ablutions performed after celebrating the avamâdana-sacrifice. The genealogy commences with Kirtivarman I.; Pulikésin II. is not mentioned; and Vishnuvardhana I. is not spoken of by name, but is referred to by his biruda as 'he who attained success under difficulties (vishama-siddhi) in harassing the forts of many enemies.' The charter was issued by Jayasimha I. himself, as Mahârâja, from the town of Udayapura; and it records a grant of the village of Penukapura in the Gudrahâra vishaya on the occasion of one of the equinoxes, in the eighteenth year of the reign. The Dâtaka was Siyâsarmân. The language of this grant is rather full of inaccuracies; and I am not quite satisfied as to its authenticity.

3. — Indra-Bhaṭṭâraka.

Seven days; A.D. 663.

He was the younger brother of No. 2, Jayasimha I. His name occurs as Indra-Bhaṭṭâraka in D., E., and F.; and as Indrarâja in K. and all the subsequent grants. In the Gódâvarî grant of the Râja Prithivimâla, the son of the Mahârâja Prabhâkara, mention is made of an Adhirâja Indra, who joined in "a tumultuous combat waged by all the kings who were gladdened by having assembled together in the desire to uproot by force Indra-Bhaṭṭâraka" (Jour. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. Vol. XVI. p. 119); the reference here seems to be to Indra-Bhaṭṭâraka of the Eastern Chalukya dynasty; the Adhirâja Indra being possibly the Mahârâja Indravarman of the Gâṅga dynasty of Kâliṅganagara (ante, Vol. XIII. pp. 120, 122, and Vol. XVI. p. 132), whose territory lay just to the north-east of the Eastern Chalukya kingdom. The only records that mention Indra-Bhaṭṭâraka as reigning, are V., W., and X., which state that he reigned for seven days. The truth seems to be, that he did not actually succeed in ascending the throne; being prevented by a confederacy of chiefs, in which the leading part was taken by the Adhirâja Indra.

---

13 This district is mentioned also in E., by the same name. And it seems to be identical with the Gudrâvâra of J. and N., and the Gudrâvâra of Q. In V. and W. mention is made of the Gudrâvâra of Gaudârâja, which Dr. Hultsch has suggested may be identical with the preceding, and may have some connection with the modern Gaudârâ in the Kistna District. (SOUTH-INDIAN INSRIPTIONS, VOL. I. p. 53, note 1); Gaudârâja, however, occurs also as the name of two villages in the Vissapatam District. — I am inclined to think that the original name may have been Gudrâhâra (Gudra + dhâra, a territorial division). The expression Gudrâhâra vishaya would be analogous to the Khâṭâkâhâra vishaya, which we have, ante, Vol. VII. p. 72, line 25 f. Gudra might pass into Guda; through the habit of doubling consonants before r. And we might thus obtain Gudrâvâra, or Gudrâvâ; the last part of the latter word being another form of visāra, a town. — But I do not see how the dental d could change into the lingual t in Gudrâvâra.

14 In V., line 37, the actual reading is tad-anu-Indrarâja-sandônasa-saptâ dînâ; this is a mistake for "Indrarâja-sandônasa-saptâ dînâ." The use of the article before the name of other grants is to avoid confusion with other grants. In W., line 10, has tad-anu-Indrarâja-sandônasa-saptâ dînâ; in X., line 31, has tad-anu-a (m) Indrarâja-sandônasa-saptâ dînâ.
4. — Vishnuvardhana II.

Nine years; A. D. 663 to 672.

He was the son of No. 3, Indra-Bhatachara. His name occurs as Vishnuvardhana in his own grants (D. and E.), and in L. to X.; and as Vishnuraja in K. D., line 10, seems to imply that he had the epithet of saravalokasraya, ‘asylum of all mankind,’ and the seals of both his grants give him the biruda of Vishnasiddhi, as in the case of his grandfather. D. describes him as a paramamahêvara or ‘most devout worshipper of the god Siva under the name of Mahêvara,’ and E. gives him the epithet of samadhiyata-pauchamahêshârda, ‘he who has attained the five great sounds,’ i.e. who is heralded in public by the sounds of five kinds of musical instruments. His title was that of Maharaja; it is used in his own grants, and is also affixed to his name in F. In M. the years of his reign are carelessly omitted. K., L., and N. to X., are unanimous in stating that he reigned for nine years.

Of his time we have two records:

D. — A grant from somewhere in the Nellore District, Madras Presidency; edited by me, ante, Vol. VII. p. 185, with a lithograph in Vol. VIII. p. 320. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya; and it adds, in respect of the members of the family, that they acquired the dignity of sovereignty through the favour of the god Karttikeya. The genealogy commences with Vishnuvardhana I. The charter was issued by Vishnuvardhana II. himself, as Maharaja; and it records a grant of the village of Royuru in the Karmarashtra vishaya.

The grant was made in the second year of his reign, on Wednesday, the tenth tithi in the bright fortnight of Chaitra, under the Magha nakshatra; and the corresponding English date, as has been shown on page 8 above, is Wednesday, 13th March, A. D. 664. The writer of the grant was Vinayaka, the son of Gira.

E. — A grant apparently from Mattewada in the Kistna District; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. VII. p. 191. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya, with the Dravijian f in the second syllable. The genealogy commences with Kirtivarman I.; and it passes from him to Vishnuvardhana I., without any reference to Pulikatin II. The charter was issued by Vishnuvardhana II. himself, as Maharaja. It is addressed to the residents of the village of Pallivada in the Arateakurarsraya which was in the Gudrahara vishaya; but the exact details of the grant are not known, the concluding portion of the charter, after the second plate, being not forthcoming. The grant was made in the fifth year of his reign, on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun on the new-moon day of Phalguna; and the corresponding English date, as we have seen at page 9 above, is the 17th February, A. D. 668.

5. — Mañgi-Yuvrâja.

Twenty-five years; A. D. 672 to 696.

He was the son of No. 4, Vishnuvardhana II. He is spoken of as Mañgi-Yuvrâja in K. and all the subsequent grants; but there is nothing to show why the title Yuvrâja is always attached to his proper name. He had the epithet of saravalokasraya, ‘asylum of all mankind,’ (see his own grant F.); and the seal of his grant gives him the biruda of Vijayasiddhi, which is also used in the text of the grant, in describing him as “he who achieved the success of victory in controversies (?) of metaphysics and other sciences.” K. and all the subsequent grants agree in stating that he reigned for twenty-five years.

Of his time we have one record:

F. — A grant from an unknown locality; edited by me at page 104 below. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya; and in the description of the members of the family, it substi-

---

13 See Gupta Inscriptions, p. 296, note 9. — This is another exceptional instance, in which the epithet is applied to a paramount sovereign.
tates the statement that they acquired their sovereignty through the excellent favour of the goddess Kaasiki (Durga),\textsuperscript{16} for the statement of D., which attributes this to the favour of Kaarttikëya. The genealogy commences with Jayasimha I. The record does not mention Maungi by his own proper name, but speaks of him in the passage which introduces the grant, as "the Mahârâja who is the asylum of all mankind." The grant, which was made by Maungi-Yuvârâja himself, was of some fields in the village of Nâtulapâru in the Karmarâstra (vishnaya). It was made on the occasion of the Uttarâyana-Saṅkrânti or winter solstice, in the twentieth year of his reign. The Dâtaka was Nissarami. . . . .

6. — Jayasimha II.

Thirteen years; A. D. 696 to 709.

He was the (oldest) son of No. 5, Maungi-Yuvârâja. He is first mentioned in K.; and in that and all the subsequent grants, his name is given as simply Jayasimha, without vallabha attached to it. K. to M. and O. to X., are unanimous in stating that he reigned for thirteen years; through a careless repetition of the length of the reign of his ancestor of the same name, N. represents him as reigning for thirty-three years.

7. — Kokkili.

Six months; A. D. 709.

He was a younger brother, by a different mother, of No. 6, Jayasimha II. P. to T., and V. to X., simply mention him as a younger brother; M. describes him as deaimâdura, 'a half-brother,' without any statement as to seniority; K., L., O., and U., state explicitly that he was deaimâdura-nâuja, 'the younger half-brother;' N. carelessly represents him as the son of Jayasimha II. His name is first mentioned in K.; that and all the subsequent grants agree in stating that he reigned for six months.

8. — Vishnuvardhana III.

Thirty-seven years; A. D. 709 to 746.

He is described in K. and the subsequent grants as the elder brother of No. 7, Kokkili; but they do not state whether he was born of the same mother. Nor do they give his seniority in respect of Jayasimha II.; I follow Dr. Hultsch, and place him between Jayasimha II. and Kokkili. In L. he is called Vishnurâja; in all the other grants in which he is mentioned, his name is given as Vishnuvardhana. He acquired the sovereignty by ejecting Kokkili. K. and the subsequent grants state that he reigned for thirty-seven years.

9. — Vijayaditya I.; Bhaṭṭâraka.

Eighteen years; A. D. 746 to 764.

He was the son of No. 8, Vishnuvardhana III.; O. describes him as an auras or 'legitimate son.' G. and X. give his name as simply Vijayaditya; in all the other instances in which he is mentioned, he is called Vijayaditya-Bhaṭṭâraka. H., which does not introduce his proper name, appears to give him the biruda of Vikrama-Râma; and it may be interpreted as giving him also the second biruda of Vijayadittha. In G. the title of Mahârâja is attached to his name. K. and the subsequent grants all state that he reigned for eighteen years.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} kausiki-vara-prasâda. I notice that Dr. Hultsch (South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 35) has preferred to connect vara with the preceding member of the compound, and thus has translated "by the favour of (Siva) the husband of Kaasiki." But the expression vara-prasâda is of such constant occurrence in unambiguous passages, that I am not disposed to agree with his rendering.

\textsuperscript{17} Dr. Bursell (South-Indian Palaeography, p. 31) has stated that, according to one grant (the charter dated in the twenty-third year of Vira-Chalukya), he reigned for sixteen years; this, however, is based on a misrection; the passage has vijayaditya-ahada-va, for -ahada-va. He has also prefixed Saktivarman to his name; but I have not been able to trace any authority for this.
10. — Vishnuvardhana IV.

Thirty-six years; A.D. 764 to 799.

He was the son of No. 9, Vijayāditya I. In O. his name is given as Vishpurāja; in all the other instances, he is called Vishnuvardhana. The title of Mahārāja is attached to his name in G., H., and I. The grants K. to X. all state that he reigned for thirty-six years. 18

11. — Vijayāditya II.; Narēndramrigaraja.

Forty-four years; A.D. 799 to 843.

He was the son of No. 10, Vishnuvardhana IV. He is called Vijayāditya in his own grants (G., line 16, and H., line 13-14), and in I. to L.; Narēndramrigaraja, in G., lines 11-12, and 51, and in M., O., U., and W.; and Vijayāditya-Narēndramrigaraja, in N., P. to T., and V.; through a careless omission of the latter part of his biruda, X. speaks of him as simply Narēndra. He had the epithet of samastahvauhavārya, 'saviour of the universe;' it is attached to his name in his own grants, and in J. and L. J. also gives him another biruda, Chālukyā-Arjuna. The seals of his grants bear the legend sri-Tribhuvanāṅkya, literally 'the glorious elephant-god of the three worlds;' and furnish the earliest instances, as yet obtained, of the use of this expression. A Piṭāparam inscription of Saka-Saṁvat 1124 (Sir Walter Elliot's Telugu śāstra, p. 561 sq.) states that his grandson had the "name" of Tribhuvanāṅkya. But, from the occurrence of the word also in the seals of K. and all the subsequent grants, it appears to have been a family-motto, rather than a biruda of this king or of any other member of the family. In J. the title of Mahārāja is attached to his name; but in his own grants he uses the fully developed paramount titles of Mahārajadhīraja, Paramēśvara, and Bhaṭṭāraka; and this is the earliest instance of the use of them in this dynasty. His own grant G. speaks of him as a paramahēśvara, or 'most devoted worshipper of the god Mahēśvara (Siva). As to the length of his reign, there are different statements: K. and O. say forty years; 19 L., forty-four years; and M., N., with P. to X., forty-eight years. These discrepancies are rather curious. It would be easy enough to make a mistake between forty and forty-four years; thus, owing to the recurrence of the sch, a careless scribe might very readily reduce vijayāditya-sa-chattur-schatādevīśāvatām (forty-four) to vijayāditya-sa-chattādeviśāvatām (forty); or he might even amplify, though not so easily, the latter expression into the former. But it is difficult to see how a mere mistake in copying could well be made between vijayāditya-narēndramrigarāja-sa-dakta-schatādevīśāvatām (forty-eight; N., line 11-12), or vijayāditya-narēndramrigarāja-ch-sa-dakta-schatādeviśāvatām (P., line 11-12), and such an expression as vijayāditya-narēndramrigarāja-sa-chattādevīśāvatām. L., however, does not use the formal expression at all; but states, in a verse, that he reigned for forty years increased by four (sa-schatādevīśāvatāmasa-sa-chattur-utterasamkhyaśāman), and, therefore, in this passage at any rate, there is no possibility of a literal mistake by a careless writer. I am strongly inclined to think that, in spite of its standing alone for the present, the statement in L. is the correct one; the explanation being that, in addition to actually reigning for forty-four years, Vijayāditya II. had previously ruled for four years as Yuvārāja; that in M., N., and P. to X., the four years of Yuvārāja were erroneously added to the forty-four years of his reign; and that in K. and O. a mistake was made in the other direction, and, it being thought that the forty-four years included his four years of Yuvārāja, four years were deducted, and his reign was thus reduced to forty years.

18 Dr. Burnell has shown him as reigning for thirty years; adding, in a note, that two records (W. and X. in my series) give thirty-six years. But I do not know what authority there is for the statement of thirty years. He has also added that one record (the grant specified in the preceding note) gives twenty-six years; but there again the original has thirty-six years.

19 Dr. Burnell has also quoted the grant mentioned in the preceding two notes, as giving forty years; but the original has forty-eight years.
Moreover, forty-four years is the only period that fits in at all naturally, if we look to such details as have been considered in the arrangement of my principal List, on page 12 above. A reign of forty-eight years cannot be allowed for there, without making such reductions in other reigns, as practically to shorten some of them by a full year at least; and it seems almost an impossible length, following, in a new generation, after reigns of thirty-seven, eighteen and thirty-six years, in three successive generations. For these reasons, forty-four years is the duration that I have adopted in my principal List, in which the reigns are determined according to the years A.D. In the alternative List, however, on page 13, the principle of the arrangement of which makes it easy enough to admit a longer time, I have allowed for forty-eight years, on the chance that this is really the correct record.

J. speaks of him as “a fire of destruction to the Gaṅga family;” and as “having the valor of a lion, splitting open (the temples of) the lordly elephants of his enemies (ari-nāgadhipa) with his unsheathed sharp sword;” this last epithet seems to have a double meaning, and to indicate also a defeat of some hostile chief of the Nāgas. And L. states that during twelve years, by day and by night, he fought a hundred and eight battles with the armies of the Gaṅgas and the Raṭhas, and built the same number of large temples of Siva under the name of Saṁbhav. The Raṭhas here spoken of, are the well-known Raśṭrakūṭas of Malkhēd, of whom the reigning kings were, Gōvinda III. at the beginning of the time of Vijayāditya II., and Amoghavarsa I. later on. In his Rādhanpur grant of Śaka-Saṁvat 750 (ante, Vol. VI. pp. 63, 71) Gōvinda III. claims to have ordered “the lord of Veṅgi” into his presence, and to have made him assist in building or fortifying a city. It would seem, therefore, that, in the contest between the two dynasties, success was not entirely with the Eastern Chalukyas. The Gaṅgas may be either some of the feudatory Gaṅga Mahāmāṇḍalēvāras, who are mentioned in some Raśṭrakūṭa inscriptions; or early members of the family of the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara (ante, Vol. XVIII. pp. 161 ff). The building of the temples of Siva is referred to again in K. and M., in passages in which the god is called Naręndrēvāra, — i. e. ‘Īśvara’ in composition with the first part of the king’s biruda. L. further speaks of him as “the lord of Veṅgi (Veṅgi-līkā);” and this seems to give really the first indication that the country of Veṅgi, constituted the dominions of this dynasty.

Of his time we have two records:—

G. — A grant from an unknown locality; edited by Dr. Hultzsch, in his South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 31 ff.; I have also my own reading of the original plates. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya. The genealogy commences with Vijayāditya I. The charter was issued by Vijayāditya II. himself; and it records the grant of the village of Korraparru, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon. The name of the viṣhaya in which the village was situated, is illegible. The Dūtaka was the prince Nripa-Rudra, who is described as a brother of Vijayāditya II., but as a descendant of the Haihaya race; he appears, therefore, to have been a half-brother, born from a different wife of Vishṇuvardhana IV., who belonged to the lineage of the Kalachuris of Tripura. The writer was Akṣharaḷalāṭāchārīya, a resident of Vijayavāda, which must be the modern Bēzwāda, in the Kistna District.

H. — A grant from ‘Īdara 20 in the Kistna District; edited by Pandit S. M. Natesa Sastrī, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 55; I quote, however, from my own reading of the original plates. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya. The genealogy commences with Vijayāditya I., who appears to be mentioned by the biruḍas of Vikrama-Rama and Vijayasiddhi. The charter was issued by Vijayāditya II. himself. It records the grant of a field at the village of Vāmṛupāleru or Vāmṛupilēreru in the Kanḍaraṇḍara viṣhaya, made on account of an eclipse of the sun. The Dūtaka was Bōlama.

20 This name is written Īdēra (ante, Vol. XIII., p. 50); Īdēra (Sewell’s Lists of Antiquities, Madras, Vol. II. p. 35); and Īdara (id., Vol. I. p. 51).
12. — Vishnuvardhana V.; Kali-Vishnuvardhana.

Eighteen months; A. D. 843 to 844.

He was the son of No. 11, Vijayaditya II. In his own grant (I.), and in J., his name occurs as simply Vishnuvardhana; in K. and all the subsequent grants, he is called Kali-Vishnuvardhana. He had the epithet of sarvalokakārāya, 'asylum of all mankind' (in his own grant, and in J.). His grant seems to imply that he had the biruda of Vishnusiddhi; and it qualifies him as a paramamahēśvara, or 'most devout worshipper of the god Mahēśvara.' The title of Mahārāja is attached to his name in his own grant, and in J. In L. he is called "the lord of Vongi (Veṅgi-nātha)." K. and the subsequent grants all state that he reigned for one and a half years.

Of his time we have one record. —

L. — A grant from 'Ahadakaram' in the Madras Presidency; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 185. It gives the dynastic name as Chālukya; and furnishes the first contemporaneous instance of the use of the long ā in the first syllable of the name. The genealogy commences with his grandfather, Vishnudvarshana IV. The charter was issued by Vishnudvarshana V. himself. The donative part of the record is in a difficult style of Telugu; and the meaning of it has not yet properly been made out. But it mentions a town named Pritivipallavapattana; and it seems to describe a grant made by the inhabitants of that town. In the word kanadī (or 9dī)-rajul, with the epithet samastabhuvanākāra, prefixed, it possibly refers to some king of the Kānṭaka country. And it seems also to mention Kāñchi and Ramāyana.

13. — Vijayaditya III.; Gunaka.

Forty-four years; A. D. 844 to 888.

He was the eldest son of No. 12, Vishnudvarshana V. In his own grant (J.), and in K. and L., his name occurs as simply Vijayaditya; in N. he is called Gunaka-Vijayaditya; in M., S., T., U., V., and X., Gunaga-Vijayaditya; in P., Q., R., and W., Gunagauka-Vijayaditya; and in O., Gunakanalla-Vijayaditya; and U. explains the prefixes by saying that he was "a thorough arithmetician (nākkakārukere nākkahā)." He had the epithet of samastabhuvanakāra, 'asylum of the universe' (in his own grant, and in L.). And his title was that of Mahārāja; it is used in his own grant, and it is attached to his name in K. The records K. to T., and V., W., and X., agree in stating that he reigned for forty-four years; U. says the same in the first instance, but adds an alternative statement, that the duration of his reign was forty-eight years.

L. tells us that, "challenged by the lord of the Rāṣṭras, he conquered the unequalled Gaṅga; cut off the head of Maṅgi in battle; and frightened the fire-brand Kṛishṇa, and completely burnt his city." The killing of Maṅgi, and the burning of the city of Kṛishṇa, are also spoken of in M.;[26] and a reference to the former event is also made in the grant of Vijayaditya III, himself. The Kṛishṇa in question must be the Rāṣṭrakūta king Kṛishṇa II.; and the city must be Mālkhāḍ. There seems to be another reference to him in U.; which states that

[21] In L., line 16 f., an attempt is made to explain the prefix of his name, by saying that he was "skilled in fighting (kali) with all weapons." But I consider that the prefix, which does not occur anywhere with the Drāvijian j that is used in that passage, is in reality the Drāvijian word kāli, 'a courageous, valiant man; a hero.'

[22] When I published this grant, I was doubtful whether the charter was issued by him, or by his grandfather. The use, however, of the epithet sarvalokakārya appears to stamp it as his.

[23] As noted above, J. gives the biruda of Chālukya-Arjuna to an earlier king, viz., Vijayaditya II.; but that record is later in date than the present one.

[24] I owe this partial explanation of the contents to Dr. Haltasch's assistant, Mr. V. Venkataya.


[26] Dr. Haltasch South-India Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 9, note 3) has already pointed out that the words Akrāṣṭhā-pura-dhāraṇa, which were not intelligible at the time, are a mistake for kṛishṇa-pura-dhāraṇa.
king Vallabha did honour to the arms of Vijayaditya III. And it is probably in connection with some earlier event of this reign, involving on this occasion a defeat of the Eastern Chalukyas, that we must understand the statement in the Śirūr inscription, that worship was done to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarsha I. by the lord of Veṅgi (ante, Vol. XII. p. 219). Maṅgi may have been a Chōla king; a Pittāparam inscription, of Saka-Saṃvat 1124, calls him Maṅgi-Rajendra, and states that Vijayaditya played the game of ball with his head.

Of this reign we have one record:

J.—A grant from an unknown locality; not yet published. — It gives the family-name as Chālukya. The genealogy commences with Vijayaditya II. The charter was issued by Vijayaditya III. himself. It records the grant of the village of Tundaṇapar or Trundaṇapar in the Gudravāra vaisāya, to a person named Vinayadisarman, who appears to be either the actual slayer of Maṅgi, or the leader of the troops on the occasion of his being slain. The grant was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon. The Dātaka was Pāṇḍarāṅga (possibly for Pāṇḍurāṅga). The writer was Kaṭṭama, or Kaṭṭaya.

Vikramaditya I.

He was a younger brother of No. 18, Vijayaditya III. K., M., N., P., S., and U., mention him with the title of Yuvarāja; and T. speaks of him as "wearing round his throat a glittering necklace (hasthīkhana)," which appears to have been the token of the dignity and rank connected with his name. But he evidently did not actually ascend the throne.

Yuddhamalla I.

He was a (younger) brother of the preceding, Vikramaditya I. His name occurs, as Yuddhamalla, in S., in which he is specified as a paternal uncle of Bhumī I., and in U.; in X. he is not mentioned by name, but is simply referred to as a brother of Vikramaditya. He apparently did not reign.

No. 14; Chālukya-Bhima I.

Thirty years; A. D. 888 to 918.

He was the son of the Yuvarāja Vikramaditya I.; and he succeeded Vijayaditya III. His name occurs as simply Bhima in S. and U.; as Nripa-Bhima in K.; but he is usually mentioned as Chālukya-Bhima, in other places in K. and U., and in M. to R., and T. to X.; L. gives the prefix with the short a in the first syllable, Chālukya-Bhima. L. gives him the biruda of Dṛgh-Ajuna; and S. seems to give him also the biruda of Saucha-Kandarpa, K. and all the following grants agree in stating that he reigned for thirty years.

From L. we learn that, after the time of Vijayaditya III., the land of Veṅgi was overrun by the Raṭṭas, and had to be reconquered by Bhima I.; and U. specifically states that his opponent, whom he conquered, was Krīṣṇavallaṇa, i.e. Krīṣṇa II. K. mentions his general, named Mahākala, the son of his foster-sister Gāmakambā, who was the daughter of his wet-nurse Nāgapoṭi.

15. — Vijayaditya IV.; Kollabīganda.

Six months; A. D. 918.

He was the eldest son of No. 14, Bhima I. His name occurs as simply Vijayaditya in K., L., M., N., O., T. and X.; as Kollabīganda-Vijayaditya in Q. and V.; as Kollabīganda-Vijayaditya in P., R., and W.; while S. mentions him as simply Kollabīganda and Kollabīganda-bhāskara; U. states that he was Vijayaditya, who was also named king Kollabīganda. L. also attaches the biruda of Kalīyartaṁka to his name; and an unpublished inscription

27 See ante, Vol. VI. p. 70, note 8; and Vol. XI. p. 161, note 27.
28 In line 16, for chālukya-bhima-pitrīya-yuddhamalla-dīnajjās, read "pitrīya-yuddhamallā.
29 saha seems to me to be used here in the sense of 'name, appellation, secondary title,' — "having the biruda of Kalīyarta" (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 18, note 44).
gives another variety of this biruda, in the form of apparently Kaliyartigandha. His wife was Mélambā; she is mentioned in M. and N. The length of his reign is not stated in L.; but K., M., and all the subsequent grants, give it as six months.

K. states that he ruled over the Vengi mantra, together with the forests of Trikaliṅga or the three Kaliṅgas. M. says that he conquered the rulers of Kaliṅga. L. mentions a follower of his, Bhāṇḍanādīya, otherwise called Kuntādīya; he was the son of Pratīvīryāja, who was the son of Sūmādīya, who, again, was a descendant of the Kālakampa, of the Paṭṭavardhini family, mentioned above in connection with No. 1, Vīśṇuvarṇdhana I.

(To be continued.)

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

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

NO. 195. — MADRAS MUSEUM COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF MANGI-YUVARAJA.

This inscription was first brought to notice by Mr. R. Sewell, M.C.S., in 1884, in his Lists of Antiquities, Madras, Vol. II. p. 24, No. 176. It is now published in full for the first time. I edit it from the original plates, which belong to the Government Central Museum at Madras. I obtained them for examination in 1883, through the kindness of Dr. Bidie, who then in charge of the Museum. I have no information as to where they were found.

The plates, of which the first and last are inscribed on one side only, are three in number. The first and second plates are entire, and measure about 6½ by 2½. The third plate is broken, towards the ends of the lines; the extant portion measures about 5½ by 2¼. The second plate is in a state of very good preservation; but the first and third are a good deal corroded by rust, and the writing on them is rather difficult to read. The edges of the plates were fashioned slightly thicker than the inscribed surfaces; so as to protect the writing. — The ring on which the plates are strung, and the holes for which are near the proper right-hand end of each plate, is about ⅛ thick and 2½ in diameter. It had been cut, for the purpose of making impressions, before the time when the grant came into my hands; there seems, however, to be no reason for thinking that it is not the proper ring belonging to the plates. The seal on it is circular, about 1½ in diameter: in relief on a countersunk surface, it has, across the centre, the legend ēva-Visajayādīḥ[ḥ]; in the upper part, the moon; and in the lower part, a floral device. — The weight of the three plates, which are rather thin, is 7 oz.; and of the ring and seal, 7½ oz.; total, 14½ oz. — The characters belong to the southern class of alphabets; and are of the regular type of the period and part of the country to which the record belongs. The average size of the letters is between ⅛ and ¼. As is usual, the interiors of them shew marks of the working of the engraver's tool. The engraving is rather shallow; and the letters do not show through on the reverse sides of the plates. — The language is Sanskrit; and, except for the quotation of two of the customary benedictive and imprecatory verses, the whole record is in prose. It is written rather carelessly; especially in respect of the number of cases in which a long vowel ṣ, a visarga, or an anusvāra, has been omitted. — In respect of orthography, the only points that call for special notice, are (1) the use of the Dravidian f in the name of the family; line 5, and in yugalkaś, line 13; and (2) the use of ṛ for ri in pitru, lines 11 and 13, though the proper vowel is used in mātri, line 2, and kripa, lines 5 and 10.

The inscription is one of the Eastern Chalukya king Mangi-Yuvaraja. He is mentioned, not by his name, but as “the Mahārāja, who is the refuge of all mankind (sarvadākṣīrāya).” But the genealogical details that are given, leave no doubt that it is he who is intended. The record is non-sectarian; the object of it being only to record the grant of some

This grant is No. 84 in Mr. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Madras, Vol. II. p. 13. It is so corroded and so difficult to read, that, not having the original plates to refer to, I cannot deal with it at present.
land to a Brāhmaṇa, at the village of Nutulapāru in the Karmarakṣa country. The grant was made on the occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-Saṁkrānti or winter solstice, in the twentieth year of the reign; but no details are given that can be tested by calculation.

**TEXT.**

First Plate.

1 Sva-sti Śrīmatāṁ sakala-jagad-abhiṣekte-tāmāṁ. Māṇavāya(vya)-sagotraṇ[ā]ṁ Hārī-
2 ti-pitrānāṁ Kāśikī-vara-prasada-labhā-lājyānāṁ mātṛi-gaṇa-paripāṭ-
3 litānāṁ Sv[ā]ṁ-mi-Mahāsēva-pād-anudhyātānāṁ bhagavā(va)ṁ-Nārāyaṇa-prasād-
4 samāśādita-variḥalāścchamānāṁ āsvamādī-avahṛthānāma-pavitrī(ṭṛ)-
5 kṛita-vapushāṁ Chālukyaṇāṁ kula-jaladhi-samudit-āndrōm-maya-vina-vikram-ō-
6 pārjita-chāra-bhūri-kṛttāṁ śrī-Jayaśīṁgha-vallabha-mahārāja-priy-ānujasya-śrī-
7 samāṇa-vikramāsya śrī-ī(ī)n[d]ra-Bhāṣṭāra-kṣaṇya su(sū)nōr-anēka-samara-sīmīgha-
8 āpabhadha.

Second Plate; First Side.

8 yuddha-vijaya-yaśaḥ-prasūty-āmōda-gandhi-ādhi-vāsīta-sakala-dī-g-maṇḍalasya
9 nānā-āśā-ābhīyās-ōpābri(ṭṛ)ūmbhīta-vimala-visāla-buddhe[hṛ]ṁ tyāg-audārya-ḍhāryya-
11 sama-
12 tiṣā[ā]ṁ-yātā-pitru(ṭṛ)-gūṇa-aṅkti-sampanna śv[ā]ṁ-kṣiṣā-ādi-vidyā-pragāhaṁ śvijaya-
14 kiraṇ-
15 ga-rajināṁ-bhūti-yugal[ā]ḥ paramabrahmayo mātāpitru(ṭṛ)-pād-anudhyātāḥ
17 A(ā)pa.

Second Plate; Second Side.

18 stāṁba-su(sū)ṭrāya Taṁtrī(tārī)ya-sabrahmāsa(cha)ṁ[ā]ṁ Kūḷiśarmanḍa[ā]ṁ paṇtrāya
19 Dōṇāśarmanḍa.
25 nāma-brāhmaṁ[ā]ṁ
27 Etakaṇḍa-ṇa[ā]ṁ-
29 br[ā]ṁhman-kṣētra[ā]ṁ

---

1 From the original plates. 
2 Read kṣiṣṭak. 
3 Read kṛitaṁya. 
4 Read "vijaya. 
5 Read raṣṭita. 
6 This word was first engraved as maṇiḥ; and then the rd was engraved twice, and the fourth time it was corrected into ku. 
7 First the sa was engraved here; and then it was corrected into ku. 
8 Read saṇhita. 
9 From the original plates. 
10 Read prajāya. 
11 Read prasūtābo. 
12 Read prasūtābo. 
13 First the sa was engraved here; and then it was corrected into ku. 
14 Read sāmāṇya. 
15 Read sāmāṇya. 
16 Read sāmāṇya. 
17 Read sāmāṇya. 
18 The construction is faulty. Either we ought to have dattāvma here. Or, if we retain dattam, the nominative case priya-tnaṇaṁ ḍc., in lines 10 to 14, must be altered into the instrumental. 
19 Read purusvataḥ. 
20 Read brāhmaṇa. 
21 Read purusvataḥ.
Third Plate.

22 uttaratā[ḥ*] Vejukatātāka-br[ā*]hmanā-ksheṭra[ṁ*] purvata[ḥ*] Koriṇipada[ḥ*]. . . . . .[brāhma].
23 ṇa-ksheṭra[ṁ*] dakhinatā[ḥ*] cha tat-satav-avadhis[ṛ*] ḍv[ṛ*]jā-kaṇḍikak-ṛdrā. . . .
24 tra[ṛ*] uttarāyāna-nimittā udaka-purva saṁrava[ṛ*]-kara-pariharā[ṣ*] datta[ṁ*] [ṛ*]
   [Pravaradhamāna-vijaya].
   [vvasudhā dattā].
26 bahubhīś-chānupālītā yasya yasya yad[ṛ*] bhūmī[ḥ*] tasya [tasya tad]
   phalam [ṛ*].
27 Sva-dāttām para-dāttām v[ṛ*] yō harēti(ta) vasundharam shashthī(āṣti)-va[rha-
   sahasraṇi].
28 viśāḥyām jāyate krimit[ṛ*] Ajñāpti[ḥ*] Nissaramijī[ḥ*]. . . . . . . . . . . . . [ṛ*]

ABSTRACT OF CONTENTS.

Of Indra-Bhaṭṭāraka (line 7), who was a very mean, risen from the ocean which is the family of the Chaṭukyas (l. 5), who belong to the Mānava vyātra (l. 1), (and) are Haritiputra; (and) who was the dear younger brother of the Mahārāja Jayasiṅgha (I.), the favourite (l. 6); — the son was the Mahārāja Vishnuvardhana (II.) (l. 10).

His son, the Mahārāja, who is the asylum of all mankind (l. 14), — who has the success of victory in controversies (?) of metaphysics and other sciences,27 — has given to Kuṇḍi-Dōṣoṣtarman (l. 16), an inhabitant of Kraṇja (l. 14), a member of the Kāṣyapa gōtra, a follower of the Āstapasta śāstra, a student of the Taittirīya (śākhā) (l. 15), a son’s son of Kuṇjiṣtarman, and a son of Dōṣoṣtarman, a padatā-field28 in the southern quarter at the village of Nutulaparī29 in the Karmarāṣṭra country (l. 16); and, apparently, also a Brāhmaṇ’s field in a site called Revadistana (l. 17).

Lines 17 to 23 contain a specification of boundaries; but the application of them is not quite plain. And line 23 seems to record that the yield of one or other of the fields was twelve khaṇḍikas.30

From lines 24 and 25 we learn that the grant was made on account of the Uttarāyaṇa-Saṁkrānti, in the twentieth year of the augmenting victorious reign. And the record ends with the statement that the Dūtaka (denoted by the word Ajñāpti) was Nissaramijī . . . . . . . (?)

17 Read pārva-staḥ.
18 Four or five letters are broken away here.
20 Five or six letters are broken away here. Probably the correct full reading was dveda[khajdikak-ṛdrav-bīja-samsthānam] keśṭraṇi, which is the proper reading in line 21 f., ante, Vol. XIII. p. 56.
21 Read “pārva-staḥ”.
22 Read pari-kāraṇa.
23 Read śīkha.
24 Metre, Śīkha (Amuhubb); and in the following verse.
25 If this line was a full one, six or seven letters have been broken away here.
26 This passage introduces the biruda, Vijayasaṅkhi, which is on the seal of the grant.
27 This word seems to be a corruption of bhadaṇa, or a Buddhist priest or venerable man, or else a mistake for adanda, or a corruption of bhaddaṇa.
28 This termination of village-names occurs with the single r again in Pempaparī (p. 27 above), and Thudaparī or Tṛuparī (p. 168); and also occurs with the double r, e.g. in Kṛnaparī (p. 161); other forms are, bāryu, in Dīggaparī, and vṛna, in Elavaparī.
29 For some remarks in connection with this word, see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 274, note 29. — It is probably identical with the khaṇḍa, which was the yield of one hundred pādas of land (ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 115, note 45).
FOLKLORE IN WESTERN INDIA.

BY PUTLIBAI D. H. WADIA.

No. 16. — The Charitable Faqr.

Once upon a time two men were journeying together to a distant place. One of them, who was a water-carrier by trade, though very poor, was strictly honest. No privations, not even famine, ever tempted him to sin. The other traveller, however, was quite the reverse. Though clever enough and strong enough to live by honest labour, he would not put his hand to anything but theft and plunder. He would roam about from place to place and rob unwary travellers for the sake of money.

After travelling several miles together, the two men halted near a well, and having refreshed themselves lay down to rest under a tree, hoping to resume their journey a little later in the day, when another traveller, who was passing by, stopped to drink at the well. He looked cautiously about him, but did not catch sight of the two men under the tree. So he put down a bundle that he carried on his head and stooped to draw water. The robber, who had been watching him all the while, crept stealthily up to him, put his foot upon the bundle, and catching hold of the poor fellow by the legs, was about to hurl him in, head foremost, when his companion, the honest water-carrier, suddenly coming up from behind, drew both the robber and his intended victim away from the well at immense risk to his own life. Thus the poor unoffending traveller was saved from certain death, and went his way rejoicing, after thanking his deliverer warmly, and suitably rewarding him for having saved his life.

The robber, in the meantime, had made himself scarce, and the water-carrier, therefore, resumed his journey alone. After a long time, however, he was again joined by the robber, who foamed with rage and cursed him all the way for having, as he said, obstructed him in following what he called his lawful profession, when all of a sudden he tripped against something, and stooping down to see what it was, found it to be a purse full of gold asrafis. He picked it up eagerly, and shewing it exultingly to his companion, said:

"Here's luck indeed! I was destined to come by gold in some way or other, and I have! Dare you now deprive me of this also?"

So saying, he ran away as fast as his legs could carry him, as if afraid that his companion might claim a share of the treasure.

The poor water-carrier was extremely surprised at this, and walked on, thinking how Allah could have seen fit to bestow so much favour upon such an unworthy individual as his late companion, when suddenly he happened to tread on some brambles, and a large sharp thorn pierced the sole of one of his bare feet.

The poor man whined and groaned with pain, and was, moreover, sorely grieved at heart to think that he, who deserved so much better at the hands of Allah, should be made so very miserable, while he, to whom punishment should really be meted out, should be so miraculously favoured.

"Strange! very strange!" he cried out with indignation; "they are all false who uphold the justice and impartiality of Allah, for had he been just and impartial he would have shewn more consideration towards one who has never all his life so much as uttered a lie or harmed any living being. However severe have been my trials and privations, I have never once yielded to temptation, and still Allah, though he withholds from me all the good things of this earth, gives me my full share of misery. Surely it is of no use to be good or honest in this world."

While he was giving way to his lamentations in this manner, a tall majestic and handsome man with a fine long beard came all unperceived and stood suddenly before him, and
asked him the cause of his grief. The poor man narrated to the stranger all that had happened since he set out on his journey, and then asked him whether or not he was justified in saying that Allah did not deal fairly by all his creatures.

"I cannot agree with you there, my friend," replied the stranger, "though I fully sympathize with you in your sufferings. I am Gabriel, the Angel, deputed by Allah to visit the earth every day and take my own estimate of the good and evil that is wrought there, and am, therefore, in a position to say that Allah is always kind and just to every one, high or low."

But the unhappy water-carrier, who felt himself miserably wronged, was not to be convinced by this. So he said:

"If you are really the Angel Gabriel, I beseech you to go and ask Allah the reason why he should have thrown that purse of gold in the way of that cruel-hearted robber, while I, who am in every respect a much better man, should have been made miserable by having a thorn thrust into my foot."

The Angel consented, but just as he was about to depart, a faqir, who had come up while the foregoing conversation was going on, stopped him, and prevailed upon him by his entreaties to hear his tale also.

"I, too, am struck with the iniquity of Allah," he cried, "for do I not say my prayers regularly five times a day and exhort others to do likewise, and again, do I not beg only in the name of Allah? And still what does Allah give me? Nothing but a bit of bread and a draught of water, and that too not every day, while others, who scoff at prayers and religion, and who never so much as pronounce the name of Allah even once a day, have a merry time of it, and eat and drink and enjoy themselves all their lives. How am I to understand that?"

"Have patience, my friend," said Gabriel; "I shall state your case to Allah and give you his answer to-morrow." So saying he quickly disappeared.

The water-carrier and the mendicant then began to travel together. The next day as the two were walking side by side, Gabriel joined them and said:

"Here I am again, my friends; I have seen Allah and given him your messages, and now listen to what he has to say to them:

"Firstly, you, my friend the water-carrier, thought it unjust of Allah that he should have given a purse of gold to that wicked man, and that, too, at a time when he least deserved it; but listen to what Allah has to say to it:

"That same man who now so displeases him by his misbehaviour, does not, as you think, enjoy the favour of Allah, but on the contrary has incurred his deepest resentment as you will see. That man was born under such happy auspices that, had he feared Allah and done his will, he would have come to be crowned a king by this time. But as he, from his childhood upwards, preferred a career of guilt and infamy, Allah in his rage held aloof every good thing from him, and gave him just enough to satisfy, only to a meagre extent, the demands of his destiny, which even he cannot avert.

"Thus, yesterday, when he found that purse of gold, he was destined to come by endless wealth; but Allah judges rightly, and he knew how little that wicked man deserved, so he in his wisdom gave him only a few coins of gold, just a semblance of what would have been his had he been honest and good, and still that fellow in his ignorance blesses his fortune, and does not know what he forfeits only for the pleasure of doing ill.

"And now as for yourself," continued Gabriel; "Allah says, he has never been unkind or unjust to you, but has, on the contrary, been very considerate in his dealings with you. You were, says he, born under such an evil star that you would have been much more miserable and unhappy in life than you have already been; but as you have always tried to be good and honest, Allah has helped you to pass through all your trials and troubles
unscathed. You told me yesterday that Allah considered it fit to put a thorn in your way and
thus caused you to suffer pain, and you naturally enough thought Allah to be very unkind.
What will you say, however, when Allah declares that that very thorn was the means of saving
your life, as you will learn presently. At the exact minute that that thorn entered your foot, it
was decreed that you should be accused of some great crime which you had never committed,
and that your head should be cut off. But seeing that you had been good and dutiful all your
life, and had, moreover, just then exerted yourself to save a human being from death, Allah was
pleased with you, and he in his mercy substituted the thorn for the headsman's sword, since, as
I told you before, it is not in his power to avert a man's destiny, and the few drops of blood that
flowed from your foot compensated for the life-blood which, it was ordained, should flow in
abundance that very same moment from your neck. Don't you now think that, by thus saving
your life, Allah amply rewarded you for all your good acts? Learn, therefore, always to bow to
his will, however unintelligible his ways may appear to you at first sight."

The poor good-natured water-carrier was so struck with all that he had heard, and
was so overcome with grief and shame at the idea of ever having doubted the justice and
wisdom of Allah, that he fell on his knees and prayed loudly to him to forgive him, and then,
kissing the feet of Gabriel, he besought him to intercede on his behalf and obtain for him the
pardon of Allah.

And now came the faqir's turn, for he too was impatient to hear why Allah had thought
fit to keep him so very poor; so turning to him, Gabriel said:—

"My good man, I am really very sorry for you, as is also Allah himself, for he says you
have been destined to remain most miserably poor. In fact, Allah says, he does not see how
to keep your body and soul together for the rest of your life, for you have still a good many
years to live, and there are only five rupees left now out of what you were destined to earn
during the whole term of your existence. You will therefore have to pass the rest of your
life in a much poorer and still more miserable condition, than you are in now."

"Is it indeed so?" cried the mendicant in a despairing tone, with tears in his eyes.

"Alas! it is but too true," replied the Angel; "and now detain me no further; for I
must go."

But the faqir caught hold of him by the hem of his garment, for an idea had entered his
head just then, and said:—

"Gabriel, good Angel, do hear me for a minute more. Wilt thou go once more and ask
Allah to send the messenger of death to me at once, so that I may be spared the uneasiness and
misery I am destined to suffer? Do pray to him, however, to send me first the five rupees
still reserved for me, so that, before I die, I may taste of some at least of the many good things
that I constantly see everywhere but have never been fortunate enough to partake of. If
you tell Allah all this, good Angel, I am sure he will grant me what I ask."

Gabriel agreed to carry the message to Allah, and quickly disappeared.

The mendicant and the water-carrier soon afterwards parted company and went their
respective ways. The faqir, in due course, arrived at his hut, and after saying his prayers
with great devotion in the belief that he was soon to go to the other world, lay down to sleep.

The next day when he opened his eyes, what was his delight to see exactly five rupees
lying by his side! He took them up eagerly and hurried with them to the bazar. There he
saw ever so many nice things spread out before him. No end of sweetmeats and fruit and
vegetables to eat and beautiful clothes to wear, such as he had never in his whole life dreamt
even of touching! But that day he thought himself rich enough to buy anything. As fine
clothes, however, possessed no interest for a man who was about to die the next morning, he
invested all the five rupees in buying toothsome catables and delicious sharbats, and went back
to his hut rejoicing.
There he cooked his food, and after duly saying his prayers, ate and drank till he could do so no more. He then again said his prayers, thanked Allah for the good things he had given him, and laid himself down on his bed with his eyes closed and his lips uttering the name of Allah, expecting every moment the messenger of death to come and bear his soul away.

Instead, however, of that grim visitor, two poor beggars like himself came to the faqir’s door, and asked for alms.

“Come in, friends,” said he; “I have no money to give you, but I have some food left in those pots yonder, of which you are welcome to partake in the name of Allah, for it is all his own.”

The hungry wayfarers thereupon set to eat, and soon emptied the pots of all their contents. They then thanked the good man for his hospitality, and resumed their journey.

Evening came, and still there was no sign of the messenger of death; so the faqir got up said his prayers, and again quietly settled down to rest and soon fell fast asleep.

When he opened his eyes in the morning, the first thing they lighted upon was five bright new silver coins again! He was very much surprised at this, and could not for the life of him make out how they came to be there again. He, nevertheless, pocketed the money, and ran out of his hut to go in search of Gabriel, and learn from him the meaning of this mystery. The Angel, however, was invisible that day, so the mendicant again wended his way to the bazaar and purchased a good many nice things to eat and drink, thinking that Allah had seen fit to keep him on this earth for one day more.

Going home, he cooked the food as before, and after making a hearty meal of it, he called in the first beggar that happened to pass by his door at the time, and gave away to him, in the name of Allah, all that remained in his pots. Then saying his prayers as usual, he lay down in his bed, fully expecting every moment to be his last, and was soon wrapped in sleep. Strange to say, however, he not only found himself alive and well the next morning, but again saw five bright silver coins lying by his side in the same place as on the two previous days.

Things went on like this for about a week, when one day Gabriel suddenly appeared to the faqir. The latter’s first words to the Angel were:

“Gabriel, you have made some strange mistake! Did you not tell me the other day that five rupees was all that was left for me to live upon for the rest of my life? How is it then that day after day I rise in the morning, and see five bright silver coins by my bedside? I spend them in buying the good things of this earth, and give away what remains to the poor, and go to bed in the belief that the angel of death will take me away from this world during the night. Nevertheless, I find myself alive and well every morning. Really, I cannot understand how Allah has been pleased to be so good and merciful to me?”

“You are a fool,” replied Gabriel, “not to see how that is, but you are mortal after all, and mortals are not expected to understand the ways of Allah. You say you give away the remains of your food every night in the name of Allah; well then, do you suppose that Allah is so mean as not to return to you whatever you give away in his name? Do you not know that whatever one gives away to the poor he lends to Allah, and Allah not only returns what has been thus lent to him, but returns it with interest. The five rupees that Allah gives you every morning, are credited back to you every evening when you feed the poor in his name, and thus is it that you see five fresh coins by your bed-side every morning. As long, therefore, as you continue to give to the poor in his name, so long will Allah bestow upon you the wherewithal to do such acts of charity.

The faqir was overjoyed at this, and went home fully determined to be generous and charitable all his life, so that he might for ever earn the favour and protection of Allah.
FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. FR. D’PENHA.

No. 7. — The Princess and the Louse.

In a certain country there lived a king who had an only daughter. When the princess was born the king engaged a Negress as a nurse for her, who tended her with all possible care, and the princess grew up to be strong and beautiful.

One day as the nurse was combing her hair, she caught a louse, and was about to kill it, but the princess prevented her from killing it, telling her she wanted it for some purpose. She then ordered the nurse to get her a large bottle with a wide mouth. The nurse fetched a bottle with a wide mouth, and the princess put the louse into it, and every time she took her tea or milk she always poured a spoonful or so in the bottle for the louse. Now drinking tea and milk made the louse attain an incredible size, so much so that, with the exception of the princess and her nurse, no one could detect the louse in it.

A few years rolled away, and the princess, attaining the twelfth year of her age, was considered marriageable. Her parents, the king and the queen, began to think of disposing of her in marriage. When it came to the ears of the princess that her parents were looking out for a suitable husband for her, she objected, saying she would marry only him who would be able to recognise an animal she had. For this purpose she told her father to prepare a grand dinner to which princes and kings from far and near must be invited, when she would produce the animal, and accept in marriage whosoever could tell its proper name. The king, who was passionately fond of his daughter, consented to do as she had proposed.

The king now sent messages to different countries, to kings and princes and nobles, to the effect that any one, who was able to recognise an animal the princess had, would win her in marriage, and that therefore they should come and dine with him on a certain day. Grand preparations were made for the dinner for several days, and on the appointed day, hundreds of kings and princes and nobles, and other persons of wealth and renown, came. Dinner was scarcely served when the princess asked her father to shew the animal to his guests; but the king said:

"Not yet, my dear daughter, let them first take their dinner, for otherwise, if they cannot recognise the animal, they may all leave the house without their dinner, and all the trouble and expense we have gone to will be wasted. Let them finish eating their dinner, and when we are serving them with pān sōpārī (betel-leaf and nut) we will ask them to recognise the animal just as they touch it."

The princess saw that this was a reasonable proposal, and so allowed him to do as he pleased. Dinner was soon served, and the guests did ample justice to the various dishes set before them. When dinner was over pān sōpārī was brought out, but the king gave orders that no one should take it up before they recognised the animal in the bottle, which was produced at the same time. The size the louse had attained was too prodigious for an animal of its kind, and no one had the remotest idea of what it was. Consequently the louse remained unrecognised, and all the king’s guests left one by one with sorrow at having been foiled in their attempt to win the princess.

Now it happened that a few days before this the princess’s nurse, who had, by this time, amassed a large fortune, expressed a desire to leave her service and go home. The king and the princess urged her very much to stay for a few years more, or at least till such time as the princess should be married, but her anxiety to go home was so great that nothing could persuade her to change her mind. The king, therefore, paid her her dues and dismissed her, giving her besides a few presents in the way of jewels, dresses, and such like other things.
The reason that the nurse was anxious to go home before the dinner came off, was that she had a son, whom she wished to be married to the princess if possible. So she went home, and on the day of the dinner told her son to go and stand near the king's palace, and say that he could make out the animal in the bottle, which, his mother told him, was a house. On the appointed day, therefore, at the dinner hour the nurse's son came and stood near the palace, and, when he saw the kings and others going away one by one, he, pretending ignorance of what was going on in the palace, inquired why so many people had assembled there, and why they were going away one after another. Somebody told him that the people he saw were all princes and nobles, who were invited to guess an animal the princess had, and that the successful person would get the princess in marriage. Upon this the Negro lad said: — "Oh, if that is all, I will recognize the animal; let me see it."

The king was only informed that a Negro lad, who was waiting outside, offered to guess the animal in the bottle. The king then ordered him in, and, in the presence of all the guests, the boy, after one glance at the bottle, said: — "Oh, its only a house." The princess' choice fell upon this Negro boy. Her parents and others tried hard to dissuade her from marrying him, but all their attempts were fruitless. She said: —

"I had imposed a condition for the selection of a husband, and as this boy has successfully fulfilled it I am willing to take him for my husband."

The parents were, therefore, obliged to yield, and they appointed a day, a few months later, for the celebration of the marriage.

In due time the appointed day came, and the nurse's son, accompanied by some of his relatives, went to Church, and was there married to the princess. They then all went to the king's palace, where they were treated to a sumptuous dinner. Now, immediately after dinner, the bridegroom sent away all his relatives, saying he would follow them soon with his wife. His relatives therefore, went in advance to his house. When the bride and bridegroom left to go to his house late in the evening, the king wished to send some of his own servants, to escort them, but his son-in-law refused to take any one with him. The king wanted to give his daughter a lot of clothes and jewellery, and asked his son-in-law how it was to be taken without servants, but he said: — "Oh, do not give anything to-day. You can send all that some other day."

Still the king pressed him to take some persons with him, and at last he agreed to take one man, who carried a box with a few clothes. After they had gone some distance the bridegroom sent away this servant also, offering to carry the box himself. The servant, of course, had no alternative but to obey, and he, therefore, went away. The princess already began to repent of her choice, and complained bitterly that she was tired of walking. So her husband told her to sit in the box, which she did, and was carried by her husband. Now when he had walked for some time he had to obey a call of nature, so, putting down the box with its precious contents he went to some distance for that purpose.

In the meanwhile a prince, who had been out hunting, and who had captured two live tiger cubs, passed that way, and seeing a box with no one near it, his curiosity was roused, and, going up to the box saw the beautiful princess, of whom he asked what she was doing there at such a time. The princess related to him her whole story. Upon this the prince asked her if she was willing to go with him, to which she answered in the affirmative. So the prince, taking her out of the box, put in it the two young tigers, and they both went to his house. Meanwhile, the Negro lad returned, and little thinking of what had transpired in his absence, took up the box, and pursued his way. He, however, felt the box heavier, but, though he wondered at it, he paid no heed to it.

He now walked on and on till he reached his house, and, without waiting, went straight into his sleeping apartment, where he deposited his burden. His parents and all his guests and neighbours were all anxious to see the bride, and asked him to fetch her out; but he refused to
do so, on the pretence that she was tired, and also that she might get frightened at the sight of his relatives who, also, were, of course, Negroes. He then told his parents to treat the guests very sumptuously and to make merry, while he himself retired to sleep. He also told them repeatedly not to pay heed to any noise or to anything that might occur in his room. Thus saying, he went into his room, and closed it tightly from within.

Supper was soon laid out, and the guests partook of it freely, after which they began to sing and dance, and made merry. Meanwhile the bridegroom, after he had entered his room, opened the box to take out his royal bride, but he saw instead two young tigers, who, from being locked up so long, grew furious, and, pouncing upon our hero, tore him to pieces. Loud cries and shrieks emanated from the room, but as the bridegroom had given strict injunctions not to pay heed to what would occur therein, the guests all kept up singing till the small hours of the morning, after which each went to his own house.

The following morning the parents of the bridegroom were surprised that their son did not rise from sleep though it was so late; so they went and knocked at the door of the room, telling him to awake, but no answer came from inside. They thought perhaps he was asleep now after the excitement of the previous day; so they let him alone for some time. Two or three hours later they went again and called him out, but still no answer. They knocked and knocked, with all their might, for nearly an hour, but to no use. They, therefore, suspected something wrong, and broke open the door, when, horrors of horrors, they saw their son torn into a thousand pieces, and no bride, but two tigers, who would have made a meal of them also, had it not been for timely aid from their neighbours and a few guests, who were not yet gone. News of this affair was immediately sent to the king. Thus were the knots of happiness suddenly changed into those of sorrow and misery!

To return to our bride, the princess. She was safely escorted by the strange prince to his own house, where every comfort was provided for her. Next day she asked the prince to take her to her father's house. On reaching home, her parents, the king and queen, who were mourning for her, were surprised to see her, and could hardly believe their eyes. She then related to them, how her husband — the husband of her choice — after sending away the servant, put her in the box and carried it himself; how, on the way, he had put the box down; and how the prince, who was now in their presence, rescued her, and protected her through the night.

When they were satisfied that their daughter was alive and safe, out of gratitude to the prince for rescuing her, they gave her to him in marriage, and, having no other children, for this daughter was their only child, the king handed over the reins of government to their son-in-law, who lived happily with his wife to a very old age, and governed the kingdom with benefit to himself and his subjects.

MISCELLANEA.

A NOTE ON AMOĞHAYARSHA I.

From a verse quoted by Mr. Haridas Sastri, ante, Vol. XIX. p. 379, we learn that a king named Amôghavarsha, to whom according to one recension the authorship of the Prakâśitārav-Ratnamâlā is attributed, "gave up his kingdom, owing to his discriminative knowledge."

Within the last few days, I have found a short but interesting record at Ahole, engraved on the outside of the south wall of a small temple, known as the temple of Râvaṇa, close to the Brâh-

1 The syllables karitāra are puzzling; but I cannot read them otherwise. — In this record, bhajāra occurs in a manical cave, which is doubtless to be applied in this connection, and probably proves that the king whose name is connected with the book in question, is the Râhu-pratīka king Amôghavarsha I.

The inscription consists of four lines. The first three, which are mostly illegible, mention the names of two persons, either as being priests of the temple, or as having caused it to be built; one of them appears to be Sûryakartarabhadâra.1

The fourth line is quite perfect, and very legible; and it consists of the words ārt-Amoğhavara-
twice with the single ! (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 366, note 7).
Amoghavarsha is reigning again."

The characters belong to the time of the first Amoghavarsha of the Rashtrakuta dynasty. And this record indicates distinctly a definite break in his long reign.

Can anything be gathered, from any literary Praṣastī, to show plainly that he voluntarily abdicated for a time? Or is it possible that the verse in the Praṇāṭṭhara-Ruhamāli is euphemistic; and that, in reality, he was overthrown for a time by the Eastern Chalukya king Vijayāditya II., in the course of the twelve years' war that he waged with the Rashtrakutas (see page 101 above)?

A certain date in the fifty-second year of Amoghavarsha I. fell in A.D. 806, and so he began to reign in or about A.D. 815 (see ante, Vol. XVII. p. 143). We have also a later date for him, in or about A.D. 877-78 (ante, Vol. XIII. p. 138).

17th February 1891. J. F. Fleet.

Readings from the Balinath Praṣastīs.

Among the rubbings, which were received by Mr. Fleet from Sir A. Cunningham and sent to me for final disposal, are several copies, or portions of copies, of the two Praṣastīs in the temple of Śiva-Vaidyanātha at Konārāma, which have been edited by Professor Bühlér in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I. pp. 97-118. Imperfect as these rubbings are, a careful study of them at the hand of the printed texts has shown me, how well, if I may be permitted to say so, Professor Bühlér has performed his very difficult task. But in the case of inscriptions in which, owing to other causes, something always is left to conjecture, opinions occasionally may differ; and even an indifferent rubbing may suggest the correct reading, where the best of impressions have failed to do so. I need, therefore, not apologise for venturing to treat here of several passages in the two Praṣastīs, regarding the true reading of which I differ from my learned friend, and in one of which the reading adopted by him is avowedly uncertain.

A.

In verse I of the first Praṣastī, the published text, so far as it is necessary to quote it here, together with its translation, runs thus:—

Yadvyaspyaṁ Paśupatē kumati[dr]a eva paryāpta-bhakti-vīvadhaḥ maṇḍūkāya ta[tha]ṁ 1

ayāṁ stutan 1 Paramēṣa nīmantrītāsī 1

"Although, O Paśupati, I am utterly wanting in intelligence, yet (rendered) wise by (my) intense devotion, I invite thee. O supreme lord, to (listen to) this hymn."

It is hardly necessary to point out that the formation of the word kumālinātra, 'the leader of those who are of weak intellect,' is justified by vīpīnātra, unānātra, basūnātra, and similar expressions. But, to bring out the full meaning of the verse, I must add one or two remarks. The poet invites Śiva and his consort to listen to his hymn; and it should be noted that, in
employing the term nimantrita, he distinctly intimates that his invitation admits of no refusal.\footnote{For the exact meaning of nimantrita, see the Mahabharata on P. III., 3, 103: "Yavanyatikah kartavyaṁ tam-nimantritāṁ Kåh panstut | Haryōh kartavyaṁ víraḥ Brāhmaṇapuṇaśiddhih bhujyaśtan-vyaktāḥ | dharmast Praśasti śtobtāḥ | — And for the employment of the locative case asyātyūdādūḥ in connection with nimantrita, compare, e. g., Manus, III, 388: nimantritā devijātā pūryaḥ, "a Brāhmaṇa, who has been invited to a (rite) in honour of the names" (Bühler's Translation).} But how can he, an ignorant mortal, venture to invite the two great deities to partake of the feast which he is about to provide for them? He can do so, because he is a divine being himself. For he is Indra; and if it be objected that he is only a kṣatrapādākāra, he certainly is a god (bhūda), raised to the rank of the immortals by his intense devotion to Śiva.

B.

In the published version, the second Pāda of verse 6 is —

purēsvu na-dēṣāhām-amarēsvu kṛvatām.

My rubbings yield the reading —

suraēsvu na-dēṣāhām-aparēsvu kṛvatām.

Śiva is able to fulfill the desires of warriors (raṣadhitāhāṁ), who, having approached the hour of death, put not their trust in other gods. Bhavāni is able to fulfill the desire of those who, having approached the hour of death, not trusting to other gods, seek her protection.

C.

Verse 14 is given thus: —

vupuśrāmavadihvamsaṁ vidhātum praṣa-galbhākṣiḥ [2]

"Thou, Mṛiḍā, hast been able to grant a glorious, imperishable body to those who, adorned with three eyes, seek eternal bliss."

"Thou, Mṛiḍā, hast been able to grant a glorious, imperishable body to those who, adorned with three eyes, seek thy protection."

The two aksāras at the beginning of the verse are particularly difficult to read, and I doubt whether I should have made them out in the rubbing before me. But the fourth aksāra appears to me to be rā (not nā); and the upper part of the fifth aksāra looks as if the aksāra were tri (not tī). I accordingly would read the first half of the verse, —


And I would translate: —

"O Mṛiḍā, who art irradiated from close at hand by (thy) three eyes; thou hast been able to grant a glorious, imperishable body to those who are ever eager for battle."

"O Mṛiḍāni, irradiated from afar by the three eyes (of Śiva), thou hast been able to destroy the pride, in their beauty of person, of those who seek shelter with thee."

D.

In verse 29 the poet relates that the merchant Manyuka erected a temple of Śiva; and the first Pāda of the verse is, in the published text, given thus: —

Bhakti-[drvūṣṭe] bhasālēna tō[na]

"by him" (i.e. Manyuka), a bee in the park of devotion," (has been erected this temple). Here drvūṣṭe, an otherwise unknown word, is professedly a conjecture and uncertain.

I confess, it has taken me a long time to find the reading —

Bhakti-truṭa:lobhā-malēna tōṇā

"by him, from whom the filth of avarice was breaking away by reason of his devotion."

But, having found it, I can only wonder that I should not have seen at once, that this is the true reading of the original. For, in the rubbings before me, the aksāras truṭa and bhasālēna are clear at first sight, and a more careful examination of the remaining aksāra shows that it undoubtedly contains the conjunct tī, with the sign of the vowel ṭ (not ś) above it.

E.

In verse 37 we are told that the temple was constructed, or that certain figures were carved on it, —

[Sā]mu-dīrśīnas-anusūpya

"in accordance with the opinion of Śāmu."

My rubbings furnish the reading, —

sāstra-dīrśīnas-anusūpya

"in accordance with the teaching of the Śastras."

F.

The rubbings do not enable me to supply, with anything like certainty, the syllables missing in verse 2 of the first Praśasti, and they are quite useless for restoring the missing portion of the first verse of the second Praśasti. But they do supply the three syllables wanted for the second

\footnote{\textit{drīṣṭi}, compare, e. g., Manus, III, 388: \textit{nimantritā} devijātā pūryaḥ, "a Brāhmaṇa, who has been invited to a (rite) in honour of the names" (Bühler's Translation).}
verse of Praśasti II. In the published text that verse is given thus:

Sa pātu vō [Ma]hādevō — — bhakti-chumbitaḥ [I]
ātmānaṃ mu[h]r-ikshanatē yat-pāda-nakha-darpē [I]

From the two rubbings before me I would read the first half of the verse, —

Sa pātu vō Mahādevō Brahma-ādyā bhakti[m=]a[thitāḥ [I]

"May that Mahādeva protect you, in the mirror of whose foot-nails Brahman, and the other ( gods) repeatedly see themselves, when engaged in worshipping him!"

As regards the reading bhakti[m=]a[thitāḥ], I may add that the aksahara tā is quite clear in at least one rubbing, and that the sign for sthi is like the sign for the first syllable of sthīta in line 54. The consonant of the aksahara preceding sthi may undoubtedly be read m, and I cannot recognize below it the sign for the vowel u. For the general idea contained in the verse, I may draw attention to the expression Hari-Brahma-ādi-ātma-stutam, applied to Śiva in verse 2 of Praśasti I.

G.

In the place of the word kritajñau in verse 9 of Praśasti II, my two rubbings give kirtitārthau, which no doubt yields a better sense, and with which we may compare kritesau in verse 23. The aksahara tā is clear in both rubbings, and the sign for sīh is like the sign for the same conjunct in bhogdrīham in line 30.

H.

There are other passages in the two poems, where I should feel inclined to alter the text. Thus, for [ma]ddi in verse 8 of Praśasti I, I would suggest the reading: addi; and for [bhur ṃ]pati in verse 35 of the same Praśasti, I would put garṇṭpatīr, 'the sun', — an alternation which seems to me to be imperatively demanded by the particle āḥ after the word kūmarārchipā in the same line. But, unable to prove the correctness of these readings from the imperfect materials at my disposal, I would rather conclude these remarks by drawing attention to a difficulty which presents itself to me in verse 7 of the first Praśasti.

In that verse the poet tells us that Śiva surpasses even the god Viṣṇu, and that Pārvatī rides on a lion. Both Viṣṇu and the lion are denoted by the word harē, which is qualified by a compound word, read in the published text, —

Ye[dha]-krī[d]ā-nikrīt-ṣaṣu-sa[rma]-pa[yasya —

"who drank the stream (of blood) from the body of the demon slain in a playful fight," or "who drinks the streams of the blood of those slain (by thee) in the battle-play."

I never like to see words within brackets which are not clearly suggested by the wording or idiom of the original text. And, in the present passage, I have the further difficulty that I know of no authority for translating sarma by 'the stream.' For, according to Ujjvaladattā, sārma means gamana, 'the act of going (or flowing);' and that meaning appears appropriate in the only passage, in the Rig-Veda, in which the word seems to have been met with hitherto. Turning to my rubbings, I find that the aksahara, read rma (in sarma-pasya), does certainly not look like the sign for rma, which we have elsewhere in this inscription. Had I to edit the inscription, I should probably read the end of the compound asura-saṅkhapasya, and should explain this word to mean both 'the leader of the host of demons' and 'the leader of the herd of elephants' (= gaṁga-yāthapasya); but I should not be surprised, if other scholars were to suggest an even more appropriate reading.

Göttingen.

F. KIELHORN.
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Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft for 1889. (Vol. XLIII.)

Dr. Max Grünbaum commences the volume with notes on Firdaši's Yusuf and Zulaiḥa. The article, extending over about thirty pages, takes up the myth of Joseph as given by Firdaši, and traces the various items to their sources in Talmudic and Koranic literature. The twelfth sura of the Qurān, although its account differs from that of the Bible in important particulars, says really very little, and Firdaši has evidently drawn his inspiration from the legends of the Talmud, and those embalmed in Arabic commentators such as Zamahārī, Baidīwī, and Ṭabarī. The article, which is really a delightful collection of Joseph-folklore, will not bear compression. It must suffice to point out how the spirit of measure for measure runs through the whole. Jacob suffers through Leah impersonating Rachel on the wedding night, because he impersonated Esau to his father. He sells away the child of a female slave, so he is condemned to have his favourite son sold as a slave. Joseph was proud of his beauty and boasted
that if he were ever sold as a slave he would fetch a great price; as a consequence he is sold for twenty beggarly silver pieces. He slandered his brethren to his father, and Potiphar's wife brought a false charge against him, and so on through other examples. In conclusion Dr. Grünbaum quotes from an interesting Spanish-Arabic MS. existing at Madrid, probably written in the second half of the fourteenth century. This Poema de José closely follows the same legend.

Dr. Paul Horn next contributes translations of the Pahlavi Vendidad. The text is given in Roman characters, and is accompanied by very full critical notes and a literal translation.

Prof. Böhtlingk gives us a solid contribution on the textual criticism of the Rāmāyāna. The article consists of a list of the epic grammatical peculiarities in the first four books of the Bombay Edition. This edition contains a considerably greater number of ancient forms than the Bangali recension, which has previously been dealt with similarly by Gorresio. At the same time it must not be concluded that all such forms were necessarily ancient ones. All that is meant is that these forms disappeared in later times, and many are actually new ones made under the influence of analogy, and due to the necessities of metre. The one really certain ancient form found in these books is the augmentless Imperfect, which occurs about eleven or twelve times in the four books. The seventh book, the Uttarākanda, of the Rāmāyāna, is admitted to be a later addition to the original epic. Dr. Böhtlingk has accordingly submitted it to the same process as the first four books, in order to see if its later date is vouched for by its language. The statistics of epic forms show that no such conclusion is deducible. This book abounds in the same irregularities. There are, for example, about thirty instances of augmentless forms.

The legend of Joseph secures another historian in Dr. Houtema of Leyden, who describes an old Turkish poem on the subject. This work is of special interest, as helping to fill up the gap in the history of Turkish literature, which has hitherto existed between the fifth and eighth centuries of the Hijra. It was written by one 'Ali in A. H. 630 (1233 A. D.). Dr. Houtema, in addition to his description, gives the text and translation of the portion referring to the sale of Joseph.

Dr. Vellens gives a description of some historical works in the Vice-regal Library at Cairo. The works mentioned are of small interest to Indian students.

The same remark applies to an appendix by Dr. Gotttheil to his list of plants and their properties from the Menda Rath Qudashed of Gregorious Bar 'Elebâsh.

Dr. Büßler next gives us a valuable paper on the Shahbâzgarhi version of Asoka's Edicts. We have here a fresh edition of the text, translation and notes. Dr. Büßler has had the advantage of new and very excellent paper impressions of several of the sets of edicts furnished to him by Dr. Burgess. These impressions enabled him to make minor improvements in the versions of Gîrîn and Khâlsî, such as corrections in regard to the quantities of vowels, the sign for ñ in composition, amsedras and the like. In the Northern versions the gain is much greater. It is now possible to give an almost complete text of that of Shahbâzgarhi, and to read the first eight edicts of Mansurâh without any difficulty. The greatest interest attaches to Edict XIII. at Shahbâzgarhi, a portion of which has hitherto been very doubtful. Dr. Büßler accordingly now gives three versions of this edict, those of Gîrîn, Khâlsî, and Shahbâzgarhi, in parallel columns. The article is preceded by an important dissertation as to the power of certain characters in the North-Indian Alphabet. The following are the principal results arrived at: —

(1) Every letter can have at its lower left end a short stroke going to the left upwards. Thus त or ॐ ka, 产品研发 or 产品研发 ya. This stroke has no phonetic meaning, and serves only to mark the end of the line to which it is attached.

(2) The usual form for the cerebral ॠ is ॠ, but the position of the horizontal strokes is not fixed and we have also ॠ and ॠ.

(3) Dr. Büßler reads the sign ॠ as ॠ, and ॠ as ॠ.

(5) The form ॠ, ॠ or ॠ, which Senart, Hoernle and Bhagvânâl read as _drv or Drv the Dr. Büßler reads as Drv.

(6) Senart has already recognized ं as a variant of ma. Other forms are 럼 and 럼.

(7) A variant of े is the sign े.

(8) Amsedras is usually represented by two short strokes meeting in an angle at the end of the vertical line. If the vertical line has any other appendage, the strokes are put in the middle. Thus द hasi, and ॐ aum. Sani is ॐ and yani ॐ. Kasî is sometimes ॐ. Main is ॐ or ॐ. Sometimes a straight horizontal line at the foot of a vertical one is used, thus ॐ अ.
Ra in composition is represented by,—

(a) a small ra appended, as in र न, saura (savra);

(b) the same ra written cursorily, as a curved line, e.g., र र प्रज्ञ, म ह (priya)draśi. In both these words the sign has hitherto been read as anusvāra; and

(c) more commonly, a short stroke added straightly or obliquely to the base of the vertical line. When the stroke is oblique, and the vertical line has also the left-hand upwards stroke noted in No. 1, it is difficult to decide whether anusvāra or ra is intended to be read, e.g., न न द्रास्तान (which some have read 

дनास्तान), य य वर्चास्ती. Sometimes the ra-stroke is curved, e.g., र र र अत्रास, and sometimes it is appended to the right limb of ka and bha.

(10 and 11) These refer to compound and double consonants.

(12) It is not very difficult to distinguish between ta and ra, da, na and sa. In the Shabhāzgarhi inscription ta is much broader and lower than ra, and da is much shorter than sa. Na is also shorter than sa, and the curvature of its head is much more pronounced.

Prof. J. Barth, of Berlin, opens Part II. of the same volume, with a study on the imperfect in North Semitic. He is followed by Dr. P. Jensen on the nominal prefixes m (s-, c-, s-) and n (t-, t-, s) in Assyrian, and by Dr. Bacher on the scientific works of Elijah Levita. None of these essays have connexion with Indian literature.

We have next a continuation of Dr. Bühler’s Essays on the Anak’s Rock Edicts. In this paper he deals with the Mansahrā version. As already said, he has had the advantage of consulting some new and very perfect rubbings from Dr. Burgess. Text and translations of the first twelve edicts are given, preceded by a study of the Northern Alphabet, as exemplified in this version. The new points in the last (in addition to the remarks about tha, tha, and sta, which have already been given for Shabhāzgarhi) are:

(1) The letter ja has usually the horizontal base which we find in the coins, thus, ज. The form is especially common in the word vra.

(2) Ta is three times written त and once त.

(3) Dha several times appears as ध.

(4) The dental nasal, especially in the form द्ह, closely resembles do, and is only distinguished from it by the greater length of the vertical stroke.

(5) Sa has sometimes an abnormally large head, with a small vertical stroke, and in one instance the latter disappears entirely, so that we have च. The form च noticed at Shabhāzgarhi also occurs.

(6) Anusvāra is more frequently than in Shabhāzgarhi expressed by a straight stroke, usually at the foot of the vertical line, by which it is divided into two equal para. Sometimes, e.g., in न न nagra, it is only on the left-hand side of the vertical stroke, and is then indistinguishable from u. If the line has another appendage, the anusvāra stroke is usually set above it, thus न in atriśu; on the other hand, we have न in (sā)viśu. Altogether abnormal is न, yanā in iyanā.

(7) Ra in composition is mostly represented by a curve turned to the right; all the other forms, however, which have been mentioned under the head of Shabhāzgarhi also occur. Mansahrā is peculiar in sometimes representing the letter by a highplaced horizontal stroke, e.g., in र vra.

(8) The following consonantal groups have peculiar forms in the Mansahrā version, — bhya, mya, vra, vra, spa.

Dr. Bühler’s article is followed by two tales from the Rasavāhini, edited and translated by Dr. Sten Konow. Spiegel published the first four tales in his Anecdoten Pādica. The present paper gives the fifth and sixth. The work is a collection of Buddhist legends, originally composed in Singhalese, and translated into Pāli by the monk Raṭṭhāpāla, which translation was subsequently revised by one Veddātthāra. It contains 203 stories, of which the first forty refer to India and the remaining 63 to Ceylon. The first story given, the Abhajukākassavatthu, should be especially interesting to Indian scholars. It narrates how the life of a heretic snake-charmer was saved by his involuntary ejaculating the name of Buddha. The Hindu story of the wicked Ajamila, who called for his son Nārāyana on his death-bed, and thereby obtained salvation, will be immediately recalled to the mind of the reader.

Prof. Hübischmann follows with a short article on kindred marriages amongst ancient Persians, in which he criticises and partly agrees with Dastur Peshotan Sanjana, who maintains, in his Next-of-kin Marriages in Old Iran, that the evidence of the Greeks as to the custom is
worthless, and that it is not ordered either by the Avesta or by the Pahlavi books.

Dr. Vollers sends a note concerning some unique MSS. in the library of the Imprimerie Catholique in Bârût. Next Prof. Franz Protorius gives a note on the Hamitic elements in Ethiopic, and Prof. Nöldeke on As-Sabti, the son of Harûn ar-Rashîd.

The number concludes with Reviews of,
(1) Sachau’s translation of Alberuni’s India, by Dr. Sprenger.
(2) Kautsch and Socin’s Genesis, by Prof. Kamphausen.
(3) Dr. Bühler’s Life of Hâmâchandra, by Prof. Leumann.

G. A. Grierson.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

VISHNU COMPARED TO RAGS.

अवन्नन्दुस्वंस्वसुस्ववस्वरासनूः
आन्तरऽमस्तद्वपिमन्तिरस्हारीयः

A Pañjâb was once asked by a rich man to praise Vishnu, and did it by the above verse, which means: — ‘I salute Vishnu, who resembles my cloth, in having many gujas, and in having a thousand eyes, in being old and in having neither beginning nor end.’ 

Guj means ‘qualities’ as applied to Vishnu, and also ‘loose threads hanging from a rag.’ The ‘eyes’ in the case of the rag are the holes in it; and owing to wear and tear ‘neither the beginning nor the end’ of the rag could be distinguished.

The story goes that the rich man rewarded the poor Brahman for his wit.

Compare with this, the following slôka from Mricchhhakatîkî, Act II., —

अर्थ पर: सबविद्वान तत्तत्त्वाय पवित्रतवेशाकृति।
अर्थ पर: प्राचीना न भव्यते हर्ष यवः संस्कृते

S. M. Natesa Sastri.

BOOK NOTICES.


The author, to whom we owe already an edition and German translation of Hâmâchandra’s treatise on the gender of nouns, publishes in his new book the text of three similar, but earlier, Sanskrit works, with copious notes, and with extracts from two native commentaries. In an able introduction (pages 1 to 63) he discusses in detail the intricate question of the relative age of various Linganâmasanas. One of the most interesting results of his researches is that the double or treble gender ascribed to many Sanskrit nouns is only partially derived from the language itself, but is for the most part a mere fabrication of native grammarians and lexicographers. Finding that words with double gender gradually became more numerous in later compilations, he ingeniously uses the approximate number of such cases as a criterion for determining the relative age of some Linganâmasanas. The oldest of those now published goes by the name of Vararuci. It is followed by two others, the authors of which bear the well-known names of Harshavardhana and Baka- tayana. Dr. Franke adduces good reasons for identifying Harshavardhana with the great Marsha of Kanauj, who is the nominal author of other Sanskrit works. The commentator on Har-
they were sentient and conscious. A soul was thought to still reside in them and to this notion, very general among the Indians, is in no small degree due that extravagant attachment to the remains of the dead which may be said to mark the race."


This number contains two important articles on the Moors of Ceylon, one by the Hon. P. Ramanathan on the ethnology of the Moors of Ceylon, and one on the Marriage Customs of the Moors of Ceylon, by Ahamadu Bawa.

The first sets out to prove at great length and minuteness of argument that the Moors of Ceylon are really Tamil Muhammadans settled in the country, and got their name from the Portuguese, who gave them the vague name of Moros, simply because they were Muhammadans, and of this Moor is an English translation. The writer of the ethnological article regards the title Mārkar or Marikar, so often found appended to Muhammadan names in Ceylon and South India, as merely the Tamil form of "a man of Marocco," that is, a Moor.

The Moors are divided into Coast Moors and Ceylon Moors, both being of Tamil origin; and the claim of the latter, or more strictly of a portion of them, to be of Arab descent, is shown to be shadowy.

Under these circumstances it is not surprising to find that their marriage customs are of Indian origin, and for this reason peculiarly interesting and instructive to the readers of this Journal.

Briefly, the Moor marriage commences with overtures from the bride’s family, the dowry to be given by the bride being so important a part of the subsequent ceremonies as to lead to the creation of "old maids," whose mode of life unpleasantly resembles that of high-caste Hindu widows. In this connection the terms "caste" and "equal caste" so constantly occur in the writer’s detailed description of these marriages, as to lead one to wish that they had been precisely defined by him.

It is well worth noting that in seeking a bridegroom sons of the proposed bride’s mother’s brother or father’s sister have almost a right to marry her. The go-between is a notable and elderly person, which reverses Indian custom. The all-important portion of the dowry is the cash included in it, as that goes to the bridegroom in order to meet the cost of the wedding presents and purchase the bride’s trousseau; while the real and personal property included in the dowry goes to the bride.

In concluding the betrothal, formerly the bride and bridegroom exchanged rings, but this custom has now died out. Presents are, however, still customary, including "king-kalf" jackets. King-kalf appears to be the familiar kinköf, and it would be interesting to trace the presence of the k in the Sinhalese variant of the word.

The months for marriage are Zu’lkada, Zu’hijja and Rajab, and the days of the week are Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Ill-omened anniversaries in the Muhammadan calendar must, however, be avoided. The invitations to the wedding are delivered personally by the bridegroom in procession, at least ten days before it takes place.

The wedding commences by a conventional feasting of the male guests, followed by a similar feasting of the female. In the evening the bridegroom is presented with cash presents from the friends of the family, apparently with the idea of giving him a fair start in life, and after that he is bathed. A start is then made for the bride’s house, on approaching which the groom is saluted with persons bearing three plates, containing respectively saffron-water, coconut-milk, and betel with small copper coins. The saffron-water and coconut milk are waved over the bridegroom’s head three times, and he spits into the plate after each waving. The betel and the copper plates are thrown over his head among the poor collected. The bride and bridegroom have to acknowledge willingness to marry, and a document is drawn up to prove it, which is, however, left in the hands of the officiating priests, apparently without any safeguards as to its future custody.

The bridegroom is conducted to the bridal chamber by the bride’s father or brother, and the marriage is concluded by clasping a faddī, which is a necklace, round the bride’s neck and in "clothing her," i.e. robing her in a veil. Thus the bridegroom has to do as best he can.

This is followed by a second feasting, and at about two in the morning the bridal pair retire. Early in the morning after daylight they are bathed by the female relatives of the bride: no males being present. They have now to feed each other with three handfuls of rice placed in the mouth.

On the third day, the bridegroom goes to market for the first time, and returns with presents for the bride’s female relatives. He usually lives with his bride’s family till the first child is born.
RECENTLY DISCOVERED BUDDHIST CAVES AT NADSUR AND NENAVALLI IN THE BHOR STATE, BOMBAY PRESIDENCY.

BY THE REV. J. E. ABBOTT.

THE portion of the Bhór State which lies in the Konkán is, I believe, seldom visited by Europeans, and as a consequence two series of Buddhist caves have thus, till recently, remained undiscovered, in the mountains forming its eastern boundary,—the one near the village of Nádsur, Lat. 18° 34' and Long. 73° 21'; the other near the village of Nenavalli (or Kharasambio), Lat. 18° 30' and Long. 73° 23'.

A study of the location of other known caves among the Western Ghauts drew my attention to the fact that they all seemed to be situated along what must have been, in ancient times, the highways from the Dekhánp above to the sea-port towns of the Konkán below. These highways were doubtless then, as now, narrow foot-paths, descending the upper sources of the Konkán rivers, and following these streams to their outlets into the large creeks common along the coast. If Chaul, near the modern Rávadán, was the important city of ancient times it is supposed to have been, it seemed strange that the highway, along the Kuṇḍáliká River to this sea-port, should not have, somewhere along its course, the extensive Buddhist monasteries common to many of the other highways to the north and south.

Believing in the possibility of their existence, I had often inquired of the inhabitants of the Róha Táliká, where my missionary operations largely lie, whether they knew of any such rock caves; but it was not until about a year ago that I received any hint that my conjectures were correct. In December 1898, I was informed that Gómási, a village in the Bhór State, there was a small rock temple dedicated to Śrishidéva. I visited this cave on the 10th December, and found it to be a plain single cell in the gorge of a hill about half a mile to the south of the village. The cell is about 15' × 7', with an image of Buddha in the bhúmisparśa-mudrā, placed on a platform at its farther end. Here I learned that there were extensive caves, a few miles further up the stream, near the village of Nenavalli, which I immediately visited. While examining these caves, I was informed of still others about six miles to the north. Availing myself of an early opportunity to verify this information, I descended the mountains near Khmaḍíla, and walked southward along the foot of the Sahyádris until I reached the village of Nádsur, making constant enquiries as I went along. Here my search was rewarded by the discovery of a series of twenty caves. I give below a brief description of these two Buddhist Vihásras.

The Nádsur Caves.

The village of Nádsur, belonging to the Konkán portion of the Bhór State, is in Lat. 18° 34' and Long. 73° 21'; and the caves, which I first discovered on the 8th January 1898, are to be found to the east of the village about an hour and a half's climb up the mountain. The escarp of rock, in which the caves are cut, runs north and south, and the caves face the west. They are twenty in number, including a natural cave to the north. The caves are, on the whole, in good preservation, although their front portions seem to have fallen away.

The first cave of interest, commencing at the southernmost of the series, is No. III., measuring 34' × 20', and containing twelve dádogás. Six of these are of solid stone, varying from 4' to 6' 6" in diameter. Two small stone dádogás are placed in niches in the walls. Four dádogás are structural. Two of the solid stone dádogás have their Tées remaining on them, one resembling in shape the Tee on the dádog of the Káśi Chaitya cave. The rail pattern appears on the base of the stone dádogás. One of the niches in the wall is perfectly plain, the other is ornamented with the window facade and rail pattern resembling that found at Bélsa and Káśi. The structural dádogás are more or less ruined, and appear to have been at some time opened with the expectation of finding treasure within. One of these lies a little outside of the cave.

The next cave worthy of mention is No. VII., a large hall 48' 9" × 39' and 11' high, with cells on the three inner sides. Between each cell is a niche in the wall. The upper part of the
doorways leading into the cells, and the niches between the cells, are ornamented with the façade pattern, including the semicircular bars, almost the exact reproduction of the façades to be found at Bēḍa and Kāarla. In these façades, below the semicircular bars, and along the upper portion of the walls of nearly the entire cave, are small figures, in bas relief, of serpents, bulls, elephants, tigers, men and women, dāyobāś, and the rail and façade pattern. In the centre of the roof is a figure of the lotus. On the north wall is a short inscription in two lines in the ancient cave character and in the Pāli language, which I have not been able to satisfactorily decipher, but which seems to give the name of the donor or excavator. The sculptures are in good preservation and are well executed. Separated from this hall by a thin wall is the dāyobā shrine, 23' by 16', with an arched roof. The base of the dāyobā is 9' 6" in diameter.¹

The only other cave worthy of mention is No. XV., a room 20' 6" × 14' with two cells. The upper part of the east wall and the doorways of the cells have the rail and façade pattern, similar to that found in the other caves. A narrow outside verandah has at its north end a similarly ornamented niche, now partly broken, a perforated screen window, and a small figure, in bas relief, of a man and woman standing upon what looks like a fish.

No. XX. is a large natural cave, but with benches running east and west. The cisterns are dry, but there is a spring of delicious water, a few rods to the south of the caves, which flows from the rainy season until about the middle of January.

These caves seem to fall into the same group as those at Bhāja, Bēḍa and Kāarla, and were probably excavated at about the same time, or about 100 B.C.

The Nenavali Caves.²

This Buddhist vihāra, which I discovered on the 10th December 1889, is situated about a mile above the village of Nenavali, in Lat. 18° 30' and Long. 73° 23'. The caves are cut into a scarp of rock running north and south, and face the east. They are ten in number, excluding those that are now so ruined as to be undistinguishable, and also excluding the natural cave to the south of the series. The rock in which they are cut is friable; hence the caves are all more or less injured by age. Large portions of rock, forming the roof of some, have fallen, completely ruining many of the caves. The rock is not suited for sculpture; there are no inscriptions; and no ornamentation of even the simplest kind.

Commencing at the most southern of the series, No. I. appears at first sight to be a large cave, 56' × 29', but a restoration of its ruined walls would show that it was formerly divided into many rooms.

No. III. is the only cave of this series especially worthy of mention. It is a large hall, 67' 9" × 52', with seventeen cells on the three inner sides. Each cell has a stone bench, and a window opening into the hall. A verandah, 9' wide, surrounds the hall, leaving a central court. Square holes in the roof of the cave, over the edge of the verandah, shew where wooden posts were once placed at frequent intervals around the central court. The roof is unsupported by pillars. The dāyobā shrine is placed at the north-west corner of the hall, and consists of a rectangular room, 24' × 18', with a circular roof. The dāyobā is 10' high and 9' in diameter, and has lost its Tce.

The remaining caves have nothing of special interest. Many of them are in complete ruin. The two cisterns which I noticed are filled with debris. In many of the cells, large patches of

¹ Since the above was first written, Mr. Consens of the Archaeological Survey has visited these caves and found another inscription on the south wall of this Chaitīya cave, which also has not yet been deciphered. — [This paper was originally received in February, 1890. It was held over, with the object of publishing plans of the caves with it. The necessary drawings, however, did not come to hand. And Mr. Consens has since made more detailed measurements, for the publication of complete plans &c. elsewhere. — Errata.]

² Mr. Consens, in his Government Report, has named them the Kharsambha Caves, from a nearer village of that name.
the original plaster, in which rice husks form a large portion, still adhere to the walls, with traces of paint.

The architectural features of these caves, from which their date must be determined, and their close proximity to the Nāḍsūr caves, lead me to the belief that they belong to the same date as the Nāḍsūr caves which with Bēḷāsa and Bhāja, belong to a period a little prior to the Christian era.

LUCKNOW MUSEUM COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE MAHASAMANTA BALAVARMADĒVA.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

I edit this grant, which does not appear to have been publicly noticed before, from an excellent ink-impression, made and supplied to me by Mr. Fleet. The original plate is in the Lucknow Museum, but no information is available as to where it was found, or by whom it was presented.

The plate is inscribed on one side only. It measures about 13\(\frac{3}{4}\)" broad by 8\(\frac{3}{4}\)" high, not including a projection, about 1\(\frac{3}{4}\)" broad by 2\(\frac{1}{2}\)" high and with a square hole in it, on the proper right side of the plate. In a few places the writing has suffered slightly from corrosion; but, on the whole, the preservation of the plate is good, so that, with the exception of two aksharas of not much importance, in line 9, the actual reading of the text is not at all doubtful. — The size of the letters is between \(\frac{3}{4}\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\). — The characters belong to the northern class of alphabets. Of essentially the same type as those of the Kāśsava inscription of Śivagraha, published ante, Vol. XIX. p. 57, they show a further development of the northern alphabet in the direction of the ordinary Nāgarī, and may thus be assigned to about the 9th or 10th century A.D. They include a form of the numerical symbol for 20, in line 12, and, in the same line, the ordinary decimal figure for 2. — The language is Sanskrit; and, excepting the benedictive and imprecatory verses in lines 13-15, the inscription is in prose. In respect of orthography, I have only to note that, except, as it would seem, in the words parama-brahmanyas and Balavarmmadēvah, in line 3, and in brahma-, in line 4, b has been written by the sign for v, and that the rules of svaādhi have been occasionally neglected, as will be shown in the notes on the text, below.

The inscription is one of the Mahāsamanta Balavarmadēva, who had assumed the puṣkamahāsabda, and who meditated on the feet of the Mahāsamanta Pāṇḍuvarmaḍēva, the latter being represented as having attained the puṣkamahāsabda through the favour of the god Varēsvaravāmin, i.e. Siva (lines 1-3). From (his residence at) Brihadgrīha (line 1), Balavarmaḍēva (in lines 4-9) makes known to present and future royal families (rājubala) and to the people concerned, that, at the request of the village of merchants (which from the context I understand to be the village granted) headed by the śrēṣṭhis Dammukā, he, for their and their parents' spiritual benefit, granted the village of Bhūjaṅgīka on the (river) Vēgamandā to certain religious students, ennumerated by name, who followed the Vājasanēyi-Mādhyaṇdina and Kauthuma-Čheṭṭhāṅgōs kāhās and belonged to the Gautama, Anamparyavaya, Sāṇḍilya, and Vāśīṅgu gōtras. And (in lines 10-11) he exhorts both the rulers and the inhabitants of the village to make over to the donees all customary dues and taxes. Line 12 contains the date — the year 20, the 2nd of the bright half of Chaitra,' the year of which appears to be a regnal year; and gives the name of the dātaka, Kēlaṅha, and of the writer, the Śāntīhīvraṇikā Ādityadatta; and lines 13-15 contain three of the customary benedictive and imprecatory verses.

I have not met the names of the Mahāsamanta Pāṇḍuvarmaḍēva and Balavarmadēva in any other record; and, not knowing where the plate may have been found, I have not attempted to identify the places and the river, mentioned in this inscription. But I may
perhaps draw attention to the facts that the name Br̥hadgṛha is by Hēmachandra, given as a synonym of Kārṣṇa, and that in a quite modern inscription, put up during the rule of the English, the name Kārṣṇa-dēśa apparently is applied to the district of Shahābād of the Patnā Division of Benga).

**TEXT.**

2. sat[II]va-vara-pradasya [ḥṛ]-Varāvāsāvāmnaḥ pāda-mūlādā-sūryā-paṣeṣhamaḥṣa-vād(a)ma-haṁsāmanta-śri-Pāṇḍuvaṁmadēva-pādaṇu-
3. dhyātaḥ parama-mahēśvaraḥ parama-[bra]haṁsāyāḥ saṁyogatapaśeṣhamaḥṣa-vād(a)ma-haṁsāmanta-śri-[B]aḥvaṁmadēvaḥ kuṇal[II]
4. Vēganand-āpakaṇṭhā Bhujāṅgikā-grāmē samugatāṁ vartamāna-bhūvishya-rāja-
5. -kulaṅgyat-ad-grāma-nvīśimsaecha bhūmaṇ-ēttarā-
6. n-yath-ārham-mānayaḥ vō(bō)dhyati chāstū vō viditam-ayam-parivīkṣita-grāmē-
7. smābhīḥ śrēṣhthi-Dammuca-pramukha-vaśī.-

**EXAMINATION OF QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE VIKRAMA ERA.**

**BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E., GÖTTINGEN.**

(Continued from Vol. XIX. p. 374.)

To facilitate the use of the preceding list, I have compiled the following general list of Vikrama dates which gives all the calculated dates in their natural sequence, without

---

1. Hēmachandra's Abhiddhama-chāhrāṇa, verse 990.
2. See Archaeol. Survey of India, Vol. III. p. 70, and Plate xxiv. 4, line 5: — Agyagha-rāja! vartamānḥ Kārṣṇa-
3. dēśa.†
4. From the ink-impresion.
5. Expressed by a symbol.
6. This sign of punctuation is unnecessary.
7. Read "vṛiddhya ēbhīyaḥ.
8. Read "vṛiddhya ēbhīyaḥ.
9. Read "vṛiddhya ēbhīyaḥ.
10. The letters in these brackets are doubtful.
11. Here and at the end of the following words of this line, the rules of sāndhi have not been observed.
12. This expression occurs, e.g., in Gupta Inscriptions, p. 216, line 14.
13. Read matrix. 14. This sign of punctuation is unnecessary.
15. Stop of this and the following verses. 20. Kāra (Anāśīvāh).
16. Read -dattāḥ vā. 17. Read shabdāhācāhā.
reference to classification by results. But in this chronological list I have included also a number of other dates, chiefly dates which do not admit of verification, because it appeared desirable to collect in one place, especially for the more early times, all trustworthy Vikrama dates which have hitherto become known to us. Dates which have not been previously calculated will here be given in full; for the rest, the principal items of each date only will be repeated, sufficient for identification, together with a reference to the page of Vol. XIX. of this Journal, where the full wording of the date may be found, together with the calculated results.

GENERAL CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF VIKRAMA DATES.

1. — **V. (?) 428.** — *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 253. Bijayagadhi (in Rājputānā) stone pillar inscription of Vishnupardhana:

(Line 1) ... Kṛtiśaḥ chaturṣuḥ varsha-satēṣha-visēṣha 460 28 Pārlīgaṇa(na)-
lahulasya paṇchadasaśyām-śasyaś-purvaśyām [1]*

2. — **V. 480 (?)**. — *ib. p. 75*. Gangdharī stone inscription of Vishnuramaː

(Line 19) ... Yatēṣhaḥ catur[ra]suḥ kri(kri)teṣha śatēṣhaḥ saṃyashvāḥ[śaṁ]-tāta-sodara-
padēṣhv-saḥ vata[s][reṣhu] (1) śuklē trayōdaśa-dinē bhuvi Kārttiśaṃsā māsasya sarva-jana-
chitta-sukha-avasayaḥ

3. — **V. 493 and 529.** — *ib. p. 83*. Mandāsor stone inscription of Kumāragupta and Bandhuvardhana:

(Line 19) ... Mālavānāṃ ganasthītyā yat[ṛ]e śata-chatsusṭaye | trinastry-adhikē-
bdānāṃ=ri[ṛ]tānu sāvya-ghana-staneḥ | Sānhasya-māsa-śuklasya prāsāṭe-hmi trayōdaśe |

(Line 21) ... Vatsara-satēṣhaḥ panīkasuḥ visāṃty-adhikē ṣu navasu ch=ūbdēṣhaḥ |
yatēṣhaḥ-abhiramāya-Tapaśya-māsa-śukla-drivyāyāṁ

4. — **V. 589.** — *ib. p. 154*. Mandāsor stone inscription of Yvacodharman-Vishnupardhana:

(Line 21) ... Paṇchasa satēṣhaḥ śaṅdaṁ yatēṣhaḥ-ekānmanavati-sahitēṣhaḥ | Mālav-
ganasthiti-vadē=kāla-jhānaya likhitēṣhaḥ

5. — **V. 746.** — *ante, Vol. V. p. 181*. Jhālāradātā stone inscription of Durgaganaː

(Line 16) ... Saṃvatara-satēṣhaḥ satasasu shaṣchatvāriṇiśad-adhikēṣha [1]*


7. — **V. 795.** — *ante, Vol. XIX. p. 59*. Kanasa stone inscription of Siyaganaː

(Line 14) ... Saṁvatara-satārī-yataḥ sa-paṇīca-navatē-arggalaiḥ [1] sapatabhr-
Mālavēśānāṁ

8. — **P. 373, No. 196.** — **V. 811 (?),** Māgha-sūtī 5, Bṛhaspati-vārē. Inscription at Chitār in Rājputānā.


(Line 20) ... Saṃvat 800 70 9 Māgha-sūtī 20 (?)

---

1 The list will be found to contain all Vikrama dates of the inscriptions published in this Journal, in the *Epigraphia Indica*, and in Mr. Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, and all important dates from the face-miles in the *Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India*, and from such impressions and rubbings as are in my possession. Some early dates from inscriptions in the *Jour. Beng. As. Soc.* have not been included in the list, because their readings appeared to me uncertain. Such are, e.g., the dates in the Shakkavati inscription (V. 1018 and 1019, in Vol. IV. p. 583, and the dates of an inscription 'from a Boolee at Hussungar' (V. 1699 and apparently the year Chitra-
bhau) and of an inscription from the neighbourhood of Mount Abā (V. 1653 and 973 (?) in Vol. X. pp. 673 and 819).

2 According to Mr. Fleet, a village about 52 miles south-west of Jhālāradātā, the chief town of the Jhālāwādī State in the Western Mālwa division of Central India.

3 In the Western Mālwa division of Central India.

4 Read vīrātāt. —

---

5 The references by page and number, here and in a similar manner under other dates, are all to Vol. XIX. of this Journal.


(Line 7) . . . Navasū satēśhav-svādānāṁ dvāttīrūṁsat-saṁyutēśhu Vaiśākhē . . .

13. — V. 933. — Ib. p. 159. Gwālōr stone inscription of Bhōjadēvā of Kanauj:


(Line 5) . . . asminnēva samvatsara Phālguṇa-vahula-paksha-pratipadī . . .

(Line 11) . . . asminnēra samvatsara Phālguṇa-vahula-paksha-navayāṁ . . .


. . . Mālava-kālāch-charadān śatīrīmśat-saṁyutēśhv = satēśhū navasu satēshu . . .


(Line 1) . . . [ma*]hārājīdhīṛā-paramēśvara-ērī-[Ma*]hēndrapālādeva-pādānāṁ māhī-pravardhamāna-kalyāṇavijaya[ri*]jyā sam[vāsa*]ra-satēshu nava-sata shaaśty-adhikēśhu Śrvāna . . . . . . . . . . samvat 960 Śrvāna . . .


19. — V. 965. — Ib. p. 174. Date in the Siyādōṇī stone inscription:

(Lines) . . . samvatsara-satēshu nava-sata paṭchhaśhāṭhy-adhikēśhu Aśvina-māśe prati-padāyāṁ samvat 965 Aśvina-ṣudi 1 . . .

20. — V. 967. — Ib. p. 174. Date in the Siyādōṇī stone inscription:

(Lines) . . . samvatsara-satēshu nava-sata sapta[sha*]shāṭhī-adhikēśhu Phālguṇa-māśa amavasyāyāṁ samvat 967 Phālguṇa-vadī 15 . . .

21. — V. 969. — Ib. p. 175. Siyādōṇī stone inscription; date of the Mahērājādhīṛā Dhūrbhāṭa:

(Line 16) . . . samvatsara-nava-satēshu ekōnasaptatī-adhikēśhu Māgha-māśa paṭchchāmyāṁ samvat 969 Māgha-ṣudi 5 adya-ēha śrimat-Siyādōṇīyaṁ mahārājādhīṛā-ērī-Dhūrbhāṭa[jaḥ]pariḥbhugāyaṁāṇē . . . .


(Line 1) . . . Paramabhaṭṭaraka-mahārāj[ri*]dhīṛā-paramēśvara-ērī[Ma*]hārī[ndra]pālād[Ma*]va-pādānudhyāt[a*]-paramabhaṭṭaraka-mahārājādhīṛā-paramēśvara-ērī-Mahīp[Ma*]lēdeva-pādā...
THE VIKRAMA ERA.

23. — V. 981. — ante, Vol. XIII. p. 252; and a rubbing, supplied to me by Dr. Burgess. Date of a stone inscription in the British Museum: —

(From the rubbing, line 9) Samvat 961² Kārttika-sudi 13 niḥpanam-iti ||

24. — V. 983. — ante, Vol. XIII. p. 253; and a rubbing, supplied to me by Dr. Burgess. Date of another stone inscription in the British Museum: —

(From the rubbing, line 16) . . . Samvat 983³ Chaitra-sudi-paṃchamayāṁ niḥpanam-iti ||


(Line 30) . . . samvat 1008 Māgha-śūdi 11 aḍī-ēha Siyaḍōṇi-pattanē mahārājādhirāja-śrī-Nishkalaṅkas . . .


(Line 28) . . . samvatsara-duṣṭa-saśeṣu ekādān-adhikēṣu samvat 1011 . . .

33. — P. 22, No. 3. — V. 1016, Māgha-śūdi 13, Sanau. Rājgūḍh copper-plate inscription of the Mahārājādhirāja Mathanadēva; of the reign of Vījyapālādēva, the successor of Khajipiṭhādēva.


(Line 33) . . . Samvat 1025 Māgha-vadi 9 aḍī-ēha Siyaḍōṇi-pattanē mahārājādhirāja-śrī-Nishkalaṅka-paribhujyamānē . . .

¹ Read -maḥ-duṣṭa-paṃchayāṁ (H?). ⁴ The published version has 781. ⁵ The published version has 783.

² Read -pādānu-dhyātāḥ .

³ Supposing the date of the original to have been V. 1006, Chaitra-sudi 4, Sukra, the corresponding date, for northern V. 1006, expired, would be Friday, 17th March, A. D. 982.
   (Line 13) śkatripiśa-sahasrika-samvatsarē-smin Bhādrapaḍa-śukla-chaturdasyādh pavi
   traka-parvvaṇi śrīmad-Ujjayaṇi-samāvāsitaḥ 
   (Line 32) sam 1031 Bhādrapaḍa-śudi 14 .

36. — P. 28, No. 4. — V. 1036, Kārttika-śudi 15, a lunar eclipse. Copper-plate inscription of the Paramāra Vākpatīrāja of Dhārā.

37. — P. 29, No. 31. — V. 1042, Bhādrapaḍa-śudi 15, Budhē. Date of Pārśvanāga's Ātmānūsāsana.


40. — P. 361, No. 168. — Vikrama 1050, Pausha-śudi 5, (Budhē). Date of Aṃtākṣita's Subhāśita-ratana-saṅgdēva, of the reign of the Paramāra Mūṇja of Dhārā.


   (Line 22) . . . Samvat 1058 Kāṛttikyāh.


   (Line 2) . . . Samvat 1083 Pausha-dinē 11 [11*].


   (Line 5) . . . adya Kāṛttikē-parvaṇi .

   (Line 1). — Samvat 1093 Ashāgha-śudi 1 ady-ēha śrīmat-Katē mahārājādhirāja-śrī-Yasaḥ-
   pālah Kanṣamba-maṇḍalē . . .

49. — V. 1089. — ante, Vol. XIII. p. 185 (Vol. XIV. p. 352). Date in the Udayagiri Aṃṛita cave inscription ;
   (Line 4). — Samvat 1093.

   inscription of Viśayādhirāja.

   inscription of the Chandella Dēvavarmadēva.
52. — V. 1136. — From a rough copy, supplied to me by Dr. Hoernle. Arthunā inscription of the Paramāra Chāmunḍarājā (the son of Maṇḍanadēva): 13

(Line 53) Saṃvat 1136 Phālguna-sūdi 7 Sukṛī...

53. — V. 1137. — From Sir A. Cunningham's rubbing, supplied to me by Mr. Fleet. Udaypur (in Gvālior) stone inscription of the Paramāra Udayāditya of Mālava; —

(Line 5) Saṃvat 1137 Vaisākha-sūdi 7.

54. — P. 36, No. 60. — Vikrama 1139, Jyāshta-sūdi 3, Soma. Date of Guruchandragaṇi's Sriśra-charitra.

55. — P. 361, No. 170. — V. 1145, Bhādrapada-sūdi 3, Soma-dīnē. 'Dubbund' (south-west of Gvālior) stone inscription of the reign of the Mahārājādhirājā Vikramasimha (?).

56. — V. 1145. — My Report on Sanskrit MSS. for 1880-81, p. 22. Date of a MS. of the Nikāyānasūtra-chāyā of the time of the Chaulukya Karnaḍēva; —

Saṃvat 1145 Jyāshta-vadī 14 Mahārājādhirājā-sūtra-karaṇa-rājyē """"


(Line 1) Vikrama-saṃvat 1148 Vaiśākha-sūdi 15 Soma 'adya-sūtra ārāmdā Aṣphu-pāṇjakē.

(Line 6) Adya sūmagrahana-parvaṇī """"

58. — V. 1150, ante, Vol. XV, p. 41. Gvālior Sāsahū temple inscription of Mahipāla; —

(Line 40) Ekādaṣāsva-atīśhau saṃvatara-katāhau cha ekōma-paṇḍasaśa(śa)ti cha gatēśvadveśv(bōsē)hu Vikramat 1 Paṇḍasaśa(śe) ch-Aśvī(śe)ni māsē kriṣṇa-pakṣē . . . .

aṃkāṭeśi 1150 1 Aśvī(śe)ni-va(ba)hula-paṇchaṃyām [118]

59. — V. 1152. — Archael. Surv. of India, Vol. XX. p. 102, and Plate xxii. Inscription on pillar of temple at 'Dubbund': —

(Line 1). Saṃvat 1152 Vaiśāsha(kha)-sūdi-paṇchaṃyām 1


64. — V. 1161. — Zeitschrift für die Kunde der Morgen., Vol. VII. p. 306. Nāgpur stone inscription of the Paramāra Naravarmadēva; —

Saṃvat 1161.

65. — V. 1164. — In the Transactions of the Royal As. Soc., Vol. I. p. 226, Colonel Tod has given the "substance of an inscription from Madhucara-ghar, in Haronta," apparently of

13 The 7th of the bright half of Phālguna of V. 1136, expired, would correspond to Friday, 31 January, A. D. 1089.

14 The 15th of the bright half of Vaiśāka of northern V. 1148, expired, would correspond to Monday, 5 May, A. D. 1091, when there was a lunar eclipse, 23 h. 23 m. Greenwich time, or, at Ujjain, 21 h. 25 m. after mean sunrise.
the reign of the Paramārā Naravarman, which is said to mention an eclipse of the sun (5), and the date of which is rendered:—

"On the full moon of Pausha, Samvat 1164."


67. — P. 362, No. 171. — V. 1173, Vaiśākha-sūdi 3, Sukrē. Date of the renewal, by the Chandēḷa Jayavarmadēva, of the Khajurāhē inscription of Dhaṅgadēva (43, above).


69. — P. 167, No. 84. — V. 1177, Kārttika-vadi 15, Ravi-dinē. Copper-plate inscription, of the Mahārajādhirāja Virājimahādeva.

70. — V. 1177. — Jour. Beng. As. Soc., Vol. XXXI. p. 124. Copper-plate inscription of Gōvindachandradēva of Kanaūj, regarding a transfer of land which had been previously granted by (the Kalachuri ?) Yasaṅk-karnadēva:—

Samvat 1177 Kārttika-sukla-chaturdasīyaḥ . . .

71. — V. [1179]. — My Report on Sanskrit MSS, for 1880-81, p. 25. Date of a MS. of the Pañcarāṣṭra, of the time of the Chunukya Jayasimhādeva:—


73. — P. 365, No. 179. — V. 1182, Māṅgha-vadi 6, Sukrē. Copper-plate inscription of Gōvindachandradēva of Kanaūj.


75. — V. 1186. — Archaeol. Surv. of India, Vol. XXI. p. 34, and Plate x, A. Kāḷaṇjar stone pillar inscription of the Chandēḷa Madanavarmadēva:—

(Line 3) . . . Saṁvat 1186 mahārajā śrī-Madanavarmadēva


77. — V. 1197. — Archaeol. Surv. of India, Vol. XXI. p. 34, and Plate x, B. Kāḷaṇjar stone pillar inscription of the Chandēḷa Madanavarmadēva:—

(Line 1) . . . Saṁvat 1187 Jyeṣṭhā-sūdi 9 śrīmad-Madanavarmadēva


Saṁvat-saṅkāśa-ādikē ēkaṇaṣa(śa)-sātē Kārtikā-paurṇamāṣayām tithau Sukra-dinē-śākate-pi śaṁvat 1188 Kārtika-sūdi 15 Sukrē


— Pauṣa-sūdi 15 of V. 1164, expired, would correspond to the 31st December, A. D. 1107, when there was a lunar eclipse, 16 h. 21 m. Greenwich time, or, at Ujjiain, 15 h. 24 m. after mean sunrise. And there was a solar eclipse, visible in India, on the 16th December, A. D. 1107, 6 h. 18 m. Greenwich time, or, at Ujjiain, 5 h. 21 m. after mean sunrise, corresponding to the pūrṇimanta Pauṣa-vadi 15 of V. 1164 expired.

18 A continuation of the same MS., ib. No. 42, is clearly dated in Saṁvat 1179.

17 The date corresponds, for V. 1188 expired, to Friday, 8 November, A. D. 1131, when the full-moon tide ended 15 h. 56 m. after mean sunrise.
81. — V. 1190. — ante, Vol. VI. p. 55. Ingamda stone inscription of the Mahārājādhirāja Vijayapalādeva:


(Line 6) . . . Āśā(śā)ha-śuklapaksh-hā-ekkāda-sāmān parvapai...

82. — V. 1191. — ante, Vol. XIX. p. 353. Date of the Paramāra Yauvvarddeva, in the copper-plate inscription of the Mahākumara Lakshmīvarmadēva (89, below):


84. — V. 1192. — ante, Vol. XIX. p. 349. Copper-plate inscription of the Paramāra Yauvvarddeva:

(Line 12) . . . Samvat 1192 Mā[rsga]-vadi 3 [11*]


86. — V. 1196. — ante, Vol. X. p. 159. Dōhad stone inscription of the Chaulukya Jayasimhadeva(?)

(Line 8) . . . śrī-nṛpa-Vikrama-samvat 1196.

87. — P. 23, No. 7. — V. 1199, Phālguṇa-śiṇi 11, Śanau. 'Gagahā' copper-plate inscription of Gōvindachandradēva and (the Mahāraja-putra) Rājya-palēva of Kanauj.


89. — P. 40, No. 80. — V. 1200, Śravana-śiṇi 15, a lunar eclipse. Ujjain copper-plate inscription of the Paramāra Mahākumara Lakshmīvarmadēva.


93. — V. 1207. — In Archael. Surv. of India, Vol. I. p. 96, Sir A. Cunningham mentions an inscription at 'Hāthiya-āhā' of the time of 'Gōsallāvē', the queen of Gōvindachandrēva of Kanauj, which, he says, is dated:

"on Thursday, the 5th of the waning moon of Āśāda, in Samvat 1207."


18 The 5th of the dark half of the amanta Āśāda of southern V. 1207, expired, would correspond to Thursday, July, A. D. 1181.
96. — V. 1208. — Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I. p. 300. Date of the Vādnagar Prāsasti of the reign of the Chaulukya Kumārapalādeva:—

(Line 43) . . . Śripāla-nāmā kavi-chakravarti prāsastims-tām-akarōt-prāsastām ||

Saṁvata(t) 1208 varahē Āśva-tuṣā(ṁ) Guraṁ likhitam . . .

97. — P. 166, No. 81. — V. 1209, Kārttika-vādi 12, Sōme. Date of a MS. of the Pīṇḍanirukti.

98. — V. 1210. — From Sir A. Cunningham's rubbings, supplied to me by Mr. Fleet. Date of the Ajmere stone-inscription containing Vigrarhatjadēva's Harakēlī-nātyaka:—

Saṁvata 1210 Mārgga-sūdi 5 Āditya-dīnē Sravaṇa-nakhastrē i Makara-sthē chahdhrē i Harshaṇa-yōga i Vā(bha)vāra-karaṇē || Harakēlī-nātyakaṁ samāptaṁ ||

99. — V. 1211. — Archaeol. Surv. of India, Vol. XXI. p. 73, and Plate xxiii., D. Mahōba image inscription of the Chandēla Madanavarmadēva:—

(Line 2). — Śrīman-Madanavarmmadēva-rājyē saṁ 1211 Āśaḥgha-sūdi 3 Sa(ṇ)au(?)

100. — P. 29, No. 32. — V. 1215, Chaitra-sūdi 8, Ravaṇ. Girnār stone inscription.


(Line 1). . . Saṁvata 1215 Māgha-sūdi 5 ērman-Madanavarmmadēva-pravarddhhamāna-vijaya-rājyē ||

102. — P. 29, No. 33. — V. 1216, Bhādra-sūdi 1, Ravaṇ. Alha-ghāṭ stone inscription of the Kalachuri (Chēdē) Narasimhadvē.

103. — P. 29, No. 34. — V. 1218, dvi Āśaḥgha-sūdi 5, Guraṁ. Date of a MS. of the Kalpachārē, of the time of the Chaulukya Kumārapalādeva.

104. — P. 30, No. 35. — V. 1218, Śravaṇa-sūdi 14, Ravaṇ, mahāchaturdaśī-parvani, Nādōl copper-plate inscription of the Chāhmāna Ālhamśēva.


109. — V. 1224. — In the Asiatic Researches, Vol. XV. pp. 445-446, is a translation, by Captain E. Fell, of an inscription from Hānāl, apparently of the reign of (the Chāhmāna) Prithvirāja, the date of which is given thus:—

"In the year of Sumbat 1224 (A. D. 1168), on Saturday, the seventh of the white fortnight, of the month Māgha."


111. — P. 182, No. 135. — V. 1225, Chaitra-vādi 5, Būdhē. Jaunpur stone pillar inscription of Vijayaśachandradēva of Kanaūj (?)

13 The 5th of the bright half of Mārgaśīra of V. 1210, expired, would correspond to Sunday, 29 November, A. D. 1153. On that day, the 5th tithi of the bright half and the karana Bilva ended 9 h. 17 m., and the moon was in the nakhastrē Sravaṇa up to 3 h. 56 m., after mean sunrise; the yōga Harshaṇa began 9 h. 47 m. after mean sunrise.

19 Compare also Transactions, Roy. As. Soc., Vol. I. p. 154. — The above date does not work out satisfactorily for, Māgha-sūdi 7 would correspond, for V. 1224 current, to Sunday, 20 January, A. D. 1167; and for V. 1224 expired, to Friday, 19 January, A. D. 1163.
112. — P. 184, No. 143. — V. 1225, Jyēsahtha-vadi 3, Budhē. Tārāchāndi rock inscription of the Mahāndyaaka Pratāpadhavālaḍēva, containing a reference to Viṣayachandradēva of Kanauj.


(Līne 17) pañcchaviṁśatī-adhikā-dvādaśa-[śa]ta-saṁvatsarā-nikē-pi saṁ 1225 Māghipuṇṇamāsiyān...


(Līne 27) Paśiddhiṁ-agamahā-deva(l)kalē Viṣayama-baḥsvatāḥ saḥdiṁśa-dvādaśa-śatē Phālguṇē kriśṇa-paśchakē 91 tīrṭhīyāṁ tīthau vārē Gunaś tērē cha Hastakē Vṛiddhi-nāmaṇi yogē cha kaṇē Taitāle tatē 92 tī Saṁvate 1226 Phālguna-vadi 3...

115. — V. 1232. — It. p. 46. Mānālgaha stone pillar inscription of the Chāhumāna Prīthvīrāja:

Mālavsē-gata-vatsara-satābhi dvādaśaśa-cha chaḥdiṁśa-pūrvakaśa...


117. — P. 171, No. 103. — V. 1229, Mārga-vadi 9, Sōmē. Date of a MS. of Dharmottarāchārya's Nyāyavindu-ṭikā.


120. — V. 1231. — Archaeol. Surv. of India, Vol. VI. Plate xxi. Inscription in temple at Vīsalpur:

(Līne 7) Saṁ 1231 Pausha-su 15.

121. — P. 30, No. 36. — Viṣayama 1232, Chaitra-sūdi 1, Bhaumē. Date of Narapati's Narapati-jayachārya, of the time of the Chaulukya Ajaya-pāladēva.


21 The 3rd of the dark half of the pūrṇimānta Phālguna of V. 1236, expired, would correspond to Thursday, 5 February, A. D. 1170.
22 There was no solar eclipse on Pausha-vadi 15, pūrṇimānta or asamānta, of V. 1236, current or expired.

(10, line 4) . . . Saú 1239.


131. — P. 37, No. 68. — V. 1243, Jyéshtha-śudi 11, Budhé. Inscription at Ajaygaúh.


134. — V. 1244. — Archaeol. Surv. of India, Vol. VI. p. 166, and Plate xxi. Visalpur stone pillar inscription of the Cháhumána Prithvirája:

(Line 1) . . . Samasta-rajá-vall-sa[ma]laukkrita-parmanabhat-táraka-mahárajádhirája-paramé-
[sva]ra-srí-Prithvirájadéva-rájyé tatra tasmin kálé saúvat 1244 . . .

135. — V. 1247 (?). — Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I. p. 49. Ratnapur stone inscription of the Kalachuri (Chédí) Prithvidéva:

(Line 24) . . . Saúvat 1247 (?).

136. — P. 23, No. 8. — Vikrama 1251, Kárttika-śudi 12, Sukré. Date of a MS. of Hémacandrá’s Vyájásátra, of the time of the Chaulukya Bhimadéva II.


138. — P. 38, No. 70. — V. 1253, Vaiśákha-śudi 11, Bhaumé. Bélkhar stone pillar inscription of one of the rulers of Kanaúj (?).

139. — P. 171, No. 104. — V. 1253, Márga-vadi 7, Sukré. Ráwah copper-plate inscription of the Maháráçaka Salakhañvarmadéva, of the time of the Kalachuri (Chédí) Vijayadéva.


141. — P. 173, No. 109. — Vikrama 1258, Bhádrapada-vadi 15, Bhaumé. Copper-plate inscription of the Chaulukya Bhimadéva II.


143. — P. 182, No. 136. — Vikrama 1260, Jyéshtha-śudi 5, (Guraú). Date of Malayaprabhasátri’s commentary on Mánatunásári’s Siddhajayanti-charitra.

144. — P. 177, No. 122. — Vikrama 1261, Áśvina-śudi 7, Rávau. Date of a MS. of Mánatunásári’s Siddhajayanti-charitra, of the time of the Chaulukya Bhimadéva II.


146. — P. 358, No. 164. — V. 1264, Áśādha-śudi [27], Sómi. Copper-plate inscription of the time of the Chaulukya Bhimadéva II.

147. — P. 38, No. 72. — V. 1265, Vaiśákha-śudi 15, Bhaumé. Mount Ábú stone inscription of the reign of the Chaulukya Bhimadéva II.
148. — P. 24, No. 9. — Vikrama 1266 (Śiśca 96), Mārga-śūdi 14, Gura. Copper-plate inscription of the Chaulukya Bhīmadēva II.


150. — V. 1269. — Archaeol. Surv. of Indica, Vol. XXI, p. 50, and Plate xii., D. Ajaygaḍh stone inscription of the Chandella Trailokyavarmadēva:—

(Line 1) Saṅvat 1269 Phālguna-vadi . . . . Sanau rája-śrī-Trailokyavaranmadēva-vijayarājyē . . .


153. — P. 24, No. 11. — V. 1275 (Chitrabhaṇu-saṅvatśarē), Mārga-śūdi 5, Sanau. Harṣandasā (or Chārwāli) stone inscription of Dēvapaladēva of Dhārā.

154. — V. 1276. — ante, Vol. XVII, p. 63. Buddhist stone inscription from Srāvasti, with references to the rulers of Kālanj Gōpālā and Madana:—

(Line 18). Saṅvat 1276 [*]


156. — P. 25, No. 13. — Vikrama 1283, Kārttika-śūdi 15, Gura. Kaḍī copper-plate inscription of the Chaulukya Bhīmadēva II.


158. — V. 1286. — From Sir A. Cunningham’s rubbing, supplied to me by Mr. Fleet. Udaypur (in Gwālīor) stone inscription of Dēvapaladēva of Dhārā:—


159. — P. 369, No. 188. — Vikrama 1287, Āśāḍha-śūdi 8, Sukrē. Kaḍī copper-plate inscription of the Chaulukya Bhīmadēva II.


161. — P. 366, No. 131. — Vikrama 1288, Bhādrapada-śūdi 1, Sōmē. Kaḍī copper-plate inscription of the Chaulukya Bhīmadēva II.


163. — V. 128[9 ?]. — From Sir A. Cunningham’s rubbing, supplied to me by Mr. Fleet. Udaypur (in Gwālīor) stone inscription of the Mahārājābhājirāja Dēvapaladēva of Dhārā:—

(Line 1) . . . Sāṅvat 128[9 ?] varshē Mārga-vadi 3 Guraū . . . .

164. — P. 25, No. 15. — V. 1292, Kārttika-śūdi 8, Ravaū. Date of a MS. of a Yājñastra-

166. — P. 166, No. 82. — Vikrama 1296, Mārga-vadi 14, Ravaū. Kaḍī copper-plate inscription of the Chaulukya Bhīmadēva II.

165. — P. 366, No. 185. — Vikrama 1295, Mārga-śūdi 14, Gura. Kaḍī copper-plate inscription of the Chaulukya Bhīmadēva II.

The 3rd of the dark half of the amānta Mārgaśira of V. 1299, expired, would correspond to Thursday, December, A. D. 1232.


170. — V. 1299. — ante, Vol. XVII. p. 236. Rêwah copper-plate inscription of the Mahârâyaka Harîrájâdâva, of the time of (the Chandélâ) Trailokyamalla: —

(Line 36). . . Saṅvâta(t) 1298 Mâghe mäsi . . .


172. — P. 170, No. 97. — V. 1303, Mârga-vadi 12, Gaurâ. Date of a MS. of the Æchârâgastra, of the reign of the Vâghêla Vishalâda.


174. — P. 175, No. 115. — V. 1306, Bhâdra-vadi 6, Ravan. Date of a MS. of Râmachandra's Nîrbhayabhûma-avânâga, of the reign of Udayasimhâda.

175. — P. 28, No. 27. — V. 1311, Jyâshâ-sûdi 15, Buddhê. Dabhoi stone inscription of the time of the Vâghêla Vishalâda.

176. — V. 1312. — Archœol. Surv. of India, Vol. X. p. 31; and Sir A. Cunningham's rubbing, supplied to me by Mr. Fleet. Râhatgaôd stone inscription of the Mahârâjâdh­hirâjâ Jaya[śimha]dâva of Dhârâ: 24 —


Saṅvat 1324 varshê . . .

24 The 7th of the bright half of Bhâdrapada of southern V. 1312, expired, would correspond to Monday, 28 August, A. D. 1256.
185. — V. 1325. — Archæol. Surv. of India, Vol. XXI. p. 51, and Plate xiv., F. Ajaygadh stone inscription of the reign of the Chandella Viravarman:

(Line 2) ... Viravarma-[rájya] saṁvāt 1325.


(Line 1) ... Saṁvāt 1325 Phālguna-sūdi 1 Rāvau


188. — P. 185, No. 146. — V. 1332, Vaiśākha-vadi 3, Sam. Date of a MS. of the Uttarā-dhyāyana-śūtra.


Saṁvāt 1335 varāha Vaiśākha-sūdi 5 Gīravau.

190. — V. 1335. — From a rubbing, supplied to me by Dr. Burgess. British Museum stone inscription of the Vaiñhāla Sārāṅgadeva: 27 —

(Line 1) ... Saṁvāt 1335 varāha Vaiśākha(kha)-sūdi 5 Somē 5dy-caha śrimd-Anahillavātakādibhiṣhitita ... Sārāṅgadeva-kalyāna-vijayarājya ... 28

191. — P. 25, No. 16. — V. 1337, Māgha-sūdi 13, Somē. Ajaygadh rock inscription of the reign of the Chandella Viravarmedeva (?).


194. — V. 1342. — ante, Vol. XVI. p. 351. Mount Ābā stone inscription of Samarāsimha of Mēwāī:

(Line 48) ... Saṁ 134[2] varāha Mārgga-sūdi [1].


(Line 66) ... Śrī-nrīpa-Vikrama-saṁ 1343 varāha Māgha-sūdi 5 Somē ... 30


(Line 1) — Saṁvāt 1344 Vaiśākha-sūdi 3 adya śrī-Chitrakūṭa samata-mahā-Rāvala-(?) kula-śrī-Samarāsimha-saṁvā-kaśyā[pa]vijayarājya[ā] ... 31

197. — V. 1345. — Ib. Vol. VI. p. 884. Ajaygadh stone inscription (apparently) of the time of the Chandella Bhājavarman:

Kahaṇḍa-dukhasi-gata-śrīti-bhūta-samāvīti | saṁvatsare śubhe-lēkhā Vaiśākha-māsa-sad-dīnē 11 aṃkē-pi 1345 saṃvāt Vaiśā[khe] ... 32

198. — P. 178, No. 123. — V. 1350, Jyeṣṭha-vadi 3, Rāvau. Date of Jayanta’s Kāvyaprakāśa-dīpiṇḍa, of the reign of the Vaiñhāla Sārāṅgadeva.


33 The 1st of the bright half of Phālguna of V. 1235, expired, would correspond to Sunday, 3 February, A. D. 1290.

34 The 5th of the bright half of Vaiśākha of northern V. 1335, expired, would correspond to Thursday, 26 April, A. D. 1278.

35 The 5th of the bright half of Vaiśākha of southern V. 1335, expired, would correspond to Monday, 17 April, A. D. 1279.

36 The 5th of the bright half of Māgha of V. 1345, expired, would correspond to Monday, 20 January, A. D. 1287.


203. — V. 1386. — Sir A. Cunningham’s rubbings, supplied to me by Mr. Fleet. Udāypur (in Gwālior) stone inscription of the Mahārāja Ḍhīrāja Jayaśimhaḍaṇā (of Dhrēra?) —


204. — P. 163, No. 88. — V. 1372, Pausha-vadi 10, Sānan. Inscription at Ajaygāth.


206. — P. 26, No. 15. — Vikrama 1884, Phāḷguna-sādi 5, Bhaṇmē. Delhi Museum stone inscription of the time of Muhammad bin Tūghlāk.


(Line 1) Kṛiti-Manḍanāḍevaṁa turya-Āhāgni-Māḍakaraṁ
Vikram-āḍhāḥ sātī Bhāḍraṁ trīṭīyāṇaṁ Guṇaḥ-dīnē ī 17 ī
Samvāt. 1384 miti Bhāḍra-vadi 3 Gurū-dīnē . . .


(Line 1) . . . Samvāt 1412 samaḥ ī Uchāhaṇa-zagara-mahāraṇa-[a]-sri-Virarāmāṇḍaṇa-
rājē . . .


(Line 6) . . . Paramabhaṭṭapārkātya-rājāvallī puryavat śramad-Vikramātītāyadēvān-
nipatāt-sātī-āravā (bdh.), samvāta(C) 1429 Māgha-kṛṣṇa-trayōḍhaṇyaṁ tithau Sanīvāsa-
aviśayam . . . pācchāya-sura-trāpani-sri-Piyārāyaśasi-rājē . . .

30 The 3rd of the dark half of the pūrṇimaṁśa Bhādrapada of northern V. 1384, expired, would correspond to Thursday, 5 August, A. D. 1327.
31 The 3rd of the dark half of the pūrṇimaṁśa Māgha of V. 1329, expired, would correspond to Saturday, 23 January A. D. 1373.
216. - P. 172, No. 106. - V. 1432, Mārga-vadi, 9, Sūmē. Date of a MS. of Prajñānanda’s Tatttvā怜ika-śākād.
218. — P. 31, No. 43. - Vikrama 1439 (Saka 1304), Vaiśākha-śūdi, 6, Ravaṇa. Māchādi (near Alwar) stone inscription of the reign of Sultan Firūz Shāh.
220. — P. 32, No. 44. - V. 1445 (Bhāva-saṅvatsara) Āśāvina-śūdi 13, Sūmē. Satī pillar inscription at ‘Boram-Dec.’
221. — P. 163, No. 89. - V. 1451, Phālguna-vadi, 12, Budhē. Date of a MS. of the Kārmāgaiḍādī.
224. — P. 186, No. 149. - V. 1464 (Manmatha-saṅvatsara), Āśāhā-vadi, 3, Budhē. Date of a MS. of the Kāśīkā-Śvetī.
228. — P. 183, No. 140. - V. 1485, Vaiśākha-vadi, 9, Budhē. Date of a MS. of Jina-dēva-
231. — P. 180, No. 130. - V. 1490, Vaiśākha-vadi 9, Sanāu. Date of a MS. of Hallāyudha’s Abhidhāvattanāmālā, of the reign of Sūrīn Ahmad.
232. — P. 366, No. 182. - Vikrama 1491, Chaitra-vadi 5, Budhē. Date of Sīlaratna-
234. — P. 38, No. 73. - Vikrama 1500 (Prajapati-saṅvatsara), Vaiśākha-śūdi 5, Gurai. Stone inscription at Mahova in Barōda (?).
236. — P. 160, No. 191. - Vikrama 1508, Bhādra-vadi 13, Budhē. Date of a MS. of the Kāla-cakrabat-tantra.
237. — P. 124, No. 141. - V. 1510, Bhādra-vadi 14, Sanāu. Date of a MS. of an Aavāchā-
239. — P. 368, No. 186. — V. 1512, Phālguna-śudi 1, Bhaumē. Date of a MS. of a commentary on the Ashtādhyāyīpradīṣṭa.


242. — P. 27, No. 22. — V. 1531 (Saka 1936, Subhakṛt-saṃvatsarē), Kārttika-śudi 9, Budhē. Date of a MS. of the Satapathā-brāhmaṇa.

243. — P. 32, No. 47. — Āśādhādi V. 1534, Śrāvaṇa-śudi 5, Bhaumē. Date of a MS. of the Prabhāsahētra-saṁhitādīśāna, of the time of Sūltaṇ Mahmūd Bigarha.

244. — P. 39, No. 75. — V. 1534, prathama-Śrāvaṇa-śudi 8, Bhaumē. Date of a MS. of the Prakṛti-kaumudi.


246. — P. 170, No. 100. — V. 1536, Mārga-śudi 11, Ravau. Date of a MS. of the commentary Prasāda on the Prakṛti-kaumudi.


249. — P. 27, No. 23. — Āśādhādi Vikrama 1555 (Saka 1420), Mārga-śudi 5, Budhē, Stone inscription at Aḍālij well near Ahmadabād, of the time of Sūltaṇ Mahmūd Bigarha.

250. — P. 33, No. 48. — V. 1555 (Saka 1420, Kshayakṛt-saṃvatsarē), Āśvina-śudi 5, Vākpati-vārē (Guran). Date of a MS. of the Vīyāda-pannatiū, of the time of Sūltaṇ Ghiśūd-din of Malvā.


252. — P. 33, No. 49. — V. 1580, Jyēśhṭha-śudi 15, Bhṛgu-vārē. Date of a MS. of the Prakṛti-kaumudi.


255. — P. 28, No. 29. — V. 1597, Vaiśākhā-śudi 1, Sukrē. Date of a MS. of the Āraṇyaśāna.

256. — P. 373, No. 195. — Vikrama 1597, Phālguna-śudi 13, Ravau. Date of Pārvatī-chandra’s Vārttika on Vrābhadrāsadadhuk’s Ċauḍāsura-paṇḍraka.

257. — P. 33, No. 50. — V. 1630, prathama-Āśādhādi 3, Māṅgala-vārē. Date of a MS. of the Ayodhya-sūtra.

258. — P. 39, No. 76. — V. 1645, Macdu-(Chaitra-)śudi 10, Bhāskarē (Ravau). Date of Puṇyaśaṅkara’s Jambūdevaprapūṇiṇī-vrata-vrata.

259. — P. 33, No. 51. — V. 1650 (Subhakṛt-saṃvatsarē), Bādhrapada-śudi 15, Bhṛgu-vāsarē. Date of a MS. of the Kāṇḍānukramaṇa-vīvaraṇa.

(Line 3) ... Pâtisåhå-Åkt-kâbba-râyâj; Strâ-Vikrama-nripa-samayât-samvâti 1651 Mårggaśîrsha-sûra-nâvami-dinâ Sôma-vârê; Pârva-bhadrapada-nâkshatré;  

261. — V. 1652. — Ib. p. 324. Another date in the same:32 —


262. — P. 176, No. 118. — V. 1652, Ásîvâna-vâdi 10, Gaurâ. Date of Dëvâvijâyagunî's Râma-charitra, of the reign of the emperor Akbar.  

263. — P. 35, No. 77. — Vikrama 1654, Åshådha-sùdi 2, Gabhâstî-vârê (Râvanâ). Date of Jñânavimalagunî's commentary on Mâhâvâra's Saivadepâhâda.  

264. — P. 34, No. 52. — V. 1654, Mådhava-(Vaiśâkha-sùdi 7, Gaurâ. Date of Râmârî's Naîdhya-fkâ, of the time of the Sultan Shah Selâm (Jehangîr).  

265. — P. 27, No. 24. — V. 1651, Kârttîka-sùdi 13, Jîvâ (Gaurâ). Date of Ívârakrîshnâ's Puevachandrodâyâ-purâya.  

266. — P. 34, No. 53. — V. 1656 (Babhûhâna-saîvatsârê), Srâvâsa-sùdi 7, Gaurâ. Date of a MS. of an Agnishtmûna-padâhati.  


(Line 46) ... Châttra-mâsâ sùhrê pakshê pratipad-Guruvâsårê; Naîdå-sùhâ-nripâ 1659 varshê praîasti[r*]-likhitâ punâh 11  

268. — P. 168, No. 92. — V. 1693, Mågåha-vâdi 1, Râvanâ. Date of a MS. of the Pradâha-manbrâmâm.  


270. — P. 27, No. 25. — V. 1707 (Saka 1572, Vikâri-saîvatsârê), Kârttîka-sùdi 3, Gaurâ. Date of a MS. of Sânkara's Sûtîrîkamaînâsâm-bhâshyâ.  

271. — P. 169, No. 93. — V. 1718, Kârttîka-vâdi 4, Bhaumâ. Date of a MS. of the Supârîdâhâya.  

272. — P. 169, No. 94. — Vikrama 1717 (Saptarîshi 36), Pausha-vâti 3, Râvanâ. Date of a MS. of the Kâshîk-Vrîti.  


274. — P. 40, No. 78. — V. 1724, prathama-Åshådha-sùdi 7, Sâmâra. Date of a MS. of the Sûkhabhâjana-straustosîtra.  


276. — P. 28, No. 36. — V. 1729, Mågå-sùdi 9, Sômê. Date of a MS. of Chandrâkritî's Sôrâsvata-dîpikâ.  

31 The 9th of the bright half of Mârgâsîrsha of V. 1651, expired, would correspond to Monday, 11 November, A.D. 1654, when the 9th tithi of the bright half ended 12h. 15m., and the moon was in the nakshatra Pûrva-bhadrapada up to 10h. after mean sunrise.  

32 The 14th of the dark half of the sañkta Vaiśâkha of southern V. 1652, expired, would correspond to Thursday, 14 May, A.D. 1656, when the 14th tithi of the dark half ended 10h. 8m., and the moon was in the nakshatra Rûpâvatî up to 2h. 38m. after mean sunrise.  

33 The date in all probability corresponds for southern V. 1659 expired, to Thursday, 28 February, A.D. 1663, though by the Tables the 1st tithi of the bright half ended 0 h. 17m. after mean sunrise of the following day.

278. — P. 40, No. 79. — V. 1748, prathama-Vaśikha-śuddhi 12, Gura. Date of a MS. of Jīnendrabuddhi’s Kālaśekhara-vāraṇa-panchākṣer.

279. — P. 169, No. 95. — V. 1747, Prāgūna-vādi 8, Kusā-vāsara (Bhaumé). Date of a MS. of Vinayakarāmā’s commentary on the Kirti-dīrghaṇṭa.


281. — P. 34, No. 54. — V. 1779, Madhu-(Chaitra-)śuddhi 13, Sōmā. Date of Bhimacāra’s Sākādasāda.

282. — P. 34, No. 55. — V. 1788 (Kālayukta-saṃvatsara), Āśvina-śuddhi 9, Sōmā. Date of Bhāskararāya’s Saṅgha-vāra-bhāvakara.

283. — P. 374, No. 200. — V. 1814 (Saka 1678, Āśvara-saṃvatsara), Kṛṣṇa-vāra 6, Gura. Date of a MS. of the Chakrāvīla-bhāṣya’s Kāvyavālāna.


285. — P. 176, No. 120. — V. 1874, Bhādra-vādi 9, Saṅkrā. Népāl stone inscription of Lalita-tripurasundari.


(To be continued.)

FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. FR. D’PENHA.

No. 8. — Bāphkhādi, the Salsette Cinderella.

There once lived a gāḍāsākti, who had a wife and six daughters. He used to beg in his neighbourhood from house to house, but could not collect more than one ēlī of rice daily, on which he dragged on an existence with his family. One day he took it into his head to go and beg outside his own village, and it happened that a woman poured into his hands some rice boiling hot from the cauldron, which made a big blister on his thumb. So when he got home he asked his wife to take a needle and break the blister; but as soon as she applied the needle to the blister, she heard a voice saying:

“Bādwā, pőkhārī ti astē pōr, father, if you break, break it carefully.”

The good couple were at a loss to understand what it could mean. The wife made two or three attempts to open the blister, but every time she tried she heard the same words repeated:

“Bādwā, pőkhārī ti astē pōr, father, if you break, break it slowly.”

At last she opened it with the utmost care, when lo! a little girl came out of it, and began to walk about. The poor gāḍāsākti began to curse his fortune, thinking to himself:

“I have already six daughters, whom I am hardly able to maintain, and here there is a

1. An ascetic who goes about begging, smeared with ashes.

2. Or “carefully.”
seventh day! Where shall I get the means wherewith to support her? However, I must submit to fate.'

One day the gosârî said to his wife: — "Wife, make us some pôlê."

The wife asked: — "How many pôlê will one sôr of rice make? At any rate, they will hardly be ready before our girls will eat them up."

Upon this the gosârî said: — "Shut them all up in a room while you make the pôlê quietly, and then we can eat them together."

So saying to his wife he went away on his daily vocation of begging. The wife, as instructed, shut up all the girls in a room, ground the rice and méthâ, and some time afterwards began to make the pôlê. As soon as the sound of the cooking of a pôlê reached the ears of the girls, one of them called out to her mother, saying she must come out for a certain purpose. The mother let her come out, but the girl made straight for the kitchen and ate up the first pôlê. The same thing occurred with the second and with the third, and in fact with all the pôlê, for the dough could only just make up seven pôlê.

Now the mother did not know what to say to her husband on his return, much less what to give him to eat. So she took some ashes and made two pôlê, one for herself and the other for her husband. Some time after this the gosârî returned after begging, and husband and wife sat down to their meal. At the first morsel the gosârî became enraged and asked his wife to explain what sort of pôlê she had made, and what it all meant. The poor wife told him everything: how she shut the girls up in the first place; how she made the seven pôlê; how the girls came and ate them all; and how she was compelled to make two of ashes for themselves.

Upon this the gosârî said: — "This will never do. I will take the girls and leave them in a forest, whence they cannot return, and they shall no more be a burden upon us."

His wife had no alternative but to agree without saying a word. So the same evening he got the girls together, and said: — "Come girls, your maternal uncle has asked me to bring you to his house. Be sharp, and dress yourselves quickly."

On being told that they were called by their maternal uncle, though they had never before heard of him, much less seen him, the girls were in a hurry to be off, and got themselves dressed with what rags they could afford, and set out immediately with their father.

The father led them on through a forest for many hours, and whenever the girls asked him how much further off their uncle's house was, he would answer: — "A long way further yet." And so they walked on and on for several hours, till the lord of darkness overtook them, and then their father said: — "Girls, your uncle's house is a long way off yet, and so we must sleep to-night in this forest."

The poor girls little thought of their father's trick, and so went to sleep. Now it happened that the youngest daughter of the gosârî, the one that popped out of the blister, was in the habit of sucking her father's thumb when going to sleep, and as soon as the thumb was removed she would awake. Of course the object of the gosârî in bringing his daughters into the forest was to leave them there and go away, but the difficulty was how to manage the youngest daughter. He managed this, however, by cutting off his thumb, and leaving it in the little girl's mouth. In this way the gosârî left them all asleep.

*pôlê, singular pôlê, are made in the following way: — Ordinary rice and a little quantity of another grain (methâ, plural méthâ) are ground together. The flour is made into dough with toddy and water, and allowed to remain for a few hours. After this an earthen plate (platî) is placed on the oven, a little oil rubbed on it (usually with a stick of the plantain leaf after beating it into the shape of a brush), and a little of the dough poured on it, which in a short time makes a pôlê.
In the morning, when the girls awoke, they were surprised to see their father gone, or rather, they did not know what had become of him. They, however, soon observed the thumb in their youngest sister's mouth, and concluded that she had eaten their father, and henceforth named her Bāpkhāḍī.8 They pulled it out of her mouth and thus awoke her, and severely reprimanded her; and, telling her, at the same time, that they intended to leave her to herself, they started off for another country. But Bāpkhāḍī followed them, till they found a large house with seven rooms in it, all vacant. Each of the seven sisters took to a room, and lived there, finding in it plenty of food and clothes and other necessitities; but Bāpkhāḍī's room was the best of all, for in it were found clothes and furniture of matchless beauty, and there was a stable attached to it. Bāpkhāḍī, however, never said a word to her sisters about it, but always remained in the rags in which she had come.

On Sunday mornings the six sisters dressed in their best to go to Church to attend Mass. Before going they always called out to Bāpkhāḍī, asking her if she was coming, but she answered never a word. Nevertheless, she quickly dressed up in rich silks with golden slippers and went to Church on horse-back, so that she got there before her sisters. So, too, after Mass she would get home before every one, and stand as usual at her door, clothed in rags. Her sisters, of course, saw a girl at Church in a very grand dress with golden slippers and saw her get on her horse, but it never occurred to them that she was Bāpkhāḍī, for did they not see her before and after Church clothed in rags at her own door?

When they returned from Church, they used to say to her: — "What have you been doing at home? If you had come to Church, you would have seen a beautiful girl, beautifully dressed, with golden slippers, on horse-back! Oh! you have lost a good chance!"

Now, one day, it happened that, while Bāpkhāḍī was returning from Church, she lost one of her slippers, and it attracted the attention of the king's son, who happened to pass by. The prince took it up, and went and threw himself down in his father's stables, thinking of the owner of the slipper, and where and how he could find her; and then he gave up eating and drinking! The king searched for him throughout his palace and all through the village round it without success, but during the day the king's maid-servants went to the stables to feed the horses. Now they never expected that the prince would be there, and as usual, they ate the grain, and they threw the husks to the horses! On seeing this the prince called out from his hiding place: — "Oh ho! is this how you feed the horses? No wonder they are getting leaner day by day, while I see you growing stouter."

As soon as the maid-servants heard the prince's voice they flew like lightning to the king and said: — "Sire, what shall we say to thee? Shall we tell thee one, or shall we tell thee two?"

The king replied: — "Come, come; say what you have to say at once. You may tell me one, or you may tell me two."

So they told him what they had seen and heard in the stables, and he immediately went with them to the stables, and thus spoke to the prince:

"Kā kartī tālā? Kā khūṣān tālā? Sāng mālā, kōnā hā tākīlaśālī, tīcchā hā tā jhēmā. Kōnā hā tākīlaśālī, tīcchā pāi tā jhēmā. Kōnā hā tākīlaśālī, tīcchā dēlā jhēmā; What ails you, my son? Tell me what you lack. Has any one lifted up his hands to strike you? Tell me, and I will take his hands. Has any one threatened to kick you? Tell me, and I will take his legs. Has any one cast his eyes on you? Tell me, and I will take his eyes."

Thus spoke the king, upon which the prince answered: — "Sire, nothing ails thy son, nor has any one done him any harm. He is grieved because he has found a golden slipper,
and does not know how and where to find the owner in order to marry her; and unless this is accomplished he will not touch any food or drink, but will kill himself through grief."

Upon this the king said: — "Be of good cheer, my son, for what do we lack? I will at once send men in all directions and find the owner; and, in the meanwhile, you must come home, and take food."

The prince then went home with the king and took his food as usual. Meanwhile the king had at once sent messengers in all directions with the slipper to find the owner, and to arrange at once for her marriage with the prince. Now, in order to find the owner, the messengers agreed that the girl in whose foot the slipper fitted must be the owner, and none else. With this idea they went throughout the country for several days, but with little success. At length they came to the house where Bāpkhāḍī lived with her sisters. They tried the slipper on the feet of the six sisters, but it fitted none of them. The sisters for once thought of Bāpkhāḍī, and told the men to try it on her feet, when lo! it fitted exactly! Of course it did, for did it not belong to her?

So arrangements were then and there made for her marriage with the prince, and a day was appointed for the celebration of the auspicious occasion. Grand preparations were made on both sides for several days, and on the appointed day Bāpkhāḍī was duly married to the king's son with great rejoicings.

The sisters of Bāpkhāḍī were also invited to come and live in the palace, but they were made to wait on her as her maids. This, of course, naturally awoke a spirit of jealousy in them, but they saw no alternative except to submit.

They continued to live in this way for some time, until Bāpkhāḍī became pregnant. Meanwhile, her husband made up his mind to go on a distant voyage, and got a ship fitted out for the purpose; but before taking leave of Bāpkhāḍī, he called the sisters together, and said to them: —

"My wife is pregnant, and I shall soon be gone on a distant voyage. I recommend her to your care. Tend her carefully until she is confined. Should a son be born to me a shower of gold will fall on my ship, but if a daughter is born there will be a shower of silver."

Thus saying he bid Bāpkhāḍī a loving adieu. In due time Bāpkhāḍī was confined of a son, but her sisters bound up her eyes and took the child and buried him alive under a Sāyā tree, and substituted in his place an ārawī. Poor Bāpkhāḍī little knew of the trick her sisters had played, and remained silent.

About this time there fell a shower of gold on the prince's ship, upon which he made sure that a son was born to him, and in his joy distributed sugar and other presents to the crew; and made all possible haste to return home. When he reached his palace he asked to be shown the son that was born to him, but was highly disappointed when Bāpkhāḍī's sisters produced the ārawī. Grieved to the heart he remained silent.

Two or three years afterwards Bāpkhāḍī again became pregnant; and again her husband, the prince, set out on a distant voyage. As before he called the six sisters and advised them to take more care this time of Bāpkhāḍī, and went away saying: — "If a son be born to me there will be a shower of gold, but if a daughter there will be a shower of silver." Her time of pregnancy over, Bāpkhāḍī was again confined of a second son, and this time too, her sisters bound her eyes, took away the child and buried it alive under an ārāh tree, substituting for it a bōvatā. The prince witnessed a second shower of gold, and again distributed sugar and other presents, and returned home with all possible speed, only to be disappointed.

---

7 The literal meaning of the words used in the story are 'golden water' and 'silver water.'

8 A round stone used for grinding spices.

9 A broom made out of the reeds of the coconut palm-leaf. It is ordinarily known as the 'Gos broom.'
and disheartened; for, when he asked to see the child, he was shewn the bōvātrā. But as there was nothing to be done he remained silent.

Another two or three years elapsed, and Bāpkhādī became pregnant for the third time; and for the third time her husband set out on a voyage. Before going he called together the six sisters and told them to exercise great care, and use every imaginable precaution to ensure a successful delivery. He then bade a loving adieu to Bāpkhādī, and went away, saying for the third time:—“If a son be born there will be a shower of gold, but if a daughter there will be a shower of silver.” In due time Bāpkhādī was delivered of a daughter, and this child also her sisters took and buried alive in the Church, and put in its place a mōvālī.10 This time there came pouring a heavy shower of silver. The prince at once understood that a daughter was born to him, and for the third time he distributed sugar and other presents, and returned home. When he arrived and asked to see his daughter, the six sisters produced the mōvālī, and also told a lot of tales against Bāpkhādī. On seeing the mōvālī and hearing all the tales he was much enraged, and, casting Bāpkhādī in a dark dungeon, took to himself the six sisters as his wives. Bāpkhādī was also deprived of all her clothes and jewellery. For her food she was thrown the remains of fish11 and such things after every one else had eaten. Matters continued like this for several years.

Let us now turn to the children. The hand of the Almighty saved the three children of Bāpkhādī, and they grew to be from ten to fifteen years old, and lived by begging. In their begging excursions they were wont to say:—

"Sāyābārchiā Sāyā dādā, Aṇābārchiā Aṇā dādā, dēulānché go Dēukā bāyē, hīā gāṃvācẖā rādā vērd, sāhsan bāiāhā bēliā, tōs āmōcẖā bōp; Brother Sāyā from under the sāyā tree, brother Aṇā from under the āḷā tree, sister Dēukā from the Church, the king12 of this country is mad, he married seven wives; he is our father.” From house to house they used to go repeating these words, and at last, reached the palace, and repeated the words there. When the prince heard them he could not understand what they meant, and asked them to repeat the words again. Upon this the children began:—

"Sāyābārchiā Sāyā dādā, Aṇābārchiā Aṇā dādā, dēulānché go Dēukā bāyē, hīā gāṃvācẖā rādā vērd, sāhsan bāiāhā bēliā, tōs āmōcẖā bōp; Brother Sāyā from under the sāyā tree, brother Aṇā from under the āḷā tree, sister Dēukā from the Church, the king of this country is mad, he married seven wives; he is our father.”

The prince made them repeat the words over and over again several times, and then told one of the six sisters to give them something in alms. The six sisters, of course, at once concluded that these three children must be those that had been born of Bāpkhādī and whom they had buried alive under the sāyā and āḷā trees, and in the Church. They, however, pretended not to know them, and one of them offered them alms, but the children refused to take any. Each one of the six sisters in turn offered alms, but the children refused to take anything from any one of them. The prince was puzzled at their behaviour, and asked them to explain why they did not take the alms. Upon this they said:—

"Let your seventh wife, who is in the dungeon, come out. Place seven curtains between her and us, then watch what occurs, after which you will come to know everything.”

The prince did as directed. He ordered out Bāpkhādī from the dungeon, and placed seven curtains between her and the children, and eagerly watched the result, when lo! three streams of milk burst from Bāpkhādī’s breasts, and penetrating the seven curtains ran into the mouths of the children. The prince was dumbfounded at this occurrence, and

10 A mōvālī is another sort of broom made of the date palm-leaf.
11 It should be remembered that the Salsette Christians are fish-eaters. They very seldom eat meat, except perhaps on Sundays and feast-days.
12 By “the king” is here meant “the prince” of the tale.
thought there must be some connection with Bāpkhäḍi and the children, and ordered the six sisters to explain it. They at first hesitated to disclose the facts, but, when they saw that the prince was determined, they revealed the whole story: — How when the first son was born they shut Bāpkhäḍi’s eyes and took and buried the child alive under a sūgyi tree, and substituted in its place an śrīnā; how when the second son was born they substituted a bēvārē, and buried the child alive under an āśād tree; and lastly, how when the daughter was born she was buried alive in the Church, and in her place a mūdīḷi was put. Upon this the prince embraced the children and also Bāpkhäḍi, and asked her why she did not tell this story long ago, even though she was thrown into a dungeon. Bāpkhäḍi said that as her eyes need to be bandaged at her confinement she knew nothing and hence her silence. The prince acknowledged the three children as his own, ordered them at once to be bathed, and afterwards got them handsomely dressed. Bāpkhäḍi, also, was restored to her former position, and was again clothed and covered with jewellery.

For the six sisters of Bāpkhäḍi the anger of the prince knew no bounds. Having dispossessed them of all their handsome clothes and jewellery, he ordered their hair and noses to be cut off, and having seated them on donkeys, banished them from the country. The donkeys galloped on and on for several hours, when the sisters said: — "Gāred, gāreči, kōnādī ćad; Donkey, donkey, which way?"

The donkeys replied: — "Ochāl athā, tāmčā kūrtā āmchī ādād; On, on, for your wrongs we have to suffer!"

After this the prince and Bāpkhäḍi, and their children lived very happily to a very old age, even after he had succeeded his father as king.

COLD RICE.

The children’s breakfast in Southern India consists usually of cold rice, being the remains of the supper overnight soaked by the lady of the house, or a servant, in good drinking-water. Rice thus treated will keep good for three or four days.

The first thing the Hindu child does after getting up, is to wash its teeth and face, and, if a Brāhmaṇ, to repeat the prāthā-sandhyā-sandana, or morning ablution prayer, and then to eat the cold rice breakfast, rendered palatable with ginger, pepper, lime, oranges, green chillies and other condiments. This style of breakfast is said to tend to good health, and is kept up usually till 15 or 16 years of age; but many continue throughout life the taste thus acquired.

Children generally sit round their mother or some female elder of the house, with palms stretched out to receive the welcome ball of rice, and are not uncommonly joined by older members of the family.

The morning rice is generally prepared in one vessel for soaking, and transferred to another before use, and then mixed with salt and sometimes spices.

Many verses exist in South India in praise of the morning rice. Here is one comparing cold rice to Vishnu: —

चाने शुदयन जगदेकरणं
विशुद्धम: मात्रलालितमः ।
अत-वर्तातसलिन्यके शीता
पुरातनवर्तातसालित॥

This may be freely translated thus: — "It is only the meritorious that obtain the boon of Puratana, who sleeps on the water, who is worshipped by the whole world, who is specially to be attended to in the early morning, who is the giver of the unobtainable, and who is of unsapped fame."

There are puns and allusions here. Puratana means Vishnu (the ancient one) as well as cold rice, and he is specially worshipped in the morning.

Another runs as follows: —

विशुद्धमात्रलालितस्य धर्मं
निर्विशुद्धमात्रलालितस्य धर्मम्।
पशुस्वत वर्तातसलिन्यस्य कारणं
पुरातनवर्तातस्य धर्मम्॥

A free translation would be: —

"O lady, I go to my cold rice, which is served in the front half of the plantain-leaf, and mixed
well with curds and with pickled ginger served in lemon juice."

In this case the cold rice has been served on a plantain-leaf, and not into the palm of the hand.

S. M. Natesa Sastri.

SACRIFICES IN PERSIA.

It is the custom, whenever a house, garden or kiun is constructed, to sacrifice a sheep, and to imprint on the door a right hand steeped in the blood. The sheep is distributed amongst the poor. This custom is said to be a propitiation of Fate, to avoid bloodshed within the building in future. For a bath, a cow is sacrificed, and the hand steeped in its blood is imprinted on the door.

There is a custom amongst the Persians of sacrificing and distributing the remains of a sheep to the poor, on the safe return home of any member of a household after a journey. The custom is that, just as you get down from your horse, the animal's neck is cut before you.

When any member of a household in Persia is very ill, it is the custom to kill a sheep in order to propitiate Fate and to avert danger from the sick person. Should a goat or any animal die during the illness of any member of a household, it is held as a sure sign of the recovery of the patient, as it is thought that Fate has been satisfied by the substitution of the goat or other animal in the place of the patient.

Tehran.

S. J. A. Churchill.

BOOK NOTICE.

There also adds four notes on Avestan grammar: (1), on a genuine instance of a sikh-aorist in the Avesta (Yasht iii. 2); (2), on a case of Avestan 3rd dual middle in -aidd; (3) several instances of difference in gender between Avestan and Sanskrit in the same word; (4), on the rendering of the Avestan eredô don-kasem in Vendidad, v. 11.

An article by Dr. Cyrus Adler on the Shofar, its use and origin is of general interest. This word is rendered in the Bible by 'cornet,' though it is usually made of a ram's horn, straightened and flattened by heat. After a lengthy enquiry into the origin of the instrument, Dr. Adler concludes by saying that the following deductions would seem to be legitimate:

(1) The oldest wind instrument used by inland peoples was the horn of an animal with a natural cavity, and a mouth-piece formed by cutting off the end. Horns which required hollowing came later.

(2) These horns were originally used as signals in time of danger and for making announcements in general.

(3) Many of the more important announcements had a religious character. The antiquity of the instrument caused its permanent adoption for sacred purposes.

(4) The shofar, speaking especially of the instrument of that name, was originally a wind instrument, made of the horn of a wild goat. No sacred character may be connected with the sacrificial use made of the goat.

(5) The etymology of the word is to be sought in the Assyrian sappar, a species of wild goat: sappartha (fem.) meant originally the horn of a sappar, and it may afterwards have been used for horn in general.
SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION.

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal for Sanskrit and Kanarese, and, for the sake of uniformity, submitted for adoption, as far as possible, in the case of other languages, — except in respect of modern Hindu personal names, in which absolute purism is undesirable, and in respect of a few Anglicised corruptions of names of places, sanctioned by long usage, — is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>å</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>é</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ë</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>lri</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>lri</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>ë</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विराग्न क्लेशमिल्यम्, or old विराग्न क्लेशमिल्यम्</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>विराग्न क्लेशमिल्यम्</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विराग्न क्लेशमिल्यम् before क and ख</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>विराग्न क्लेशमिल्यम् before क and ख</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>kha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>ga</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>gha</td>
<td>gha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>eha</td>
<td>eha</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>eha</td>
<td>eha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>eha</td>
<td>eha</td>
<td>अनुवेध्री</td>
<td>eha</td>
<td>eha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single hyphen is used to separate words in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen is only used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, as divided in the original Text, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line; intermediate divisions, rendered unavoidable here and there by printing necessities, are made only where absolutely necessary for neatness in the arrangement of the Texts.

A double hyphen is used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the euphonic rules of sāndhi. Where this double hyphen is used, it is to be understood that a final consonant, and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel, are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it is to be understood of the orthography of the original, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the final consonant either has the modified broken form, which, in the oldest stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the sāndhi attached to it; and that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form. In the transcription of ordinary texts, the double hyphen is probably unnecessary; except where there is the sāndhi of final and initial vowels. But, in the transcription of epigraphical records, the use of this sign is unavoidable, for the purpose of indicating exactly the paleographical standard of the original texts.

The avagraha, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial a, is but rarely to be met with in inscriptions. Where it does occur, it is most conveniently represented by its own Dēvanāgari sign.

So also practice has shown that it is more convenient to use the ordinary Dēvanāgari marks of punctuation than to substitute the English signs for them.

Ordinary brackets are used for corrections and doubtful points; and square brackets, for letters which are damaged and partially illegible in the original, or which, being wholly illegible, can be supplied with certainty. An asterisk attached to letters or marks of punctuation in square brackets, indicates that those letters or marks of punctuation were omitted altogether in the original. As a rule, it is more convenient to use the brackets than to have recourse to footnotes; as the points to which attention is to be drawn attract notice far more readily. But notes are given instead, when there would be so many brackets, close together, as to encumber the text and render it inconvenient to read. When any letters in the original are wholly illegible and cannot be supplied, they are represented, in metrical passages, by the sign for a long or a short syllable, as the case may be; and in prose passages, by points, at the rate, usually, of two for each akṣar or syllable.
A NOTE ON THE SAPTARSHI ERA.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

In the Chambers Collection of MSS. of the Berlin Library\(^1\) is a worm-eaten roll of paper, about 9' 3" long by 5\(\frac{1}{2}\)" broad, which contains a calendar for the time from Wednesday, the 18th March, A. D. 1793, to Monday, the 31st March, A. D. 1794; or, to use the terms of the original, from Chaítra-súti\(^2\) pra. Ví, i.e., Budaívará, the first of the bright half of Chaítra, to Chaítra-vati am. Chán, i.e., Chaúdravára, the new-moon day of the dark half of Chaítra,—of a year which will be described below. The characters employed in this MS. calendar are the peculiar Nágarí of some of the MSS. purchased by Professor Bühler on his Káśmir tour, and shew therefore that the calendar was written in the very north of India, if not actually in Káśmir.

From the last day of the year, the new-moon day in the dark half of the month Chaítra, it will be seen that the year of this calendar is a so-called northern year, with the párśimánda scheme of the months. As in ordinary Pańchángas, the year is divided into lunar fortnights which here follow each other from the top to the bottom of the roll. And since, in the specified period, Vaiśákha was an intercalary month, we have here altogether 26 lunar fortnights, headed—

- Chaítra-súti, i.e., Chaítra-śukla-pakshá;  
- Vai vati, i.e., Vaiśákha-krishna-pakshá;  
- Dví Vai vati, i.e., dvi-vaiśákha-śukla-pakshá;  
- Dví Vai vati, i.e., dvi-vaiśákha-krishna-pakshá;  
- Vai śuti, i.e., Vaiśákha-śukla-pakshá;  
- Jyé vati; Jyé śuti; Áśhádha-vati; Áśhádha Śuti; Srá vati; Srá śuti; Bhá vati; Bhá śuti;  

and so on up to—

- Chaítra-vati, i.e., Chaítra-krishna-pakshá.

Under each lunar fortnight, we have from the left to the right four principal columns.\(^4\) The first column gives the name of the weekday (A., Chań, Bháń, etc.) and the nakśatra (A., Bháń, Krí, Ró, etc.): the second the number of the day in the lunar half (pra., dvi., tri., cha., etc., up to either pú. or am.); the third the śuyá (Ví, Pri., A., Suń, etc.); and the last contains remarks about festivals, etc. But, besides, the calendar also gives, before the first column of the lunar fortnight, the number of each day according to the Muhammadan calendar, sometimes preceded by the name of the Muhammadan month. Thus, in a line with Vai śuti A. dvi. (i.e., Sunday, the 2nd of the bright half of Vaiśákha, corresponding to the 12th May, A. D. 1793) we have Samvád 1; before Áśhádha-súti Vú. dvi. (i.e., Wednesday, the 2nd of the bright half of Áśhádha, corresponding to the 10th July, A. D. 1793), Jyé háyá 1; before Srá śuti Su tri. (i.e., Friday, the 3rd of the bright half of Srávája, corresponding to the 9th August,


\(^2\) From the above it will be seen that in this calendar the śukla-pakshá or bright fortnight and the krishna-pakshá or dark fortnight of a month are throughout denoted by the terms śuti and sutí. On this usage, which is quite common in Sárája MSS., see ante, Vol. XIX., p. 217.

\(^3\) It will be observed that of the intercalary month Vaiśákha the first and last of the four fortnights are called simply Vaiśákha, while the second and third fortnights are described as dvi-vaiśákha, i.e., the second Vaiśákha. In a MS. calendar of the Berlin Library for the expired northern Vikrama year 1883, in which Bhádrapada was intercalary, and in another MS. calendar of the same Library for the expired northern Vikrama year 1855, in which Srávája was intercalary, the first and last fortnights of the intercalary month are likewise called simply Bhádrapada and Srávája, but the second and third fortnights are described as adhika-Bhádrapada and adhika-Srávája. And in a MS. calendar of the same Library, for the expired northern Vikrama year 1853 in which Bhádrapada was intercalary, the first and last fortnights are called sávája-Bhádrapada, and the second and third adhika-Bhádra.

\(^4\) It may be of some interest to state here that the results (as regards tikhá, nakshatras, and yángas), obtained from Professor Jacob's Tables in Vol. XVII. of this Journal, for the large number of days for which I have made the necessary calculations, entirely agree with the actual statements of this calendar.
A. D. 1793), Mahāraṣṭra 1; and before Bhā. śuti Ā. ṛi. (i.e., Sunday, the 3rd of the bright half of Bhāḍrapada, corresponding to the 8th September, A. D. 1793), Saphar 1.

In the introductory remarks at the top of the roll, the year for which this calendar is intended is described thus:—

Sri-Saptarshi-chār-anumatātena sahatv 4869 tathā cha sahatv 69 Chaitra-śuti 1 tri Sākaḥ 1715 karana-gat-āvda(badāḥ) h 1128 dina-gaṇaḥ 412 010 tri-Vikramāditya-sahvat 1850 Kalpa-gat-āvda(badāḥ) h 1 972 948 894 śesh-āvda(badāḥ) h 2 347 051 106 . . . . . . Kalēgata-varshāṇi 4869 śesha-varshāṇī 427 106.

Accordingly, the year with which we are here concerned is the luni-solar year 4894 of the Kaliyuga, distinctly described as an expired year, and, consequently, the expired northern Vikrama year 1850 and the expired Saka year 1715, called simply the Vikrama year 1850 and the Saka year 1715, respectively. The number of years, elapsed since the epoch of the Kārava up to the commencement of the calendar-year, is stated to be 1128, which for the epoch of the Kārava gives us Saka 587 expired, the epoch-year of the Khandakālīḍya. And the number of days, elapsed since the same epoch, is put down as 412 010. By Dr. Schram's Tables the luni-solar Saka year 1715 current ended on the day of the Julian period 2376 011, and Saka 587 current ended on the day of the Julian period 1964 001; and deducting the latter set of figures from the former, we obtain a remainder of 412 010, being the number of days of the 1128 luni-solar years elapsed since the epoch of the Kārava, exactly as given in the calendar. But for my present purpose the interesting part of the introductory statement is this, that the year of the calendar is primarily described as "the year 4894, in agreement with the course of the Saptarshayàh, and therefore the year 69," as I take it, of ordinary usage. For this shews us that our calendar, in the first instance, was intended for people who followed the Saptarshi era. 7

The Saptarshi era has been treated of by Sir A. Cunningham in the Book of Indian Eras, and its epoch has been incidentally discussed by Professor Bühler in his Kālavr Report6 and by Professor Bhāḍārkar in his Report on Sanskrit MSS. for 1883-84. 8 But little attention has as yet been paid to dates recorded in that era. Starting from the data which are furnished by the calendar described above, I propose therefore to collect here those Saptarshi dates of inscriptions and MSS. which have come hitherto under my observation. The number of these dates is small, and all belong to comparatively modern times. But I hope that, by publishing what has been ready for some time, I may induce scholars in India to make known other Saptarshi dates, or to furnish me with reliable materials for enlarging this list.

From our calendar, which makes the Saptarshi year 4894 equivalent to Kaliyuga 4894, it is clear that, assuming the Saptarshi years to be current years, and to commence with the month Chaitra, Saptarshi 0 = Kaliyuga 24 expired, Saptarshi 1 current = Kaliyuga 26 expired, Saptarshi 2 current = Kaliyuga 27 expired, and so on; and generally, that by the addition of 23 a current Saptarshi year is converted into the corresponding expired year of the Kaliyuga. Thus the current Saptarshi year 4300 would be the expired year 4325 of

---

6 According to Wüstenfeld's Vergleichungs-Tabellen der Muhammed. und Christl. Zeitrechnung, these equivalents are correct.
7 The original has 19729485 at the end of one line, and at the commencement of the next line 594, i.e., 19 729 485 594, clearly a mistake of the writer.
8 Long after the above was first written, I received, through the kindness of Dr. Stein, from Paṇḍit Gōvinda Kaul a MS. Paṭṭīchāgā (or Kāṇṭhapattra) for the year which ended on the 30th March, A. D. 1890, which is very similar to the calendar of the Berlin Library, but gives also (often wrongly) the days of the European calendar. In this calendar the year treated of is described thus:—Sri-Saptarshi-chār-anumatātena sahatv 1995 (clearly a mistake for 1900) śrītātāḥ-tattvavika-pratikāmchāro-śeṣavikāmchāro-sahvat 3 tathā cha sūtra-praktāyā śrī-śeṣavikāmchāro sahatv 63 Chaitra-śuti 1 tri-Sākaḥ 1811 karana-gat-āvdaḥ 1224 dina-gaṇaḥ 447 003 (according to my calculations a mistake for 447 092) śrī-Vikramāditya-sahvat 1946 Kalpa-gat-āvdaḥ 1972 948 990 śeṣavikāmchāro 2347 051 011 (wrongly for 2347 051 010) . . . . . . Kalēgata-varshāṇi 4991 (wrongly for 4990) śesha-varshāṇi 427 010.
9 Page 60.
the Kaliyuga, and Saptarshi 4951 current would be Kaliyuga 4976 expired. So far, matters would be simple enough. But writers who, in recording their dates, follow the Saptarshi era, generally omit the hundreds from the years of the date, and put down only the years within the century. To make up for this deficiency, they sometimes add the corresponding year of some other well-known era; but sometimes they neglect doing so. However this may be, it follows from the above, that, disregarding the hundreds, we must add to the Saptarshi year of a date —

25, to find the corresponding expired year within one of the centuries of the Kaliyuga;
46, to find similarly the corresponding expired Saka year;
81, to find the corresponding expired northern Vikrama year; and
24/25, to find the corresponding year of one of the centuries of our own era.

Thus, a current Saptarshi year 36 would, disregarding the hundreds, correspond to an expired year \((36 + 25 = 61)\) of the Kaliyuga; to an expired Saka year \((36 + 46 = 82)\); to an expired northern Vikrama year \((36 + 81 = 117)\); and to a year \((36 + 24/25 = 60/61)\) of our own era.

All this is well known; and using the several equations for verifying individual dates, we obtain the following results:

1. — Dr. Stein has informed me that a much damaged Bhūripattra MS. written in Sārada characters, — apparently the oldest MS. of the kind hitherto discovered, — is dated

Sanhvāt 4300 Aṣva-vati 13 Saṇau tra ś 6 44 cha ś ṣ 11 53 pra 11 3 . . . .

Referring the year of this date to the Saptarshi era, we find that the corresponding date, for Kaliyuga \((4300 + 25 =)\) 4325 expired and the amanta Āśvina, is Saturday, the 12th October, A. D. 1224, when the 13th tithi of the dark half ended 8 h. 55 m. after mean sunrise (for Ujjain).

2. — The Deccan College MS. of the Dvandvyātika is dated

Saptarśhi-sanhvāt12 4951 Aṣva[yu*]-ja-krishna-saptamī Maṁgalam vāsaram. 13

The corresponding date, for Kaliyuga \((4951 + 25 =)\) 4976 expired and the purnimānta Āśvina, is Tuesday, the 21st September, A. D. 1875, when the 7th tithi of the dark half ended 21 h. 14 m. after mean sunrise.

3. — According to Dr. Hultzsch in Zeitschrift Deutsch. M orn. Ges., Vol. XI. p. 9, a MS. of his collection is dated

Sanhvāt 24 Kārtika-vātī trayādaśyām Budhē II Sṛi-Sakāh 1570 II

Here a Saptarshi year 24 is put down as equivalent to a Saka year \((24 + 46 =)\) 70; and the corresponding date, for Saka 1570 expired and the purnimānta Kārtika, is Wednesday, the 4th October, A. D. 1648, when the 13th tithi of the dark half ended 16 h. 43 m. after mean sunrise.

4. — A Deccan College MS. of the Kāṇṭha-vaśīti Bālabūkhā is dated —

Sṛi-Sakāh 1591 sanhvatsaraḥ 45 Bhādradāna-māsaḥ pakshas-sanitārāḥ tithiḥ-dvādaśi vārōrah Kavyasy-śtī II

Here a Saptarshi year 45 is put down as equivalent to a Saka year \((45 + 46 =)\) 91; and the corresponding date, for Saka 1591 expired and the purnimānta Bhāadrada, is Friday, the

---

10 As regards centenary years, I am informed by Pāṇḍit Gōvinda Kaul that, at the present day, some people would simply say saṁ 100, but that it is more common to say sanhvāt 4900, sanhvāt 4900, etc.
11 The reading of the above date has been carefully verified, and there can be no doubt as to its correctness. But I have not been able to obtain a satisfactory explanation of the term tra ś 6 44 cha ś ṣ 11 53 pra 11 3, which follow the word Saṇau.
12 Read Saptarshi-sanmaṭ.
13 Read Maṁgalam-vāsaram.
13th August, A. D. 1669, when the 12th tithi of the dark half ended 5 h. 15 m. after mean sunrise.

5. — The Deccan College Sārada MS. of the Kāśikā-Vṛttī is dated —


Here a Saptarshi year 36 is put down as equivalent to an expired Vikrama year (36 + 81 = 117 = 17); and the corresponding date, for Vikrama 1717 expired and the pūrṇimanta Pāusha, is Sunday, the 9th December, A.D. 1669, when the third tithi of the dark half ended 16 h. 32 m., and the nakṣatra was Tishya up to 17 h. 44 m. after mean sunrise.

6. — The Chambā stone inscription, mentioned in Archeol. Surv. of India, Vol. XXI. p. 136, bears the date —

Sriman-nripati-Vikramāditya-saṅvatsara 1717 sri-Sālavāhana-sakē 1582 sri-Sastra-saṅvatsara 36 Vaisāsha(kha)-vadi trayodāśyām Vu(bu)dha-vāsara ī Mēshē-ṛka-sahkr[ā]-mītau...

The Saptarshi year (which in this date and in the dates under 8, below, is described as the Sāstra-year) 36 is here put down as equivalent to a Vikrama year (36 + 81 = 117 = 17), and to a Saka year (36 + 46 = 82). And the corresponding date, for the expired northern Vikrama year 1717, or the expired Saka year 1582, and the pūrṇimanta Vaisākha, is Wednesday, the 28th March, A.D. 1669, when the 15th tithi of the dark half ended 21 h. 37 m., and the Mēša-saṅkrānti took place 13 h. 1 m. after mean sunrise.

7. — According to a communication received from Professor Bühler, the Sārada MS. of the Karmakāṇḍa (or Rīchaka) of the Vienna Library is dated —


Here a Saptarshi year 51 is put down as equivalent to a Vikrama year (51 + 81 = 132 = 32), and to a Saka year (51 + 46 = 97), and the corresponding date, for the expired northern Vikrama year 1732, or the expired Saka year 1597, is Saturday, the 24th April, A.D. 1675, when the 10th tithi of the bright half ended 21 h. after mean sunrise.

8. — In connection with the preceding dates I may be permitted to give here also the dates contained in the Chambā copper-plate inscription which is mentioned in Archeol. Surv. of India, Vol. XXI. pp. 136 and 137, and of which Sir A. Cunningham's rubbings have been sent to me by Mr. Fleet. In that inscription we read —

(L. 1) . . śrīmad-Vikramā[ṛka]-saṅvatsara 191[5] sri-Sastra-saṅvatsara 34;
(L. 7) . . śrīmad-Vikramāditya-saṅvatsara 1917 Śastra-saṅvatsara 36;
(L. 8) . . Vikramāditya-saṅvat 1915 sri-Sastra-saṅvatsara 34;
(L. 18) . . Vikramāditya-saṅvat 1917 Śastra-saṅvatsara 36.

These dates, of course, do not admit of verification, but, disregarding the hundreds, the difference between the Saptarshi years and the corresponding Vikrama years is again, what we have found it to be elsewhere, 81.

In the case of Saptarshi dates, from which the corresponding years of other eras as well as the hundreds of the Saptarshi years have been omitted, extraneous circumstances may sometimes enable us to calculate the proper European equivalents with certainty; in the absence of such circumstances to guide us, we must rest satisfied with a greater or less degree of probability. This may be seen from the two following dates:

14 Aurangzeb caused himself to be proclaimed emperor on the 26th August, A.D. 1668. See Elphinstone's History of India, ed. Cowell, p. 392.
9. — In Zeitschrift Deutsch. Morgen. Ges., Vol. XL. p. 9, Dr. Hultsch informs us that at Hariparnavat there is an inscription, dated —

Saṅvat 60 'Srā vati prā Suṅkrā 2 Mahammadā-śāhā-raja 2
i.e., 'in the year 60, on the first of the dark half of Sravaṇa, on a Friday; in the reign of Muhammad Shāh.'

According to Dr. Hultsch, Muhammad Shāh is said to have ruled from A.D. 1487 to 1587. Assuming this to be approximately correct, the Saptarshi year 60 of this date should correspond to A.D. 1484-85, or Saka 1406 expired, and the presumption is that Saka 1406 is really the year of the date, and that Muhammad Shāh reigned a few years before A.D. 1487. And calculating for Saka 1406, we find that the first of the dark half of the pūrṇimānta Sravaṇa of that year corresponds to the 9th July, A.D. 1484, which was a Friday, as required, and is undoubtedly the proper equivalent of the date of the inscription.

10. — Dr. Stein has kindly informed me that a Sārada MS. of the Ratnāvali-nātikā is dated —

Saṅvat 69, Chaitra-vati ākāśiyāṁ Chandra-vāsare Sravaṇa-nakshatṛē —
i.e., 'in the year 69, on the eleventh lunar day of the dark half of Chaitra, on a Monday, (the moon being) in the nakshatra Sravaṇa.'

A Saptarshi year 69 should correspond to an expired Saka year (69 + 46 = 115 = ) 15, and, the MS. being apparently an old one, we shall probably find the proper equivalent of the date in one of the expired Saka years 1615, 1515, or 1415. Calculations for 1615 and 1515 yield no satisfactory results; but in Saka 1415 expired the 11th of the dark half of the pūrṇimānta Chaitra fell on Monday, the 3rd March, A.D. 1494, when the 11th titti of the dark half ended 19 h. 33 m., and when the moon was in the nakshatra Sravaṇa from 5 h. 16 m. after mean sunrise. Here it is highly probable that Monday, the 3rd March, A.D. 1494, is the proper equivalent of the date. But, if the MS. were unusually old, an equally good result would be obtained for Saka 1215 expired. For in that year the 11th of the dark half of the pūrṇimānta Chaitra fell on Monday, the 22nd February, A.D. 1294, when the 11th titti of the dark half ended 9 h. 13 m., and when the moon also was in the nakshatra Sravaṇa from 7 h. 53 m. after mean sunrise. — I am indebted to Dr. Stein for several other dates of this description, which it would serve no purpose to examine here.

It is clear, then, that all the above dates work out satisfactorily with the equations with which we have started. Besides, the dates prove that, since Saptarshi 4300 = A. D. 1224, the Saptarshi year has always, like the Saka year, commenced with the month Chaitra. And from the dates 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9, which fall within about the last four hundred years, we see that the scheme of the lunar months during that time has been invariably the pūrṇimānta scheme. On the other hand, the date 1, which falls in A. D. 1224, works out properly only with the amānta scheme; and further research must show whether this is a solitary instance of the employment of the amānta scheme, or whether that arrangement of the lunar fortnights was followed generally in more remote times.

We have assumed above that the Saptarshi year, as they are more commonly called, laukika years are current years. To us it would indeed seem only natural that in a popular mode of reckoning this should be so; but we are not left altogether to our own guidance. Professor Bhājādārki has drawn attention to certain passages in a Sanskrit work connected with the Khaṇḍakādiya, in which a rule and examples are given for converting laukika into Saka years. The main point of the rule is, that 47 should be taken as a constant, to which the number of passed laukika years should be added, to find the Saka year corresponding to the

14 On that day, the first titti of the dark half ended 11 h. 56 m. after mean sunrise.
15 See also the Khaṇḍakādiya, I. 53, and note, Vol. XVII. p. 213.
16 Report on Sanskrit MS., for 1883-84, pp. 33 and 34.
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laukika year current. And one of the examples is, that, by putting down Saka 1547 and adding 17, the number of passed laukika years, we obtain Saka 1564, as the equivalent of the current laukika year 18. Here the writer distinctly intimates that in his time the laukika years were really regarded as current years; and, as the Saka year spoken of by him must in accordance with ordinary usage be an expired year, his rule is equivalent to our own, by which we take 46 as a constant and add the number of the current laukika year.

At the same time, I am not prepared to maintain a priori that, for a Hindu writer to quote a passed laukika year in a date, would be an utter impossibility. And in connection with this question I would draw attention to the following verse which occurs at the end of Kayṣaṇa's commentary on the Dvēṭālaṅka:-

Vasu-muni-gaṇap-udadhī-sama-kālē yātē Kalēs-tathā lōkē dhvapānchakāśi varshē rachit-ēyāṁ Bhāmagupta-nripē II

The author here tells us that he composed his commentary under the king Bhāmagupta, in Kaliyuga 4076 expired, tathā lōkē dhvapānchakāśi varshē. Now Kaliyuga 4076 expired should correspond to a laukika year 53 current, and assuming the statement contained in the verse to be correct, we cannot, it would seem, help assuming that the 52nd laukika year has really been quoted by the author as an expired year. Here, too, we want other old dates to show us what the practice may have been in earlier times.

I have omitted from the above the difficult date of the first Bājñāṭh Prāśasti, which has been already commented on by Professor Bühler in Epigraphia Indica, Vol. I. p. 103. In my opinion, the most important question to be answered in connection with that date is, whether the first figure of the Saka year in the date of the second Prāśasti is 7 or not. Sir A. Cunningham and Professor Bühler say that it is; and if they are right, the laukika year 80 of the date of the first Prāśasti should, according to what we know at present of the Saptarshi era, no doubt correspond to Saka 726 expired. But the first of the bright half of Jyaiśhīṭha did not fall on a Sunday, the week-day given in the date, in Saka 726 expired, nor in fact in any of the eight years from Saka 722 to 729 expired. If, on the other hand, we were not restricted by the date of the second Prāśasti to any particular century of the Saka era, I would say that the laukika year 80 of the first Prāśasti must correspond to Saka 1126 expired, because, of all the expired 26th years of the centuries of the Saka era from Saka 626 to Saka 1426, only the year 1126 yields the desired Sunday (the 2nd May, A.D. 1204). And I should not be prevented by anything in the contents of the inscription and the language of the author, or in the alphabet employed, from assigning the inscription to so late a period.

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI.

BY E. SENART, MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT DE FRANCE.

Translated by G. A. Grierson, B.C.S., and revised by the Author.

(Continued from Vol. XIX. p. 102).

CHAPTER III; continued.

THE DETACHED ROCK EDICTS.

2. THE EDICTS OF SAHASARAM, BUPNATH, AND BAIRAT.

These inscriptions, without being identical, have too many points of analogy to allow of their interpretations being dealt with separately. Moreover, in certain difficult passages they throw light on one another, and hence their simultaneous consideration is specially necessary. It is well

18 This verse first became known to me through an extract from the work sent to me by Dr. Stein; it is published in the Kāmpīṣatī, in the note on the heading of the Fākeyāpančakāśa.

19 In Saka 730 expired the first of the bright half of Jyaiśhīṭha did fall on a Sunday (the 14th April, A.D. 984), but there is no reason to assume that the writer put down a wrong month in the date.

20 In Saka 730 expired the first of the bright half of Jyaiśhīṭha was a Sunday, — the 16th April, A.D. 986.
known that, of all our edicts, these are those which have been most recently published. Discovered by different persons (cf. Corpus, p. 2), they owed their reproduction for the first time to the labours of General Cunningham. The copies and rubbings were sent to Dr. Bühler, who published them, and was the first to interpret them, in 1877. The facsimiles which he has given of the first two, form as yet the best complement for their study which we possess, but, though superior to the reproductions of the Corpus, they are, unfortunately, still unsatisfactory. We now know too well how generally imperfect are the reproductions prepared for the Corpus. In the present case the numerous and serious divergencies to which Dr. Bühler calls attention, may perhaps be explained by the condition of the rock; but they at any rate justify a certain amount of distrust in the corrections which several passages demand. Fortunately, we may be almost sure that, however desirable it may be to have a revision of the text of these monuments undertaken by a competent hand, it will be of much more use from the point of view of philological detail, than from that of understanding the general sense of the whole.

I must express here my thanks to Dr. Bühler, who has been kind enough to furnish me with the photograph of the Sahasaram inscription, to which he refers in his first article as having been sent to him by General Cunningham. I refer to this photograph under the abbreviation Ph. B.

**TEXT.**

**SAHASARAM.**

1 Dévánaḿpiyé hēvaḿ ἀ — iyán9 savachhaláni ; aṁ upásaké sumí na cha bádhámaḿ palakánitó [ ].

2 savimchhalé sádhiké t á — t3 étëna cha aṁtaléna jaḿbudipasi aṁmisan dévá ? saṁ ta.

3 munissá misándévya kaṭá [ ] pala — iyám phalé, ó — yaṁ mahátá va chakiyé pávatávé [ ] khudakánám pí palan-

4 kamamínéná vipulé pí suagakiyé Álā — v.9 [ ] sá étëya aṁháya iyám sáván9 [ ] khudaká cha uḍálá cha pa-

5 lakamántu aṁtá pa cha jánántu27 chilaḿhitéké cha palakáné hóta iyám cha aṁhé vaṭhasati vipulaú pí cha vaṭhisati

6 dlyáddhiyám avaladhíyéná diyaŚdhiyám9 vaṭhisati [ ] iyám cha saváné vivuthéna [ ] duvé sapamáláti

7 satá vivuthá ti2 256 [ ] ima cha aṁháma pavátéya likhápayathá ya . vá a-

8 thi héttá súlátamábhá tata ni likhápayathá yí10 [ ].

**Notes on Dr. Bühler’s Readings.**

1. 2. B. dévá husán ta : 1 4. B. suag[á] [sa]kíyá ā : Judging from the facsimile neither is there any trace of the character sa, nor is there the necessary room for it. 1. 5. pi chaín, I can discover no trace of the anusvára in Ph. B. 1. 8. B. thi hétté si—.

**BUFNATH.**

1 Dévánaḿpiyé hēvaḿ ἀ [ ] sáti[ ś]kéni adhiyáni vasí sumí páká . . . kó nó cha bádhá pakaté sáti[ ś]ké cha chhavachháre ya sumí háká — pité

2 bádhán cha pakaté11 [ ] ya ímáya kályá jaḿbudipasi amisádévá husa tó dání misaḿka [ ] pakamasi hi ésa phalé nó cha ésa mahátá pápotávé [ ] khudakán [ ] ka

3 pí12 pakamántumé sákiyé pipulé pí svác árōdhévé [ ] étiya aṁháya cha sáváné kátét khudaká cha uḍálá cha pakamántum13 ti aṁtá pí cha jánántu [ ] iyám pakará va

---

1 I give the text as it seems to me to appear in the facsimile in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. VI, p. 155. Dr. Bühler’s variants are given in notes.
Notes on Dr. Bühler’s Readings.

I. 1. B. sātirakēhāni adhitisāni; sumi pākā sa[ya]kī nō; sumi haka saṅghapāpiṭē
1. 2. B. bādhi cha; yi imiya; dāni masākā; khudakēhā hi, according to Dr. Bühler it is possible that there was a letter between hi and ka, but he is inclined to see only accidental scratches in the tracés of the facsimile; 1. 3. B. pi paumainē; āroḍhavē; pakārē cha;
1. 4. B. diyaḥdiyaṁ vaḍhisati; hadha cha athi; 1. 5. B. silāṭhubhē; vivaṭsativā ti vyuṭhēnā.

BAIRAT.

1 Dēvānaṁpiyē áhā [.] sati —
2 vassānān ya paka upāsakē — bādha —
3 aṁ mamayā saṅghē papayā atē . dhī cha —
4 jaṁbudipasi amisānaṁ dēva hi — vi — mási ēsa . lē —
5 hāhi ēsā mapātanē vachakayē — pì maminēnā ya — pa
6 vipulē pi śvaṅgikiyē ālādāḥtayē — kā cha udāḷā cha palakaṁata ti
7 aṁtā pi cha janaṇtu ti chilathiṭi — pulaṁ pi vaḍhisati
8 diyaḥdiyaṁ vaḍhisati [.] — 56

Notes on Dr. Bühler’s Readings.

I. 1. B. sāti; 1. 2. B. ya haka upāsakē n[ō] cha bādhaṁ cha ——; 1. 3. B. saṅghē papayītē bādhaṁ cha ——; 1. 4. B. — kamasi ēsa . lē —; 1. 5. B. [n]ō hi ēsē mahatanaḥ; 1. 6. B. śvaṅgē [sā]kyē alādāḥtavē — kā cha udāḷā cha palakaṁata ti; 1. 7. B. aṁtē pi janaṇtu; 1. 8. 56. According to B., these figures do not appear in the rubbing, and he has doubts as to their existence.


NOTES.

SAHASARAM.

I. I cannot but agree with the decisive remarks of Dr. Oldenberg (Mahāvagga, I. xxxxvii., and Zeitschr. der Deutsch. Murg. Ges., loc. cit.), in favour of the reading [aḍha]tiyānī both here and at Rūpiṇāth. It is true that at Rūpiṇāth the apparent reading is adhitisāni, but I have just now warned my readers as to the prudent mistrust with which our facsimiles are to be regarded. Even in this very passage we have savī[n]aḥkhaḷā, which, there can be no doubt, should certainly be a[ś]v[k]aḥkhaḷā and at Rūpiṇāth (l. 4) we have twice over vaḍhisati, although the correct reading must be vaḍhisati. Again, in line 2 of that edict, with the same letter ē, we read bādhiṁ, where the original stone assuredly has, or had, bādhaṁ. This reading must be translated ‘two years and a half.’ Judging from the facsimile, the lacuna represents only seven characters, and I would complete it by [aḥa sādihkēnā aḍha]tiyānī rather than by sādihkēnā. It will be seen that, a little further on, our text gives us savī[n]aḥkhaḷā sādhuḥ, as against sādulēkēhā chaḥvachkarē at Rūpiṇāth. With regard to the other details there is nothing to add to the remarks of Dr. Bühler; I may only observe that, if we translate literally ‘I am an upāsaka (Buddhist layman) for two years and a half, and have not made great efforts,’ we shall give a wrong idea of the real mean-
ing, as the remainder of the sentence clearly shows. What the king means is ‘I have been an 
\textit{up\`asa\`ka} for two and a half years without making great efforts; and it is now more than a year 
since,’ &c.

2. It is clear that we must complete the \textit{lacuna} either by \textit{\textit{ah[sumi b\`udh\`ah\`a pal\`ak\`ah]}\`a}, or by 
\textit{\textit{ah[sumi sa\`ungha\`ap\`e\`j}\`a} (cf. the note to the corresponding passage in R\`upn\`athi). Dr. B\`uhler pro-
poses the former restoration, and, as a matter of fact, the \textit{lacuna} seems to be one of about seven 
characters. The meaning, in any case, would remain identical in substance. In dealing with 
the sixth Columnar Edict (note I), I have had occasion to point out how the chronological data 
which we find here, combined with the indications which we find in the 10th Edict of Kh\`alsi, 
put it beyond any doubt that the present text does actually emanate from the same author as he 
who engraved the columnar edicts. These data permit us to fix the time of our inscriptions, 
\textit{Piyadasi}, according to his own statements, having been converted in the ninth year, say eight 
years and three months, after his coronation, we must first add to these figures two years and a 
half and a fraction, say two years and seven months, and again a year and a fraction, say a year 
and three months, which sum places these inscriptions, as well as those on the Bar\`abara caves 
which we shall shortly examine, in the thirteenth year after his coronation. This is not the 
place to enter into the general historical question, and I shall content myself with one 
remark. The \textit{Maha\`va\`isa} (p. 22, l. 2; p. 23, l. 3) places the conversion of A\`oka in 
the fourth year following his coronation, which disagrees with the evidence of Kh\`alsi; 
but it places the king’s coronation in the fifth year after his coming to the throne, 
which gives for his conversion the ninth year of his effective rule. There is, therefore, 
in this partial agreement between authentic documents, the trace of an exact tradition. We 
need not decide here as to what cause can be assigned for the mistake; whether the 
coronation has been arbitrarily separated from the coming to the throne, or whether the epoch 
from which the nine years were counted has been unduly moved back by the Sinhalese annals 
from the coronation to the coming to the throne of the king.

3. In my opinion this is one of the most difficult sentences of the edict. In the first 
place, it presents a little uncertainty as to the reading of the character which follows \textit{\`a\`va}. 
Dr. B\`uhler reads \textit{\textit{hu}}, which gives \textit{\`a\`va\`na\`}, corresponding to the \textit{\textit{h\`au}} (P\`ali \textit{\`a\`na\`}) of R\`upn\`athi. 
But R\`upn\`athi gives a correlative \textit{\`a\`} to the pronoun \textit{\`e}}, which we could scarcely do without, and 
which is wanting here. Moreover, to judge from the traces of the facsimiles, the character \textit{\`a\`} 
must have taken the form \textit{\textit{\`u}} instead of the \textit{\textit{u}} of the ordinary method of writing. Under these 
conditions, I think that in the vertical mark \textit{i} we can only recognize the sign of separation, 
common both in our present text and in that of Kh\`alsi, and that the two horizontal marks are only 
two accidental scratches on the rock. Moreover, an inspection of Ph. B. appears to me to do away 
with all uncertainty on this point. I accordingly take \textit{\textit{s\`a\`ta\`}} for \textit{\textit{s\`a\`ta\`}}, as equivalent to \textit{\textit{s\`a\`t\`a\`}}, 
the nominative plural of the participle \textit{\`e\`i\`a}. At the same time, it is clear that the choice 
between the two alternatives is not of a nature to influence the general interpretation of the 
phrase. It is the meaning, which it is most important to determine. Dr. B\`uhler translates: 
‘During this interval, the gods that were [held to be] true gods in Jambud\`vi\`pa, have been made 
(to be regarded as) men and as false.’ I should have been much surprised had not Dr. B\`uhler, 
with his vast experience of the turn of Hindu thought and expression, been himself taken aback 
by such a manner of speaking. He adds, in a note, ‘this phrase probably alludes to the 
Buddhist belief that the D\`evas also have shorter or longer terms of existence, after which 
they die, and are born again in other stages of existence, according to their \textit{karma}.’ But this 
belief, as a whole, is quite as much Brahm\`anical as Buddhist, and Piyadasi, if he preached 
it, would have said nothing new. Besides, such an expression would be extremely inexact 
and insufficient: it is not only as men, but as animals, as dwellers in the infernal regions, 
\&c., that the D\`evas, like other living beings, are liable to be born again. On the other 
hand, how could we admit that a Buddhist should characterise his conversion by saying 
that he had reduced the Brahm\`anical D\`evas to the rank of false gods, ‘True gods’ and
'False gods' are phrases not only strange to what we know of both Buddhist and Hindu phraseology, but directly contradictory to all that we know of the Buddhist writings and teachings. We never find in them any polemics against the popular deities. They have their recognised place in the cosmological system, and in the legends are put into continual connexion with Buddha and his disciples. It was the Dēvas, Indra and Brahmā, who received Buddha at his birth; it was to the fellowship of the Dēvas that the mother of Buddhā was raised when she died: and it was from among the Dēvas Tushitas that, according to all schools of tradition, Sīkyamuni descended to become incarnate; his future successor is, pending the hour of his mission, the very Chief of the Dēvas. Without doubt, these Dēvas play but a subordinate part in the general system of Buddhism; but that is as much the case in those systems of philosophy reputed the most orthodox. I may add, with the reserve which an argument of this nature demands, that it would be singular for the king to thus pride himself on having waged a war of extermination against the Dēvas, while he thought it proper, in this same inscription to call himself dēvānuḥpriya. This is not a real name, a personal or family name, which could not be arbitrarily changed, and of which the exact meaning might have been obliterated or worn out by use; but a surname, a title chosen freely, and of which the meaning 'dear unto the Dēvas' was evident to every mind. Evidently Dr. Bühler's translation is but a last resource, and cannot be held to be satisfactory. So far, we can venture to be certain; but it is not so easy to show what alternative explanation is to be given. We cannot turn to the parallel phrase at Rūpānātha, for it is less explicit than the present one, and it rather requires to borrow light from it, than is able to lend any of its own. I may add that I cannot but agree with Dr. Bühler so far as regards the analysis of each single word of the sentence, especially of the words mids (or misān) and amisā (or amisān), which are the only ones about which there can be any doubt. Like him, I consider them as equivalent to the Sanskrit mṛīṣā and amṛīṣā. An initial difficulty arises as to the syntactic part played by munīsā; — whether we should take it as a subject or as an attribute. If I am right in reading sahitē, the present participle, the mere position of the words places the matter beyond doubt, and we must take munīsā as the subject: the reading kusānā, although it would not make this conclusion so certain, would certainly not exclude it; even in that case it would be the more natural one. It is on the other hand, indirectly confirmed by the absence of the word at Rūpānātha. The king could not omit a word which was characteristic of the work which he boasts of having accomplished; while he could very easily do so, if the word were merely a general designation of the people to whom it is applied. I consider, therefore, that we must translate, 'the men who were really the Dēvas (or the gods) have been rendered falsely gods,' or in other words, 'have been dispossessed of their rank.' The king, therefore, had here in view a category of men who, while they were all the time mere men, were in reality gods. Who are these men, gods of Jambudvīpa? It appears to me that we can have no hesitation in recognising them as the Brāhmaṇas. To call a witness who is beyond suspicion, I cite the St. Petersburg Dictionary, which, in the article dēva, has a special paragraph for the case, in which the word means 'a god upon the earth,' who is, says Dr. Böhtlingk, properly the Brāhmaṇa. We meet, moreover, in a similar sense, the synonyms kṣitidēva, bhūdēva, bhūṣāra, all of which mean literally a 'terrestrial god,' and which commonly mean 'Brāhmaṇa.' I will only refer to that passage, quoted by Aufrecht, of the Sankhāpetanākarajaya, in which the author refers to Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists by the expression bhūṣāra-saugāṭāḥ, "the terrestrial gods, and the disciples of the Sugata." That the expression is a very customary and very old one, may be seen from numerous passages. It will suffice to refer to Weber, Ind. Stud. X, pp. 35 and ff., and H. Zimmer, Alkind. Leben, p. 205. But there is more than this, — we have some historical confirmation of the interpretation here.  

1 We could, however, even with taking munisā as subject, get a translation, not very different from that of Dr. Bühler's, provided we considered mśiddā, and amśiddā, as bhavāṃkī. But, besides this translation having against it the same objections as those which appear to me to condemn Dr. Bühler's rendering, it will suffice, in order to exclude it from consideration, to point out that B. has not amśiddā kāti but amśiddātā.

proposed. How does the Mahāvamsa characterise the conversion of Aśoka? It is by the fact that he dismissed the sixty thousand Brāhmaṇas whom, according to the custom of his father, he had fed every day, and substituted for them sixty thousand Buddhist Śramaṇas. It characterises the conversion, therefore, by an evident manifestation of the disfavour with which he regarded Brāhmaṇas. By this conduct, by this example, he could indeed flatter himself with having inflicted a deep wound on their prestige. Tradition, therefore, comes positively to our aid, and has moreover the advantage of replying beforehand to an objection, feeble enough in itself, which we might be tempted to found upon the tone with which the king generally speaks of Brāhmaṇas, continually associating them with Śramaṇas. We must evidently see in this fact only the results of the spirit of tolerance which animates his edicts: but surely, it is not more difficult to reconcile this tolerance with our translation of the present sentence, than with the tradition handed down by the Sinhalese annalists.  

4. There is no doubt as to the characters required to complete the two lacunas; pā- [kamā ḳī] iyān and phalē [a] dh [chā iyaṃ. The words which follow present greater difficulties. Dr. Bühler translates nō [chā iyān &c., by 'and it ought not to be said to be an effect of (my) greatness.' It is quite possible that pāvatavē should correspond to a Sanskrit prāptāvyah, although it must at least be admitted that the ō long is out of place. But it is a pity that Dr. Bühler has not been more explicit as to the supposed phrase mahatāvāchākiyē, the analysis of which is far from clear. He himself states his doubts as to the derivation of vāchākiyē, from vīchāka + the suffix iyā. I fancy that what has induced Dr. Bühler to adhere to this analysis of the text, is the apparently nearly concordant reading of Bairā, mahātāvā vāchākiyē; but that inscription has suffered so greatly, and is so fragmentary, and the reproduction of it is so plainly incomplete, that it appears to me to be very unwise to take it as a point of departure: on the contrary, it is much more probable that the reading of Sahasasaraṁ has had an influence on its decipherment. Under these circumstances, I cannot but incline towards another analysis; I read sahāiye for chākiyē, which gives us nō [chā iyān mahatāvā vārākiyē pāvatavē. This closely approaches the turn of the sentence at Rūpānh, about which there can be no doubt. Dr. Bühler has correctly recognised the pāpātya of that inscription as corresponding to the Sanskrit prāptāvyah. We have the same root here in pāvatavē, which, transcribed according to the rules of Sanskrit orthography, would be prāptāvyāḥ. The v stands for p as elsewhere, — e. g. lower down in this same inscription we have avadāhiyēna for apalāḍhyāḥ: the substitution of the infinitive is rendered necessary to the sentence by the addition of sahāiye, 'and this [fruit] cannot be obtained by mere power alone.'

5. We shall have exactly the same construction in this sentence as in the preceding one, if we (following Dr. Bühler's example) add the syllable sa after nāṣ after nāṣ and before kīye, both here and at Bairā. Judging from the facsimiles, it does not appear to be likely that the stone has really ever had the character; but, even if it has not been inadvertently omitted, Dr. Bühler, who has had more of the original documents in his hands than we have, is the best judge of these possibilities. Moreover, Rūpānh certainly confirms this conjecture, and I think that, for the present, it is best to adhere to it. As regards the form palakamāminēnāḥ, which also seems to occur at Bairā, and perhaps, too, at Rūpānh, see above, note 19 to the first Dhauli detached edict. We know that vipsalē is in antithesis to khudahēna, 'even the small can conquer svarga, however great it may be,' that is to say, however great the recompense may be.

6. It is important to fix accurately, before we proceed further, the exact meaning of the word śāvēte. I do not here refer to the literal meaning of 'proclamation,' 'proclamation,' which need not form the subject of any discussion. We have already met it twice in the 7th

* I have indicated the reasons which appear to me to demand that munātē should be taken as a subject. It is almost useless to remark expressly that, if it is preferred to take it as an attribute, my explanation would not be essentially modified. We should then translate 'the people who were in reality the gods in Jambudvīpa. I have reduced to [become simply] men, and usurpers of the title of Déva.'
(l. 20) and in the 8th (l. 1) Columnar Edicts. In both cases the word is expressly applied to the proclamations of the king, made by him or by his order, and recorded in his inscriptions. *Iṣana* is, moreover, the same pronoun by which Piyaçasia, in all his monuments, alludes to the inscription in which it may be found, ‘the present inscription.’ We have no reason for taking it here in any other sense, and *a priori* we can only translate the whole by ‘it is with a view to this result that the present proclamation is made.’ We shall shortly see if what follows is inconsistent with this interpretation.

7. Dr. Bühler is mistaken about *nāta*; it is a nominative plural, which refers to the frontier populations,—to the foreign countries. Comparison with J. ii. 6, with Dh. (det. ed.) ii. 4, &c., leaves room for no doubt. As for *jñāṇāṇātu*, if we should not read *taṇa* for *chana*, which would give the verb an object, the meaning of the sentence is completed without effort, by supplying an equivalent object understood. Compare the final sentence of the edict of Bhabra.

8. It will be remembered that in the 13th (Rock) Edict (n. a.) we have already noticed an analogous use, in an indefinite sense, of the word *diyaḍha*, Pāli *diyaḍḍha* and *divaḍḍha*. We are reminded of the meaning in Sanskrit sanctioned for *parāṛtha*, to express the highest possible number. I think that we may sufficiently accurately represent the analysis of the phrase by an equivalent such as ‘a hundred times, a hundred times a million times.’

9. This sentence is the one of the whole edict which presents most difficulties, and which leaves most room for discussion. It early attracted the attention of General Cunningham; he read the figures correctly, and this point is now undisputed. The two doubtful points, the solution of each of which is connected with the other, are, on the one hand the translation of *vivuṭha* or *vyaṭha*, and, on the other hand, what it is to which the figures refer. Regarding the second point, Dr. Bühler shews no hesitation. On the supposition that they refer to years, and contain a date, he has been almost necessarily led to find in the *vivuṭha*, which thus becomes the initial point of an era, a name of Buddha. The great authority of Dr. Bühler has evidently accounted for the assent, expressed or tacit, with which his interpretation of the figures and their meaning was at first received. Since then, Dr. Oldenberg has reconsidered the matter, and has pointed out that in the two members of the phrase in question,

\[
\text{at Sahasaraṭh}
\]

\[
\text{duvə sapāṇālākā satā vivuṭhā tı 256.}
\]

\[
\text{at Rāṇāṭh}
\]

\[
256 satavivesā ta.
\]

the word signifying ‘year’ is wanting, and that there are on the other hand nominatives plural, *vivuṭhā*, *vivuṭhā*, such as might be expected beside a noun of number. As no other instance has yet been quoted authorising the omission of the word *eṣa* or *sānvaḥkhaṇa*, he concludes that we should translate ‘256 *satas* are *vivuṭhās*’ and ‘there are 256 *vivasas* of the *sata*.’ We shall return to these outline-translations subsequently. It appears to me, however, that under any circumstances Dr. Oldenberg is right in his criticism, and in his general analysis of the sentence. The omission of the word for ‘year’ might be explained if we had to deal with a simple number, but here we have before us a whole sentence, and, if we take Dr. Bühler’s interpretation, we should have to admit that the king expresses himself thus, ‘256 are passed,’ which is barely credible. I may add that, on two or three occasions, our inscriptions employ numeral figures, for instance, in the first Edict at Kapur di Giri, in the enumeration of two peacocks, and one gazelle, or in the 13th Edict at Khālesai and at Kapur di Giri, d *propos* of the four Greek kings. From this it follows that there is no reason *a priori* for assuming that the figures here necessarily refer to years. Dr. Oldenberg makes another very just remark, that we cannot separate the *sata* *vivuṭhā* at Sahasaraṭh from the *satavivesa* at Rāṇāṭh. From this there results a two-fold conclusion: first, that *vivuṭhā*, *vyuṭhā*, must be derived, as Messrs. Rhys Davids and Pischel have from the first pointed out, from the root *v-va*, and corresponds to the Sanskrit *vyuṣṭa*. Dr. Bühler, who, not without hesitation, opposes this analysis, relies principally on the difficulties of translation, but these have little weight, being founded on the preconceived idea that we absolutely require here the meaning of ‘elapsed.’ I doubt if at the present day this derivation would meet.
with any opponent. I can offer a further confirmation in the future participle *vivastāvīyē*, which has not hitherto been recognised at Rūpanātha, and to which I shall come back again immediately. The second consequence is that *sāth* at Sahasram cannot be, as Dr. Bühler would have it, the noun of number 'hundred,' because that translation is, as all agree, inadmissible at Rūpanātha; we must therefore give up the translation proposed by Dr. Bühler for the characters *duēśa pānkīlāti sāth* which he renders in Sanskrit by *dvē śatapāṇchāsadadhiśatā*, while at the same time recognising the difficulties of the explanation. Of these I see two principal ones: the first is phonetic; *pānkīlāti* for *pāṇchāsadadhī* is without analogy or example in the phonetics of our inscriptions. In the second place, the intercalation of the number fifty-six between the number two and the number hundred, in order to express two hundred and fifty-six, would be opposed to all practice, and, it seems to me, contrary to the most elementary logic. Dr. Oldenberg accordingly reads *J* for *J* a very simple correction (I must allow that Ph. E. is not very favourable to this reading, although *J* is by no means above all suspicion), and, admitting that, as often happens, the numbers are written in an abridged form, he transcribes *duēś sa* (i.e. *sāth*) *pānkī* (i.e. *pānḍaśa*; Skr. *pāṇchāśat*) *chha* (i.e. *śat*) *tt*. I concur entirely with his conjecture, and do so the more easily because, in all particulars, I had previously independently arrived at the same conclusions. If I state this, it is certainly not to claim the honour of an hypothesis which I think to be a happy one. In the present case, the priority of the suggestion is not a matter of discussion, and unquestionably belongs to Dr. Oldenberg. I only lay stress upon the coincidence in order to add probability and credit to the explanations proposed. Dr. Oldenberg has again rightly perceived that it is impossible, in two short sentences closely connected like these, to attribute to one and the same word, *vivutha*, two applications so different as those which Dr. Bühler proposed. Having come so far, I am now obliged, as to the true meaning of this word, *vivutha*, to differ equally from both my learned predecessors. I have just above touched on its derivation; — we have to do with a participle of *vī-vaś*; I have pointed out that Rūpanātha gives us a further proof in the word *vivastāvīyē*, Skr. *vivasaśayātayāh*, regarding which reference may be made to the commentary on that text (n. 6). It will there be seen that the king recommends *vivasaśayāh*, or, in other words, the being, the becoming *vivutha*. That ought at once to cause us to distrust the proposed interpretations. In the *vyutha*, both Drs. Bühler and Oldenberg search for the head, the one of the Buddhist doctrine, the other of a doctrine perhaps analogous but different, the word not being sanctioned as a technical term in Buddhism. We know now, from what I have said above (n. 1) that our inscription is certainly Buddhist. It is certain, on the other hand, that *vyutha*, meaning the Buddha, would be a name absolutely new to us. It remains to be seen if the conclusion to be drawn from these premises is not simply that *vyutha* in no way refers to the Buddha at all; and it is, in fact, this to which we are led by all the other indications. I have previously drawn attention to the fact that the 8th Columnar Edict presents, when compared with the present one, analogies of which I am astonished that advantage has not been taken: 'that men may make rapid progress in the Religion, it is for this reason that I have promulgated religious exhortations, that I have given various directions in regard to the Religion. I have appointed numerous [officers] over the people . . . . . that they may spread abroad my instructions, and develope (my wishes). I have also appointed *rajaśikas* over hundreds of thousands of living beings, and they have been ordered by me to instruct the faithful. Thus saith Piyādasi, dear unto the Dē ras: it is with this object alone that I have erected columns [covered with] religious [inscriptions], instituted overseers of the Religion, and spread abroad religious exhortations.' We are here in the presence of the same ideas, of the same stage of development as in our present edict in both cases the same terms are found, — especially the word *śivaśa*. At Delhi, as here we are informed about the instructions which the king promulgates, and the inscriptions which he scatters far and wide to insure that his teaching should be the more lasting. There we are told further about the officers who in this propaganda lend him an essential aid, who go forth spreading abroad and developing his intentions. I believe that, in this particular also, the agreement continues in our text. We have seen
that, in line 4, there is no reason for seeking in advae anything other than the same instructions which are here recorded. It is exactly the same in the present passage. The exhortations of the text are purely and simply identical with those which the king, in many other passages, continually speaks of as emanating from him and in his own name, without ever invoking the authority of a sacred text of which we have no reason to expect the mention in the present case. But how then to understand viuutha? The most experienced students of Hindu and of Buddhist literature, have hitherto discovered no proof of a technical use of the verb vi-vas. We can therefore only start from the ordinary sense of the word. This is well known, and gives rise to no doubt; it is that of 'to be absent,' 'to depart from one's country.' The substantive viuutha is used with the corresponding value of 'absence, departure from home.' Under these conditions, nothing is simpler than to take viuutha as meaning these messengers, these, as it were, misi dominici, on the establishment of whom Piyadasa set so much value, the dutas or messengers of whom he speaks in the 13th Rock Edict. Subject, therefore, to these remarks, I would render the word by 'missionary.' Among the expressions which occur to me, it is the only one which allows me to retain for the participle viuutha, and for the verb vi-vas in its various applications, an equivalent which would give in the English translation the uniformity of expression used by the text. The word will have the advantage of directly reminding us of those missionaries of whom, as we know from the Mahavamsa, so great a number expatriated themselves during the reign of Asoka, to carry the teaching of Buddhism to all parts of his vast empire, and above all to the foreign nations, the aukta, with whom our edict expressly deals a little higher up. The viuutha would be here, as is in the nature of things and in the essence of his rasa, only the representative, the substitute of the king. In this way the whole passage is perfectly consistent: the king, after having spoken of these instructions as coming from himself, returns to the subject saying that it is his 'messenger,' his 'missionary,' who is charged with spreading them abroad, with actually putting them into circulation, and he adds that there have been two hundred and fifty-six departures of similar messengers. It follows from this that vata can only be understood as corresponding to the Sanskrit satya, 'living being, man,' as has been already recognized by Dr. Oldenberg. We could, if absolutely necessary, follow Dr. Bühler in interpreting it as an equivalent of the Sanskrit asatri, 'master, teacher.' This translation would, in no way, be incompatible with the meaning which I attribute to viuutha; but the phonetic difficulty, the presence of an unaspirated t, would render such an explanation only allowable as a last resource. There remains only one slight obscurity over a matter of detail. It is natural that, reduced as we are to a translation solely founded on etymology, we should not be in a position to determine the precise official signification of the title, and how far it corresponds with those mentioned in other inscriptions, dharmaahahmatrias, ditas, &c. We may, at the same time, remark that according to the 6th Gimbir Edict, the creation of the dharmaahmatrias belonged to the year following that from which our inscription takes its date. It is possible that, at the epoch at which we now are, Piyadasa had not yet conceived the idea of a regular organization, and that the somewhat vague term viuutha corresponds to this early stage of affairs, when, yielding to the first inspirations of his zeal, he sent abroad a large number of missionaries, without fixing their precise title, charging them to go as far as they could (cf. n. 6 of Rānãth) to spread abroad his teaching.

10. There can be hardly any doubt that the end of line 7 should read yata va a-. It forms a correlative to the rata following. There remains therefore, for the verb which precedes, likhápayathá, and not likhápayá thágya, as Dr. Bühler writes. We thus escape the necessity of admitting with him a complication of forms and of constructions equally improbable. Likhápayathá is the second person plural. The king here directly addresses his officers (as we shall see that he does at Rānãth in another sentence) and says to them: 'cause to be engraved upon the mountains,' &c. It is clear that, according to this analogy, we must read at the end of the edict likhápayatha ti. Ph. B. actually favours the reading ti instead of yi. I have some hesitation regarding the analysis of the word hétid. The method which first suggests itself, is, as Dr. Bühler has done, to seek in it the nominative plural of the pronoun; but the
presence of the pronoun is awkward, as the king wishes to say ‘pillars’ rather than ‘these pillars.’ On the other hand, it appears that at Rūpāthi we have the adverb kūdha, that is to say, ‘down here, on the earth, in the world.’ It is perhaps preferable to admit that we have here its equivalent in hēlā, i.e., atra, ētha. Cf. G. VIII. 1. 3; Kh. VIII. 23 and the notes.

RUPNATH.

11. We have seen that it is adhātiyāni which we must read (see above, note 1); so also kādā and not kādē, and, further on, bātham and not bāthāin. Regarding the characters following ēnu, I cannot agree with Dr. Bühler, who reads, or restores, sā[sa]kī. From his own facsimile it is clear that between the letter which he reads sā, and that which he reads kī, and which I read kē, there are wanting two characters, and not one. The first sign, which he reads sā is by no means clear. It is rather sū which should be read, if the traces visible on the facsimile were above all suspicion. But numerous examples bear witness that it is not so, and, under these conditions, I have little hesitation in maintaining that the stone had really, here as at Sahasarām, āpūkalē. Moreover, sāvākalē, meaning a layman, is a Jain expression, the presence of which here would surprise us. The reading sanskṛtpūpatā, translated ‘having reached the Saṅgha, being entered into the Saṅgha,’ is a very ingenious conjecture of Dr. Bühler’s. But, if I am inclined to accept this reading, I am not ready to concur in its interpretation as given by Dr. Bühler. The expression sanskṛt prāptān, for the precise idea of ‘entering into the monastic order,’ is vague and not sanctioned by the ordinary terminology, necessarily fixed at an early date in such a matter; besides, this situation of a king, who, while preserving his royal prerogatives and his royal life, enters into a religious order, is far removed from the idea which we are accustomed to form with regard to Buddhist monachism in the ancient period. I shall later on come to this matter again, and shall explain why I prefer to take this ‘entering’ in a material, physical meaning, and the phrase as commemorating the first solemn visit paid by the king to the assembly of monks, after his conversion.

12. It is probable enough that the complete reading is that indicated by the facsimile of the Corpus, — khudakēna hi pi ka. Dr. Bühler corrects to kūpī pakē, in which he is very probably right. I suspect that pīpūlē of the facsimile does not represent a variant orthography, but that the variation is only apparent, and that the stone had in reality vipūlē. The reading drūdhavē is also, I am persuaded, only apparent. Everywhere in this inscription, r is replaced by ṛ, and it is dṛadhavē which we may be inclined to assume. The inspection of the facsimile appears to me to greatly favour this correction, which, under any circumstances, would have to be made conjecturally.

13. I pass over evident rectifications such as ētāya. It will be remarked that the absence of the pronoun ēdu, or some such, giving an indeterminate shade to the substantive, tends to favour the interpretation which I have given for the corresponding sentence at Sahasarām.

14. The reading pakē, admitted by Dr. Bühler, appears to me to give little satisfaction as regards sense. Moreover, I can discover in the facsimile no trace of the ē long. I think that there can be no doubt that the stone bore in reality pakamē, corresponding to the palakamē of Sahasarām, and I translate in conformity with this conjecture. For kīti read kiūtā. As for vadhī I cannot recognise it as an accusative. We must either read athavādhi as a nominative, or admit that the two syllables vadhī have been repeated by an error of the engraver. I confess that the perfect agreement which it would establish with Sahasarām causes me to lean to the second alternative.

15. Dr. Bühler has, I think, been led astray by his not recognising the two future participles passive which the sentence contains. At the end we must certainly read ikkhoṭaṭhatvīyāt. As for the exact form of the first one, the evident errors in the facsimile as regards the characters which follow, throw the matter into some uncertainty. For ikkhoṭaṭhatvīyāt, we must certainly read the consonants: l, kk, p, t, v, y, t. But, according to
the vocalization, which, whether owing to the rock being worn away or to the imperfections of the facsimile, unfortunately escapes us, we must either understand lēkkhāpita va yuta (in which yutra commences the following sentence), or lēkkhāpitāniyē ti. It is possible to adduce arguments in favour of either solution; but I do not venture to decide absolutely, and console myself with the small importance of the question, so far as regards the general meaning of the passage which is not affected. What is certain, is that the king, here as at Sahasarām, gives an order, or at least a counsel, to the readers whom he addressed. We shall see that the following sentence throws still further light on this new construction. For hadha, I correct with Dr. Bāhler, but not without some hesitation, hidha, equivalent to tha. It is unnecessary to point out the corrections athi, siddhanabhe.

16. In the interpretation of this passage, I differ entirely from Dr. Bāhler: the difficulties and improbabilities in the translation proposed by him are evident. I hope that the solution which I propose will recommend itself by its simplicity, and by its agreement with the general tone of the edicts of the king. Regarding the reading, I only differ from my eminent predecessor as regards two details: in the place of savara, I read savata; if the reader will take the trouble to refer to the facsimile, and to note, on the one hand the distance which separates the so-called f from the letter following, and on the other hand, the form k, and not k, which t has in this inscription, I do not think that he will have any further doubt as to this correction. The other reading is no less easy; it consists in reading tupaka (more correctly tūpākā) instead of tūpaka, the b and the b being, as we know, very similar. I do not speak of additions of vowels which are necessary according to any hypothesis, and which the experience of all the rest of the inscription shews to be perfectly legitimate. This being settled it is sufficient to distribute the characters suitably, in order to obtain a natural, as well as an excellent, meaning. I read: etinā cha vyayāmāna yavatake (cf. āvatakē in the edict of Bhabra) tūpākāh bhālē saeeta vivasitāniyē ti. Vyayāmāna means ‘sign,’ and marks, as we have seen in the 3rd of the Fourteen (Rock) Edicts, the exterior and material form of the thought. We could, therefore, understand, ‘and by the order here engraved.’ If this turn of speech appear a little vague, it is justified by the existence of a pun. In fact, the continuation is clear, ‘you must set out on your mission as far as you will find nourishment,’ that is to say, as far as is humanly possible. Now vyayāmāna has also the meaning of ‘condiment, relish,’ and, by designating his written will by this word, Piyadasi represents it as in some sort a viaticum which should accompany and sustain his missionaries whom he exhorts to expatriate themselves. It is unnecessary to draw further attention to the corroboration which this sentence, as well as the one which I have cited in commenting on the text of Sahasarām, gives to my translation of vyutha. If this special exhortation is missing in the other texts, it will be noted that it is particularly appropriate here, at the frontier zone in which Rūpāngh is situated.

17. We must, of course, read vyuthéna, and vyāsā ti.

BAIRAT.

The version of Bairat, very fragmentary, and very imperfectly reproduced as it is, does not lend itself, at present, to a detailed examination. There is only one passage, in line 3, where it can serve to fill up a lacuna in the other texts, and I have already said that there also the reading appears very doubtful. It would be useless to enumerate all the corrections which the comparison of the parallel versions authorises us to make in the text as we have it now. Any one can make them for himself. There are other doubtful passages, such as amitānā kē, where conjectures would be without interest, as being based on no serious authority. The only point which deserves notice, is that to which Dr. Bāhler has drawn attention, that the figures represented in the facsimile of the Corpus, are wanting in the rubbing. I can only state my agreement with his opinion, when he adds that the position which they occupy renders him very sceptical as to their existence.
TRANSLATION.

(In translating, I neglect the peculiarities of Bairâtâ. For Sahasaram and Rûpnâth, I print the translations of the two texts in parallel columns, from the point where they diverge, too decidedly, from each other.)

Thus saith the [King] dear unto the Dêvas: — During two years and a half was I an upâsaka (Buddhist layman), and did not display great zeal. A year has passed since I visited the Saïgha (the monastic community). [R adds: — and I displayed great zeal]. During this period, the men who were the real gods of Jambudvîpa have been reduced to be no longer really the gods. [R. : — Those who at that time were the real gods of Jambudvîpa, are now reduced to be really so no longer]. Now that is the result of my zeal; that result cannot be attained by might alone [R. omits this last word]. The most humble can, by displaying zeal, gain heaven, high though it be. It is with this aim that these instructions are delivered: that all, humble or great, should display zeal; that the foreign nations themselves should be taught (by my proclamations), and that this zeal should be lasting. Then will arise a [religious] progress, a grand progress, an infinite progress.

SAHASARAM.

It is by the missionary that this teaching is spread abroad. Two hundred and fifty-six men have been sent forth on missions, 256. Have ye these things engraved on mountains; and in those places where there are pillars of stone have them engraved there also.

RUPNATH.

Have these things engraved on mountains; and in that place where there may be found a pillar of stone, have them engraved upon the pillar. And with these instructions, which will be to you as a viaticum, set ye forth on your mission to all the world, so far as ye will find means of existence. It is through the missionary that my teaching is spread abroad. There have been 256 settings forth of missionaries.

3. THE EDICT OF BHABRA.

We know that this edict was discovered in the same locality (Bairâtâ) as that in which was found the third version of the preceding edict. If I adhere to the name of Bhabra, I do so because that name is already sanctioned by long use, and because it prevents any confusion arising regarding the two inscriptions found in the same neighbourhood. To avoid a useless multiplication of divisions, I include it in the present chapter, although, strictly speaking, it is not engraved on a rock in the same sense as the preceding ones. It is engraved on a small detached block of granite, which it was found easy to transport to Calcutta, where it is now preserved. The most trustworthy reproduction of the stone is that which has been given in the *Journal Asiatique* (1887, Vol. I. pp. 498 and ff.) from a rubbing of Dr. Burgess, together with some fragments of a rubbing previously sent to me by my learned friend and colleague, Dr. Hoernle. On this facsimile the following reading and commentary are based.

TEXT.


1 Piyadasi (â)jâ màgadhànm saùghânm abhipàdànaâm âhâ apàbâdâtaâm cha phàsvúyâlâtaâm cha […]

2 vidíté vè bhànté àvàtaké hàmaâ budhâsì dhammasi saùghâstì galâvé chaù pasàdè cha […] è kàmohaâ bhànté

3 bhagavàtâ budhâna bhàsité savé sè sùbhásité vâ è chu khô bhànté hāmiyâyé diêyâ hèvâm sùbhàsìté
4 chilañhitkë hōsamitā lalāhāmi hakañ tam vatavē [...] imāni bhañtē dhammapaliyāṇī vinayasyamukāsē
5 aliyasānī anagatabhayānī munīsāthā mōnyasātē upatisasānī ē cha lābhulō
6 vādē musāvādañ adhigicchāya bhagavata buddhēna bhāsītē ētāna bhañtē dhammapaliyāṇī ichhāmān
7 kiñcī bahuñkē bhikkupāyēś chā bhākhumiya chā abhikhinaṃ sunayu chā upadhā-
8 lēyēnu chā

NOTES.
1. The third word of the inscription has long been read māyadē, and the question arose whether it was to be understood as an epithet of lāyā or as an irregular orthography for māyadhānā. From the last facsimile it may be seen that the supposed vowel-sign is by no means regularly cut, and is probably nothing more than an accidental scratch,—especially as the following anusvāra seems to be quite clear. It is thus māyadhānā which we must read, and which we must, of course, construe with sunghānā. Hitherto, the word has been taken simply in its geographical signification: 'the samgha of Magadhā.' I have some doubts on this point. In the first place, sunghā, as is proved by what follows, was from this epoch consecrated, in its generic and, so to say, abstract use, to designate the clergy in its most general terms. Hence its association with a local restrictive designation is no more likely here than it would be in the ordinary literary language of Buddhism. In the second place, it is difficult to explain the erection in Rijāsthān of an inscription destined expressly for the clergy of Magadhā. Ought we not to consider that māyadhā should be a synonym of 'Buddhist,' based on the place of the origin of the doctrine? If such a use really existed, it would explain, for instance, how Pāli ultimately received the name of māyadhā bhāshā, although it had surely nothing to do with Magadhā. This is a mere conjecture which I put forth subject to all reserves. The old reading abhīvādēma(t)anuḥ must be put aside altogether with the various conjectures to which it has induced the several interpreters. Neither mā nor tā can be made out of what are really incoherent scratches, whether the stone was from the first defective at that spot or the engraver intended to blot out some letter erroneously begun by himself. I consider that the vowel-sign ē has no more reality here than in the above māyadhē. As to this point the fragmentary rubbing of Dr. Hoernle (photographed in the abovementioned paper) is especially decisive. We have consequently to read as I have transcribed abhīvādānāma dha... This construction of dha or some equivalent with abhīvādāna and a double accusative is frequent enough in the phraseology of Buddhistic Sanskrit. I shall only quote one example (Mahāvastu, II, 105): अविवासं च म व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व व

2. I find it, I confess, a little rash to have recourse to analogies borrowed from Hindi to explain the form kama. The meaning has, however, been recognised by Dr. Kern, and there can be no further doubt about it. Moreover, the form is not isolated here. Beside the genitive kama, we shall shortly find the instrumental hamiyijē, which has not hitherto been recognised under the reading panīyijē. Hamiyijē is to maniyijē (Dh., det. ed., ii. 4), maniyijē (J., det. ed., ii. 6; Col. ed. vii. 7), as kama is to maha. The two sets of forms are in complete correspondence. We could, strictly speaking, explain their origin, either by a metathesis of maha to kama, which has been afterwards continued in the declension, or by a false analogy with the nominative kāma. At any rate, we can be certain about the meaning in both cases.

3. The old copy has here the right reading kēchē. The rubbing, however, seems really to have the anusvāra.
4. The *facsimile* of the Corpus, by giving the double reading *hamiydyē* and *dīwyē", has given a new meaning to this passage. The versions of Burnouf and of Dr. Kern were only ingenious makeshifts, on which it would be, I think, superfluous to dwell at length. As far as *subhāsītē vā* all is plain; for the remainder, it is of importance to explain the construction clearly. And first of all the particle *chu kāhā", which, as I have had occasion to point out has a slight adversative shade, announces a proposition destined to complete, and, to a certain extent, to form an antithesis to what precedes. The relative *ē* which commences the sentence, requires a correlative, which we find in *tānū before vatavē*. So far as concerns the relative proposition, I have just stated my opinion regarding *hamiydyē* which is the instrumental of the pronoun of the first person, *Dirēyēmā" is simply the regular form of the first person of the potential. As for the meaning of the verb *dīēs*, it is determined by that of the substantive *dēśa*. I have shewn (Dh., ed. det., i. n. 7) that, in our inscriptions, it is everywhere the equivalent of the Sanskrit *saṃvēśa", and signifies, 'order,' 'commandment.' *Dīś will, therefore, mean not merely 'to show,' but 'to direct,' 'to order.' We shall thus obtain this translation; and so far as I may order myself, that is to say, by my own authority, besides what has been positively said by the Buddha. The reading *tānū vatavē instead of tva vatavē, tāta vatavē*, has put everything here in order. The construction, with the infinitive dependent on *alabhām" is excellent. Only one slight doubt remains, viz., who should we not transcribe *vatavē* with an anomalous compensatory *d long? It would, however, alter nothing in the rendering of the word which is equivalent to Sanskrit *vaktūnū*. In furnishing us with the necessary antecedent *tānū to the relative *ē*, this reading allows us to take, with Burnouf, *sadbhāmē" as equivalent to the technical Buddhistic *sadābhāmē.*

5. The reading *vinayaṃ samuksē", formerly given by Wilson on the authority of Capt. Burt, Mr. *sāṅkhaṃdēsānā* (cf. Childers, s. v.); but the bearing of this qualification is far from being established. The only point which is certain is the derivation, — *sāṃkhaṃkāika" equivalent to *sāṅkhaṃkārika; that which the Pāli commentators propose is only a play upon words. Provisionally, it is perhaps safest to adhere to the established meaning of *samutkarsha" in Sanskrit, and to translate, subject to every reservation, 'the Excellence of Discipline.' We may compare the use of the verb *samutkarṣati" in a passage of the Mahāvaṭṭa (I. p. 178, 1, 1, of my edition, and the note). Under any circumstances, we are not as yet, in a position to identify this title with any of those which are known to us from literature. The conjecture of Dr. Oldenberg (Mahāvaṭṭa, I. p. xi. note), who seeks for, in it, the *pātimākha", is the less probable, because he has, for several of the other titles here given, shown their exact agreement with the titles which his consummate experience of the Pāli Canon has enabled him to be the first to discover. He identifies the *āṇāgata-hayānā" with the *āṇāgata-hayānāvutta" of the Āṇāgataxranaika, That Sūtra 'describes how the Bhikkhu, who leads a solitary life in the forests, should have always before him the dangers that might suddenly put an end to his life, serpents, savage animals, &c., and such thoughts should lead him to exercise all his energies in order to arrive at the goal of his religious strivings.' Here we have an example of how the literal translation of a title may easily become a source of error, and how these 'Fears of the Future' do not treat of the fear of infernal punishment, as Burnouf had very naturally supposed. This lesson warns us not to presume to determine the exact meaning of *āṭīyavāsini" (probably *āṭīyavāsini", a title not identified, of the *mānatātu" or of the *upatiyāsini". About the last, we can only be certain so far as to transcribe it, with Dr. Kern, as *upatiyāsini". As for the *muniyādikā", Dr. Oldenberg recognises in it, with much probability, the same subject which is treated of in the twelfth Sūtra of the Suttanipīṭa bearing the same title; and he compares the *lāghubhūdā" with the Sūtra entitled *Ambalatikārāhitānuvada", the sixty-first of the Majjhimaṇḍaya (Vol. I. pp. 414 and ff. of *Māyāye, 1891.]
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4. The *facsimile* of the Corpus, by giving the double reading *hamiydyē* and *dīwyē", has given a new meaning to this passage. The versions of Burnouf and of Dr. Kern were only ingenious makeshifts, on which it would be, I think, superfluous to dwell at length. As far as *subhāsītē vā* all is plain; for the remainder, it is of importance to explain the construction clearly. And first of all the particle *chu kāhā", which, as I have had occasion to point out has a slight adversative shade, announces a proposition destined to complete, and, to a certain extent, to form an antithesis to what precedes. The relative *ē* which commences the sentence, requires a correlative, which we find in *tānū before vatavē*. So far as concerns the relative proposition, I have just stated my opinion regarding *hamiydyē* which is the instrumental of the pronoun of the first person, *Dirēyēmā" is simply the regular form of the first person of the potential. As for the meaning of the verb *dīēs*, it is determined by that of the substantive *dēśa*. I have shewn (Dh., ed. det., i. n. 7) that, in our inscriptions, it is everywhere the equivalent of the Sanskrit *saṃvēśa", and signifies, 'order,' 'commandment.' *Dīś will, therefore, mean not merely 'to show,' but 'to direct,' 'to order.' We shall thus obtain this translation; and so far as I may order myself, that is to say, by my own authority, besides what has been positively said by the Buddha. The reading *tānū vatavē instead of tva vatavē, tāta vatavē*, has put everything here in order. The construction, with the infinitive dependent on *alabhām" is excellent. Only one slight doubt remains, viz., who should we not transcribe *vatavē* with an anomalous compensatory *d long? It would, however, alter nothing in the rendering of the word which is equivalent to Sanskrit *vaktūnū*. In furnishing us with the necessary antecedent *tānū to the relative *ē*, this reading allows us to take, with Burnouf, *sadbhāmē" as equivalent to the technical Buddhistic *sadābhāmē.*

5. The reading *vinayaṃ samuksē", formerly given by Wilson on the authority of Capt. Burt, Mr. *sāṅkhaṃdēsānā* (cf. Childers, s. v.); but the bearing of this qualification is far from being established. The only point which is certain is the derivation, — *sāṃkhaṃkāika" equivalent to *sāṅkhaṃkārika; that which the Pāli commentators propose is only a play upon words. Provisionally, it is perhaps safest to adhere to the established meaning of *samutkarsha" in Sanskrit, and to translate, subject to every reservation, 'the Excellence of Discipline.' We may compare the use of the verb *samutkarṣati" in a passage of the Mahāvaṭṭa (I. p. 178, 1, 1, of my edition, and the note). Under any circumstances, we are not as yet, in a position to identify this title with any of those which are known to us from literature. The conjecture of Dr. Oldenberg (Mahāvaṭṭa, I. p. xi. note), who seeks for, in it, the *pātimākha", is the less probable, because he has, for several of the other titles here given, shown their exact agreement with the titles which his consummate experience of the Pāli Canon has enabled him to be the first to discover. He identifies the *āṇāgata-hayānā" with the *āṇāgata-hayānāvutta" of the Āṇāgataxranaika, That Sūtra 'describes how the Bhikkhu, who leads a solitary life in the forests, should have always before him the dangers that might suddenly put an end to his life, serpents, savage animals, &c., and such thoughts should lead him to exercise all his energies in order to arrive at the goal of his religious strivings.' Here we have an example of how the literal translation of a title may easily become a source of error, and how these 'Fears of the Future' do not treat of the fear of infernal punishment, as Burnouf had very naturally supposed. This lesson warns us not to presume to determine the exact meaning of *āṭīyavāsini" (probably *āṭīyavāsini", a title not identified, of the *mānatātu" or of the *upatiyāsini". About the last, we can only be certain so far as to transcribe it, with Dr. Kern, as *upatiyāsini". As for the *muniyādikā", Dr. Oldenberg recognises in it, with much probability, the same subject which is treated of in the twelfth Sūtra of the Suttanipīṭa bearing the same title; and he compares the *lāghubhūdā" with the Sūtra entitled *Ambalatikārāhitānuvada", the sixty-first of the Majjhimaṇḍaya (Vol. I. pp. 414 and ff. of

5 My two rubbings read *dīwyē" without the *amvāta*. It is simply one example more of the equivalence, which has been previously mentioned, between a long and a nasalised vowel.
Trenckner's edition). It is certain that the king had some version or other of this in his mind. This is proved by the addition musvāduṇaṁ adhiśīchya. Burnouf was completely at sea in his commentary on this phrase, which Dr. Kern has perfectly correctly transcribed as mṛshāvadānaṁ adhikṛitya. The latter translates it as, 'on the subject of,' 'having reference to the falsehood.' At the most it would be possible, if we are permitted to base our translation absolutely on the Pāli version, to propose a slight modification. It is not correct to say that it has the falsehood for its entire subject, but rather that it has it for its text or point de départ. We could translate our text in this way too, the meaning 'to set at the beginning' being sufficiently proved for adhikṛitya. I shall revert, on another occasion, to the orthography of adhiśīchya, equivalent to adhikṛitya, which is both curious and instructive.

6. The readings etāni, and bhikkunīpāṇi suggest themselves. The real difficulty consists in the words kīṝtī bahukā bhikkupāṇā, although I have no hesitation regarding the two first. I can see no means of permitting us to give bahukā the value of a substantive, in the sense of 'increase.' The spelling of kīṝtī being certain, the division of the words into kīṝtī bahukā, seems to me to be beyond discussion. But bhikkupāṇā (and this reading is certain) has hitherto resisted all efforts. The evidence of the adjective bahukā shows, as indeed is evident from the form itself, that bhikkupāṇā is a nominative singular. The first member of the compound is as clear as the second is doubtful. It looks as if we required something like bhikkusaṅgā. The only transliteration which I can see is bhikkusūryaṇaḥ. It would be necessary to admit for pṛṣṭha, which is known in Sanskrit with the meaning of 'abundance,' a possible translation, 'collection, assembly.' This is the least improbable expedient which I find myself able to suggest. I may remark, en passant, that there is no allusion here to written books: suṇāya would, on the contrary, appear to refer to a purely oral tradition.

7. Read etānā, Wilson's facsimile confirms for these last words the reading of General Cunningham. I do not think that the corrections me jānusākta it will appear doubtful to any one, and for this use of jānusākta we may compare the analogous passage at Sahasaram and Rūpnāth, aṅka cha jānusākta. As for abhipālan, the new rubbing has brought documentary evidence which was hardly necessary. The last letters are not very clear, which explains the doubts which arise regarding the vowels. Upon the whole, this restoration appears to me a matter of certainty.

I translate in the manner following:

TRANSLATION.

The king Piyadasi bids the Māgadhī clergy his greetings and wishes of prosperity and good health. Ye know, Reverend Sirs, how great are my respect and my goodwill to the Buddha, to the Law, and to Clergy. Whatever has been said by the blessed Buddha, all that has been well said, and so far as I may, Reverend Sirs, pass orders of my own will, I consider it good to proclaim them, in order that the Good Law may long endure. Here are religions teachings: the Vīnaśāntamāṣa (the Instruction of Discipline), the Aśyavāsas (the Supernatural Powers of the Aryas), the Anāyatahāyas (the Dangers to Come), the Munipāṭhas (the Verses relating to the Muni, or Religious Ascetic), the Upatispadāsas (the Questions of Upatisha), the Māṇḍāya śūra (the śūra on Perfection), and the Sermon to Rāhula pronounced by the Blessed Buddha, which takes its starting point from the falsehood. I desire that many Bhikkhus and Bhikkunīs should frequently hear these religious teachings and meditate on them. So also for lay devotees of both sexes. It is for this reason, Reverend Sirs, that I have had this engraved, that people may know my wish.

4. THE INSCRIPTIONS OF THE BARABAR CAVERNS.

For the sake of completeness I add, in conclusion, the three inscriptions of the Barabar caves in which the name of our king Piyadasi is expressly mentioned. It is well known that they were discovered and published for the first time by Kittce.
I combine in one the explanations of the two first, which only differ in the proper names used.

TEXT.


I.

(Sudānā Cave.)

1 Lājinā piyādasinā duvādvasasābhīsitēnā
2 iyān nighahukbā dīnā ādīvikēnhi [·]

II.

(Viśva Cave.)

1 Lājinā piyādasinā duvā-
2 dasasābhīsitēnā iyān
3 kubhā khalatikapavataśi
4 dīnā ādīvikēnhi [·]

NOTES.

I have only two brief observations to add to the remarks of Burnouf. The first refers to the year from which these inscriptions date. It is the thirteenth after the coronation of the king. These figures have their own interest. We have seen that, according to one of the Delhi Columnar Edicts (cf. above, Sahasrām, n. 2), this year was the first in which, according to his own evidence, the author of these inscriptions had religious teachings engraved; it is, to within a few months, the one which marks his active conversion to Buddhism. This coincidence, without being in itself decisive, affords at least one more presumption in favour of the conjecture, which at first attributed these inscriptions to our Aśoka-Piyādasī.

The second remark concerns the word ādīvikēnhi. I have no doubt that we should read, as in the better preserved inscriptions of Daśaratha, ādīvikēni. I take it, — not as an ablative, which would be unintelligible both here and in the other places where the word occurs, — not as representing a dative, we should in that case rather expect ādīvikānāḥ, — but as an instrumental, in the sense of the locative. In dealing with the Mahāvastu, I have had occasion to quote numerous instances of this peculiarity in the syntax of Buddhist Sanskrit (Mahāvastu, l. 387, &c.) Burnouf has quite correctly recognised the base ādīvika as being the equivalent of ādīvika.

TRANSLATION.

This cave of the Nyagrōdhā [II: — this cave situated on Mount Khalatika] has been given to religious mendicants by king Piyādasī, in the thirteenth year after his coronation.

III.

(Karan Chaupār Cave.)

TEXT.

1 Lāja piyādasai ēkunēviṃ-
2 sativasābhīsitē nāmē thā
3 adamathātimā iyān kubhā
4 supiyē khalatipavata di-
5 nā [·]

NOTES.

The new facsimile of the Corpus is a marked improvement on the first copy of Major Kittoe, which did not permit Burnouf to give a connected translation. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that, even according to General Cunningham, the rock is much defaced, and that
the reading is both difficult and doubtful. We are thus permitted to introduce, at need, new corrections into the text which is presented to us. The formula is here different from that which we find in the two preceding cases. Burnouf clearly saw that the name of the king is this time in the nominative. It follows that we must divide the words after abhisitē. The characters which follow present some uncertainty. I shall commence by considering those with which the next line commences. Basing my emendation on the analogy of the inscriptions of Daśaratha, which have been also commented upon by Burnouf, I do not hesitate to read instead of ṣaṭādamathātimnā several characters of which are expressly given as hypothetical, ṣaṭādamathātimnā. We must further, in order to complete the phrase, admit that the last letter of the preceding line is in reality ṣaṭā. There remain the characters ṭaḥā ṭaḥā ṭaḥā ṭaḥā ṭaḥā, which thus concludes d sentence and separates it from what follows. The concluding words present two difficulties. The first is the form supiyā, which ought to contain the name of the cave, and should consequently be corrected to supiyā, equivalent to supiyā. The second concerns the word khalatiṇwata. As in No II, we should expect a locative. I only see two alternatives. One is to read, -pāvatā, but the locative is rarely formed in this fashion in inscriptions, such as the present one, in the Māgadhi dialect. The other is to assume that a letter has been omitted, and to restore to -pāvatā. This is, in my opinion, the preferable course. To sum up, we may almost certainly translate as follows:

TRANSLATION.

The king Piyadasi was crowned nineteen years ago. [This has been made] for as long as the moon and the sun may endure. This cave, called Supiyā, on Mount Khalato, has been given.

WEBER'S SACRED LITERATURE OF THE JAINS.

TRANSLATED BY DR. HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

(Continued from p. 29.)

XII. The twelfth angam, diṭṭhivāsa, drīṣṭhivāda, presentation of the (different) views. This title [342] corresponds to our information in reference to the contents of this text now no longer extant; and we conjectured on page 243 that the character of its contents was the causa movens of its loss. On page 242 we saw that in all probability the diṭṭhivāsa is not further mentioned even in the aṅga with the exception of aṅga 4. This remark holds good merely of the name diṭṭhivāsa and not of the so-called 14 puvvas, which, according to the presentation of the subject in aṅga 4, form a principal part of the diṭṭh. Tradition indeed appears to regard the puvvas as identical with the diṭṭh. The 14 puvvas are mentioned both in aṅga 10 (the redaction of which, as we have seen, p. 327 foll., is of secondary origin), where their division into pākudas is alluded to (see p. 333), and frequently in aṅga 6 and 8; and in fact in a very peculiar way. The detailed discussion, according to name and contents, of the 14 puvvas in aṅga 4 and Nandī and in the later tradition, cites the uppāyapuva at their head. Twice in aṅga 6 and once in aṅga 8 (3, 4) are characterized, just as are the eleven aṅgas, or together with them, as sāmaiya-mādyām. Leumann says: "Of special interest are three of the many instances in aṅga 6, where it is related that a man who has just become a member of the order studied the 14 puvvas or 11 aṅgas." These three instances are found in p. 591 of the Calcutta edition, compared with p. 597, p. 1354, compared [343] with p. 1353 and p. 1454, compared with p. 1455. The second passages quoted, in which the 11 aṅgas are mentioned, have reference to a period later by five to twenty years than that, in which the 14 puvvas are treated of."

1 I have seen this inscription many times, it being situated in this district (Gayā). It would be useless to attempt to give a revised rubbing, except to show how extremely hypothetical much of the Corpus reading inevitably is. The face of the inscription has been chiselled away by some Mussulman fanatico.—O. A. G.
2 drīṣṭhivāsa dūrāṇcakṣi, vāṣṭānām vāṣā, drīṣṭhivāsa vādō drīṣṭhivāsa vā paṭā yatra.
3 Leumann ed. sūtras 6, 20, s for the durāṇcakṣa vānipīga, or ṣaṭā dūrā diṭṭhivāsa, likewise bāmanagī in aṅga 8 4.1. The first passage is based in the last instance on aṅga 4.
How can this use of the attribute sāmāya-māyāyim of the 14 puvas be explained? This use is found in no other place with the exception of aṅgas 6 and 8, and here only in the parallel use of the epithet in reference to the 11 aṅgas, and in no instance where there is an isolated mention of the 14 puvas. Hence it is too bold an assumption if we assert that a sāmāya-purva, instead of the upāyapuvas, once actually stood at the head of the 14 puvas. On the other hand, it is probable that in aṅga 6 this epithet has been transferred from the aṅgas to the puvas, and that the generic signification of the word sāmāya, and the greater antiquity which the statements in aṅga 6 probably possess in contrast to those in aṅgas 4, formed the means of transition. This assumption is however a mere make-shift, since there is no further criterion for such a special inter-relation of both groups of texts.

The upāygas, too, attest in several particulars the existence of aṅga 12. In up. 8 — 12, probably the oldest of the upāyga texts, it is true, only 11 aṅgas are mentioned. But in up. 1, (Leumann, p. 36) we discover a reference to the chuddasapuva together with the duvālasaṅgān; and in the introduction to up. 4, (344) in v. 5, the dīṭṭhivās, and in v. 3, the puvasavya, are mentioned by name as the source of information of the author. It is furthermore worthy of note that up. 5 and 7 agree with the puvas in the division into pādhatas. According to up. 6 they both appear to have been divided into putthas at the time of this upāyga. The tradition is desirous of establishing a close connection between the upāyga and the aṅga in the present order of succession of each. Hence we may conclude that, at the period in which the existing corpus of the twelve upāygas was established,—that is, at the date of the redaction of the present Siddhānata,—there were in reality 12 aṅgas, and that the dīṭṭhivās consequently still existed or was considered as extant.

The dīṭṭhivās or, as the case may be, the duvālasaṅgān gaṇipādāgatam is frequently mentioned in the other parts of the Siddhānata, which are united to the upāyga. These portions of the Siddhānata are in reality the storehouse of information about the dīṭṭhivās or duvālasaṅgāna gaṇipādāgatam. See the citations on p. 246 from Avasṣy and Anuvādako. With these may be associated the corresponding statements in chhēdas. 2 and Nandik, in which we find several direct citations (see below) from the puvas; and in fact the chhēdas 3—5 are repeatedly called an excerpt from puva 9, 3, 20, which is referred back even to Bhadrabāhu!

On p. 223, 224 we have seen from several old versus memoriales, the source of which is unfortunately no longer extant, that the dīṭṭhivās at the period of the existence of these verses was highly esteemed, inasmuch as it was designed for the highest gradation of intelligence, and was held to be the object of the study of the nineteenth year. Here we must not suppress the thought that the reason for this relegation of the dīṭṭh to a late period of study, was because it may have been considered (345) dangerous for an earlier and less mature stage of advancement. Finally, appearing as too dangerous, it may have been dropped altogether.

It is exceedingly peculiar that the puvas, which are a principal part of the dīṭṭhivās and represent a preliminary stage of the aṅga both according to tradition and, in all probability, to their name itself, are said to have proceeded from the mouth of the īṭhakara and to have been collected by his gaṇadharas before the aṅgas. The puvas are mentioned in aṅgas 6 and 8 as texts independent of, or even previous to, the 11 aṅgas, but in aṅgas 4, &c., are represented as forming but one of the five sections of the last aṅga. It was to be expected that they should be partly independent texts, and partly should stand at the beginning of the entire Siddhānata.

The key furnished by tradition points to the fact (of p. 214) that the knowledge of the dīṭṭhivās (or of that of the puva here identified with the dīṭṭhivās) was limited to Bhadrabāhu alone even at the time of the Council of Pāṭaliputra, which constituted the first collection of the

---

3 The cases cited above, p. 244, 245, where was mentioning made of sāmāyam-ji jāva bhūmiṣṭubhak, do not belong in this connection, since the first aṅga and not the first puttha was there referred to.

4 The same probably holds good of the other texts above mentioned, which immediately preceded the dīṭṭhivās, and which are no longer extant.
aṅga texts; and that recourse was had to Bhadrabāhu when the collection of the 11 aṅgas was perfected. To this circumstance then we must ascribe the fact that the "pūrvas" are placed at the end and not at the beginning of the whole collection. But, [346] according to this very tradition, at that time, on the one hand, there were no longer 14 but 10 pūrvas, the knowledge of which was further disseminated, and, on the other, the pūrvas do not appear as a part of the dīñthivaḍa but as the dīñthivaḍa itself. Both of these statements of tradition are contradicted by a locus classicus which, in default of the text itself, affords, together with the detailed table of contents in aṅga 4 and Nāndi, information concerning the dīñthivaḍa. Aṅga 6 and the Nāndi, our sources of information, are here in complete agreement, but in the table of contents of the other aṅgas the Nāndi is much briefer than aṅga 4. The contradiction is this: (1) there is not even the slightest difference made between pūrvas 1—10 and 11—14; and (2) all the 14 pūrvas are cited as a mere section—the third part—of the dīñthivaḍa.

As regards the latter circumstance, it may be stated that in the Siddhānta itself, though in late texts, we find several times the peculiar fact, that, in case a collective enumeration of the aṅgas is attempted, and the first member, whether it be sāmāta or aṅgara, and the last, are mentioned, this last member does not appear as dīñthivaḍa but as viññuḍāra. See above, p. 244, 245. Viññuḍāra is the title of the last of the fourteen pūrvas. It is certainly very remarkable that the title of a section (and viññuḍāra must be considered to be such in this connection as in others) is coordinated with that of an independent text. As regards these passages it is impossible to assume [347] that the dīñthivaḍa at that time exceeded this section in extent. This constitutes an important divergence from the presentation of the subject in aṅga 4, or N., in which latter the viññuḍāra, as the last section of the third part, is followed by two additional parts, Hēmchandra, who in his treatment of the dīñthivaḍa (abhīṣ. v. 245, 246), cites the pūrva (gata) as its fourth, and not as its third-part, affords us only such assistance as confirms the divergence in question. Since the fifth part of the dīñthivaḍa consists of so-called chālākās, which are a secondary addition, the dīñthivaḍa, according to Hēmchandra’s treatment too, actually concludes with the viññuḍāra section.

So much is clear:—That that conception which limits the dīñthivaḍa to the 14 pūrvas alone is too narrow. We find a recognition of the other constituent parts of the dīñthivaḍa also in those statements of the scholia, in which (of p. 258) "pūrvaś sammaṭyādikā chaḥ (anyugyāḥ) are mentioned instead of the dīñthivaḍa referred to in the text. See As. nīji. 8, 54. By saṃmaṭyādikā (anyug.) we are probably to understand the first parts of aṅga 12, though the order has been inverted.6

[348] To the statements made, p. 212 foll., in reference to the gradual decline of the knowledge of the pūrvas, I add the following:—In the kālāsattari of Dhammaghoṣa verse 38 foll., Thāñabhadda is referred to the year Viṛa 215; and there still existed in the time of Viṛa 584 (Viṛa) 10, in that of Dubbalia 616 (Viṛa), 94 pūrvas. In the scholiast on the passage and in Kl. 247 the latter name is cited as Durbalikā-Pāshpa(cāya)mitra; in the Berlin scholiast on the Nāndi, introduct. v. 32, as Durvalikā-pāshpa (cāya), he and his teacher Āryarakṣita being called the two navapūrvikaṇ. In the year 1000 the entire pūrvagayām was "gayām."

Let us now turn to the locus classicus itself. Its statements are unfortunately not clear and in fact were unintelligible to the scholiasts of both texts (Abhayadēva on aṅga 4, and Anon. on Nāndi). They both assert with tolerable unanimity that, inasmuch as the text itself was

6 In Hēmchandra’s treatment of the subject are other minute divergences from the statements in aṅga 4, or Nāndi; on which see below.

7 In Hindi “opinion,” “view,” in the St. Petersb. Dict., i.e., synonymous with dīñthi. Leumann tells me that Śāhāka, too, on aṅga 1, 4, 8, refers to saṃmaṭyādikā a discussion on the 7 aṅgas (see below p. 335), and was in possession of a text of that name before him; cf. also the samamatiśrittī, below p. 317.

Dhammāghoṣa, scholar (v. 74) of Dīñthi, died according to Kl. 255a Saṁvat 1857. This does not agree with Kājas. v. 44 foll., where in general the same prophetic statements are found as in Saṁwat. Māh. 14, 260 foll. (See my Treatise, p. 47.) These statements contain the dates 1912 and 1850 Viṛa (i.e. Saṁvat 1442 and 1380).
no longer extant, they merely report the few utterances of tradition. Abhayadêva has the foll. at the beginning of his remarks: sarvāṇi idāna práyō vyavachhinnāmah tathā 'pi yathāpîṣṭha
(‘dvīṣṭha’) kimchit likhyatē; and the anonymous scholiast on N. has: s. i. pr. vy. tathā 'pi leśata yathāgatasampradāyaḥ kimcichā vyakhyāyatē. In explaining the first part Abhayadêva
says: étac ca sarvāṇi samalottarabhādānaḥ sūtrārthatāḥ vyavachhinnānaḥ and the anon. schol.:—
tānā cha samalottarabhādānaḥ sakalāny api sūtratā 'ṛthatā ca [319] vyavachhinnāni yathāgatasam-
pradāyataḥ ca darśiṇāni. Finally, Abhayadêva expresses himself in a similar manner concerning
the second part: amùny api sūtrarthaḥ vyavachhinnānaḥ tathā 'pi dvīṣṭhamāraśistāḥ kimchit
likhyatē, and the anon. schol. says étānā api saṃpratī sūtratā 'ṛthatā ca vyav., yathāgatasam-
pradāyotā vācyānī.

The dīdhivāsa is stated to have consisted of five parts. The first part is the parikramma
by which, the scholiast says, we are to understand those preparations necessary to grasp
the meaning of the sūtras correctly. These preparations are analogous to the 16 arithmetical
operations parikarmāṇi, which must be understood in order to compute without assistance from others.9
They are divided into 7 groups, each one of which is again divided into various subdivisions,
the total number of which is 83. The first two groups have each 14, the next five but 11 of
these subdivisions, which everywhere bear the same title. They begin,10 in the case of groups 1
and 2 with the mānyāpayaṁ, in the case of groups 3—7 with the pādha. Pādha doubtless signifies
"reading;" and the mānyāpadyāṁ, numbering 46 according to aṅga 4, 46—see p. 281,—recall
the 46 signs of the alphabet, and therefore deal with preliminary instruction in reading and
writing. The statement bauhīthī pañī livātē chāhīlāsakā mānyākharāṇi, which follows immedi-
dately thereupon, tends however to invalidate [350] this assumption. Since this statement
certainly, though strangely enough (see above, p. 281 note), refers to 46 sounds or signs of the
alphabet, the 46 mānyāpadyāṁ which are mentioned immediately before must refer to something
cise.10 Furthermore since both scholia upon this occasion offer the second of the above-cited
explanations of their ignorance, and consequently make no attempt to clear up the names of the
7 groups or of their 84 subdivisions, it cannot be demanded of us that we do more than follow
their example.11

Following upon the enumeration of the seven groups is the significant statement12 that six
of this number (according to the schol. the first six) belong to the system kṣit ēṣṣaṁ
(sasamāyāṁ) and that the number seven belongs to the ēṣṣiṣya. The six are then char-
acterized as chāukānetayānī (chaturnayikā); the seven as terāsāyāṁ (yāmīśā nayakāṁ N,
traināśākāṁ). The scholia explain one of these two names of schools by [351] Gōsālapa-
variśājaśivika(ṭā ēṣṣiṣyaṁ N) = pāshaṇḍasiddhānta (pāshaṇḍināṁ N), the second by traināśa-
kapāshaṇḍasthāna. The mention of this name leads us, so to speak, to the domain of
history. The Tērāśyas represent the sixth schism,13 which Ānāy. 8, 28, 43 refers to the year 544

9 Schol. on N: parikarma yogyatāpādānaṁ, tadhetuḥ āśtram api parikarma; sūtra-pärvaṅgatā'nyoyaśu
trāṭhāgṛahayāgyaṁ apsarūpamānāṁ samsarthāṁ parikarmāṁ, yathā gupthaśtriḥ sāṅkhyāḥdhaṁ gudāpi abhāyu
parikarmāṁ āsṛgupthaśtriḥ trāṭhāgṛahapāṇāḥ samsarthāṇīpyāḥ (doubtless 'trāṭhāgṛahapāṇāḥ) samsar-
thaḥ. The interesting fact becomes here apparent that the text of N is unconditionally older. See below.
10 It is greatly to be lamented that the MS. of Abhayadeva to which I have had access, is here so corrupt, that
the passage may be partly gained from it. The passage reads—(dīdhivyāsā pañī chāhīlāsakā mānyākharāṁ pañī,
bauhīthī pañī livātē chāhīlāsā mānyākharā pañī): dīdhivyāsā tī tī dvīṣṭhamāryaṁ, mānyāyaṁ tī sakalā-
trāṭhāyayaṁ (? eva) keśānī (akṣyādā) mātrikāpadāṁ ('vamahāvādaśātrasarṭah) nimagāṁ dhvāya (? lakṣa
pāṇi va (tānī cha)-sādhvāryaṁ mānyākharāyā (dēva). The names of the first two groups of the parikarma) vihsya-
bhīḍa (vēma) kaḥām api bhādyāniṁ sañcataḥsvarisyād gacchati (bhavanītī 'tīf) saṃbhādyāyatā ('vyatē); tathā
bauhīthī pañī livātē tī kāṃbhyāvidhānā 46 mātrikāścharaṇī, tānī cha ... (see p. 281).
11 Some of these names are not certain since the MSS. vary, Āgālaṇāyāṁ, kāmbhyāṁ, rācādāḥāṁ, kāmbhyā-
padigoppaḥ refer probably to the domain of astronomy.
12 In the Berlin MS. of the Nandī this passage is omitted in the text, though it is explained by the scholiast.
13 See above p. 275; accord. to Abhayadeva, however—tā eva 'jīviśa' traśīlaḥ bhanīthāḥ, or, accord. to the
schol. on the Nandī, which is identical—tā eva Gōsālapavartistā jīviśaḥ pāshaṇḍama traśīlaḥ muktiyānte—the
traśīlakās are the same as the adherents of Godāḷa! In § 6 of the Tērāśvalī of the Kalpaśstra Chalnam, the
founder of the sixth schism, is stated to have been the scholar of Mahāgiri, who was the successor of Thālabuddha
(Ānāy. 215, cf. p. 348), and is placed about 500 years earlier than Vīra 544. These are discrepancies not easily overcome. The
and this name is perhaps attested by epigraphic testimony of the time of Götami-
putra Sātakarnī. If we suppose that the reading Tērāsikā, proposed by Bühler (Archaeol.
Survey of West. India, 1882, p. 104) for the inscription Nāṣik No. 11*, is conclusive, it is
not improbable that it refers to the Tērāsīyas quoted above. Bühler, it must be confessed, has
adopted another explanation of the name in his Survey.

The explanations of the scholiasts have as yet not assisted me in the endeavour to discover
what is referred to by the four nāyas,15 &c. [352] It is a significant fact that the twelfth aṅga,
according to the above statements, treated not merely of the proper but also of heterodox
doctrines, or, as the case may be, of hermeneutic methods; and the title of this aṅga seems to
refer to this peculiarity in its contents, which was probably of great moment in determining
the fate of the last of the aṅgas. See pp. 248, 342.

The suttāi are cited as constituting the second part of the dīṭhivā. In all there are
88 suttāi, a number ascribed16 to the second part in aṅga 4, 88. In reality, however, there are
but 22, beginning with ujjaya (ujjusna N; vijaya), but conceived as divided into four parts.
The proper orthodox (vasamayā) doctrines and the heterodox views are represented as being
equally authoritative. The former are divided into two different forms which are also
represented by the aṭṭiya (Gōśālakapraparihāpahārā Abh.), or tērāsīya. The 22 names are
not explained by the scholias. They refer17 the name aṭṭira to the explanation of the meaning
of the pūrvas, and consider this as well as the first part as an introduction to the third part of
the dīṭhivā which follows.

[353] The third part is composed of puvva gaē, pūrvagatam, i.e.,18 the 14 pūrvas, which
the tirthakara (Mahāvīra) himself is said to have imparted to his scholars, the gaṇadharas—see
above p. 216, 217—who then composed the aṅgas (achārādikam). Besides this explanation which
represents the pūrvas as older and earlier doctrines anticipating the aṅgas, there is another which
is possible. If our second conjecture is correct, we should have to understand by the pūrvas
that preliminary knowledge necessary to the comprehension of the doctrine. The titles of the 14
pūrvas19 quoted here in the text and enumerated before in § 14 are explained singly in the
scholia, and the number of their padas is stated. The enormous size of these figures greatly

further explanation of the name tairīśīka in the schol on N. is—‘tē sarvān vasta trayātmakam ichchānti, tad yathā; jīva jīva jīva jīva cha, lokā lokā lokā lokā lokā cha, sat sat sat sat sat; nayāntīṣṭham drayāṭśīkam paryāṭśīkam
ubhyāṭśīkam cha; tatas trihīṃḥḥā rāddhāḥ chaḥuttī śarīratī tī tairīśīkas, tannatāma saptā pāthi parihāra-paḥ ucdatītū. It
is worthy of note that the triad form ascribed to the Tairīśīkas is made use of—cf. p. 296—in aṅga 4, where the
statement of the contents of aṅga 2 is given, and in fact the citation of two of the examples quoted here.
Accord. to the schol. on Kulpāsa, cf. Jacobis, p. 119, the Vaiśēshikādānanāma took its rise from the Tērāsīyas.

15 Cf. Aṣṭ. 87; tē śādīna (Fēhīr naigamādibhīkhi nayalī) diṭhivīzā pūrvaruṇa suttatāthakahāya ya.
16 Nayēh sapta naigamādaya, naigamodīrīhā, sāmānyagṛndvīśāśā śādīnāhēcha, tatrā dyah saṅgrahabhī devaṃsī tu
saṃhyāvaśārā pravishānta, tāt dva saṅgrahāya saṅgrahārama, rīṣṭītraśa chaḥ kab sabādhyāsī cha traṃ py eka
nayēh kalpatē, tataḥ evān ānātē eva nayēh, ānātē chaturbhir nayēh ēdānā śaḥ parīkarānī vasamayavatāka-
vatāya śādīnāṃ; on this see Śīlamāṇikai on aṅga 1, 1, 6, above p. 347n.
17 The ujjusna and the paripāṭi paripāṭi yān are stated to be the first two in the series. As regards other names
reference is made to the Nanol and not to the independent treatment of the subject further on in aṅga 4. See
above p. 294.
18 Sarvasava pūrvagatasatārthavaya sūcanaśa sūcrai, tāni cha sarvasvaparyāpi saṁsārasyāpi sāmcavānā
sāmabhagāgivikālasmin prāśātkāri dvīvāśāt prajñapti, tathā rīṣṭītraśā tī dhā.
19 Cf. Schol. Hēm. 245: pūrvarṣa gataṃ jñānam asmin pūrvagatam. The anonymous author of the Vīchārā-
mītasaṅgraha which contains in 25 vīhāras a grouping of siddhiṭa passages, ilāpakaś, states that the pūrvagratā-
śūrdhāras were called vīhāras, or, according to the Nandivrtti, cited by him, but which I have not seen; three other
names vīdā yā khamānahāna dīvīyārā vīhāya tī gōṇāhi gōṇa pūravagāmī tu suttī ēc sāddā pautantī. Can the
Vīchārāmītasaṅgraha be identical with the Siddhiṭūžpūkādīhāra of Kulaśāli, Sāñcī. 1490 — 55 cited in
Kl. 255f?

They agree in general with those in Hēm. 247, 243. The explanation is likewise identical; see the schol.
ibid. The number of padas is the same as that stated in the introduction to the Kalpaśūraḥarṣipāṇi. In this work
the number of vātī (Uvātī) of each pūrva is said to increase from i on by geometrical progression (8192 in the
case of pūrva 14). Here however in the text itself—see p. 560—we find entirely different figures which are quite
credible. The figures in the case of 1, 3, 7, 10 vary somewhat in the enumeration of the pūrvas in Nāmicandras
pravachanasūrdhāhāra § 92, v. 719—25.
exceeds as a rule that which the scholars—see above p. 288—state to be the number of the paddas of the aągas, each one of which was said to contain twice the number of paddas of the preceding.

The names of the Pûrvas [354] are as follows:—

1. uppâyapuvam,20 utpâdápûrvam; 10 vastu and 4 chûliya vastu; ēkā padakōti, 10 millions.

2. aggânya (A B C), aggâ-sûlyam N (aggânya N e d., according to Leumann); agrâya-yam Abhb.,21 and agrânya-yam Solch. on N; 14 vastu (so also in § 14) and 12 chûliya vastu; shaúvatāt padalakshā (9,000,000). A direct citation from this is found in Ācârya, 10, 422 and in Malayagiri on apâgya 4 (agrawaryaśakyâ dvîtyapûrvâ karmaprajñâ prabhúté bhûdha-viśeša bhûdha-kâtya chatvâri anûyogadvâraṇi . . .). An anonymous avâdhûri on Chandramahatāra's saptatikâ (ms. or fol. 690) calls this work an excerpt from the di∫hīva, especially from the fourth prabhútam (karmaprajñânamam) of the fifth vastu of the second pûrva ("agrawânya"). In the Viçhârama-sa∫vara he finds the following interesting statement taken from the "Nâdîvâriṭṭa":—Sivâsarma-Sûryâdibhir agrâ 'iyâdipûrvâbhûya śamudhârâḥ šatakâdi-karmagrânatâḥ. There actually [355] exists a siddhapâkuṭam in 120 gâthis, which is characterized as having taken its rise from the ugyânya-purâna; see p. 361.

3. viriyam, viryapravâdam24; 8 vastu and 8 chûliya vastu; tasyâ 'pi ('k) sapati bhâdha-râṣā Abhb., but in the schol. on N: 78 padalakshâh 7,800,000.—Citation from this in Haribhadra on Ācârya, 10, 42 (see p. 364, note 4).

4. atthinaṭṭhapâyam, atthinaṭṭhpravâdam25; 18 vastu (also according to § 18) and 10 chûliya v.; 60 padalakshâ, 6 millions.—Citation as above.

5. nāgappâyam,26 nāga-pravâdam; 12 vastu; ēkā padakōti śkapadā (Abhb., padēnā 'kēna nyūnā schol. on N), i.e., 9,999,999 (!); Malayagiri on N has, according to Leumann, 10,000,000.

6. sâchappâyam, sâtyapravâdam27; 2 vastu, ēkā padakōti śkapadā adhikâ, 10,000,066 (0) 060 Malay., according to Leumann.

7. āyappâyam ātmapravâdam28; 16 vastu (also according to § 16); 26 padakōtāya, 260 millions. Leumann says that a passage, which caused the second schism, is found in the schol. on āuâga 3, 7 (see above, p. 275). Utpâradhâ, 3, 9 Ācârya, 8, 63.
9. pachchakkhabappavyām, pratāyākhyanapravādam; 20° vastus (also in § 20); 84 padalakahāḥ, 8,400,000. For this pūrvam we have quite a number of references. The above cited passage of Āvāśy. 8, 8-9 and Haribhadra’s scholion seem to prove that the Abaddhī or Gotthāmaḥāla to inaugurate the seventh schism is found in the extract just quoted, and in Haribhadra on Āvāśy, 8, 19, where he remarks: athamāṃ kammappavāypuvve kammāḥ paruṃjñāṇaṃ upon the following passage of the text: Gotthāmaḥāla navamathāṁśu puchchhā ya Viṁjñāha.

10. vijjānapappavyām, vidyānapravādam; 15 vastus (also in § 15); ēka padakotīḥ dāśa cha padasahasraśa (dāśa cha p. omitted in N) 10,010,000. The cause of the formation of the fourth schism is a passage from this puvva, cited in the passages quoted on āvāra 7, or Āv. 8, 8; [358] ucpūpiḥ ’nuṇṇavāv, on which Haribhadra says: anupravādapurvā ucpūṇiyaṁ vachhāṁ (vatthu? pañcasi). Leumann compares the 9 ucpūṇiya vatthas in aṅgā 3, 2.

11. avanājham, avanādhyayaḥ; kalpadūm Hēm., abandhyaya iti vā Schol.: 12 vastus; 26 padakotayāb, 260 millions.

12. pāgārūṇa, prāgyaḥ; prāpavāyaḥ (7) Hēm.; 13 vastus (cf. § 13); 1 padakotī 56 padalatatasahasraśa, 15,600,000.

20 karma jñānavaramavāyikam ashta-prakrātāh, tat prakrāṭēḥ prakritiśthity-anvadyaḥ-praddhādibhir bhedaḥ saprakāreṇa vadati, Schol. on N. , bhedaḥ anyaśaḥ chā tattvottaratadibhir yatra varṇyaṭaḥ, Abb.

21 tatra sarvapratāyākhyanavasārabhir varṇyaṭe, Abb., in the Schol. on N merely: atṛa ’pi padākadadēṣa padasamudāyopakārāt.

21 The text reads puṭṭhā jáhā abaddhā | kaṇṇuṣiaṁ kaṇṇuṣiaṁ sāmuneśi | evaṃ puṭṭhā abaddhāḥ | jtvā kammāḥ sammaneti || 90 || pachchakkhaḥ sānaḥ | aparīmaḥaḥ hūḥ kīyavaṇaḥ | jñānaṁ tu parimāṇaṁ | taṁ daśṭhum (duḥḥam B H) āsamaḥ hūḥ || 91 || Haribh. has: pratāyākhyanāḥ śṛṣṭaḥ aparīmaḥāṇaḥ kāśvāhān viśya kartavyam, — yaḥ tassā avasāsam navavamavacchha taṁ sammanattāḥ; tatō sā abhinivesantā pāsāmattāyānā bhavatā bāhuvah — Pāśamatā’s name is elsewhere brought into connection with the fourth schism. See schol. on up. 1, below p. 381. This name occurs frequently in the legends of the Brahmins and Buddhistas.

23 This is the chief passage, which contains the statements in reference to the pūrvas.

24 Dasa is not to be connected with kappā, as is assumed by Jacobi (The ten kalpam), but denotes the dasāḥ, the fourth chhaddasāṭām itself, a part of which exists to-day under the title of this chhaddasāṭām.

24 navasāvapānekkhyāntatvārtham aśīyamānāḥ cāndhāntām ārthah Haribhadrāvāyāmāṁ nīryāḥbhā. The following fact speaks decisively against Bh. as author of the ogaha. In v. 1 not only are the chādadasāvānąs praised, to which he himself belongs, but also the dasāsāvānąs which reach to Vajra; consequently the existing text must have been composed at a period considerably posterior to Vajra.

26 tatra ‘nākvidyāśāyaḥ varṇyaṭe, Abb., vidyā anuktiśāyaśaśānāmāṁ anūdhyāvaḥ śādhiprakāraḥ vaddhi tī, Schol. on N. On sātāṣayaṁ in connection with viṣyāḥ, p. 251n.

26 vacāhyānaṁ nāma nibhāhanā, avanādyān samhāhān ity a., tatra hi sarve jñānātapaśasandhānyamāgāḥ śubha- phalaṁ sahālī varṇyaṭe, apramāṇaḥ cha pramāṇāṅkāḥ sarve asubhaphalaḥ varṇyaṭe, Abb.

27 prāpataṃ paṇci-mānīyāḥ 7, trīṣi mānasālīni uṇāni 7, ucyāna-tā hadēva 7, āyānā cha, tāti yatra varṇyaṭe tad upacharati prāgāyāḥ, schol. on N.
13. kriyāvāśālam, kriyā (bhīhi) vāśālam; 30 vastas; 9 padakātāyab, 90 millions.

14. lōgavindusāraṃ (without lōga in § 14), viṇṇur iva sāram; 25 vastas (also in § 25); ardhatraya-bāsā (śārdīha N) padakātāyab 125 (135 N) millions. This pūrvaṃ is often mentioned as the conclusion of the aṅgaṃ or of the uśanā. See above p. 245, 346.

It is now perfectly clear that the number of padas which has been handed down to us is purely a matter of fiction. The vast figures in the case of 5 and 6 are simply amusing. It is easy to revel in details, when the fancy is the only controlling agent.

The enumeration of the names in the text is followed by detailed statements in reference to the number of each of the vattas, [359] vastas and chūliyas, or chāla-vattas, i.e., sections into which each of the 14 pūraṇas are divided. These numbers, in all 225 vattas (udāla) and 24 chālas, are also mentioned in three kārikās, which have been inserted; and each of which has been quoted in its proper place.

The fourth part is called anuyāga; Hēm. calls it pūrvaṇyogam and places it (cf. p. 347) in the third position, the pūraṇatām occupying, according to him, the fourth place. A contents of historical character is ascribed to this fourth part. The anuyāga is divided into two sections: (1) into the mālapratamanyogam, treating of the root of the tree of the sacred doctrine, or, according to the scholiasts, of the tirthakaras, i.e., the history of the beginning, of the preliminary birth, of the existence and of the final completion of the bhagavāntānam arhatānam; and (2) into the gandikānyogam, i.e., the doctrine of the "little knots," single knotted points, members, sprouts of the sacred doctrine, i.e., the history of the numerous figures of the Jaina hagiology which are stated to be — [360] kulakara, tirthakara, gāndhaka, chokkakara, Dasāra, BALADĀVA, VASUNA. The history of Hariyānā is added to this group and, strangely enough, that of Bhadrabādu himself, whom tradition represents to be the last teacher of the dīthiṣṭa! Other "knots" are finally added, viz. tavakamagandikā, chittatāra (chitratāra) gandikā, osappigā and ussappigā, and also all sorts of stories illustrating the way how beings become gods, men, animals or hell-beings.

Abhayadāva is unfortunately very brief here, and to add to our difficulties the MS. is full of corruptions. Abh. refers especially to a Nanditikā, composed probably in Prakrit, which is, however, not the same as the commentary on N, which I have before me. This too, is very brief and presumably contains a direct citation from one of the sections which belong here. See below p. 368 on chittatārang.

The fifth part is composed of the chūliyas — additions, which were referred to p. 358 in the discussion on part 3 to which they belong. They belong however to the first four pūraṇas alone. According to the scholiast (and also to the scholiast on Hēm. 246) by these chūliyas we are to understand cālī-like (i.e., like place etc.) paddhati, which embraces that which was not...
treated of in all the four preceding parts of the *dr̥śṭhitvāda*. [361] The text, however, takes pains to limit them to the first four puṇeas.

In the final remarks in reference to the complete extent of the *dr̥śṭhitvāda*, the following parts are ascribed to it, — 1 *suyyakkaḥundra*, 14 puṇeas, samākhaya “computable” (perhaps “innumerable,” see above, p. 281) vatthu and chūla(chulla N)vatthu,48 and pāhuḍa (prākhṛita), pāhuḍapāhuḍa, pāhuḍiyā and pāhuḍiyapāhuḍiyā, to which the same epithet is attached. The payasahassas,49 akkharas, &c., are characterized by the same epithet, i.e., samākhaya.

Though the scholia fail to explain further the words pāhuḍa, &c., they manifestly signify the same as chapter, paragraph, &c., and are actually so used in upāgases 5, 7; and in aṅgā 10 (see p. 333), the word pāhuḍa is used in connection with the 14 puṇeas. In the Anuyogādvarāsūtra (end of the pāmaṇa section), the *dr̥śṭhitvāda* is said to be computed according to pāhuḍa, pāhuḍapāhuḍa, and according to vatthu. This method of counting is said in the Anuyogādvarāsūtra to be similar to the division of the kālīya suv, i.e., into uddēsaga, ajjhayana, suvakkaṇḍha, aṅgā, which is there contrasted with the *dr̥śṭhitvāda*. Vatthu appears in up. 6 as the name of the sections of up. 5 and 7, in which it no longer occurs in this signification.

If we now cast a glance at the entire field of information which we possess in regard to [362] the twelfth aṅgā, it is manifest that, though this aṅgā had a genuine existence, nevertheless the information at our command produces an impression of lesser weight than that concerning the previous eleven aṅgās. In the case of the latter we possess the texts themselves as a means of verification, but in the case of the twelfth aṅgā there is no such help upon which we can rely.

These statements, and especially those in reference to the 14 puṇeas, are, however, not purely fictitious. This is clear from the citations adduced above in our consideration of each, and especially of 2—4, 7—10, and from traditions in reference either to the extracts from them or to their relations to the origin of some of the seven schisms. Another proof of the validity of these statements lies in the fact that the number of the vatthas, manuṣyapadānī and sattāpī, contained in the *dr̥śṭhitvāda*, which is mentioned in aṅgā 4 §§ 13 — 16, 18, 20, 25, 46 and 58 is in direct agreement with the later statement of contents. Finally the name pāhuḍa in aṅgā 10 appears in direct connection with the 14 puṇeas. At the period of the Āvāyakasūtra, especially, and at that of the Anuyogādvarāsūtra these texts must still have existed, and perhaps even at the time of the older commentaries (cf. e.g., p. 347n.), if the statements of the latter are not mere reproductions of old traditions. See p. 225.

The statement of the contents of aṅgā 13 is found in aṅgā 4, or Nandī (N), and is as follows:—

Sē kiṁ taṁ *dṛṣṭhitvā? dṛṣṭhitvā? saṁ savaṁbhavaṁ paṁpataṇavaṇayaś? āghavijñāti,52 sē samāsaṁ paṁchavibhū pāṁ[363](nāṭī), taṁ : parikammaṁ53 sattārīṁ puvravayaṁ54 anuyogī55 chūlayāḥ; — sē kiṁ taṁ parikammaṁ? 2 satavibhū paṁ, taṁ : siddhaś,56 sīpiyaśparikammaṁ,57 maṇussaś,58 buddhaś,59 uggahanāś,60 urvasumapajjapāsā,60 vippajjahaṇaś,60 chnūcchayaś,60 — sē kiṁ taṁ siddhaś?60

47 The number of vatthas and chūlas for the 14 puṇeas at least, was shortly before (cf. p. 359) stated with exactness in the text itself.
48 See above for the fabulous accounts of the scholia.
49 The number of pāhuḍa is found in the Siddhapāchāsthāka of Dēvindrasūri in 58 gāthās. The author, in v. 1, says that he has taken his material *aśramaśiddhāpāhuḍā*. See above p. 354.
50 ABC, "caṇā N.
51 ABC, "cājā N.
52 ABC, "mmē N.
53 ABC, "gaś N.: when I henceforth cite N alone, ABC agree.
54 BC, "uṇā A, "cē N.
55 siddhi AN.
56 siddhi AN.
57 tānā siddhāṣṭṛāśkaparik śiṇādi (dīna) mūlabhedaṁ saptavibhāṅi, māṭrikāpaddhyutānhābhāpamghāyā tryasati dhāhānī, schol. on N.
58 BC, paṭṭhas. A.
59 BC, uṇā A, "cē N.
60 siddhi A.
2 choddasaavihā pannatā, taṁ jahā : māṇyāpyāyaṁ
dāgāṭhyāpyaayaṁ pāḍhō aṭṭhapayaāṇi
āgāṣapayaāṇi kubhūyāṇi rāśibuddhanā ēgupuṇān
dugunān tigunān kubhūyaṁ padigagā
suñihārapaḍigagā
nāduvattanā siddhāvattanā, sō 'taṁ siddhasa\n; sō kiṁ taiṁ maṇussasā? 2 choddasaavihā paṁ, taiṁ :
tāla čheva māṇyāpyāyaṁ jīva
nāduvattanā maṇussāvattanā; sō 'taṁ maṇussasā,
ā evaṁ evaṁ āvāvāro ca satta paṭikkamāṁ
tāsām bhavanti ti-m-akkhāyāṁ; se 'taṁ' paṭikkamāṁ;
so kiṁ taiṁ suttāṁ? suttāṁ aṭṭhāsī bhavaṁ ti-m-akkhāyāṁ,
tāṁ tu ujgāṁ paṇiṁ yāparipāyaṁ, bākubhāgyāyaṁ,
vinaṇaṇāvariyaṁ, ahaṁtāraṁ, paṁpareṇaṁ,
sāmāyaṁ, bhāyaṁ, sāyatiyaṁ, ghaṁtaṁ, nāduvattanā,
bālāyaṁ, pūṭhāpaṭṭhāṁ, vīyavattanā, evaṁbhāyaṁ,
duvāvattanā, vattmaṇapuṣyaṁ, samabhūdūḍaṁ,
savvattobhaddaṁ, paṁsaṁ, duṇipadigagāṁ, ichch-ēyāṁ
bālāyaṁ suttāṁ chinnachchayapāyaṁ sasam[365]ayahuttaiparivādā; ichch-ēyāṁ
bālāyaṁ suttāṁ aĉchin-
chchayapāyaṁ ājīvyasuttaiparivādā; ichch-ēyāṁ bālāyaṁ
suttāṁ tikaṁ nāyāṁ.

Sse kiin taam chuliyad 73 jan naa?i4 aliyama chaunghama puuvagama chuliyad,75 sesai puuvaii achuliyaiini; so se ttama chuliyad.

At the conclusion of the review of the 12 anugas, I present the apostrophe to eternity, which is given in anuga 4 and in Nandli, in entire agreement with each other, at the close of their statement of the contents of the anugas. With all the unwavering firmness of this apostrophe it looks like a protest against all who might either doubt or attempt to undermine its validity (see p. 293):


Before I proceed further I should like to state that beside the Vidhiprapa of Jina prabha (A.D. 1307) (see above p. 223) in the meantime two other samachari texts, unfortunately anonymous, have come to my knowledge. They are both written in Prakrit with an occasional intermingling of Sanskrit, and are in agreement throughout with the statements in the Vidhiprapa, which they antedate. The first of these texts, ayaravithi, in 21 dama, contains in its tenth daram, jivavithi, not merely the enumeration of the anugabhaika texts, as Nandli [370], Pakshikas, and Vidhiprapa, especially in the form of the two latter, but also the same detailed exposition and examination of the single portions of the anugas, upanagas, &c., according to the period of time requisites for their study (measured according to dita and eyavitha). The order of succession is the same as in the section of the Vidhiprapa which treats of this point. It is especially

58 jahah omitted in A; instead of 2 anagha jahah N has gaaga paani jahah.
59 Thus N, yato BC, yaa A; so also further on; kulakarakas Vimalaravanadinaapsavravajananamadadnaprapaincham uparaunyasit, evam tirthakarakasamukkahi abhidihrunvadato bhavanti schol. on N.
60 In N after Vasandevac.
61 BC, chakkaviti AN.
62 In N after Bhaadaa.
63 In N after 66 eapp. chitta sonakkaa biinara Bhagabhatitaitechakarakapanture Bhagabhatitaasamsabdhuteen bhupatikutih aghijjaintiisa avakaritaavataarupsahapattipadadee ganimmikaa, taisam cha paripap sauddhau-nunnuu Sagaracaravantaaring mahamajjanaa abhirasaadag Sagaracaravartisutothaya Ahdityasaaharpamrtriinikaah Bhagabha-v%), arasan naa naraapunana saanbhuparadasanaa kritia, sii cha 'ischhahaajalaa Usbhaasaa ty-aadhaa vasayaa, schol. on N.
64 N, usaa BC, usaa A; pi BCN, pi A.
65 BN omit; usaa A, pi C.
66 niiray omitted in A; anararici ti vidhiivenu paivarittheenu bhavharaamaa pahu janainuum iti gamayate 'maritrayaagura-

yagatgamananu, evan adikaa gaadiyaa vahaa (l) akhyayante, schol. on N.
67 gaa N.
68 BC, naagaa A adhaanu N.
69 BC, yaa A; stiyato BC, merely 6 in N.
70 AN, gaa BC.
71 BC, yaa N, yaa A.
72 ajjayaa.
73 BC, AN omit.
74 BC, AN omit.
75 BC, yaa A.
76 BC, AN omit; skadyan.
77 niirayaa.
78 BC, AN omit; skadyan.
79 Bhaan.
80 Instead of sv. niceo N has here aparitipiti. In the following repetition, however, it is the same as in the text.
81 usaa N.
82 niirayaa N.
83 BC, AN omit; skadyan.
84 BC, AN omit; skadyan.
85 AN omit; skadyan.
86 AN omit; skadyan.
87 AN omit; skadyan.
88 AN omit; skadyan.
89 AN omit; skadyan.
90 AN omit; skadyan.
interesting that ten, and not five, ajjh. are here — see p. 332 — ascribed to each of the first two vihāras of the second part of aṅga 6: dusu dusu vaggēsu kamā ajjhayaṇaḥ huṇī dasa ya chaippaṇna | bhattā śaśa antha ya dhammakaḥ bhā suṣakkaṁduhā ||. The text which we possess does not agree with this allotment of ajjh. The same holds good of the second of these two texts, which bears the name sāmāyaṇiyavihī. We read in it the following concerning the first vāgga: tammi dasa ajjhayaṇaḥ, and immediately thereupon viś dasa ajjhayaṇaḥ. Since this second text is twice — at the conclusion of the jātaka section and at the conclusion of the whole — expressly ascribed to Abhayadēva, or to his oral instruction of the author Paramānanda, it is very surprising that we find such differences between it and the present text, Abhayadēva himself in his commentary commenting upon that text which allot to both vāgga only five ajjh. each. If the sāmāyaṇiyavahī appears to be more than two hundred years older than the Vīdhīpuraṇa on account of its pretended relation to Abhayadēva (A.D. 1064; above p. 277), [371] the āḷāravaciḥi must be regarded as of greater antiquity. Its author refers, at the conclusion of dāra 21, “Āṭāni gurukriyaṇi, śravakakṛiyaṇi pūruṣa śrīmad Umāsvātivāchaka-śrī Haribhadraśūri pratishṭhākalpañcabhāṣyō ‘vasėyaṇaḥ’ to two authors considerably before his time. In v. 50, 51 of the Gaṇadharmārādhānatanam composed by Jinadattasūri, the scholar of Jinavallabha who died A.D. 1112, (see Kl. 248 9), the former of the two authors is called the first teacher after the internal following upon Āryaravakha and Durlakāpuṣpa (above p. 348). In Sarvaraṅgaṇi’s schol. on the Gaṇadharmārādhānatanam a śravakaprajnapti is cited among the 500 (or 105?) payanaṇas (prakaraṇa), composed by him in Sanskrit according to the statement in the text. The title śravakaprajnapti is in entire harmony with the statement of the āḷāravaciḥ just quoted. According to the Gurgavāl of Tapāgcha Kl. 253a (28) there lived an Umāsvātikara in 1190 Vīra (= Saṃvat 720), who is, however, distinguished from the author of the śravakaprajnapti (patyuddhi) — (yataḥ samatviṃśita, cf. above p. 347, śrī Umāsvātivāchaka ity uktam). The latter is probably, as Klett kindly informs me, the person of this name who appears in the Bombay MS. of a pāṭāvall of the Vīrah-Kharataṅgacālha, in the continuation of the old Sthāviravall immediately after its last member, Dāsahāṇi, the teacher of Dāsavaridhahāṇi, and separated by one gradation alone from Haribhadra who is mentioned together with him in the āḷāravaciḥ. Since the date of Dāsavaridhahāṇi is 980 Vīra, and the death of Haribhadra is placed in [379] 1055 Vīra, see Kl. 253a (27), tradition seems to place Umāsvātikara, the author of the śravakaprajnapti, about 1000 Vīra (= Saṃvat 530) ! While it is true that the āḷāravaciḥ does not claim to stand in direct connection with Umāsv, and Haribh., merely citing them, yet this citation is of such a character that it is calculated to afford ancient testimony concerning a treatise which mentions, not sources of information of later date, but merely these two names which are manifestly of tolerable antiquity. The statements contained in this work gain consequently in authority; and the same conclusion holds good of the information of a literary and other nature in harmony therewith, contained in both sāmāchārī texts (sāvīhī and vihipaṇa). In continuing from this point on to adduce the testimony of the Vīdhīpuraṇa (V) especially, I do so, partly because it has a fixed date, and partly because it contains the most detailed statements. I shall, however, not fail to state where Āḷāravāhi (Avi.) or Sāmāyaṇavihī (Svi.), which takes an intermediate position between Avi. and V. as regards fullness, offer anything worthy of particular note.

84 śrī Abhayadēva śrīgurukriyaṇaḥ mayam maṇe ṣyam | Paramāṇandaḥ kavyam . . . śrī Abhayadēvaśrīr āḷāravaciḥavāhāṇiḥ (?p) patre | sāmāchārī rūmārd (? Paramāṇandād padam ekaśe ||

85 The very faulty MS. reproduces the Umāśāyī of the text by Umāśāyī in the commentary! This form of the name is found elsewhere, e.g., in the Vīrāṅgaṇitāsaṅkramaḥ as that of the author of the śrī ’pi.

The pâtél of a certain country had seven sons, six of whom were married, the seventh being yet young. The wives of the six brothers brought with them little or no dowry, but when the youngest son married, his wife brought several hundred rupees' worth of jewellery.

Now it happened that, with the exception of the youngest daughter-in-law, the whole of the pâtél's family were an indolent lot, and thus had to dispose of what little property they owned, and also the few jewels that the daughters-in-law had, to buy provisions and other necessaries. But the youngest daughter-in-law, who was wise and the only industrious person in the family, saw to what a pass they had come, and hit upon a plan. She went to her father-in-law, and thus said to him:

"Father, we have already lost everything through our laziness. Let us do something to get out of this wretched way of living. I propose to dispose of the jewellery, which my father has given me in dowry, and see what we can do with the proceeds."

The old pâtél, who could suggest no other alternative, agreed to the proposal of his youngest daughter-in-law. So they took a portion of her jewellery, and, going to a goldsmith, got it weighed, and sold it for what value the goldsmith set upon it. She next went to the bâzâr and bought some rice, spices, and such like other necessities, and then proceeded to wash the rice before grinding it into flour, and asked the other women to help her; but they all refused, some on the plea that their children were crying, others that they had to attend to some other work, and so on. At last, with the help of her husband and father-in-law, she managed to wash the rice, to spread it out on mats in the sun to dry, and afterwards, when dry, to collect and bring in the house. She had now to grind the rice into flour, and so she again asked the others to help her, but met with the same refusal. The old man and her husband again lent their help, and she did the grinding of the rice. In this way she made their food last them for some days, while she had still a good sum of money left. Now, it struck her that, if they continued so idle, the provisions would soon be finished, and in a short time also the money that remained would have to be spent, and they would once more have nothing to eat. She, therefore, made the following suggestion to her father-in-law:

"Come, father, we will take a few labourers, and, going to a jungle, we will fell some trees and sell them as firewood, and I'm sure it will well repay our trouble."

The father-in-law, who loved her more than any of the others for her kindness and industry, at once gave his consent. So one day, having fitted out a ship, taking with her the husband, father-in-law, and some labourers, she sailed through a river, and came to a large forest. There she got felled several trees, with which, after they were dried, she filled the ship, and came back home.

One day a great merchant was passing by the pâtél's house and saw the great heap of firewood. Being in need of firewood, the merchant inquired to whom it belonged, and having been told that it belonged to the pâtél, he went to his house and asked him if he would sell the firewood. The pâtél, as previously instructed by his youngest daughter-in-law, said:

"No, no; we are not going to sell the firewood. The rains are fast approaching, and we shall want it all to ourselves."

1 I take this opportunity of stating that, in my contributions of Folklore in Salsette, I have, when alluding to the people, called them "Salsette Christians," but they are not to be mistaken for the "Bombay Portuguese," by which term are understood the "Goanese," and these latter have no connection with the Folklore in Salsette. The Native Christians of Bombay and Salsette, including Bassein, now call themselves "Bombay East Indians," and in my future contributions I shall call them as such, i. e. "East Indians."

2 Until lately the pâtél was considered a person of great importance, and was respected and feared by all.
But the merchant urged and begged very much, saying: — “Come, come, sell it to me at any price; my need is greater than yours, as I want it immediately, while you can wait for the rains, by which time you can collect another and bigger heap than this.”

The pâtél, however, said that he must consult his daughter-in-law before disposing of it. So he called her out, and told her that the merchant asked him to sell the firewood.

“No, no,” answered the daughter-in-law, quick as lightning. “What are we going to burn during the rains, which will begin in a few days, if we sell the firewood now? If we buy it afterwards it will cost us twice or three times as much as we have paid for it now, and we could ill afford to pay even the present price!”

In this way she refused to sell the wood. But the merchant, who was in very great need of it, offered to give her even four times its value, and at last she consented, and sold the wood, which brought them near a thousand rupees. Thus, through the industry of the youngest daughter-in-law, the family now owned more money than it ever had before. Her next care was to take her father-in-law to a goldsmith’s house, where she bought jewels for the pâtél’s other daughters-in-law. After this she bought more provisions. This time also, when she asked them to help her in the washing of the rice, grinding it, and so on, the ungrateful and lazy wretches refused to help her, and, again, she had to do it with the aid of the old pâtél and her husband.

With all this, she still had a large sum of money left; so she thought of using it in a way that would bring in still more. This time she suggested to her father-in-law to gather some stones into a large heap. The old pâtél, therefore, hired some labourers, and at once set to work. In a month or so they collected an enormous heap of stones.

It now happened that the king of that country was building a new palace, but, unfortunately, as one wall was erected and another was being built up, the first would give way and fall into ruins. As soon as the first wall was rebuilt, the second wall gave way, because they were being built of mere earth. This went on for several months, and the king had already spent much time and a vast sum of money, but in vain. At last his kârbdâr thus advised him:

“Your Majesty has already spent much time and money over this building, but apparently to little or no use. In my opinion it would be better to use stones for the building, which will ensure greater strength, and I feel confident that the work will not trouble you as it does now.”

The king, who always abided by the counsel of his kârbdâr, agreed to the suggestion, and sent his men to seek for stones. The men chanced to pass by the pâtél’s house, and, seeing the great heap of stones, asked him if he would sell them.

The pâtél, as instructed by his daughter-in-law, said: — “No, these stones are not for sale; we are about to rebuild our house, and so we shall want them ourselves.”

The king’s men, however, pressed him very much to part with the stones, telling him that as they were wanted by the king, he would pay him a high price for them.

Upon this the pâtél called out to his daughter-in-law, and said to her: — “Look here, here are the king’s men, who want to buy up this heap of stones.”

The daughter-in-law at once replied: — “Oh no, oh no! See, our house is in quite a dilapidated state, and it may tumble down at any moment. We must soon set about rebuilding it, and if you are going to sell these stones, what will you do? It will be difficult for us to get together such a heap in time. Do not talk of selling them.”

But the king’s people would not be quieted with this answer. They begged and urged very hard, till at last she yielded, and named the price of the stones at some thousands of rupees, which were paid, and the stones taken to build the king’s palace, which was shortly completed to the great joy of the king.
The pāṭēl with his whole family were now well settled in life. At the instigation of the youngest daughter-in-law, their house was rebuilt and furnished handsomely. The old man now took his youngest daughter-in-law to heart, and loved her more than ever. In everything that had to be done he always consulted her, and gave everything in her charge. This of course naturally led the others to envy her. They, therefore, began to invent stories in order to prejudice the pāṭēl and her husband against her.

Said they to the pāṭēl, the first time he called her: "Oh yes, you have taken such a liking to her; but do you know what is going on behind your back? What people are coming and going, and such like things?"

In this way the old pāṭēl's mind was poisoned against his youngest daughter-in-law, and he in his turn told everything he had heard to her husband, who also took a dislike to her. Her husband then got her hair cut off, and, seating her on a donkey, drove her away from his house with strict injunctions never to return. The poor woman had no alternative but to submit to her fate, and went where the donkey carried her. She had, however, for some time past, suspected foul play, and had, therefore, put by a small sum of money for her private use, should she require it. This she took with her, and the donkey carried her to another distant country. Here our heroine laid aside her own clothes, and assumed the disguise of a man, and began to wander about the city. The king of that country saw her, and, taking her for a man, asked her if she would take employment. She offered to serve the king in any capacity, and was accordingly engaged as a police sipāhī.

Now, it happened that that country was visited every night by a bhujāṅg (monster), who used to eat up anything and anyone that came in its way, — men and animals alike. Many attempts were made to capture it, but with no success. The king had set a reward on the bhujāṅg's life. Whoever should kill it, would be rewarded by getting the king's only daughter in marriage, and half his kingdom.

Our heroine was apprised of this. So she went and bought a sword and concealed it in her house. That night, as she went about the town patrolling, she saw, by moonlight, the bhujāṅg coming down from a hill, and marked well the road it took. The following day she went and dug a large ditch in the bhujāṅg's way, and in the night lay concealed close to it, sword in hand.

At the usual time the bhujāṅg descended, and fell in the ditch, upon which our heroine rushed from her hiding place, and cut off its head, which she wrapped in a cloth and carried home.

The king was every day in the habit of calling together the sipāhīs that were on patrol duty, and asking each of them in turn what they saw and what they did in connection with the bhujāṅg. Unfortunately they never saw the monster, but, nevertheless, without knowing what it was, each invented a tale for the nonce.

Said one: "I saw a large beast in the form of a cat which made its way towards the East."

Another would say: "It was a monstrous tiger that I saw, and it went towards the stables of such and such a person."

A third said: "A hideous saīlīā (devil) passed me at a few yards' distance, and when I tried to capture it, it disappeared."

And in this way every one told the king some tale or other. Last of all the king asked the supposed new sipāhī: "Well, then, what did you see?"

"Sire," replied our heroine: "at about ten o'clock, as I was looking towards a hill, I saw a large monster descending, upon which I ran and cut off its head, and then I found that it was a bhujāṅg."
The king got into a rage, and roared out: — "Thou liest. One tells me he saw a cat, another saw a tiger, a third saw a suilín; and you say you saw a bhujáh. How can it be possible? Should you again tell me such tales, I shall send you all to the gallows! Why not say that you all went to sleep at your posts? Or, at any rate, tell me the truth another time."

Our heroine, however, was confident of what she had seen and done, and said: — "Sire, pardon me for interrupting you. What I have told you is nothing but the truth, and I will prove it to you by shewing you the bhujáh's head, which I brought with me after I had killed it."

"Very well," said the king, and away went our heroine to her house, and in a short time came back in triumph carrying the bhujáh's head, which she placed before the king, who, on seeing it, was amazed at the bravery of his sipáthi, and praised him in eulogistic terms, and at the same made overtures for marriage with his daughter, also offering him half of his kingdom as promised. Our heroine, who did not wish to betray herself, willingly accepted the offer, and the king at once fixed on a day for the celebration of the auspicious event.

First of all the king erected a large palace for his daughter and son-in-law to live in after their marriage, and furnished it very handsomely. He also attached to it a large establishment of servants, such as befitted a royal couple. Next, the king made preparations on a very grand scale, and in due time the wedding was celebrated with great pomp and show, after which the married couple went to reside in the newly built palace. A few days afterwards, on enquiry from her mother, the bride complained of her husband's backwardness regarding the consummation of the marriage, and the queen in her turn told about it to the king, who remonstrated with his son-in-law.

Our heroine replied: — "Father, I have made a vow to that effect for twelve years, in consequence of which, I trust, you will pardon my backwardness."

This answer satisfied the king, who never afterwards touched upon the subject. A few years later, the king made over the reins of government to his supposed son-in-law, who, on his part, governed the kingdom with great justice and benefit to his subjects.

To return to the pátél's house. As soon as the youngest daughter-in-law was turned out of the house in the manner related above, the money and property, acquired by her industry, was soon spent, and the family became again sunk in deep poverty, and this to such an extent, that at times they had to live without a meal for several days together. Then the pátél and his youngest son began to repent of their folly in listening to the tales of the other daughters-in-law, and in turning out of the house the youngest daughter-in-law, and leaving their house, wandered from city to city and country to country, in search of the youngest daughter-in-law.

Now our heroine, when she assumed charge of the kingdom, had privately sent some men to the pátél's country to bring her news as to how her family were faring; but all returned saying that they could not trace his house, and that all that they could hear was, that the family was in a very deplorable state, and had left the place, and gone no one knew where.

One day it happened, that, as the pátél and his youngest son were wandering, they chanced to come to the country over which our heroine was reigning. They were reduced to mere skeletons, and of clothing they had none, save little rags about their loins. In this state, the son, who was fatigued, sat down to rest himself not very far from the palace, while the pátél went about begging. Our heroine saw the old man and recognized in him her father-in-law, in spite of the state he was in, and sending a servant, ordered him into the palace. As soon as he arrived, she had him bathed, then she gave him some clean clothes to wear, after which she served him with food in the manner she used to do when at his house. After doing ample justice to his appetite, he exclaimed: —

"Ha! Yes! This is exactly how my youngest daughter-in-law used to treat me. Now she is gone, I don't know where."
The pretended king was now quite sure that the old beggar was no other than her father-in-law, and asked him what he meant by the above saying, upon which the pātēl related the whole story, from the time his youngest and seventh son was married, to the moment he was speaking; and, concluding with many grateful expressions for the kindness shown him by the supposed king, was about to go away. The king, however, stopped him, and told him to go and fetch his youngest son, who, he said, was resting himself not very far from the palace. The old man promised to do so. When he came to the spot where his son was, his son could hardly recognise his father, and asked him where he had got such nice clothes. The pātēl told his son how the king saw him and sent for him, and gave him meat and drink and all the clothes he saw. He then mentioned that he was ordered to bring his son also to the palace. The son was at first reluctant to go, but after much persuasion he consented. When he arrived his wife treated him in the way she used to do at home, and he too said:

"Oh good king, you put me in mind of my wife, who always treated me in the kind way you did to-day."

The king asked him also to relate his story, which he did just as his father had done. At the conclusion of the story, both the father and the son burst into tears, and our heroine, too, could no longer control hers, and for two reasons, — first, for the sufferings of her husband and father-in-law, and secondly, that she had seen them and that she was in a position to make them happy. At last she went into the room, and, having changed her clothes for those of a woman, she sent for her husband and father-in-law, who, on seeing her, at once recognized their lost wife and daughter-in-law, and fell on her neck and embraced and kissed her.

Our heroine then went with her husband, father-in-law, and the king’s daughter, to the king’s palace, where she told the king everything, and asked his pardon for thus imposing upon him so long. The king was astonished at the story and more so at the bravery of a woman, and not only pardoned her, but gave her daughter in marriage to the pātēl’s son and made him heir to his throne. When the king was dead, the pātēl’s son took upon himself the government of the country, and lived with his two wives in happiness.

AN HISTORICAL ALLUSION IN THE BHAGALPUR PLATE OF NARAYANAPALA.

Mr. Fleet has presented me with an excellent impression of the Bhagalpur plate of Narayapanala, an examination of which has shewn me, what indeed did not require such proof, how well that inscription has been edited by Dr. Hultzsch, ante, Vol. XV. p. 305. There is in fact, in the poetical portion of the inscription, only a single verse for which the impression suggests a better reading than the published one; and my reason for writing of this publicly is this, that the same verse contains an historical allusion, hitherto overlooked, to which attention should be drawn. In the published version the third verse, in lines 7-8, together with Dr. Hultzsch’s translation, reads thus:

Jitvā-Indrā-rāja-prabhritāṁ arātiṁ
upārjijītā yēna mahādāyā-āraṁ
dattā punah sāvalinā-ārthiyātṛ
dhārāyaḥ—ānāti-vāmanakṣyaḥ

"This mighty one (bala) again gave the sovereignty, which he had acquired by defeating Indrāja and other enemies, to the begging Chakrāyudha, who resembled a dwarf in bowing, just as formerly Bali had given the sovereignty (of the three worlds), which he had acquired by defeating Indra and his other enemies (the gods), to the begging Chakrāyudha (Vishṇu), who had descended to earth as a dwarf."

I believe that most Sanskrit scholars who may read this verse will be puzzled by the compound ānāti-vāmanakṣya, with which the verse ends. For, admitting that this expression may convey the meaning ‘who resembled a dwarf in bowing,’ they will probably be slow to adopt the suggestion that the poet, in applying the compound to Vishṇu, should have taken the liberty of using the word ānāti, the meaning of which is at once clear and transparent, in the sense of ānātra which means quite a different thing. And referring to the impression, I find that the difficulty is removed in a much simpler way. For the impression shews that the sign for the vowel i of the word ānāti has been struck out in the original, and that the intended reading therefore is ānāta-vāmanakṣya.
Referred to the king Chakrâyudha, this would mean (as a Bhumivrihi) ‘who bowed down to (or worshipped) Vâmana, i.e. Vishû; referred to the god Vishû, (as a Karmadhârâya) ‘Vâmana, who bowed down to (Bali).’

The verse eulogizes the king Dharmapâla, and has been rightly understood to mean that the king conquered Indra and other enemies, but gave back the sovereignty which he had thus acquired to a certain Chakrâyudha. But the verse tells more than this. It states distinctly that the sovereignty which Dharmapâla gained for himself by defeating Indra and which he afterwards returned to Chakrâyudha, was the rule over Mahôdiyâ or Kanauj; for there can be no doubt that the word mahôdiyâ-ârâh, like the rest of the verse, has two senses, and that, with reference to Dharmapâla, it must be translated by ‘the sovereignty over Mahôdiyâ.’

I know neither a king Indra or Indra nor a king Chakrâyudha of Kânya-kubja, and can only form certain conjectures to which I would not attach too much value myself. Bali took the sovereignty of the three worlds from Indra, and gave it to that god’s younger brother Vishû (Upândra). Similarly Dharmapâla may have given to the younger brother (Chakrâyudha) what he had taken from his predecessor, the elder brother (Indra). Chakrâyudha is only another name of Vishû; and a third name of Vishû is Adîvarâha. And Adîvarâha is, as Dr. Hultzsch has shown, another name of Bhîjâdèva of Kanauj. For Bhîjâdèva we have the dates A. D. 882, 876, and 882; and, according to Sir A. Cunningham’s account, Dharmapâla would have ruled from about A. D. 830 to 860. Bhîjâdèva and Dharmapâla may thus have been contemporaries, and it is at least possible that the former may have owed his elevation to the throne to the latter. Other inscriptions may throw all this to be untenable, but it is curious that Bhîjâdèva’s successors (Mahândrapâla, Kshitipâla, and Dêvapâla) all should append to their names the word Pâla, which would seem to connect them somehow or other with Dharmapâla and his family.

Göttingen.

CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM INDICARUM,
VOL. III.

Mr. Fleet has asked me to publish from time to time in this Journal any suggestions regarding the texts and translations of the inscriptions contained in his Gupta volume, which might occur to me in the course of my own studies. In complying with his request, I can only say that in work of this kind the task of the critic is very much easier than that of the editor. The editor, unless he be ready to delay the publication of his work ad infinitum, must within a limited time make up his mind on whatever difficulties he may meet with; while the critic may concentrate his attention on certain selected passages, and trust to continued study and to accident for clearing away the difficulties offered by them. This certainly is my own experience; and in this spirit I have written the following short notes on some of the inscriptions of Mr. Fleet’s collection. If I should have found the true readings or the right interpretation of a few doubtful passages, it will be so only because Mr. Fleet has done all the hard work before me,—work which few scholars would have been competent to undertake, and which fewer still would have brought to so successful a conclusion.

Mandâsor Stone Pillar Inscription of Yasôdharman.
No. 33, Plate xxi. B, p. 142 ff.; and ante,

In line 8, the sentence chalati niyamitam = dhamûnd láka-vidnya has been translated—‘the (good) customs of mankind continue current, unimpeded (in any way) by him.’ The construction should rather be taken to be—aum niyamitam láka-vidnya chalati, ‘controlled by him, the conduct of mankind does not swerve (from the right course).’

Mandâsor Stone Inscription of Yasôdharman.
No. 35, Plate xxii. B, p. 150 ff.; and ante,
Vol. XV. p. 222 ff.

In lines 11 and 12 of this inscription we have the verse—
Sukrâti-vishaya-tungam râjâ-mulân dharâyâm aśhitim-apagata-bhangam aśhyasim-adâhânam [1]
guru śikharam-iv = ārēs = tat-kulaṁ sv-âtma-bhotyâ
ravir = iva Râvikirttiśu prâkâśám vyadhatâ II

The difficulty offered by the verse is this, that, while the first half should be applicable to the summit of a mountain (śikharam) as well as to a family (kula), the word suktâti-vishayâ-tungam when referred to the former, yields no suitable meaning. The word dharâyân, ‘is the earth,’ at the end of the first line, suggests the idea that the beginning of the line should contain some reference to the sky; and we obtain what we want, and remove every difficulty, by altering the reading of the text to suktâti-vishayâ-tungam, ‘high like the abode of those who have performed good actions,’

or (applied to kulam) 'eminent in being the abode of (or in containing) men who perform good actions.' That heaven is acquired by good deeds, is a common notion. Thus, in Mr. Fleet's own volume, p. 147, 1. 7, we have dirah sukrit-sukrit-
itydah, and in Raghunān dai, xviii, 21, dyah sukrit-
opulabāhām. And in Śrīvadātā's Paddhati, 1072, we actually read vyāma mahat-padaśukrit-
titānām, where padaśukrititānām is exactly equivalent to sukti-viśaya. The true reading having thus been established, I would, judging from the photolithograph published, ante, Vol. XV, opposite to p. 224, venture to say that the sign for the second i in viśaya has been struck out already in the original.

In line 18 I would read an-ahivivābhah instead of an-ahivivābhah, because 'not seeking his own comfort' appears to me more appropriate than 'not being too eager about his own comfort,' and I would translate the word a-saṅgaṁ (referring to dhāranā) by 'meeting with no obstruction,' = a-pratibhootahām. Compare Mallinātha on Raghunān, iii, 63.

In lines 19 and 20 we read the verse—
Upahita-hita rakṣaṇa-mañḍana jāti-ratnai=
bhujya iva prithul-āmāsasa-taaya Dakṣāh
kanyān [*]
mahāti-śraddaṇāma kṣanāyam-asā bibhrach=
chhriti-hridaṁ-nitaṁ-ānandī nirūḍāsah-
nāma [i—

the first half of which has been translated—
'His younger brother, Dakṣa, — invested with the decoration of the protection of friends, as if he were (his) broad-shouldered (right) arm (decorated) with choice jewels.'

Differing from Mr. Fleet, I take the proper name of the man spoken of, to be Nīrūḍā, but my chief difficulty lies in the first line of the verse. There appears to be no authority for translating the word jāti-ratnai by 'choice jewels,' and the word bhujya of the second line should undoubtedly be qualified by that of the first line. The word rakṣaṇa-mañḍana, being synonymous with rakṣaṇa-bhāṣāya, 'an ornament or amulet worn for protection (against evil spirits, &c.),' rakṣaṇa-ratna, rakṣaṇa-mañḍi, &c., I propose reading jāti-ratnai (with which we may compare jāti-vriḍdhaṁ in Raghunānai, xvii, 12) instead of jāti-ratnai, and would translate the first half of the verse thus—

'His dexterous younger brother, by excellent relatives invested, as with a decoration, with the protection of friends, — being as it were (Dharmādāśa)'s broad-shouldered arm, to which excellent relatives had fastened a beneficial ornament to guard (against evil) — . . .

Here, again, I fancy I recognize in the photolithograph faint traces of the sign for a below the j of jāti-ratnai.

In line 23 we read —
Pryatama-kutapānām rāmayam = baddha-rāgāṃ kisalayam = iva mugdhāṁ mānasāṁ māṁsaṁ nānām [i—

The first two aksaraes of rāmayan are not clear in the photolithograph; and the word appears objectionable, because, when construed with kisalayam it yields no suitable meaning, and because the ordinary causal form of ram is remayam. My own reading would be kampiyam, 'causing to shake,' or 'causing to tremble.'

The text of this inscription has been reprinted in Khāyamāla, Prachinādhamāla, pp. 112-116, where the editor of the reprint has suggested the following alterations: — jātāḥ for jātī, in line 5; mēthyaṁ for mēkhyāṁ, in line 7; ahūṛārya for ahūṛārēṇa, in line 9; dhavṛāyā for vāstāyā, in line 10; tāra-maṇḍrāsā for bhāra-
maṇḍrāsā, in line 32; and kīraṇa-saṅgadāsāṅga-kāntāsā for kīraṇa-saṅgadāsāṅga-saṅgā-
kāntāsā, in line 24. Of these, I regard only the alterations in lines 9 and 24 as improvements of the text; in respect of line 9, note rakṣaṇa-bhāṣāya, in the Kīrītideṇa, XVI, 7. But, differing from Mr. Fleet, I would, in the first passage referred to, take jītī to govern jocalti, and translate — 'victorious is (Vishnuvardhana), who in battle has conquered the earth,' although I know that it would be difficult to justify the formation and construction of jītī by the rules of Pāṇini's grammar. It would be equally difficult to account by that grammar for the gerund viśaya in the same line, about the reading of which there can be no doubt.

As regards the translation, I would, besides, take the words hāvī ḍhujaṁ ḍvādāvarā, in line 13, as an accusative plural, in the sense of 'like the (three) sacrificial fires'; and would compare Raghunānai, xv, 35, where the three brothers of Rāma are described as treṇḍīgyā-ṭeṣaṇāḥ.

Nāgarjuna Hill Cave Inscription of Anantasvarman.

No. 49, Plate XXXI. A, p. 233 ff.

In line 1 the actual reading of the stone, to judge by the photo-lithograph, is undoubtedly maḥākṣatām-awur-īrā, as given by Mr. Fleet; but I cannot help thinking that the poet after all is really referring to Manu, the maḥākṣatām-
dyāḥ (Raghunānai, i, 11), and that the reading therefore must necessarily be altered to maḥā-
kṣatām Manur-īrā. The writer or engraver has been guilty of similar slight blunders.
In line 3 we have on the stone para-hitaḥ śrī-paurusah, ‘benevolent to others (and) possessed of fortune and manliness.’ But śrī-paurusah being an impossible compound, we are obliged to read para-hita-śrī-paurusah, ‘whose fortune and manliness are beneficial to others.’ And in line 8 we must alter vimāthita-gajottāranta-vaij pravrāṭa to vimāthita-gajottāranta-vaij-pravrāṭa, because pravrāṭa cannot by itself be taken as an adjective, qualifying vānāḥ.

As regards the interpretation of this inscription, I would translate dhriṣṭa-dhriṣṭha-vibhūti vīmātāṃ, in line 4, by ‘an image, the great beauty of which is only dimly seen’ (on account of the image having been placed in a cave), and would compare compounds like dhriṣṭa-dhrikta, ‘done and not done’, i.e., ‘badly done,’ the formation of which is taught by Pāṇini, ii. 1, 60. (See my Mahābhāshya, Vol. I. p. 401, Vārttika 4). Besides, the meaning of line 6 appears to me rather to be this, that the does, when they see the king hunting, stand still and gaze at him, only to be killed by him (antāya); for the words dhriṣṭaḥ sthitiḥ nṛpiḥ āhāryāḥ clearly show that it is the does who are represented by the poet as standing still, — not Antanavarmā.

I may add here, that in line 2 —
Yasya-śāhita-Sahasanatā-viraha-kahāmā sadā
dharmavaraśāḥ
Paulomāś chiram-adraśu-pāta-maliniḥ dhattā
capāla-śāhitaḥ
the author clearly appears to have imitated Kālidāsa’s Raghuvansa, vi. 23 —
Kriyā-prabhānta-ayam-adhavarāmant
ajasram-āhita-Sahasanarathā
Śachyāś-chiram pāṇḍu-kapāla-lambān
mandāra-śāhitaḥ-akāmāḥ-chakāra

Bōdha-Gayā Inscription of Māhānāman.

Of this inscription I possess a good impression kindly presented to me by Dr. Hoerle, and I am thus quite certain that Mr. Fleet’s transcript of the text, as given in the Gupta volume, is correct. Nevertheless, a serious difficulty is presented by the following verse in lines 7.9—
Vātsalyaṃ saraṇ-āgatasya satataṃ dhīyata
vaisahāsikāṃ
vyāpat-sāyaka-santati-kahata-dhritēś-ārttāsya
ch-āsapaṭyakām
krūrasya-āhita-kāriṇaḥ pravitataṃ va(ba)ndhāṃ
yathā-bhārataḥ
evam sacc-charitād bhāvaṃ yaśāśaṃ yasya
āchitam bhātalant

‘Whose special characteristic of affection, of the kind that is felt towards offspring,—for any distressed man who came to him for protection, and for any afflicted person whose fortitude had been destroyed by the continuous flight of the arrows of adversity,—extended, in conformity with the disposition of a kinsman, (even) to any cruel man who might seek to do (him) harm; (and) by whose fame, arising from good actions, the whole world was thus completely filled.’

Here, with the actual reading which is on the stone, Mr. Fleet felt obliged to translate the words bandhūro-yathā-bhāvatah by ‘in conformity with the disposition of a kinsman,’ and to divide the verse into two separate sentences, the first sentence extending to the end of the third line, and the second consisting of the fourth line, the two sentences being joined by an ‘and,’ which had to be supplied. But yathā-bhāvataḥ is an impossible word; and the relative yasya towards the end of the verse, referring to Upāśanas in the preceding verse, shows that the verse with which we are dealing is a single relative sentence.

What we want at the end of the third line, is the genitive singular of a present participle, qualifying yasya and governing vātāsyaṃ and the other accusatives in the earlier part of the verse. And I have no doubt that bhāvataḥ is a mistake of the engraver for kurvataḥ, a mistake which in the alphabet employed by the writer is easily accounted for; and with the reading kurvataḥ, the construction and the meaning of the verse leave nothing to be desired. Upāśana showing continuous affection . . . . . . towards cruel people, as if they were his relatives, the fame arising from such noble conduct filled the whole earth (yasya, krārasya bandhūro-yathā vātāsyaṃ kurvataḥ, evam sacc-charitād bhāvaṃ yaśāśaṃ bhātalant-

Here I would add that, in the first half of the verse —
Vyaṣagata-viṣhaya-anēha hata-timira-daśāḥ pradīpavaḍa-saṅgāḥ
kuśalē-sānēha janō bōdhi-sukham-anuttaram
bhajātām

in lines 11 and 12, the author, in my opinion has imitated (with little success), or has had in his mind, Raghuvansa, xii. 1 —
Nirvighaṇa-viṣhaya-anēha sa daśaṃatām-upyāṃ
vānām
dādā-saṃsār-vīranaḥ pradīpa-arśhī-iva-dbhāsir
(‘Daśaṃtha), when he had enjoyed the pleasures of life and had come to the end of his days, was approaching unto eternal beatitude, being like the flame of a lamp at dawn which is about to go out when it has consumed the oil of the wick and has come to the end of the wick.’

Göttingen.

F. KIELHORN.
CALCULATIONS OF HINDU DATES.

No. 48.

In the Chellur grant of the Eastern Chalukya king Kulottunga-Chodadewa II., published by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIV. p. 55 ff., it is recorded that the Daudadihatha Kasta, otherwise called Kolani-Kastamanjaka, granted the Mahadogru agrahara, with the village of Ponuvagrama, in the Sâvettiili dèśa, to Brahmans, (1.49 ft.) Sakabhâsha pramâna 45.5. saâsa visâkha vinyach-chandrama-saâkhya pâyâle.

... s-Adrâ arshâ pârvama (paâkaâ vishvâru su-tithiâ) (that),—"when the measure of the Saka years has advanced beyond the number of the sun (six), the arrows (five), the sky (nought), and the moon (one),

... at the equinox, together with the Adra nakshatra, in the first fortnight, on an excellent tithi."

Here, bearing in mind that for the period of this grant the "first fortnight" is the bright fortnight, according to the anâlada scheme, we require a tithi of a bright fortnight, on which there occurred either the vernal or the autumnal equinox, and when the moon was in the Adra nakshatra. And, apparently, the day should be found in Saka-Saiva 1057 current. The results, however, are not satisfactory:—

Saka-Saiva 1056 current:—(A) the vernal equinox, as represented by the Mâsha-Saîkârânti, occurred on Friday, 24th March, A.D. 1133, at about 9 ghâfs, 25 palas (for Bombay); on this day there ended the tithi Chaitra krishna 2; and the nakshatra for the moon at sunrise was not Adra, No. 6, but either Swâti, No. 16, or Vîshkha, No. 16; or, if the nakshatra should be intended for the sun, it was Rêvati, No. 27; and (B) the autumnal equinox, as represented by the Tûlâ-Saîkârânti, occurred on Wednesday, 27th September, at about 5 ghâfs, 30 p.; on this day there ended the tithi Asvina krishna 12; and the nakshatra at sunrise was Pûrâtha-gandham, No. 11, for the moon, or Chitrâ, No. 14, for the sun.

Saka-Saiva 1057 current:—(A) the vernal equinox occurred on Saturday, 24th March, A.D. 1134, at about 25 ghâfs; on this day there ended the tithi Chaitra krishna 12; and the nakshatra at sunrise was either Shrâdrâs, No. 24, or Pûrâtha-Bhadrapadâ, No. 25, for the moon, and Rêvati, No. 27 for the sun; and (B) the autumnal equinox occurred on Thursday, 27th September, at about 21 ghâfs; on this day there ended the tithi Asvina sukla 8; but the nakshatra at sunrise was Uttarâ-Asvina, No. 21, for the moon, and Chitrâ, No. 14, for the sun.

Saka-Saiva 1058 current:—(A) the vernal equinox occurred on Sunday, 24th March, A.D. 1135, at about 40 ghâfs, 30 p.; on this day there ended the tithi Chaitra sukla 8; but the nakshatra at sunrise was Punarvasu, No. 7, for the moon, and again Rêvati, No. 27, for the sun; and (B) the autumnal equinox occurred on Friday, 27th September, at about 36 ghâfs, 35 p.; on this day there ended the tithi Asvina krishna 3; and the nakshatra at sunrise was Kritikâ, No. 3, for the moon, and again Chitrâ, No. 14, for the sun.

In these three years, the only approximation is in the case of the vernal equinox of the 24th March, A.D. 1135; but it entails the supposition of a mistake in the year, as given in the record; and also of a mistake in the computation of either the equinox or the nakshatra; for the Adra nakshatra ended, at the latest, about 23 ghâfs before the sunrise at the end of the day preceding that on which the equinox took place.

For Saka-Saiva 1057 current, the vernal equinox can be accepted, if we alter s-Adrâ arshâ into Bhadrâ arshâ, and if we also interpret pûrâtha-pakshâ as standing for apûrâ-pakshâ, "in the second (i.e. dark) fortnight," which is permissible by the rules of saûdhi, though the use, in that case, of so ambiguous an expression, would speak very badly for the skill of the composer. In these two respects, however, quite as much violence has to be done to the original text, as in the case of the vernal equinox of Saka-Saiva 1053 current.

Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit has brought to my notice that the only neighbouring year which furnishes a correct result for the equinox, the fortnight, and the nakshatra, is, Saka-Saiva 1055 current. In that year, the vernal equinox occurred on Wednesday, 23rd March, A.D. 1133, at about 53 ghâfs, 55 p., and, on account of the lateness of the hour, would be celebrated on the Thursday, on which day there ended the tithi Chaitra sukla 6; and the moon entered the Adra nakshatra at about 12 ghâfs, 40 p.

Accordingly, this date, Thursday, 24th March, A.D. 1132, seems very likely to be the real intended date. It entails a mistake in the original, in respect of the given year.

J. F. FLEET.
NOTES AND QUERIES.

FOLK MEDICINE IN MADRAS.

The gum of the *Acacia arabica* is a delicacy in Gujarát and a medicine in Mâisdr, used especially with *ghî†* by women during pregnancy. It is supposed to be a strong tonic.

The favourite remedies among South Indian old-wives for a bad cough in children, are the *punâga-seed* (*punâga glabra*; Skr. *śrâgâ†; Hind. *karaśī†*), and a copper medal or token engraved with the image of a dog on both sides.

When a bad cough sets in, a coin is taken to a copper-smith, who alters the superscription to an image of a dog on both sides. Or a dried seed of the *punâga glabra* is procured. In either case a hole is bored, and the "charm" is hung round the loins or neck of the suffering child.

The modern theory is that a cough is a nervous affection, and that copper and *punâga-seeds* act on the nerves and so cure the ailment! I can vouch for the action being very slow!

To persons who have lost their nervous power by excess of debauchery, a preparation made out of the seeds of the *nâgâvî†* (Skr. *spâmârga†*) is supposed to give an instant cure. The seeds (*ashyramâthâ aspera†*) are gathered, dried in the sun, husked, and turned into a kind of rice. This rice is fried in a little *ghî†* and is powdered. A handful of the powder with a little sugar is to be taken in the morning on an empty stomach. Cure follows in a week.

A certain oil is extracted from the seeds of the plants called *kundumå†* (*abrus precatorius†*), and *arharï†* (*amaranâthâ tristî†*). Either kind of oil is supposed to be the best of restorers for falling hair. When rubbed into the hair in a healthy state, they are supposed to promote its rapid growth.

In addition to these two oils, the hot blood of hares when rubbed into the hair of the head is supposed to promote its growth. The pride of the *Marâjah* kings of Tanjore was that they daily killed a hare and smeared its hot blood over their heads, and thus made their locks grow long.

The *kâdâjâr†* or *tragia cannabina†* is a very irritating plant, and is supposed to have the same effect on debilitated nerves as the *nâgâvî†*. The root of the plant (generally half an anna in weight) is fried in *ghî†* and the preparation is eaten with the ordinary food. If it is taken for a week, the lost power is revived.

S. M. Natesa Sastri.

---

A SONG ABOUT LORD LAKES.

The following is an old song quoted in that curious book *The wanderings of a Pilgrim in search of the Beautiful*, by Mrs. Fanny Parkes: perhaps some one can give some more of it, or some information about the author, &c.

Mëri jân, kahiñ dëkhâ Kumpàññ nisnân?
Bënë Lëk mär lëo Hindustân.
Mëri jân, kahiñ dëkhâ Kumpàññ nisnân?
Lâl lâl kûrtî, gavvë gavvë javàân,
Hàth mën patthar kailë, píth par tándan;
Mëri jân, kahiñ dëkhâ Kumpàññ nisnân?
Àgi àgi pâltan, phichhë phichhë sawâr:
Tëp ki dankâr së bhagë Hindût Musalmàn!
Mëri jân, kahiñ dëkhâ Kumpàññ nisnân?
Das das kumpàññ jis mën gôrê gôrê Kaptân!
"Gudâmë phaut" bòltë, nîkâl jàvë ansân.
Mëri jân; kahiñ dëkhâ Kumpàññ nisnân?

I suppose it means — "My love, have you seen anywhere the Company’s flag? The gallant Lake has conquered Hindustân. My love, have you seen anywhere the Company’s flag? With red red coats, sturdy sturdy young men, firelock in hand, and cartridge pouch on back! My love, have you seen anywhere the Company’s flag? Foot regiments in front; cavalry in the rear: At the cannon’s roar bolted Hindût and Musalmân! My love, have you seen anywhere the Company’s flag? Companies ten by ten, and a white Captian over each! As they shout "Fire! God damn you!" we are stuipided. My love, have you seen anywhere the Company’s flag?"
BOOK-NOTICE.


**SECOND NOTICE.**

In our former notice of these interesting volumes we followed Mr. Frazer in his argument so far as the killing of the Corn-spirit, and were introduced to the conception of the Corn-spirit as an animal. Now it can be shown that in the popular mind he can take the form of the wolf, dog, hare, cock, goose, cat, goat, cow, ox, bull, pig and horse.

All through France, Germany, and the Slavonic countries, the Corn-spirit is the Rye-wolf, Corn-wolf, Rye-dog, and is a common bugbear to frighten children with, whose fertilising power is in his tail. In Germany the binder of the last sheaf is the Wheat-dog, Pea-pug, Rye-wolf, Potato-wolf, Wheat-wolf, Oats-wolf, and so on, or simply the Wolf. In France the last sheaf is the Bitch, and there are harvesting customs connected with killing the Dog or the Wheat-dog, Rye-dog, Potato-dog, Harvest-dog, as the case may be. At the threshing floor, too, in France the Dog or the Corn-pug, Rye-wolf, Wheat-pug, is stuck down, to which there is an analogous German custom of killing the Corn-wolf in threshing the last sheaf. In France when a harvester is sick “the White Bitch has bitten him” or “the White Dog has passed him,” and lastly, to complete the proof of the animal form of the Corn-spirit, in the Vosges the Harvest-May is called the Harvest-dog.

Again, in Germany, Hungary, Poland and Picardy a cock is sacrificed in one way or another with the last corn cut, and its feathers mixed with the next year’s seed. Cutting the Hare is in Ayrshire cutting the last corn, and also in parts of Germany, Sweden, Holland, France and Italy. In Norway the Hare’s blood in the form of brandy is given to his comrades by the reaper who has “killed the Hare.” In Germany and France the Cat takes the place of the Corn-dog and the Corn-wolf above described. So also in Germany the Corn-goat, Rye-goat, Oats-Goat, Bean-goat or Harvest-goat plays the part of the Corn-wolf. So in Skye the Cripple-goat was the last sheaf cut on the last farm that finished reaping, every previous last sheaf having been carefully transferred to a neighbour who had not yet finished. At Grenoble a goat is actually sacrificed at the harvest, and part of its flesh kept till the next harvest, and a similar custom prevails among the Prussian Flavs. In several parts of France a bull or a calf is killed in the same way, leading to the custom of the King of the Calf at Pont-à-Mousson; and the naming of the last sheaf in various parts of France and Germany as the Cow, the Bull, the Corn-steer, the Tresher Cow and so on, points to the spread of the same ideas. Crying the Mare in Hertfordshire, the naming of the first sheaf as the Cross of the Horse at Lille, and the expression “seeing the horse” for the noonday sleep of harvesters at Berry, prove the transfer of the Corn-spirit to the horse. Similar customs prevail in Germany with reference to the Rye-bear, Rye-sow, Corn-sow, and to the Sow-driver, and Carrying the Pig in Bavaria, and burying a pig’s tail or bone in Germany and Russia in the field or with the seed. And, lastly, the well-known Scandinavian custom of the Yule-boar and mixing the straw of it with the next year’s seed to procure a good harvest, is an interesting addition to the evidence on this head. So also is the Swedish custom of throwing Yule-straws to the ceiling and prognosticating the next year’s sheaves from the number that stick there. Other manifestations of the Corn-spirit are to be found in modern Europe in the stag, roe, sheep, bear, ass, fox, mouse, stock, swan and kite.

Now, Dionysus the tree-god appears as a goat and as a bull. As a goat he is hardly to be distinguished from Pan, Silenus, the Satyrs, the Fauns and the host of sylvan goat divinities, ancient forms of the modern Russian Ljeschie, which are Wood and Corn-spirits in human form, but with the horns, ears and legs of goats. As a bull, the Athenian ceremony in his honour of the bouphonias, or murder of the ox, and the stuffing of the murdered ox and yoking him to a plough, shews his close connection with agricultural divinities. Further, the ceremonies of the bouphonias are partly paralleled by those of the Great Mondard at the apple harvest at Beauce in France. In Guinea and in China also are customs directly connecting the ox with the Corn-spirit.

The pig was sacred to Demeter, and at the great autumnal festival of the Thesmophoria in her honour pigs were thrown into the “chasms of Demeter and Proserpine,” and their decayed flesh afterwards recovered and sown with the seed corn. The connection of Demeter with the pig as the Corn-spirit here comes out, and her connection with the horse as the Corn-spirit is visible in the representation of the Black Demeter in the cave of Phigalia in Arcadia as a long-robed woman with the head and mane of a horse.

Attis, Adonis and Osiris were all closely connected with the pig or the boar, and in this connection Mr. Frazer cleverly brings out the

1 See page 45 ff., above.
confusion between uncleanness and sacredness in animals, and shows that the abhorrence of the Syrians, the Jews, the Egyptians, and one may say of Orientals generally, to the pig, is due as much to the animal having once been a god as to anything else. Abhorrence of eating, touching or injuring of totems, that is, sacred animals or plants, is common to most savages, in the belief that the eating thereof will produce disease and death through the displeasure of the gods they represent. This will account for the muses a Muhammadan will feel if he accidentally eats pig's flesh, and it would be of interest to see how far it may account for the aversion to horse and dog's flesh in most parts of Europe. To Mr. Frazer's collection of evidence on this head we may add that in Upper Burma towns pigs are sacred, and until the advent of the British it was a serious offence to interfere with a pig in Mandalay. This was accounted for, partly by saying they were public scavengers, and partly by the Buddhist custom of ဗုဒ်ဝင်း, or the granting of life; King Mindon Min having been supposed to have turned the forefathers of these pigs loose in the town, "to live forever," after which ceremony if would be sacrilege to destroy them.

Osiris was identified with the bull Apis or Memphis and the bull Mnevis of Heliopolis, and Isis with the cow, which latter was never killed. As granting this ancient and local identification to be genuine, which however is doubtful, the annual sacrifice of sacred cattle and the determination of the life of the Apis after a certain term of years, brings us back to Osiris the Corn-spirit.

The annual sacrifice of an animal sacred to a god or considered as his enemy, and its preservation or seclusion from that god for the rest of the year, as in the case of Osiris and many other divinities of the ancient world and the modern savages, can be shown to lead inerringly to the inference that the animal and the god were originally identical, and this leads to a conjecture that the connection or rather the special disconnection of Virbius with horses at the Arician Grove points to the original identification of Virbius as a Corn-spirit in the form of a horse. In support of this there is the very ancient custom of the October Horse at Rome, in which in pre-Republican days a horse was sacrificed to the corn in precisely the same fashion as is the modern mock horse, bull, boar, and what not, all over Europe.

The harvest-suppers of the European peasant afford unmistakable evidence of the custom of the sacramental eating of the god of the corn. In this way in Sweden the grain of the last sheaf is baked into a loaf in the form of a little girl, and divided amongst the whole household. Here this loaf is the Corn-spirit in the form of a maiden, just as it is represented in Scotland as the Maiden or last sheaf itself. Two hundred years ago the Lithuanian peasants held a festival called Sataris every December, at which every kind of grain was eaten sacramentally with prayers, and a cock and hen sacrificed to procure a good harvest in the ensuing year. In modern Europe similar customs have dwindled into such habits as the tasting of all new potatoes in Sutherlandshire, and using the grain of the first corn cut for the communion bread in parts of Yorkshire. In the wilder East we have "eating the soul of the rice" at harvest and so on, and among the more civilized Hindus of South India the Pongal festival, at which the way the new rice boils is taken as a portent of the harvest of the coming year. The Buddhist festival of the first fruits, the chief annual ceremony of the Creek and Cherokee Indians, at which the new corn and the new fruits were eaten sacramentally, proves the prevalence of similar ideas in North America. The sacrament of bread as the body of a god is an ancient American and European rite, chiefly in the form of making a bread or meal image of the god and "killing" him before eating him: witness the festival of Hintzioochtitl in Mexico and the maenier of Rome.

The notion at the bottom of these sacraments is the common savage one that by eating the flesh of an animal or man, the physical, moral, and intellectual qualities of that animal or man are acquired. For this reason the North and South American Indian chiefs would not eat the flesh of heavy or slow moving animals, Arabs anoint themselves with lion's fat, Zulus take the bones of very old animals, the Miris of Assam will not allow women to eat tiger's flesh, the Dyaks of Borneo will not eat venison, and so on ad infinitum. So the Chinese eat the gall-bladders of tigers and bears, because the gall-bladder is the seat of courage; and the people of Darfur in Central Africa eat the liver of animals, because the liver is the seat of the soul and they wish to enlarge it. From the lower animals to man is a small transition, and so we find savages everywhere killing a brave prisoner of war in order to eat him and gain his qualities. So Maori warriors strived to slay a chief and eat his eyes because divinity lies in the eyes. Thus by drinking the blood of the vine-god and eating the flesh of the corn-god, or in other words wine and bread, the worshipper partakes of the real body and blood of his god. In this view the Bacchanalian festival becomes a sacrament.
Just as the worshippers of agricultural deities kill their god, the worshippers of animals kill theirs on the ground that the god is incarnate in the whole species and is multiplied by killing one of the individuals in which he is incarnate. In this belief the Achsehene tribe of California annually kill the great buzzard, their chief god, and the Egyptian worshippers of the god-ram Anamun slew a ram annually. The Zuni Indians of New Mexico believe that the dead are transformed into turtles and annually kill them in order to send the departed souls back into spirit-land. The Ainu of Japan regularly sacrifice a bear, an animal which they regard with special reverence, as do the Goldi and Gilyak tribes of Siberia.

Now all these bear-worshipping tribes freely hunt the bear, but in their sacrifices and in their slaying they propitiate the animal dead or alive, and the reason for this is that he might otherwise bring about the vengeance of his class upon them.

It is this that makes savages, all the world over, reluctant to slay wild beasts who can revenge themselves, such as crocodiles, rattle-snakes and tigers; and makes the Sumatrans go into the jungle and explain to the tigers that the Europeans, and not they, are setting traps for them. Similarly Kamchatkans explain to dead seals, and Ostiaks to slain bears, that it was the Russians that slew them! Again, animals, which are not dangerous in themselves, are propitiated after slaughter in case their guardian spirits might injure the slaughterer. This is why Siberian sable hunters are particular as to the treatment of the bones of sables, the Alaskans and Canadian Indians as to the bones of beavers, and the North American Indians of those of claws, deer, and elk. If they did not, the take would be bad for the season, or some other misfortune would be inflicted by the incensed spirits. For exactly the same reason the Peruvian Indians adored the fish they chiefly caught, the Otawa Indians of Canada never burned fish bones because their souls passed into them, and the Hurons preached to the fish to induce them to come and be caught. Hence to the good treatment of the first fish caught in order that he may induce others to come into the net, is a small transition; leading to putting him back into the water among the Maoris, and to special ceremonies over him elsewhere.

The reason why so many savage hunters are particular about preserving bones is that they believe that they will be re-clothed with flesh, and so, if they destroyed them, the animal could not be resurrected and the supply of game would stop. This belief in resurrection is direct among the Indians of North America, the Lapps, and the Kamchatkans, either in another world or in this one, and is probably at the bottom of the world-wide objection to breaking the bones of slain or sacrificed animals. It will also explain the curious custom of detaching parts of a slain animal from the carcass, as the sinew of the thigh in North America, and the tongue in other places, as being necessary to its reproduction after death.

Vermin are treated much in the same way as the dangerous and the valuable animals. They are propitiated in various ways, and coaxed to keep out of the crops, but for the present purpose the most interesting custom with regard to them is treating favoured individuals with great distinction, while pursuing thereat with relentless severity. This is prevalent in Germany, Syria, and Russia. The special individuals are in fact turned into gods much in the same way as the larger animals, and in Syria the favoured caterpillar is given a human "mother" and then buried. Here, again, we have the killing of the god.

We have thus two kinds of sacramental killing and eating of the gods; one in which an animal is habitually spared and never eaten except sacramentally; and the other in which an animal is the habitual food of a tribe, but an individual is eaten sacramentally by way of warding off the revenge from its congener.

The custom of sacramental eating of the god leads to a very interesting set of customs as to communion with the divinity. This is shown strongly at the pastoral sacrament of the lamb among the Madí or Moun tribe of Central Africa. Here the lamb is sacrificed, and its blood is first sprinkled over the people and then smeared on them individually. Similarly the Gilyaks of Siberia promenade their sacramental bear before killing him, and the Mirjas of the Pafjâb, who are snake-worshippers, send a down snake about their houses and then bury it. In Europe until recent times a custom based on a similar idea was very prevalent. The wren has always been a sacred bird, and one which is extremely unlucky to kill, and yet the annual Hunting of the Wren, in which it was killed, carried about and then buried; has been a common custom in the Isle of Man, Ireland, in various parts of England, and in France. In Sweden a magpie is substituted, and in ancient Greece probably a swallow or a crow.

Connected with the killing of the god, is the idea that the dying god carries away with
him the accumulated sins and misfortunes of the people. It is as natural to a savage to transfer his mental burdens to another person, animal, or thing, as it is to put a physical load on his own shoulders on to another’s. Instances of this idea are innumerable all over the world, but perhaps the Malagasy fudita is the most striking, for it is anything that the diviners fix upon for the purpose of carrying off a hurtful disease or evil. The Sin-eating of Wales and parts of England was a deliberate taking of the responsibility of the sins of a deceased person by a living one upon himself. In the Himalayas poverty-stricken Brâhmans will take upon themselves the sins of deceased Ṭâjâs, and in Southern India too, notwithstanding the loss of caste occasioned thereby.

From the necessity of transferring evils from individuals to that of transferring them from the community at large, the savage soon passes. Evil may be expelled directly or indirectly through a scapegoat. The former method accounts for the noisy driving away of devils common to all parts of the world, and familiar to us in India at eclipses and in Burma in times of cholera, when the people make as much noise as possible and thrash the roofs of their houses. Among the Hurons the men rushed about from wigwam to wigwam, breaking everything and making a noise. They then retired to sleep and dreamt of something, and next morning went about asking for a present in the form of a riddle, rejecting everything except what they had dreamt of. To receive this was to escape the epidemic. This is an extremely interesting point in India, as it may explain a curious and obscure point in folktales, where the hero can usually win the heroine only by successfully answering conventional riddles, and where such successful answers often avert evil. Riddles were originally probably a form of divination, and in the Celebes no riddle may be asked except when there is a corpse in the village.

From the occasional expulsion of evils, we come to their periodic expulsion. In Australia, among the Esquimaux, in North America, in Peru and among the African Negroes, this is done with many varying ceremonies in the direct manner. In Abyssinia it assumes a Christian form in the ceremony of Mascal or the Cross. In India among the Hos and Mundaris and the Khonds, and among the Hindu Kush tribes, the annual ceremony takes place at seed-time or harvest. In Bali near Java, in Fiji, in Tongking and in Cambodia it is a great national festival. Driving out Satan among the Finns of Russia is another form of the same custom. Similarly all over Southern Europe, in Albania, Italy, the Tyrol and Switzerland, witches are driven away with much noise in March, April or May. Driving out the Butterfly in Westphalia is a pretty custom based on the same ideas.

The Scriptural scapegoat is the most familiar form of expelling devils by proxy, but the practice assumes many other shapes. Among the Californian and North American Indians and in Cambodia, the devils are represented by men, and are regularly driven away after a ceremonial fight, a custom which has a rural survival in Spain. These fights with the devils among the Khasias of Assam, the Burmese, the Sinhalese and the people of the Celebes, assume the form of "a tug of war" over a rope. In Burma this custom is common as a rain-charm, a fact worth mentioning in this connection.

The custom of assuming the devils to occupy a vehicle constructed for their departure, has led to the use of Disease Boats in the Indian Archipelago and in the Pacific Islands. A boat is provisioned for a voyage and the demon is either unrepresented at all or by an effigy. In India scapegoats are common enough with the idea of driving disease away altogether, or of transferring an ailment to the neighbour. Fowls, goats, pigs, buffaloes, and even men are employed for the purpose. From the scapegoat which takes away a specific evil, to that which is employed periodically for the purpose of removing sins and possible evils, — from cure to protection in fact, — is but a short step, and we accordingly find periodic scapegoats all over the world of a nature, similar to the above.

The use of human beings as scapegoats has led to much horrible cruelty in various parts of the earth, and in Tibet it would seem that the correctness of the choice of the victim is finally settled by a throw of dice. Survivals of the custom are to be traced in Europe, especially in the Driving out of Pesterli in Switzerland.

Divine animals have been used as scapegoats both in India and in Egypt, where the Brâhmans of Malabar use a cow and the ancient Egyptians a sacred bull for the purpose. Divine men have also been scape-goats in the same way among the Gonds of Central India and the ancient Albanians of Europe.

The periodic expulsion of scapegoats, and with them the accumulation of the sins of the past year, seems to have given rise to those periods of licence so noticeable in India and among savages elsewhere, and of which many traces are to be found in the civilized world, notably in Boxing Day in England.
In classical antiquity the scapegoat was largely used both in Rome and Greece, and took the form chiefly of the periodical sacrifice of beings who were in some way or other divine, and this was accompanied frequently with the beating of the scapegoat. This last custom did not arise from a desire to cause pain, but to drive away evil influences, and accounts for many survivals of the customs of “beating out sickness and beating in health” observable all over modern Europe.

We are now once more brought back to the main argument of Mr. Frazer, that, even if it be shown that the killing of the priest of Nemi as the representative of the spirit of the grove stood alone as a custom in the classical world, it can be abundantly shown in answer that the divine man was there sacrificed periodically for other reasons. That customs on a large scale closely allied to the “Role of the Arian priesthood” existed in Mexico among a people of considerable culture, we have abundant evidence in the writings of Spaniards at the time of its conquest.

Having thus disposed of the questions of — why had the priest of Nemi to slay his predecessor? and, why, before doing so, had he to pluck the Golden Bough?; we pass on to the questions of — what was the Golden Bough? and, why had each candidate for the Arian priesthood to pluck it before he could slay the priest?

In this connection there are two rules of life among the divine kings or priests, which are to be noticed, viz. they might not touch the ground nor allow the sun to shine on them. Both were true of the Mikado of Japan and of the supreme pontiffs of the Zapotecs of Mexico; the former of the King and Queen of Tahiti, the King of Dosauma, and the very ancient Kings of Persia; and the latter of the Kings of Colombia in South America and of the Incas of Peru. Both rules are also observed by girls at puberty in many parts of the world, leading to cruel seclusions lasting one, four, and even seven years, and often accompanied by ceremonial beatings, — which amongst savages must be severe, — to drive away the dangerous contagion with which the girl is supposed to be infected. It exists almost universally among Hindus, though shortened to such reasonable periods as four days and the like. Traces of the idea are common in European folktales, especially in that class where the maiden becomes impregnated by the sun or a sun-beam. The Story of Danaë probably belongs to this cycle, with a Kirgis (Siberian) counterpart, and the idea of impregnation by the sun is to be seen in marriage customs in more than one part of the world.

The origin of all these customs is the intense dread excited in the savage by menstrual blood, exhibited by his practices in all parts of the world, — Australia, North and South America, Africa, and North Europe; and amongst the ancient civilized nations of Europe this dread was quite as extravagant. Among modern European peasants, similar ideas are still strongly entertained. The object then of those who entertain these notions is to isolate or, so to speak, insulate girls at puberty, so that they may do no harm to themselves or to those about them; they may not touch the earth or see the sun. They are, in fact, kept between heaven and earth, and out of contact with either, so that the power for mischief with which they are charged by nature may be kept within bounds.

Now this uncleanness, as it is called, of the girls at this period does not to the savage mind differ from the sanctity of holy men. They are merely different manifestations of the same supernatural energy and the precautions to be adopted in both cases must be the same. Both must be kept between heaven and earth. This is generally necessary in the case of all sacred or tabooed things and beings. The sun must not shine on the head of an Aino while mourning, the Costa Rica Indian must not go out nor see the sun while fasting, the Swedish peasant before the Yuletide pilgrimage must dwell awhile in a dark cellar. North Indian warriors on the war-path must not sit on the ground, and their holy ark must never be rested on the earth; in Loango newly-born infants must never be placed on the ground, in Aberdeenshire the last bit of standing corn must lie in the “guedman’s” lap after being cut, in Scotland also water from sacred wells to cure the sick must be carried to them without touching the ground, and lastly in the Pañjáb things and persons in a “sacred” condition can never be placed on or touch the earth.

Now the myth of Balder, the Norse god that was neither of heaven nor of earth, and whom all things had sworn not to injure, except the mistletoe, is a reflection of the ritual of the time which gave rise to it. The points of this myth are that Loki, the mischief-maker, finding that the mistletoe had accidentally not been sworn not to injure Balder, pulled it and by its means procured his death, and that after death the god was ceremonially burned.

From time immemorial fire festivals have been current in Europe, at which peasants kindle bon-
fires and dance round them, or leap over them, or burn effigies or pretend to burn living persons in them. A review of these customs will bring out traces of human sacrifices, and the pulling of the mistletoe has often been connected with the ceremonies observed at the fire festivals.

In different parts of German Europe, on the first Sunday in May the ceremonies of burning the hut, the castle, the witch, the old wife, or winter's grandmother, and driving away the wicked sorrows, consist in one form or another of burning an effigy or a disc or wheel, with a view to procuring an abundant harvest or keeping vermin from the fields. These Quadragesima Sunday customs are hardly to be distinguished from those of Carrying out Death observed about the same time, in which Death, varied in the Tyrol as the Old Woman, is frequently burnt, and sometimes a particular personage must leap over the burning embers.

The New Fire customs and that of the Easter Candle on Easter Eve kept up in Catholic countries, are observed with a view to the fertilization of the fields and gardens and keeping off blight and hail. The ashes of the consecrated Easter Bonfires made from the "new fire" are mixed with the soil at sowing, and sometimes a wooden effigy of Judas is burnt in the bonfires. All over Germany unconsecrated Easter Fires are lighted in which the Easter Man or the Judas is burnt with the object of averting hail. Particular hills are sometimes used for the purpose year after year, and called the Easter or Pascal Mountains. Dancing round and leaping through these fires is a conspicuous part of the ceremony, while in some places squirrels and even bones represented the Judas: The Beltane Fires of Scotland kindled on the 1st May, and which, in the person of the Beltane Carlin, "devoted to be sacrificed to Bail" in the fire, show clear signs of former human sacrifices, were burnt in order to preserve the flocks and herds: while a similar festival in Sweden is held with a view to predicting the character of the coming Spring.

Midsummer Fires, accompanied with dancing and leaping, and with much the same ceremonies as those of Lent and Easter, have been, and are to some extent still, current all over Europe from West to East. Their object has always been to prosper the herds or the crops, or to keep off evil influences. The slaying and burning of effigies at the Midsummer Fires has existed in Württemberg in the custom of "the Beheading of the Angel-Man," in the Tyrol in that of burning the Lotter now corrupted into the Luther, in Austria in the burning of the Tattermann, and in Russia in the mock burning of Kapalo. In French Flanders they used to burn the figure of a woman at this festival.

The proper explanation of the Fire Festivals is that most likely they are Sun-charms for men, animals and plants, and probably originated in sympathetic magic to induce sunshine. The fact that the fire required for these festivals has frequently been kindled in the same way as need-fire, viz., by the friction of wood or by the revolution of a wheel, is strong evidence of this; as it is pretty nearly certain that, at the kindling of the need-fire, i.e., a magically curative fire kindled in time of distress, the wheel represented the sun. At the Pongal Festival in South India at the harvest, which is a fire-festival, fires are everywhere lighted to wake up Surya the Sun, or Agni the Fire. In Yucatan a fire-festival is held on New Year's Day to rid the people of their troubles, and the Hottentots drive their sheep periodically through ceremonial fires to preserve them. These last two cases show the universality of the customs and of the ideas conveyed by them.

That the effigies burnt in these fires are representatives of the spirit of vegetation or the tree-spirit, there can be little doubt; and that human beings representing the tree-spirit were formerly sacrificed among the Celtic nations, we have strong reason to believe from the narrative of Julius Cæsar. He shows us that in his time or before it colossal images of wickerwork or wood or grass were filled with living men and animals and burnt, and the customs at the Beltane Fires and so on seem to point emphatically to the conclusion that these wicker-images represented the tree-spirit. "Giants" at the spring and summer festivals have been familiar in England, France, Belgium and Flanders, and in parts of France the giant was regularly burnt and his ashes scattered among the people. At Luchon in the Pyrenees a hollow column is still lighted and live snakes thrown into it and burnt on Midsummer Eve, and live animals have been thrown into the Lent, Easter and Midsummer fires in France, Germany and Russia. There is little doubt that these animals have played the same part as the human victims.

The sum of the evidence as to these Fire Festivals is, that they were originally held at Midsummer, and consisted of human burnt sacrifices, representing the tree-spirit or spirit of vegetation, with a view to making the sun to shine and the crops to grow.

They had another chief feature—the gathering of the mistletoe. Pliny tells us that the
Druids gathered it in June for their religious purposes, and the fact that it is still gathered on Midsummer Eve in common with a large number of other magical and healing plants all over Europe, points to the antiquity of the connection of the mistletoe with the midsummer fires.

We are thus brought back to the Balder myth, whose two chief features — the pulling of the mistletoe and the burning of the god — belonged to the great midsummer festival of the Celts. In Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, the home of Balder, the connection of Balder with the midsummer fires is seen in the name for the — Balder's Bale-fires; and assuming that the myth describes a common and important ritual, we must arrive at the conclusion that “Balder must have been the Norse representative of the being who was burnt in effigy or in the person of a living man at the fire festivals in question.”

The oak is the tree most likely represented by the victim at these festival fires. It was the principal object of worship among Celts and Slavs, and the most sacred tree of the Greeks and Latins, and generally of the nations of the Aryan stock. It was used by the Germans in kindling the need-fire, in common with the Slavs and Celts, and for feeding the old sacred fires kept burning at their sanctuaries.

If then we concede that the tree represented by the human victim at the great festival was the oak, we see from the Balder myth why the pulling of the mistletoe was mixed up with the ceremonies. The mistletoe was the only thing that could kill Balder because the mistletoe was the external soul of the oak, a notion probably arising from the observation that while the oak is deciduous the mistletoe growing on it remains ever-green. So that according to savage ideas before the god could be killed, i.e., the oak could be burnt, it was necessary to pluck away his soul, which was the mistletoe.

This leads to an extremely interesting enquiry — What is the external soul? Now, primitive man always conceives the soul as a concrete object upon which life depends. The soul need not necessarily reside in the body, and it may, in fact, be safer elsewhere hidden in a place of safety, for as long as the soul is uninjured the life of the body remains intact. Many folk-tales gathered from all parts of the world prove this, and turn on this point. The villain usually, but also frequently the hero or the heroine of a tale, has a soul or life-index which is kept somewhere under tremendous safe-guards, and until that soul is got at the owner is invulnerable. In the Norse story the giant has no heart. In India, where the notion is very common, this life-index has been kept in a bird, an insect, a plant, a necklace, in mother's milk, in a sword, in a bull, in a lamp, and so on. It is always exceedingly difficult of access: e.g., when it is in a green parrot, that bird is in a cage under six pitchers of water in the centre of a circle of palm-trees in a thick forest in a far country guarded by 1,000 ogres. The same idea is traceable in Siam, Cambodia, Kašmir, Gilgit, and ancient Greece. Hair is a common place of residence of the soul; e.g., the story of Nišas, king of Negara, of Poseidon and Perseus, and of the Biblical Samson. Among the Russians, Saxons, Scandinavians, Celts, the same idea and the same tales are common. In Ancient Egypt, in a story recorded in 1300 B.C., in the story of Salfu'malk, in stories amongst the Kabyls, the Magyars, the Tātārs, the Mughals, and the Malays, and in a tale from Niš near Sumatra, we have samples of identical notions among peoples who are not of Aryan origin.

Folk-customs from various parts of the world prove that these folk-tales are mere reflections of a real article of primitive belief. Thus in the Celebes the priests collect the souls of the whole family in a bag, to keep them out of harm's way when entering a new house. There, too, the soul of a lying-in woman is given to the doctor to keep in a piece of iron until all danger is past. In Ambonia cutting off the hair is more terrible than torture, because it destroys the strength. Trees containing the lives of newly born children are planted or exist in Western Africa, in the Cameroons, and the Celebes, among the Papuans, the Maoris, and the Dyaks. Families in Russia, Germany, England and France plant trees on the birth of children. Something of the same custom obtains among the Royal family at Osborne. The custom of passing children through trees seems to be connected with the same idea. The Karen believe that the life of a new-born infant is bound up in the knife that severs the naval string. The soul is transferred to an animal among Malays, the Banks Islanders, the Zulius, the Zapotecs, and the Central American Indians generally, where some animal is the second self of every human being.

The close connection between such an animal and the human being whose life is bound up in it, has led to its sanctity, as among the Australsians. There owls represent women, and bats, men, and are looked upon as brothers and sisters to the human race: e.g., all owls are sisters to the women, and all women are owls; so all men are bats and all bats men's brothers. This is
sex totemism, and leads to an interesting set of phenomena.

Tribal totems can be explained in the above manner. “When a savage names himself after an animal, calls it his brother, and refuses to kill it, the animal is said to be his totem.” The reason for the belief is that he believes that the life of each individual of the tribe is bound up with some one animal or plant of the species. This is the case even when the current belief is that there is more than one soul to each individual, as amongst the Caribs, Hidatsa Indians, the Laos, and so on. The Battas of Sumatra who believe in seven souls per man, one of which is always outside him, thinks that he dies the moment the outside soul dies.

This view of totemism is confirmed by the initiatory rites of boys at puberty amongst many savages, which consist chiefly in transferring his soul to his totem, and thus causing his temporary death (i.e. trance) and bringing him to life again. Such rites are observed among the Australians, the Fijians, the Africans of the Congo and elsewhere, the North American Indians, the inhabitants of Polynesia, and the Malays. The idea perhaps survives in the expression “twice-born” among the higher castes of India, and in some of the ceremonies of tying on the sacred thread, and so on.

The argument, then, is that Balder’s life was in the mistletoe, and that when the mistletoe struck him he died. Balder was the oak-spirit, and the life of the oak was in the mistletoe which was between heaven and earth, and to kill the oak-spirit it was necessary to get at the mistletoe. That the Golden Bough was the mistletoe may be inferred from Virgil, who describes it as growing on an oak and compares it with the mistletoe. The priest of the Arician Grove — the King of the Wood — was the personification of the tree on which grew the Golden Bough, i.e. the oak-spirit; so it was necessary to pluck the Golden Bough in order to kill him. And it was necessary to kill him, to carry out the annual fire festival held at midsummer at the Arician Grove, no doubt, for the benefit of the crops and herds.

Why was the mistletoe called the Golden Bough? This is the last question to be answered. It is so in Welab, and we have an analogy in the golden fern-bloom or fern-seed of folklore. This is supposed to bloom like gold on Midsummer Eve or at Christmas, and in a German story it was got by shooting at the sun on Midsummer Day at noon. Three drops of blood fell down and were the fern-seed. Thus, the golden fern-seed is clearly the golden blood of the sun. The power of the fern-seed was to procure gold for its possessor.

Now, mistletoe is gathered at the solstices in the same way as the fern-seed, and in Sweden it is used as a divining rod for discovering gold, no doubt in its character of the Golden Bough. Like the fern-seed, is the Golden Bough an emanation of the sun’s fire? The midsummer bonfires were sun-charms to give the sun new fire annually. These fires were supplied by the oak the home-fire, whose life was in the mistletoe, which therefore contained the seed of the sun’s fire. So the sun’s fire was an emanation of the Golden Bough. So also Virilius, as the spirit of the oak on which grew the Golden Bough, would be the Sun — as he was — and Balder would be “so fair of face and so shining that a light went forth from him.”

The result of the whole argument is, that the Rule of the Arician priesthood at Nemi represented the original worship of the Aryan, and that the Rex Nemorensis lived and died as an incarnation of the supreme Aryan god, whose life was in the mistletoe or Golden Bough.

We have thus followed Mr. Frazer through some 800 pages of most interesting discussion, backed in his case by innumerable facts gathered with immense pains from an extraordinarily large number of sources, and the only fault we have to find with his book is the way in which it is printed. There is nothing from end to end in the typography to enable us to distinguish his argument from a discussion on the value of data, or his main argument from a side issue. The book, therefore, though pleasant and entertaining throughout, is exceedingly difficult to follow; so difficult, indeed, that, if we have not been able to do so clearly, we claim that it is not our fault. No doubt, in its present shape, the book is more saleable than perhaps in any other; but to the scientific student, for whom it appears to be primarily meant, the free use of numbered paragraphs, thick type, upper and lower case, italics, and other devices for differentiating the components of an intricate argument, would have been invaluable. So would a table in the form of a paragraphed and suitably indexed list of contents, or in the form of a tree, have been an important aid in following the argument, — had either been given.

With this one criticism we take leave of Mr. Frazer with feelings of gratitude for an unusually important and interesting work.
SANSKRIT PLAYS, PARTLY PRESERVED AS INSCRIPTIONS AT AJMERE.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.L.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

Among the papers of General Sir Alexander Cunningham, transmitted to me by Mr. Fleet, I have found rubbings of two unique inscriptions, of which even an imperfect account cannot fail to interest my fellow-students. For these inscriptions contain portions of two unknown plays, one of which, entitled Lalita-Vigraharaśa-nātaka, was composed in honour of the king Vigraharaśa-dēva of Sākambhari, by the Mahākavi Somaśēva, while the other, called Harakōli-nātaka has for its author no less a personage than the king Vigraharaśa-dēva himself. Actual and undoubted proof is here afforded to us of the fact that powerful Hindu rulers of the past were eager to compete with Kālidāsa and Bhavabhūti for poetical fame. And it shews the strange vicissitudes of fortune, that the stones, on which a royal author, who could boast of having repeatedly exterminated the barbarians and conquered all the land between the Vindhya and the Himalaya, made known to his people the products of his Muse, should have been used as common building-material for a place of Muhammadan worship, by the conquerors of his descendants.

According to a note on the back of the rubbings, the two inscriptions, which I shall call A. and B., are at the Arhāi-dīn-kā Jhonpra, a mosque situated on the lower slope of the Tārāṇāṭā hill, at Ajmēre, the administrative head-quarters of the Ajmēr-Mērwār Divison, Rājpūtānā. The inscription A. consists of 37 lines of writing which cover a space of about 3' 5" broad by 1' 11" high. The writing of lines 1-18 and 21-32 apparently is in a state of perfect preservation, though in the rubbing the first line is very indistinct. Portions of the lines 19 and 20 have suffered by the peeling off of the surface of the stone; and at the commencement of lines 33-36 some aksaras are missing, owing to the lower proper right corner of the stone having broken away. The lines 1-30 cover the whole breadth of the inscribed surface; the line 37 measures only 9½" in length, and is placed below the centre of the preceding line. The size of the letters is about 1½". The characters are Nāgarī of the 12th century A. D. They were well and regularly written and carefully engraved by the learned Bhāskara, the son of Mahipati (line 37). The languages employed in the inscription are Sanskrit and several Prākrit dialects; and, as regards orthography, the only thing to note is that the consonant b is throughout written by the sign for v. The inscription bears no date.

The inscription B. consists of 40 lines of writing which originally covered a space of about 3' 3½" broad by 1' 11½" high. But at the upper proper left corner a piece of the stone, measuring about 7½" broad by 13½" high, is now broken away, causing the complete loss of the concluding portions of lines 1-23. Besides, the rubbing of part of these lines is very faint. The writing of lines 24-40, on the other hand, is well preserved, and may be read with certainty throughout. The size of the letters in lines 1-39 is about 3½"; of those in the short line 40, which is placed below the centre of the preceding line, 1½". The characters are in every respect the same as those of the inscription A., and they were written by the same writer, Bhāskara, of whose descent we have here (in lines 37 and 38) a somewhat fuller account. Bhāskara's father Mahipati was a son of the learned Gōvinda, who was born in a family of Hīnā princes, and was, on account of his manifold excellencies, a favourite of a king Bhōja. The languages employed in this inscription are, again, Sanskrit and Prākrit; and in respect of orthography we have only to note the use of the sign for v to denote the consonant b, and the occasional employment of the sign for the jihveda-mālāga. The inscription is dated (in lines 38 and 39) in the year 1210, on Sunday the 5th of the bright half of Mārgaśīrha, while the moon was in the nakṣatra Sravaṇa and in the sign Makara, during the yōga Harshaṇa and karaṇa Bālava. Referring this date to the Vikrama era, I find that the corresponding date, for Vikrama 1210 expired, is Sunday, the 22nd November A. D. 1158, which satisfies all the requirements of the case.

Below I shall give nearly the whole of the text of the inscription A., and the concluding.
(really important) portion of B. As the language of the originals is generally plain and easy to understand, my own remarks on these texts need not be many.

The inscription A. contains the end of the third act and a large portion of the fourth act of the Salita-Vigrahārāja, a nāṭaka composed, evidently in honour of the king Vigrāharājadēva of Śakambhari, by the Mahākavi, the learned Sōmadēva. It opens with a conversation between Śaśi-prabhā and the king (Vigrāharāja), from which we may conclude that the king was in love with a daughter of a prince Vasunāpatā.1 The two lovers, one of whom apparently has seen the other in a dream, being separated, Śaśi-prabhā, a confidant of the lady, is sent to ascertain the king’s feelings; and, having attained her purpose, she is about to depart to gladden her friend with her tidings, when the king confesses that he cannot bear to part with Śaśi-prabhā, and proposes to send Kalyāṇavatī to the princess instead. Accordingly Kalyāṇavatī is despatched with a love-message, in which the king informs the lady that his march against the king of the Turushka, a battle with whom appears to be impending, will soon give him an opportunity of joining her. Suitable preparations having been made for making Śaśi-prabhā’s stay with the king comfortable, the latter goes to attend to his mid-day ceremonies. Thus ends the third act.

At the opening of the fourth act two Turushka prisoners appear on the scene, which represents the camp of the king (Vigrāharāja) of Śakambhari or a place close to it, in search of the royal residence. In their perplexity they luckily meet with a countryman, a spy, sent to the camp by the Turushka king. This man tells them how he has managed to enter the enemy’s camp, in the guise of a beggar, together with a crowd of people who went to see the god2 Sōmēvara. He also informs them that the army of the Chāhāmāna (Vigrāharāja) consists of a thousand elephants, a hundred thousand horses, and a million of men; in fact, that by the side of it the ocean would appear dry. And having pointed out the king’s residence, he departs. The two prisoners take their places near the royal quarters; they meet with the king, who is thinking of his beloved, address him (in verses which unfortunately are greatly damaged in the text), and are sent away richly rewarded.

Vigrāharāja now expresses his surprise that his own spy, whom he has sent to the camp of the Hammira, has not returned yet. But just then the spy comes back and informs his master of what he has been able to learn regarding the enemy’s forces and his movements. According to his account, the Hammira’s army consists of countless elephants, chariots, horses, and men, and his camp is well guarded. On the previous day it was three yōjanas distant from Vavvēras,3 the place where Vigrāharāja then is, but it is now located at a distance of only one yōjana. There is also a report that the Hammira, having prepared his forces for battle, is about to send a messenger to the king.

The spy having been dismissed, Vigrāharāja sends for his maternal uncle, the Rāja Simhabala, and, having explained the state of affairs, consults with him and his chief minister Sridhara as to what should be done. The cautious minister advises not to risk a battle with the powerful adversary. But the king, intimating that it is his duty to protect his friends, is too proud to appear upon peaceful negotiations, and is encouraged by Simhabala to act according to his own views. While they are still consulting, the arrival of the Hammira’s messenger is announced. The stranger is admitted into the royal presence, expresses his wonder at the

---

1 I know of no prince Vasunāpatā who lived in the 12th century A.D.; but the name looks as if it might belong to one of the Tūrā princes of Delhi. See Archaeol. Survey of India, Vol. I. p. 149.
2 Sōmēvaradēva, of course, might also be the name of a prince, and it should be noted that the Chāhāmāna Prīthvirāja was a son of Sōmēvara.
3 I give this name in its Prākrit form, because I am not sure how to transcribe it in Sanskrit. An inscription published in Jour. Beng. As. Soc., Vol. XV. Part I. p. 49, apparently in line 12, mentions a place Vavvēras, which possibly might be the place intended by the Vasunāpatā of the play. If this were really the case, the place would be the modern Bāghara, about 47 miles to the south-east of Ajmere. See Archaeol. Survey of India, Vol. VI. p. 126.
splendour and the signs of power which surround the king, is struck with Vigrahāraśa's own appearance, and cannot conceal from himself that the task entrusted to him will be a difficult one to perform.

Here the inscription ends. It may be assumed that Vigrahāraśa and the Hammira on the present occasion did not fight, and that the king eventually was united with his lady-love. From the Delhi Siwalik pillar inscription⁴ we know that in reality Vīṣṇulāva-Vigrahāraśa repeatedly and successfully made war against the Muhammadan invaders by whom, it may be added, a successor of his was utterly defeated and put to death in A. D. 1193.

The inscription B. contains the concluding portion of the fifth act, called Kraunchāvijaya, of the Harakēla-nāṭaka, which in line 40, as well as in lines 32 and 35, is distinctly called the composition of the poet, the Mahārajādhirāja and Paramēvara, the illustrious Vigrahāraśadēva of Sākambhari (line 37). It opens with a conversation, held by Siva, his wife Gaurī, the Vidūshaka, and a Pratīhāra, in which, so far as the fragmentary state of the inscription permits me to see, the worship rendered to Siva by Rāvaṇa is spoken of with approval. Siva and his attendants then, for reasons which are not apparent, turn into Sābaras or mountaineers. Noticing some fragrant smell, as of some oblation presented to him, the god despatches his attendant Mūka to ascertain the cause of it. Mūka returns and reports that Arjuna is preparing a sacrifice. He is told to assume the form of a Kirāta, to go near Arjuna, and there to await Siva. As soon as he has left, Siva perceives that Mūka and Arjuna, who were enemies before, begin fighting with one another. He therefore goes himself, as a Kirāta, to assist his attendant; and behind the scene a terrible battle ensues between the god and Arjuna, the progress of which is related to Gaurī by the Pratīhāra, and which ends with the god's acknowledging the valour of his opponent, and bringing him onto the stage. — It is hardly necessary to say that the poet here has imitated the Kirāṭārjunāya of Bhāravi.

The remainder of the act is given in the original text below. The two deities, Siva and Gaurī, reveal to Arjuna their real nature; and Arjuna asks their forgiveness for whatever he may have done to offend them, and praises Siva as the most sublime divine being. Siva, pleased with Arjuna's valour and piety, presents him with a mystical weapon and dismisses him. After Arjuna's departure, Siva tells Gaurī that the poet Vigrahāraśa has so delighted him with his Harakēla-nāṭaka that they must see him too. Vigrahāraśa then himself enters, and after a short conversation, in which he pleads in favour of his Harakēla, and the god assures him of the pleasure which that play has afforded to him, and tells him that his fame as a poet is to last for ever, he is sent home to rule his kingdom of Sākambhari, while the god with his attendants is proceeding to Kailāsa.

The inscriptions have been executed with such minute care and accuracy that, in writing out the following texts for publication, I have had little else to do than to follow the rubbings before me. In the Sanskrit passages, I have taken the liberty of writing the letter ० for ०, wherever it seemed necessary, and to use the nasal letters of the several classes instead of the sign for anānāra which is employed in the originals, just as if I were editing a text from a MS. The Prākrit passages I have considered it necessary to give exactly as they appear on the stone.

It will be seen that the Sanskrit of our authors is throughout correct and fluent; and the only phrase which strikes me as unusual and for which I cannot quote an analogous example, is the sentence सोधुः कथानु गद्यति 'how will it be borne?', in A., line 4, where the verb गद्य has apparently been employed simply to give to the infinitive सोधु a passive meaning. The metres of the 28 verses which my extracts contain are Sārdālavikṛṣṭita (in 10 verses), Vāskantatilakā (in 7 verses), Śikharini (in 4 verses), Sragdharā (twice), and Anushṭūbba, Āryā, Pushpitāgrā,

⁴ ante, Vol. XIX. p. 218. — It is very desirable that the various inscriptions relating to the history of the Chāhuminae should be properly re-edited.
Hariñ, and Mandakránta (once each). None of these verses occurs in either Sārvagadharā's Paddhati or Vallabhadēva's Subhadēśitālī, and my friend, Professor Pischel, informs me that none is quoted in any of the works on Alahkāra, accessible to him.

The Prakrit dialects employed in A. are, besides the ordinary Sauraśeni, Māhārashiri, in the two Aryan verses recited by the lady Sāśiprabhā, in lines 2 and 3, and Māgadhī, spoken by the two Turushka prisoners and the Turushka spy, in lines 13-15. According to Professor Pischel, to whom I have submitted the Prakrit passages with my Sanskrit translations and to whom I am indebted for several suggestions, the Prakrit furnished by this inscription is highly interesting, because it agrees more closely with the rules laid down by Hēmachandra, than is the case with the Prakrit of any of the known plays. As Sāmadēva and Hēmachandra were contemporaries, the former, of course, may have been acquainted with the teaching of the industrious grammarians; but whether this was really the case, it is impossible to say. A few slight irregularities which the text contains will be pointed out in the notes.

Tradition has it that the Hanumān-nāṭaka originally was written on rocks. By a piece of good luck I am enabled to put before the reader portions of two plays which undoubtedly were engraved on stone. And I feel sure, that the zeal of the Indian services, to whose disinterested help scholars in Europe never appeal in vain, will endeavour to advise us soon of the existence of many more stones, with similar inscriptions.

[The confident tone in which, little more than three months ago, I wrote the preceding paragraph, has been justified already. For, through the kind offices of Mr. Fleet, I have received from Mr. Ramchandra Dube at Ajmere, not only additional rubbings of the inscriptions here described which have enabled me to amend my readings in one or two places, but also impressions of two other inscriptions, one of which contains a new portion of the Lalita-Vigrahārāja-nāṭaka, while the other furnishes a new portion of the Harakes-nāṭaka. And it is only from one of these new inscriptions that I have been able to insert in the above the proper title and the name of the author of the Lalita-Vigrahārāja-nāṭaka, which do not occur in the inscription marked A. The impress of these new inscriptions are not sufficiently clear to edit from at once, and I have therefore applied to Mr. Ramchandra Dube for additional copies. In the meantime I must confine myself to the following remarks—

The new part of the Lalita-Vigrahārāja-nāṭaka consists of 38 lines of writing which cover a space of about 3" broad by 1' 10" high, and contains a large portion of the first act and the beginning of the second act of the play. The writing appears to be well preserved, but the stone has several cracks by which some akharas may have been damaged or lost. In line 32 we have the words—

\[iti \ mahaśa-vinaśita-śrī-Somadeva-virachītē \ Lalita-Vigrahārāj-ābhidhānē nāṭakē prathaṃ-sāmāptah;\]

and from the commencement of the second act it appears that the name of Vasantapāla's daughter, with whom Vigrahārājaśe is represented to be in love, was Dēsaladēvi; and from line 20, that this princess resided in the north, near or at the town of Indrapura (?).

The new part of the Harakes-nāṭaka consists of 41 lines of writing (written by Bhāskara) which cover a space of about 3' 1½" broad by 2' 2½" high, and contain portions of the second and third acts of the play. Of this inscription too the writing appears on the whole to be well preserved. In line 23 we read—

\[iti \ mahāraja-śrī-Vigrahārāja-kavi-virachītē \ Harakes-nāṭaka \ Śrīgōdbhavē nāma dvī[ illuminate this line];\]

5 The above remark equally applies to the fragmentary verses in that portion of B. which has not been edited here. In the Subhadāśita, the verse 1192 is stated to belong to Vigrahārāja, who now need no longer be considered to be a prince of Kaśmir.
A. — Extracts from Śomadēva's Lalita-Vigraharāja-nāṭaka.

2. Saśīprabhā II sāṇaṇḍa II (a) Deva dīṭṭhā puṣpaṇaḥ bhūvadā vitiṇā va [la]heṇa a1 achchharaḥ achchharaḥ 1
Daṃṣaṇa-suhā na pī ṣāṇaḥ patīḥṛjā ṣeṣa dūnāhaṃ jassa 1
So vī hu jai tussa ka jhījaī ṭā kiṃja paṭjattāna II 6
Dāpi 1 jaḥ bhaṭṭidārīcā tārīṣa-kīṣeṣāla-saṁti-va-parampāraie e
3. risasā a ṣī-ppasā-vaḷiṣāsasā ṣātraṁ taṁ āreṇā jyeṣa kījāhad 1 jado 1
Paṭvāla-paṭvaṇoḥ-duddhara-dāvāna-vaḷiṣānaḥ taru-vaṛa vī 1
Na sahaṁti chhiḥ kiṃ uṣa saṃālaṁ māladi-kasumāna II
Ahaṁ tu eriyaṃ devyām 5-aṇurāṇaḥ 6-aṛisaṅha sa śīriṣaṇa-saṁviṣānantām naveya ṣāṣaemi sa-pa-
4. riṣaṇaḥ bhaṭṭidārīm 1
Rājā II svagataṃ 11
Sa prauḍha-prasaraḥ priya-vaḥa-jō duḥkha-auga-duṭvānaλ
vishvag-vīg-amṛītīcavāk-ambuṇa-tattva-jyeṣṭha nirvāpitaḥ
Āḥ kaśṭam suḥya-eva nirvāīta-tanōs-tasya-sādhuḥ-śaṃsītaḥ
kṛṣpa-ṣaṭṣasya samūnasasya vaḥaḥ sūdhum kathaṁ yasyati 9
prakāṇaṃ 11 Saḥki Saśīprabhaḥ saṃprahī pri-
5. yatamā-vaḥa-duḥkha-duṭvānaλ-tvad-vibhā-vaḥa-prabhaḥ-vaḥa-saṁa-thuṣaṃkīṣitaḥ
kaḷaṇyayām śaṃcaḥ dēha-vīptināḥ kathaḥ śaṃcahiḥ sūdhum 1 tatō yavat-priyā-saṃgamon bhavati tvadat-savaivā tīṣhita bhavati 1 tatra tu tvadṛśa-kāla-vaḥpaṛiṣṭy-vaḥpaṛiṣṭīḥ-bīmāṃ
ātmanāḥ kuśala-vśrtīnāḥ niśēyaṃ tvatāṃḥ śaṃcitaḥ sa kalasāviṣa-
6. bhū-bhuvaḥ Kalaśaṣvatiḥ maṇa paḥṣhyatiṣyāṃaḥ
Saśīprabhā II (b) janv devo ṣaṇvade ṣa,
Rājā II Kaḥ kṛtra bhōḥ kaḥ kṛtra II
Pravīṣa puruṣaḥ II (c) ṣaṇveduḥ bhaṭṭah II
Rājā'II Bhadra annaṃ-vācahaṃ-dabhiṇyānānāḥ mahāmātyāḥ yathā saṃtiḥ-dhatā-āśeṣha-saṃvāla-
īha-bhiḍ-ṛdvy-aṣṭakaṃ tambūla-kasaṃa-karpūrā-viṣeṣa-vaṃ-
7. nādi-samastābhiṣaṇa-vasti-saṃpannaḥ sa-pairanāyaḥ Saśīprabhāyaḥ pthiṭy-ṇaḥitaṁ
samāduṣyā-dāvasa-ḥavanasām 11
Puruṣaḥ II (d) janv devo ṣaṇvade 11 iṣi ṣiḥkrāṇataḥ II
Rājā II Saśīprabhā
dāḥ kalpadruma-maṃjarīva hi maṇa smēra-smṛagū-jvarā-
īvaḥ-ṭhāyāmālitāsi-maṇorathāṣaṭaṁ-bhrūi-air-śa-ṣaṅgiti 1
Āḥ kaṃśaḥ 1
(c) Deva dishtaḥ prasannānaḥ bhagavaṭa viṃśiṇa vallabhēṇa cha 1 śaḥcharyāṃ śaḥcharyām
Darśana-sukham-apy-aniraḥ prārthyaḥ yēna durbhāh yasya
Sa-ṣeṣa khalu yaḥ tasya kṛite kalyaḥ tāt-kiṁ na paryāptaṃ II
Idānāṃ yad-bharāṭdārīkhyāṃ-tāḍājaṃ-klēśāna-saṁti-va-paramparāyā 1 ṣiṃśaḥya cha ni-jā-
prasāda-viśīṣyaḥ-anurāpaḥ tad-achirāṃ-svaiv kriyaṭaṃ 1 yataḥ 1
Puruṣa-prahānakha-durpāra-tāpāna-vaḷiṣānaḥ taru-vaṛa apī 1
Na sahaṁta eva kiṁ pūnāḥ sukaṃraṇaḥ mālaṃ-kasumā II
Ahaṁ tv-ṣiṃśaḥ dāvasā-anurāgam etāṭiṣyaḥ cha svapaṇa-saṁvīdhaṃ sa niyāṇah āśvāyām
sa-pairanānāḥ bharāṭdārīkām 11
(b) Yad-deva āṇāpayata 11
(c) Āṇāpayata bharā 11
(d) Yad-deva āṇāpaya 11

* Metro, Ārya; and of the following verse.
* See Professor Pischel's note on Hēmāchandra IV, 277, according to which we should read tādāyaṃ.
* The m has been retained through the influence of the Sanskrit. Read devaḥ avyāmā driṣṭaṃ.
* Metro, Sādūlakṛṣṭa; and of the next verse.
8. r=vidhē=viśaśatair=durvatā=viṇa=iva
krūrair-vyākulaṁ balēna gamitā tanvi kathāṁ sthāyati
Vidūṣhakāṁ prati Vayaśya samādhvam kalyāṇavatām

Vidūṣhakāṁ (c) Hi hi jañe vayaśeṇa vyaśasaṇaṁ 11 niśa-viśāha-kajjena 1 tāṁ amhāpam
chira-vardhitaṁ dānti phalatataṁ khaṇḍa-laṭhadantim manoratha-iddau[mā] 11

ily=ukṣyāṁ nishkṛtya Kalyāṇavatāṁ saha praviṣati 11

Rājā Kalyāṇavatī ih-āsana upaviṣaya.im 11
Kalyāṇavatī tathā kurū 11
Rājā Kalyāṇavatāṁ Saśīprabhā-varāpam-agamana-prayājanāṁ cha sarvaṁ nishkṛtya 11
Kalyāṇavatī vratāṁ avanipatī=VASANTAPĀLASYA putrīṁ=asād-bhavaniṁ=anumādayanam=ā-

10. rādhayitaṁ cha 1 idāntah=ch-āsmat-saṁdhiṁ rājaputrī śrāvayitvā 11
Drutatah-maṁtē viśvaṁ samaṁ bhir-indriyāṁ
kvachād-āpi manūḥ smākaṁ nītaṁ tvayaḥ prathamaṁ hāthāṁ 11
Annjgamanishor=ṛṣaya=ātityāṁ=āṣya Saśīprabhā-
vacana vihitād=āśa-tantör=abhūd=avalaṁbanam 11

Idāntaḥ ch-ācāraṁ kartavyam=asaṁdham 11

11. vijñapatiṁ rājaputrī yathā Turushkondra-vigrāha-prasāgēna drutatah-mahyāga
dēvi bhavatēṁ prasāda-ṣadvam yatas=Turushkaraṅjō-py=asaṁ-prati prachalitaḥ śrūyate 11
Kalyāṇavatī 1 (f) Jām devo ṣāvaṇēvī 11
Rājā Vayaśya asād-bhavaniṁ=uchyataṁ mahāmātyo yathā=dam-idam-upayan-ādy-
uchitāpakaraṇām.

12. saṁpūnaṁ kṛitvā sa-ṣvarāṁ prāshyataṁ Kalyāṇavatī 11
Vidūṣhakāṁ (g) Jām vayaśo bhaṇedi 11 iti Kalyāṇavatī saha nishkṛntaṁ 11
Rājā Saśīprabhā śūvasam gatvā vyanapag-ādhaṃ śramaḥ bhavatē bhavati 1 vayaṃ=api
maṁdhyānim kāvaḥ vīdhātum=uttishṭhamāḥ 11 iti sarvē nishkṛntaṁ 11

11. Tṛtiyo-ahā śaṁpataḥ 11
Tataḥ pra-

13.
Vandinau (h) Ese se Śayaṁbhalaśa-sīvīla-nīvēse 1 edaśiṁ alaśkīyamāṇa-payaṁdaṁ
dadām [la] ujaḥ yaṇidavāvaṁ 11 puruṣ-valōhya 11 Vayaśsa esse ke vi chale vva dīṣadi 1 tā imāda
edaśa śīvīlaśa śālūvaṁ 12 lūlaṁ cha yaṇiśamha 11

Tataḥ praviṣati charaḥ 11

Charaḥ (i) Aśchalyaṁ aśchalyāṁ 1 aho Vīgghalāa-

14. naśala-nilpaṁ avayaṇadā 11 puruṣ-valōhya 11 amhadeśya vva kevi puliśa
peśkīyamādi 1 yā[va] vaṁdhiṁ edehiṁ huvadavāvaṁ 11

(h) Hi hi jañe vayaśeṇa vyaśasaṇaṁ niṣa-viśāha-kīryēṇā(“ryam”) 1 tad=asaṁkaṁ chira-
vardhitaṁ idāntiṁ phalantu khaṇḍa-laṭhadantim manoratha-drūmaṁ 11
(f) Yad=dēva ājñapayati 11
(y) Yad=vayaśo bhaṇeti 11
(h) Esha sa Śakambharīṣvara-śībīra-nīvēṣaḥ 1 etasmin=alakhyamāṇa-paryantē kathāṁ
rājakulaṁ jātaṁyam 11 Vayaśya ēsha kṣāṇa cāśa iva dṛṣṭayā 1 tad=asaṁdētāśya śībhrasaya
svarāpaṁ rājakulaṁ cha jāṣṭīrayāvaḥ 11
(i) Aśchalyaṁ=aśchalyāṁ 1 aho Vigrāharāja-marēṣvara-āśpam=paryantatā 11 asadādēt-
yāvāviva kṣāṇa=api puruṣhau prēkṣhayetē 1 jañe vandhibhyām=ēṭabhīyān bhavityavam 11

Read vacaṣiṇaṁ; the word is construed with a double instrumental case.
11 Metre, Harihāt.
12 Read ālōvauṁ.
Vandinau (j) Bhadda amhāqam Tuluskāṇam desīye vva tumaṇ peśhiyyasi 1 tā kadhēhi Chāhamāṇa-sīvila-sālavaṇa lāulaṁ cha II

Charāb (k) Śuṇāda he vaṇḍaṇa śuṇāda I hage Tuluskāṇaṇa -

15. Sāmabhaktisālaśa sīvilaṁ peśkiṇuṁ peśide 1 taṁ cha dūṣaṁchalaṁ I yado tatthastheṁ idale peśchaṁde14 vi niśīkaṇaṁde vi a palakite tī yāṇiyādí 1 tadhāvi maie kiṁpi kiṁpi pāçchaṁ15 kkhikadām II

Vandinau (l) Aschaliṇa āscharaṁ I kadhān bhadda tatthāa nvaśtidānaṁ chadulide16 aqunām pi tae laśkaṇaṁ II

Charāb (m) [Su]ṇāda he vaṇḍaṇa ya-

16. dhā maie taṁ sīvilaṁ niłūvidaṁ I hage khu śili-śomeśalayvaṁ peśkiṇuṁ vaṇḍānaṇaśa saṭaṇa17 milide milia a etthā paviśiṇa bhiškam pastidun18 lagge I tado yaṁ yaṁ yuṣiṇaṁ taṁ taṁ tumbāṇaṁ yahastam kadhiyadu I maas-vāṇi-nijjhalā-kalāla-kaṇṭastalānaṁ kalimāṇaṁ dāva sahaśaśa I tulaṅgānaṁ u-

17. ya laskaṁ I naḷaṇaṁ uṇa yujjha-śkamānaṁ dāha laskaṁ tī kīṁ vahunā yaṃpiṇedaṇa taṣa kaḷaṇaṁ paśa-stide śavaḷa vi śuṣke bhodi II bāhum=utkeśiyya II edaṁ cha taṁ laśkaṁ II iti darīkayati II

Vandinau (n) Sāhule chala śāhun II

Charāb (o) Ale le vaṇḍiṇo chilaṁ khu me niśi-staṇḍo niśśalidaṇaṁ I taṁ ha-

18. ge vaṇñami II

Vandinau (p) Gaścha le chala gaścha II tī charō nīhkrantaḥ II

Vandinau (q) purato gato=vaḍolokya II (q) Taṁ niḍaṇaṁ lāula-duvālaiṁ tī idha stiḍa eva niśā-ppahavāṁ payāśemha II punar=vaśoliya II sānandam II ese so Sāmabhaktisale astaṇa-stide pulado dīśadi II

Tataḥ praviśati rājā vībhaṇataḥ-cha pari-

vṛṇaḥ II

Rājā II svagatam II Aḥoh vaśiḥtryām I

(j) Bhadrā āvayō=Turushkayōr=diśiyā13 iva tvāṁ prēkhyasō 1 tat=kathaya Chāhamāṇa-sībira-svarūpaṇaṁ rājakulaṁ cha II

(k) Śrīgaṇtāṁ ro vandinau śrījatam I ahaṁ Turushkājōna Śaṅkambharīvarasaṇa śibiraṁ prēkhiṇuṁ prēṣhitāḥ 1 taḥcha duḥṣaṁcharam I yatā=taṁrasthair=itarāḥ priechhaṁ=api nirksaṁhaṁ=pi cha paraṇya 1 tathāḥ mayā kīṁ=api kīṁ=api pratyakṣhaśkītiṇam II

(l) Āścharyam=āścharyam I katham bhadrā tat=opatiśṭiṇāṁ chatra-svabhāve (?)= yuṣkam=api tvaya laksitaṁ II

(m) Śrīgaṇtāṁ ro vandinau yathā mayā taḥcha chhipinaṁ nirūpitaṁ I ahaṁ khalu śrī-Śomēśvaraṇaṁ prēkhiṇuṁ vrajaṭaṁ sārthasya militō militōv cha-śtra praviśya bhiṣkhaṁ prṛṭhitaṁ tu lagnaḥ II tato yat=yat=jaṭaṁtat=tat=aṭuvaṁyaṛaṁya yathāṁrāṁ kathyatāṁ I maṣa-vārī-nirjharā-kaḷa-kaṭaṭhānāṇaṁ karṇḍāṇaṁ tāvata=sa-hasaram I turaṅgāṇaṁ punar-lakṣhaṁ I nariṇāṁ punar-yuddha-kṣamāṇaṁ daśa laksitāṁ=iti I kīṁ bahunā jālipīṭaṁ sasya kaṭakasya pārīṣa-sthitāṁ sāgarō=pi śuḥkā bhavati II etachcha tad=rājakulaṁ II

(n) Sādhunā re chara sādhun II

(o) Arē re vandinau chirāṁ khalu mē niśa-sthāḥniśśitaṁ 1 tad=ahāṁ vrajamī II

(p) Gaśchcha re chara gaśchchha II

(q) Tad-idaṁ rājakula-dvāraṁ tad=chha sthitāeva niśa-rāja-prabhavāṁ prakāsyāvaḥ I cāha sa Śaṅkambharīvarama astāḥsa-sthitāḥ purato dīṣyatē II

13 The above is not proper Sanskrit; the two men mean asmad-diśiyā eva.
14 Originally puśchhado vi niśīkaṇaṁ de, but the o has both times been altered to e.
15 Originally only a single ch was engraved, but it appears to have been altered to chēh.
16 Prof. Pischel suggests to me that chēhūlaide may stand for *chatuṛite, an abstract noun derived from chatuṛa.
17 Originally śatiśa, altered to śatīśa,
18 Originally piśtidūm, altered to piśtidūm.
21. Vighara-rāja-dēvāḥ ॥

22. *pratihāram=dkhṛya ॥* Pratihāra dāpyatām=ōtayōr=yaṭthā-dīyamāṇaḥ kansaka-vasan-ādis-tyāgaḥ ॥

Pratihāraḥ ॥ Yad=adhāati dēvāḥ ॥ iti vandibhyāṁ saka nīśhkrāntaḥ ॥

Rāja ॥ Ahō nādyāpy .. .. pāy āgātā Hāmītra-kaṭak-āvāsa-avarōpa .. .. kaḥ ॥

Praviṣṇa charaḥ ॥ (r) Jayadu jayadu devo ॥ Deva devega Hāmītra-kaṭaḥ ॥

23. a-vuttatāṁ jāpiduṁ paraśiṁ diṇa pesido saṁpaduṁ ōdā mhi ॥

Rāja ॥ Bhadra kathaya kiyat=Turushkēvareśībimah katra chêti ॥

Charaḥ ॥ (e) Deva agahīda-gaa-raha-turaa-ppavīra-samaḥkhaṁ a[n]a-perāntaṁ amuqida-pavesa-niggama-maggan rūrūkō kaṇaṁ ॥ āvāso uṇa kalē iḍo Vavveraḍa jōa- ॥

24. da-taś āsi ॥ ajna uṇa teṇa ājōva sivireṇa samaṁ ṣachchhīṇa taṁ ido jāoṣpekaṣa āvāsidaṁ pekkhiṇa aśado mhi ॥

Rāja ॥ Bhadra kādrīśi punas=tatra kaṇvadantī ॥

Charaḥ ॥ (t) Deva jāṛjhathaṁ saalāṁ pi sēṇḍāṁ saṃśaddḥāṁ kārīṇaḥ etomuhaḥ charakteṇa Hāmītraṇa tumhāraṁ pise keṣa ॥

25. vi vaṣṇaḥ dōdo pesīdvavo iti kehīṁ ṭi jāṛhīṁ jaṁṣiṣiḥ jāṁṣiṣiḥ jāṁṣiṣiḥ ॥

Rāja ॥ Bhadra gacchheva tvaṁ viśmēya ॥ iti charō nīshkrāntaḥ ॥

Rāja ॥ Kaḥ koṭra bhōh kaḥ koṭra ॥

Praviṣṇa puruṣaḥ ॥ (u) Eso mhi āṣavedu devo ॥

Rāja ॥ Āhūyatāṁ mātulaḥ Simhasaḷaḥ rāja ॥

26. viṣati Simhasalaḥ ॥

Rāja ॥ sūdaraṁ āsanaḥ pratīḍhya ॥ sarvaṁ vṛttātāṁ nīśdyā [II] Mātula kim-īdāṁṁ vimbhēyaḥ ॥

Simhasalaḥ ॥

27. viṣati Simhasalaḥ ॥

Rāja ॥ *maṇṭraṁ Maṇḍharaḥ praṭiḥ ॥* Bhavatām=aṭra kim praṭiḥbhāti ॥

Sridharaḥ ॥ Dēva ॥

Virāgāṁ cha vipāṣchitāṁ cha gaṇaṇāśa=ūdyaṁ tvaṁ ēvīvādunā vīdvaḍḍhīṁ-gaṇītiṁ=sa ātpto bhavatāḥ kvāpya=asti na dvāparaḥ ॥

(r) Jayatu jayatu dēvāḥ ॥ Dēva dēvēna Hāmītra-kaṭaṁ vṛttātāṁ jānūṁ parasmin-dinē prēshitaḥ sām pratatām=āgatō-smī ॥

(e) Dēva agrihta=gaṇa-ratha-turaga-pravīra-samaṁkhyām=a[jēṣa? paryantam=ṣa[jēṣa-pravēsā-nirgama-mṛḡnaḥ ripuṛājaṁ kaṭakam ॥ āvāsah punah kaḷyā śātō Vavvēraḍ20=yojana-traya śaśi ॥ ādya punas=tēn=aiwa śiśiđeva samaṁ=ṣaṁyā tadi=tiśo yōjan-aike=āvāsam prēkhaḥ=āgatō-smī ॥

(t) Dēva yuddhārthyaṁ sakalāṁ=api saṇyāṇi saṁnaddhāi kṛityāṁ=aitad-abhimmukhām chalāta Hāmītraṇa yushmākāṁ pārāve kēn=āpi vachanēna dūṣṭaḥ prēshayitaṁ yēti kair=api janaṁ kathytē ॥

(u) Āshē=smī ājēṣapāyatu dēvāḥ ॥

(v) Yad=dēva ājēṣapāyati ॥
Kumāvatā śāmāya vidhēyam-adhunā yat-prīṣṭam-asamāḍīśām
sva-prajñām-anunāśīyta tat-kathayatāṁ

Kṣantavyam-īśa tvaya II

Rājā II
Mahāmatē śāmākaṁ tvam-eva maṅgripiṁ-agraṇīṁ-tat-kim-evaṁ-abhidhīyate II

Srīdharāḥ II
Dēva satyaṁ-pāyāntara-saṁbhavē yuddham-anupāya iti dharmārtha-āśtra-
vidām samayaḥ II

Rājā II
Bhavēde-evaṁ yady-upāyāntaram-antra syat I kiṁchā durātmānam Miśc-
chhārajanāṁ praty-upāyantar-ānusaraṇe ma-

Hatē virāṇa II

Srīdharāḥ II
Dēva tathāpi jagad-ekavīṛṇa Hammirēn-śaṁkhyā-sainya-svāmīnaṁ saṁa
yuddh-āvataraṇāṁ kathām-anumanyāmahē II

Rājā II

Akṛtiṁ kāpy-ucchaḥśāṁ suhṛd-abhayadāna-vratā-hatis=
tathā dhṛtāṁ-tīrttha-duśva-su manasaṁ vṛtta-vigamaṁ II
Mam-aitiṣṭhau vyastēsvā-apī ∨ ∨ [a]sahyēśu sakalam=
iman-āṅgī-

30. kartuḥ kathayata vidhēyaṁ kim-asubhi II

Sīṃhabelāḥ II
Mahārāja I
t-kaṁ.nidhaṁ-thāyināṁ
vṛttaṁ tanushu dhruvaṁ pariṣṭānam yasyatya-śāmākhyātattam I
Dīpāc-ekata ēva [bha]dra tiṁira-pradhiṁśa-ḍhūraṁ ma[ha]ṁ svākāravān-iha hi pradipa-nivahō dṛśiṣṭāntatām-aśītānaṁ II

Api cha I

Kṣatram dhāma tav-śdām-ādhutatalamaṁ ivam-

31. t-saṁnidhiṁ-thāyināṁ
vyājōm tanushā dhruvaṁ pariṣṭataṁ yasyatya-śāmākhyātattam I
Dīpāc-ekata ēva [bha]dra tiṁira-pradhiṁśa-ḍhūraṁ ma[ha]ṁ svākāravān-iha hi pradipa-nivahō dṛśiṣṭāntatām-aśītānaṁ II

Api cha I

Yudhāṁ saṁyam ēva tvam saṁnidhiṁ-sthē-śī-pi chēṁ-mayī I

dakeśaṁ-karēṇa saṁ-badha ni[rē]jaya II

Tad-dāśhāṁ-dhive-āṁma bhārasa dhanaśhī śrūn-

32. tayōṁ-vṛītē II

Praviśa pratihāraḥ II
Dēva Turushkarājēna prahiṇā prāsānta-vēśhāṁ kō=pi viśiṣṭa ēva
pumāṁ-saparichchhadā dvāri saṁgaṭhasa-tīṣṭhatah II

Rājā II
Śīṃhabela-Srīkharāv-uddōṣya II
Kim=īṁ-pē tēna pravēṣṭaṁ ēva II

Tau dvā-āpi I

Kō dāśhō rāja-sadanaṁ hēśdāṁ tat-prayōjan-ānuṛdhānaṁ sarvāṁ-āpi
pravēṣṭaṁ ēva II

33. [Rājā] II
prathihāraḥ prati II
Pravēṣaṁ tarhi drutam II

Pratihāraḥ II
Yad-ādiśati dēvah II iti njītaya dōtēna saha praviśati II

Dūtas II
samantasa-vāldāya II sānandām II

Prāg-ānīya-sundarābhir-vībhūṭībhīḥ

34. pūrō rājunām-vaḷōkya II sānandādbhutaṁ II

Ahō sakala-jaña-vilākṣakaṁ kō=py=ayam-apūrva

bhīr=naṁ-dhantara-praṇayai-jaṁair=iha rājate nṛpī-śrīḥ II

purō rājunām-vaḷōkya I sānandādbhutam II

Ahō sakala-jaña-vilākṣakaṁ kō=py=ayam-apūrva

22 Metre, Śākara; and of the next verse.
23 Metre, Śākara; and of the next verse.
24 Metre, Śākara; and of the next verse.
25 Metre, Śākara; and of the next verse.
THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY.

35. ēva paurāṇikaḥ pravādaḥ | katham=aparathyā tēshām=idaṁ
vaisavarūpyam | tathā hi 1

Chārāh kārya-vilokānaśravaṇayod=chakshusārunti vāg=vayaṁ
vaktuṁ samādhi-virōdhah-karma samara-krājāsu vīrāḥ karāḥ 1

Krītya-ākāriya-avrūchana-vyatikarē san-mantrīnā mānasāṁ
hasty-aśvāṁ kramitum payohṛīhanāṁ=ētām mahr-

36. vyāhata-viśhēya-dvay-ōparthānēṇa paryāklinē-smi 1 | tathā hi 1

Sāmarthyaṁ yadi na prabhōr=abhidadhē yāsyanti tad-vidvishaḥ
samādhi-yatvam=saśādhi-vasāḥ katham=atha prakhyāpayē

| Vighrharādāya=uddīya 1 |
syāt=ātādā 1

Ākṛtya=āvaa vibhāvyamāna ○ ○ [kaṁ] dhām=ēdam=āvīr bhavat-
kopaṁ kasya vibhāvyamei=ṇaubhaya-

37. Mahipati-sūtēna paḍgita-Bhāsakarōṇa svayam=ālikhyē-ōttāpīnyakšharāśi 1

B. — The Concluding Portion of Vighrharājādevā’s Harakēlī-nātaka.

25. Īdevō evvarūpēṇ=āvīr bhavatāḥ 1

Arjunaḥ 1 dṛṣṭvād 1 sa-bhokti-praṇāmam 1

Sāmvarēu tanu-chitta-

26. vāṁmaya-malāra=ēno mayā yat=krītāṁ
yach=ch=āchyāvē dhiyā kSHApanām=ītō yushmath-pad-ambhōrūhāt 1
Yan=n=ādhiyāyi pada-dvayaṁ bhagavatōr-advaita-mdṛ≈āukitaṁ
tan=nāthaṁ trijagat-sriyā=asadriśāṁ sarvāṁ kalamēthaṁ mama 11

Api cha 1

Yat=kāyē niruji tvad=ānhi-kaumālaṁ n=ārādhitaṁ Tryambaka
svāntē śāntatamē na bu-

27. ddham=āgaha tvad-dhāma tat=tādriśām 1

Vāchaṁ phalgu-vachāḥ-praṇācha-chaturē śaṁyamā yyan=na stutamān
tan=me śālyam=iva sphuraty=āvīrataṁ sam=āntarē Saṃkara 11

Api cha 1

28. Dhātāḥ kas=tvāṁ Girīḍa praṇāvam=ajagavaṁ tulyam=ētad=dadhānas=
tisrō bhīttā vuri=dā ravi≡śaśi-śikhināṁ antar=anyō bahīṁ=cha 1

Nivrōṣāṁ bandha-vahnet=Nītisūta-

subhaṁ-krodha-vahne=cha kurvaṁ
jān=ājānē vitanvaṁ=Nītpraharastayā mōkṣa-saṁsāra-vīrāḥ 11ηη

Api cha 1

29. Sva-pratyayāya jagataṁ parama-priyāya
pralēya-bhānu-kalāyā krīta-śekharāya 1
Dēvāya durgama māj-patañ-lāpāhāya
svasmā Śivāya nīrupādhi-mudē namas=te 1ηη

Api cha 1

Brahmādi-viśva-guru-varga-

niyāmakāya
svājā-vibhāskita-sun=ākura-nirākāya 1
Yāvad-viḍhāyaka-nishēdhaṁ-vigrahāya
tubhyaṁ nāmas=Tūhināśaīla-sutā=prīyāya 1

27 Metre, Śārdula-vikrējita; and of the next verse.  28 Metre, Śārdula-vikrējita; and of the next verse.
29 Metre, Śrāddhā.  30 Metre, Vasantatilakā; and of the two next verses.
Apichara 1

Tat-paṃchakārapatayā jagatāṃvidbhātṛ
tad-bhāva-karma-kriti-sākhitayāniyantre
Bhāsvat-svachhitanayāsaḥaj-echchhayācha
traigusyatanmayatayānama

30.

Īśvaraya 11

Apichara 1

Namaḥ yūga-sthāya svavidita-pada-sthāyamahāc
namaḥpuṣya-sthāyaprati-tanausukha-sthāyabhavate
Namaḥ pāpa-sthāya prabhavadasukha-sthāyabhavine
namaḥ jñāna-sthāyapravarad-amṛita-sthāyakṛśinē 12

Apichara 1

Namaḥ kṛtṛvādhārukṣuviśatēsaṃyamayotē
namaḥ kṛtṛvādharātuchardhika-

31.

shashṭi-prapayanē 1

Namaḥ vyakt-āvyakta-trijagad-agha-vidhvaśa-patavē
namaḥ puṣya-śuṣya-śhitishuṣritamghūraikavapuṣhe 11

Īśah 11 Vatsa pritōtsmi tad-grhītyapāsūpataDamtram 11 iti karṣe mantras dādēti 11
Vatsa anēṇa mantrēṇ-sābhīmantritaṁtiṣam-apī pāsūpatastrayatē 1 idam-aparāṇaḥ yāvad-astra-
sshitam nījagūpṭidvam-grhītā

32. na 11

Arjunah sa-viniyau grhīνēti 11

Īsah 11 Mrīttikā-liṅg-ārādhanasyayuddhēnāsmad-ārādhanasya cha phalān labdham tadem-
yath-āgataṁgachchhanā 11

Arjunah 11 Yathājānāpayati dēvah 11 iti nishkrāntah 11

Īsah 11 Gaṁba prati 11 Anēṇa Harakōli-nāṭakōṇa sādhu priṇītōtsmi Vigrāharāja-
sakīnātadēnuṁpasyāmas-tavat 11

Ta-

33.

Vigrāharājah 11 drīṣṭaṁdēvau prāṇasyakrit-dūjaṁ 11
Smṛṭīṃjuṁkjho prakāṣa-sarva-rasēpi bālē
sahārāmaḥapaymrītiramādādāhānē 1
M-āstam prabhohkhaladuraksharavahni-varshair-
abhyarthayēmalinatāHarakōll-kāyē 12

Ūrdhvaamavalōkyau11

Śvar-vāsinō Bharata-śaśyajanaśchirīsē
Sthāpōḥ śirāmśinanr dūnā-

34.

yutōṁsaśah 11

Pratyakshararsvnta-ras-amṛta-vāhinīnāṁ
kallōla-kēlībhirśitōHarakōḷr-āstām 11

Punar-ūrdhvaamavalōkya 11 Apichara 1

Stōtā guṇān-akhidadhat-stutitIndumauliṁ
stutaya sa eva phalarpataya sa eva 1
ItthamaḥchatrumpayatāHarakōḷr-āstām=
ā-chandramā-ravimudēyasāeviṁiyēvaḥ 11

Īsah 11

Sarvāṁ char-ācharam-śadam kha-

11 Metre, Śikharī!; and of the next verse.
12 Metre, Vasantālakā; and of the three next verses.
A NOTICE OF THE GULABNAMA.

BY E. REHATSEK.

(Concluded from p. 73.)

After the English army had been thus victorious in the Pañjáb, it encamped near Lábór, and the Governor-General issued a proclamation. The purport of this proclamation was that the English had defeated the Sikhs in every engagement, and taken from them more than 220 pieces of artillery; that they waged war because the Sikhs had infringed the treaty of 1809 A. D.; and that they would not evacuate the Pañjáb before an indemnity was paid and the fulfilment of the arrangements to be agreed upon by the English and the Pañjáb government was guaranteed. The English government did not desire to increase its possessions, but found it necessary for greater security to annex a portion of the territory now under the jurisdiction of Lábór, consisting of the sīlas situated between the rivers Satlaj and Bīyās, as well as of the Kohístān, the value of which would be deducted from the indemnity to be paid. Lastly, one of the sons of the late Mahārājā Ranjhīrī Saṅgh was to be made sovereign of the Pañjáb, but in case of fresh disturbances arising, the British government would again be under the necessity of quelling them.

The Mahārājīa Gulāb Saṅgh at once presented the English prisoners with dresses of honour, placed them on elephants, and despatched them with an escort of sepoys to the camp at Qasár. The Mahārājīa then consulted the members of the court, viz., Bhāi Rām Saṅgh, Diwān Dinā,

31 Metro, Sārādūlavīkṛṣṭa. 32 Metro, Sṛagdha. 33 Metro, Sārādūlavīkṛṣṭa.
Nâth, and Faqir Nûru’ddin Şâhib, about the conclusion of peace, and they entrusted him
with the negotiations. The Bibi Şâhibâ, having been requested to give her opinion, not only
approved of the decision arrived at by the above-named members of the darbâr, but issued a pa-
řanâ to that effect under her special seal, with the signatures of all the Sardars attached thereto.
Accordingly the Mahârajâ Gulâb Siṅgh started with several Sardars, viz., Diwân Dinâ Nâth,
Faqir Nûru’ddin, Diwân Dèvi Sahâî and others, taking with them five paḫfa of Sikh troops,
each private of which received five rupees. But as there were turbulent men among them, many
had to be left behind, and only one company retained by the deputation arrived at Old Naushahra.
The deputation continued its journey to the Governor-General’s camp at Qâṣur, and when the
members were at a distance of one kâs from it, Sir Henry Lawrence, who was at that time
Resident in Nêpâl [sic], came to invite them to proceed further. When they arrived, Sir
Frederick Currie, Baronet, Chief Secretary, conducted them to the Governor-General’s tent,
who came out in person, shook hands, and took them in. When they were seated the Mahârajâ
Gulâb Siṅgh explained how the Khâlsâ army had become so demoralised and insubordinate, as
to venture upon hostilities, and expressed his hopes, that after what had taken place, tranquillity
might again be restored, whereas the Governor-General declared that it would be necessary to pay
an indemnity of two kârof of rupees, and to cede the Dôâb to the British government, but Gulâb
Siṅgh rejoined that it would be impossible to raise such an enormous sum of money. Then Sir
Frederick Currie and Sir Henry Lawrence took the Mahârajâ aside, and politely reminded him,
that as he had lost brothers and other dear relatives in these disturbances, there was no need of
his espousing so warmly the cause of the Pañjâb government, the more so as His Excellency the
Governor-General desired to make him independent thereof, by constituting him sovrâge of
the Kohîstân and Kâsmîr, with the title of Mahârajâ. Gulâb Siṅgh replied that the wish of
His Excellency was a command to him, but that his relatives had been slain because they were
cherished by the Pañjâb government and had served it; that as the Mahârajâ Dalîl Siṅgh had
not attained his majority, he had been deputed to treat with the Governor-General; and that if his
lust for power and independence were to become injurious to the young sovereign, his own
reputation and that of his descendants would be tarnished for ever. He begged His Excellency
to keep in view the treaty of friendship with the late Mahârajâ Ranjit Siṅgh and to consider that
Dalîl Siṅgh was altogether guiltless of its infringement by the army. The said two gentle-
men reported these words to the Governor-General, and after the negotiations had been pro-
tracted to a late hour of the night, an agreement was finally arrived at, that the Sikh govern-
ment should pay one kârof and fifty lâkhs of rupees as an indemnity, and cede the Dôâb. Gulâb
Siṅgh at last succeeded in getting his offer accepted, to pay fifty lâkhs at once, and the remain-
ing kârof of rupees in three successive instalments, and the surrender of the Dôâb. A desire for an interview with Dalîl Siṅgh having been expressed, Gulâb Siṅgh despatched a
letter to that effect to the Bibi Şâhibâ, and accordingly the Mahârajâ Dalîl Siṅgh arrived the
next day in a buggy, wherein a salute of artillery was fired, and the Governor-General
presented both Dalîl Siṅgh and Gulâb Siṅgh with robes of honour.

Some difficulty arose concerning the entrance of English troops into Lâhôr, to which Gulâb
Siṅgh first demurred, but afterwards consented, the English having agreed to march again back
to Fûrâspûr after receiving the fifty lâkhs of rupees promised to the Governor-General. The
Bibi Şâhibâ, however, made an arrangement with Lâl Siṅgh, and despatched a letter to the
English authorities, informing them that he was her plenipotentiary, and that Gulâb Siṅgh had
no power. Lâl Siṅgh accordingly became surety for the payment of the above sum, made
arrangements for the stay of the English troops in Lâhôr, and surrendered in lieu of the
stipulated kârof of rupees the districts on the other side of the Biyâs with Kângàr, the Kôhis-
tân, Kâsmîr, Hazârâ, and Chambâ to remain for ever in the possession of the English, so that
even Jâmûnâ and other possessions of Gulâb Siṅgh fell into their power. Gulâb Siṅgh, not a
little amused at this transaction, immediately sent the Diwân Jwâlâ Sahâî to Sir Henry

\*\*\* on the British side.
Lawrence with whom he had become intimately acquainted on a former occasion at Peshawar. Sir Henry after consulting with Sir Frederick Currie, Chief Secretary of the Foreign Department, sent a reply, that the British Government, having the interests of Gulab Singh at heart, had simply presented him with the said possessions, but would now grant them to him for money. The Governor-General then agreed to let Gulab Singh have the district between the B Upas and the Indus, with Kangra, Kasimur, Hasa and the boundaries of the Kohistan for one karsh of rupees; but as Gulab Singh had not at his disposal such a large sum, negotiations were begun for giving him a smaller portion of territory, excluding the district between the B Upas and the Indus. Even this arrangement displeased the Bibi Sahiba, who sent the Rajah Dinah Nath, Faqir Nuru’din, and Bhil Ram Singh to Sir H. Lawrence and Sir F. Currie, to dissuade them from the transaction, and threatening to go herself to London. But no attention was paid to her protest, and she sent Khalsa troops to capture Gulab Singh. Major MacGregor arrived, however, in time with a rasdla of European troops, and put an end to the strife by carrying him off to the British camp. The terms ultimately arrived at are embodied in the following document:

Treaty between the British Government on the one part and the Maharaja Gulab Singh of Jammun on the other, concluded on the part of the British Government by Frederick Currie, Esquire, and Brevet Major Henry Montgomery Lawrence, acting under the orders of the Right Honourable Sir Henry Hardinge, G.C.B., one of Her Britannic Majesty’s Most Honourable Privy Council, Governor-General, appointed by the Honourable Company to direct and control all their affairs in the East Indies, and by Maharaja Gulab Singh in person.

Art. 1. The British Government transfers and makes over for ever, as independent possessions, to Maharaja Gulab Singh and the heirs male of his body, all the hilly or mountainous country with its dependencies, situated to the east of the River Indus and west of the River Rawal including Chambal, and excluding Lahaul, being part of the territories ceded to the British Government by the Lahor State according to the provisions of Article 4 of the treaty of Lahore, dated the 9th March 1846.

Art. 2. The eastern boundary of the tract transferred by the foregoing Article to Maharaja Gulab Singh shall be laid down by Commissioners appointed by the British Government and Maharaja Gulab Singh respectively for the purpose, and shall be defined in a separate engagement after survey.

Art. 3. In consideration of the transfer made to him and his heirs by the provisions of the foregoing articles, the Maharaja Gulab Singh will pay to the British Government the sum of 75 laks of Nanakshah rupees, 50 laks to be paid on ratification of this Treaty, and 25 laks on or before the 1st October of the current year A.D. 1846.

Art. 4. The limit of the territories of the Maharaja Gulab Singh shall not be at any time changed without the concurrence of the British Government.

Art. 5. The Maharaja Gulab Singh will refer to the arbitration of the British Government any disputes on questions that may arise between himself and the Government of Lahor, or any other neighbouring State, and will abide by the decision of the British Government.

Art. 6. The Maharaja Gulab Singh engages for himself and his heirs to join the British troops with the whole of his military force when these are employed within the hills, or in the territories adjoining his possessions.

Art. 7. The Maharaja Gulab Singh engages never to take or retain in his service, any British subject, nor any subject of any other European or American State, without the consent of the British Government.

Art. 8. The Maharaja Gulab Singh engages to respect in reference to the territory transferred to him, the provisions of Articles 5, 6, and 7 of the separate engagement between the British Government and the Lahor darbar, dated March 11th, 1846.
Art. 9. The British Government will give its aid to the Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh in protecting his territories from external enemies.

Art. 10. The Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh acknowledges the supremacy of the British government, and will, in token of such supremacy, present annually to the British government one horse, twelve perfect shawl goats of approved breed (six male and six female), and three pairs of kāṣmīr shawls.

This treaty consisting of ten articles has been this day settled by Frederick Currie, Esq., and Brevet-Major Henry Montgomery Lawrence, acting under the direction of the Right Honourable Sir Henry Hardinge, G.C.B., Governor-General, and by the Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh in person; and the said treaty has been this day ratified by the seal of the Right Honourable Sir Henry Hardinge, G.C.B., Governor-General.

Done at Amritsar on the 16th March 1846, corresponding to the 17th Rabi, the first A. H. 1262.


On this occasion the Governor-General sent his children on a pleasure trip to Kāṣmīr, and enjoined the Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh to care take of them as if they were his own. He was delighted with the proposal and started the same day to Jasarṭā, and during his journey Utam Siṅgh, with his troops, as also other chiefs, paid him allegiance. On his arrival at Jasarṭā he presented the author's father with a jāqīr producing a revenue of Rs. 1,000 per annum, and conferred likewise other favours upon him. He also sent Dīwān Hari Chand with Sikh and other troops to conquer the Havāra district. Shortly afterwards, the Kāṣmīri, spouse of Gulāb Siṅgh, who had been ailing for some time, died, and internal troubles arose in Kāṣmīr among his own vassals, which were quelled and the rebels punished, but only with the aid of English troops. The sānadvāra of the Havāra district being also very turbulent, Gulāb Siṅgh desired to exchange it for that of Maṇāvar and Gharī, which was in charge by Major Abbot on behalf of the Paṅjāb government. Accordingly the Havāra district was made over to it, and the two desired districts to Gulāb Siṅgh, by a sānadvāra, dated 5th May 1847.

When the English officials Ayerton and Anderson, who had gone to Mīlān in the early part of A. D. 1848, were both slain by the troops of Mūlāj, Major Edwards marched with the Kāhīṣa army in command of the Sardār Shēr Siṅgh Aṭārīwālā to conquer Mīlān, and encamped at Sūrakund. The Sardār Chhunstār Siṅgh Aṭārīwālā, who was in charge of the Havāra district, then made an alliance with Dōst Muḥammad Khan, Amir of Afghānān, and attempted to conquer the Paṅjāb. Accordingly Lord Gough attacked him with the British forces, and defeated him at Rāmmagar and Chilīāwāla, although the Sikhs fought bravely. About this time also Mīlān fell, and the Sikhs were routed at Gujrāt after the English troops had been reinforced by those of the Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh. After this the Kāhīṣa army submitted at Rāwal Piḍḍī, and the Paṅjāb was reduced to tranquility.

Mīlān under the Sikh government had been administered by the Dīwān Sāwan Mall who, having been slain by an assassin, was succeeded by his son, the Dīwān Mūlāj. The latter failed to pay regularly the tribute due. Accordingly the dārbar reported the matter to Sir John Lawrence, who had, after the overthrow of the Kāhīṣa power, been appointed Resident at Lāhōr. The Dīwān Mūlāj was summoned to Lāhōr, but excused himself by alleging that the province was disturbed, and that his brothers were contending for the supremacy with him, and he said that he would be glad if the British government would send officials to settle the accounts, exonerating him from all responsibility after the payment of the arrears due. Sir John Lawrence, however, procrastinated this business and allowed Mūlāj to return, but

---

3 [The value of this version of the treaty is that it gives the account current in Kāṣmīr. — R. C. T.]

4 These and the following events are narrated also in the last Chapter of the Zafarānī, but the account differs in several respects from the above.
when Sir Frederick Currie took his place as Resident at Lāhūr, he sent Mr. Ayrton and Mr. Anderson to accompany the Sardār Kānh Singh Mān, who had been appointed to supersede the Dīvān Mūlrāj as Ṣhāhbdār of Multān. When these officials paid their visit to Mūlrāj, requesting him to surrender the keys of the fort and his authority over the province, he replied in an abusive and cunning manner, and when they returned to the 'īdqāh where they were lodged, some miscreants assaulted them, pierced the breast of Mr. Ayrton with a lance, and killed Mr. Anderson with a sword. Then a great disturbance arose, the troops prepared for hostilities, and the Sikh escort of the English officials joined them, and the Sardār Kānh Singh was taken prisoner and conveyed to Mūlrāj. Sir Frederick Currie having been informed of what had taken place, at once despatched Sikh troops under the command of the Sardār Shēr Singh to punish the rebels of Multān. The army of the Nawāb of Bahāwalpur and Major (Sir Herbert) Edwardse, who had arrived from the district of Bannū, swelled the number of the troops; but the fort of Multān was taken only after some English troops sent from Bombay had arrived. At this time the Sardār Chhattar Singh Ajāirwālā, who had been sent by the Lāhūr government to take over the administration of the Ḥazāra country, from which the author’s father had withdrawn when Gulāb Singh obtained the ‘īdqā of Manāwar in exchange for it, becoming afraid for his own safety, because the Sikh troops under his command had slain an English officer in the service of the Khāliṣa government, conceived that he had no other remedy but to revolt. He persisted in this although Sir Frederick Currie had sent the Rājā Dinā Nāth to dissuade him. He also repeatedly sent letters to his son Shēr Singh with orders to join the troops of Mūlrāj, which he obeyed; whilst he himself prepared for hostilities, and was reinforced from every side by great numbers of Sikhs, who, vainly imagining that they would overthrow the government, began to plunder the country in every direction, and burnt the bridge of boats across the Rāvī at Rājghât near Shāhbdāra. Arjūn Singh, son of the late Ḥārl Singh, occupied the country as far as Gujrānwālā, whilst on the other side the graceless Rām Singh kicked up the dust of rebellion at Nūrpūr. Chhattar Singh, having arrived at Peshāwar, despatched the Khāliṣa troops who had made common cause with him, to Rāwal Pīṇḍī. Here Messrs. Lawrence and Boyd whom the Sardār Sultān Muḥammad Khān Bārūkzāī had caused to be captured, were sent to him. Dost Muḥammad Khān, the Amir of Afghānīstān, also came to the aid of Chhattar Singh, and intended to conquer Kašmīr, Ḥazāra and Rāwal Pīṇḍī as far as the Jhēlam. Sardār Chhattar Singh surrendered the fort of Aṭāk, which he had taken with his help, to the Amir.

Gulāb Singh having in former times been on friendly terms with Chhattar Singh, the latter now sent envoys to Srinagar, requesting his aid in this war, which would in that case, said they, terminate by Gulāb Singh becoming the sovereign of the Paṇjāb, to whom Chhattar Singh would be glad to pay homage. The Mahārājā Gulāb Singh replied with his natural shrewdness, that as the Khāliṣa government had sold him to the English, it is now his bounden duty to remain loyal to the latter, and advised Chhattar Singh, through his own mediation, to crave pardon for what he had done, saying that he remembered well how often the late Mahārājā Ranjit Singh had said, that whoever opposes the English ensures only his own ruin. The Bakshāil Ḥirānānd, who had come to Srinagar as envoy from Chhattar Singh was detained under surveillance, and the envoy of the Amir Dost Muḥammad Khān, who had arrived with letters and presents of horses and Persian swords to obtain the aid of the Mahārājā Gulāb Singh, was not admitted to his presence, or even permitted to enter Srinagar, and returned without effecting anything. Gulāb Singh had offered the English to march with his troops to the Ḥazāra district to quell the rebellion. Sir Frederick Currie delayed his reply, but at last advised that the rebels should be prevented from entering the mountain districts. The Dīvān Ḥarī Chand then marched from Jammu to Manāwar, and another portion of the troops, commanded by Sayyid Ghulām ‘Āli Shāh and Zārāwar Singh, was ordered to punish Rām Singh. This force, operating under the direction of Sir John Lawrence, who was at that time  

* This is the name of the author of the Tūrīkh-i-Sultān.
Commissioner at Jālandhar, did good service, as did the forces of Nūr Muḥammad, commanded by Major Harrison. Orders were also issued to hold the families of all those responsible who might leave Jamrūh and enrol themselves among the Sikhs, or make common cause with the rebels. For this reason the houses of certain persons in the 'īlāqā of Jasrôtā were burnt down. This example was so effective, that henceforth none of the subjects of the Jamrūh government joined the Khāla forces. On that occasion the English troops, commanded by General Nicholson, were encamped at Rāmnagar, whilst the Sikh troops, who crossed the Chhānāb had taken up a position near Wazīrabād. Some pāltuns of them, however, who were stationed at Jamrūh, desired to join their comrades there, but the government deprived them, by a stratagem, of their arms and accoutrements, and when they wanted to recover them by force, the pāltun of Brajrajā succeeded in foiling their intention. Dharm Singh was, for his bravery in this affair promoted to the rank of colonel.

Whilst the Mahrājā Gulāb Singh was at Srinagar, Ranbir Singh governed the district of Jamrūh with ability; but the whole of the Paṣjāb was disturbed. The Amīr Dūst Muḥammad Khān joined the Sikh army, while Major Abbot evacuated the Hazāra district and retired to the māzā of Bhārkēt, where Gulāb Singh loyally sent him in leather bags a large sum of money by trustworthy merchants, as well as gunpowder and small pieces of artillery. Qādī Nādir 'All Khān was also sent, and remained in constant attendance upon him. In the same way the author's father attended upon Sir Frederick Currie at Lāhōr, in order to be of service whenever an opportunity presented itself.

The Sardār Shēr Singh marched from Multān to avoid the British troops, which were besieging it, by order of his father Chhātar Singh, and after joining the rebels encountered the forces commanded by General Nicholson at Rāmnagar, which crossed the Chhānāb and surprised him early in the morning. His troops fought bravely, but they had to yield at last. The next action took place at Chhāpāwalā in which Lord Gough, the Commander-in-Chief, was present, and used his artillery with terrible effect, but the Sikhs, undaunted by it, followed the heroic example of Shēr Singh who led them, and the contest ceased only when darkness set in. The English remained on the battlefield, and the Khāla army marched on about two kōs and encamped at the māzā of Rāsūl, where, however, difficulties arose, provisions being scarce, whereas they were plentiful in Gujrat. Accordingly it marched there. Colonel Lawrence now informed the author's father that the English meant to strike a final blow at the Sikhs, and that therefore it would be proper to guard all the roads and passes leading to the country of Jamrūh and Kasmir, and to disarm any Sikhs who might attempt to enter, and to station detachments of troops at Manāwar, Bhimbar, Mīrpūr, and other localities near the mountains. Tāhir Khān, agent for the Mahrājā Gulāb Singh in attendance on Major Mackison, always communicated the orders of the English officers to the Dīwān Hari Chand, who was stationed with the troops at Mīrpūr, from which 'īlāqā also the commissariat of the British troops was supplied. At last the great battle at Gujrat took place. The English began the action with artillery, and the Sardār Chhātar Singh attacked one flank with Afgān Cavalry, whilst Shēr Singh rushed upon the other. Here Rām Singh Chhāpāwalā, who firmly and valiantly stood his ground, lost his life. After the Sikhs had been defeated and dispersed, many of them purchased their safety from the officials of Gulāb Singh in various localities, but were disarmed and deprived of their horses and elephants. A number of them were captured near the fort of Māhgalā, and rendered harmless by being deprived of their weapons. The Khāla troops, who had intended to march to Peshāwar, and were now encamped under the command of Chhātar Singh and Shēr Singh, unanimously laid down their arms and sued for quarter. The disturbances in the whole of the Paṣjāb having thus been brought to a conclusion, Mr. (Sir Henry) Elliot, the Chief Secretary to the government in the Foreign Department, held with the consent of Colonel Sir Henry Lawrence a general darbār in the fort of Lāhōr, where the Mahrājā Dalp Singh was living with all the notables. The annexation of the Paṣjāb to the British dominions was published, and Dalp Singh deposed.
Some time afterwards Lord Dalhousie, the Governor-General in India, paid a visit to Lāhōr, and sent Dallp Siṅgh to Kārāchī. Gulāb Siṅgh, having remained in Jammūn, had no interview with the Viceroy, but when Lord [sic] Napier, the Commander-in-Chief, arrived, Sir John Lawrence went there and conveyed Gulāb Siṅgh to Siālkōt, where a meeting with the Commander-in-Chief took place.

Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh, at the commencement of the year 1907,† travelled via Rāmpūr to Kāsmīr, and Colonel Sir Henry Lawrence and Lady Montgomery and Captain Hudson entered it by way of Nīhāl. The Dīwān and Raqīb Siṅgh went to receive the party, and Gulāb Siṅgh went in a boat as far as Bātẖwārā, and lodged his guests in the Koth Bāgh, where he enjoyed their company till they departed on a tour to Shārdō and Lādākh. About this time the auspicious birth of Mīān Partāb Siṅgh,* took place. It was celebrated with great rejoicings, and when Colonel Lawrence departed from Kāsmīr, the author's father accompanied him as far as Lāhōr, and then returned to Jammūn. Gulāb Siṅgh next proceeded in great state with Raqīb Siṅgh, Jawāhrī Siṅgh, Mōṭī Siṅgh, and other notables to Wazīrābād. When the party arrived at Suchētṛghār, Mr. John Inglis, Deputy Commissioner of Wazīrābād, with Mr. Prinsep, met it, and on reaching the cantonment the English troops fired a salute of artillery. At Shāhdara, Colonel Sir Henry Lawrence came to meet Gulāb Siṅgh with Sir Robert Montgomery, Commissioner of Lāhōr, and Lord Napier (of Magdala) who bore at that time the rank of colonel. When the cavalcade approached the cantonment of Wazīrābād, Brigadier-General Horsey and other officers came to meet Gulāb Siṅgh, and escorted him to his residence. The regiment of infantry and the raẃāla of cavalry stationed there were drawn up, and the artillery fired a salute. Mr. [Sir Henry] Elliot, Chief Secretary, with Colonel Sir Henry Lawrence, then paid a visit to Gulāb Siṅgh, but for a day or two no interview could take place between him and Lord Dalhousie, the latter having sent excuses through the Secretary that he was suffering from a boil on the leg. When, however, afterwards Gulāb Siṅgh proceeded to the tent of the Governor-General, accompanied by the Brigadier and other officials, the troops were drawn out, and a salute was fired. On Gulāb Siṅgh's entering the tent the Viceroy went as far as the edge of the carpet to meet him, shook hands with him cordially, and seated him on his right hand. A salute of artillery having again been fired, the distribution of presents began, and the Viceroy spoke in a friendly manner, especially when he bestowed a robe of honour on Raqīb Siṅgh. Then he said: "Your father has risen to his high station under the sway of the late Mahārājā Ranjīt Siṅgh, whose image he is said to be still worshipping, and I hope that you will, in your turn, be likewise loyal to Her Majesty the Queen." At the same time he handed him her miniature set in a ring. Raqīb Siṅgh replied, that as he had greatly profited by his father's services to Ranjīt Siṅgh, he had himself gained ten-fold more from the graciousness of Her Majesty whom he would loyally serve with body and soul. The Dīwān received a robe of honour, and obtained, in addition, at the request of Sir Henry Lawrence, a horse with a golden saddle, the Viceroy observing that they were given to him as a reward for his loyalty to the government. When the robe of honour was bestowed upon the Dīwān Harī Chand, Major-General Sir Walter Gilbert, commanding officer of the forces in the Paţjāb, rose, and, addressing the Governor General, said that when the British forces pursued the rebels and crossed the Bhōṭ River, they could not have effected the crossing so easily nor obtained the aid of the Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh's army without the help of the Dīwān. Accordingly he received further presents. Various other officers also obtained dresses of honour, and among them the author of this book. Next day the Viceroy paid a return visit to the tent of the Mahārājā Gulāb Siṅgh and was met half-way by the Mahārājā, who distributed on that occasion costly gifts and fleet horses. The next day a grand review of the troops took place, after witnessing which the Mahārājā took leave and departed to Jammūn.

* A. D. 1859.
† This is the present Mahārājā, whose father, the late Mahārājā Raqīb Siṅgh, died on the 13th September 1888.
In St. 1907, the Dard people, who possessed, on the north-western frontier of Kasmir, the strong and inaccessible fort of Chilas in the mountains, made incursions and plundered the adjacent possessions of Gulab Singh. The severity of the winter prevented their punishment. So he despatched in the spring of the following year Dwan Hari Chand with sufficient forces and officers, including the Wazir Zoharwar, Colonel Bijai Singh, Colonel Jawahir Singh, Pujan Singh, and Dwan Thakurdev to attack the fort. They accordingly besieged it in spite of its extreme height, expecting to starve the garrison into surrender, but did not succeed. The commissariat of the besieging force was defective, and no provisions were obtainable on the spot, whilst the male portion of the garrison was indefatigable during the night, and the women continued firing musketry during the day. A portion of the troops in command of Colonel Dowl Singh Jandlwala erected a stockade in a place called Sangal, but he was attacked in the night by the population of the surrounding district, and in the fight the commander barely escaped with life. Meanwhile the besiegers attempted to take the fort by storm, but the scaling ladders were too short. The garrison hurled stones as well as fired upon the assailants and killed about 1,500 of them, among whom were also several brave officers. For all that, however, the besieging force did not lose heart, but subsisted on the leaves and bark of trees for food. During this campaign Gulab Singh's health declined, as he suffered from diabetes, and Ranbir Singh, being stationed at Sopur, carried on the administration of the district with the aid of the author of this work, who had been attached to his service. Meanwhile the besiegers, who knew that the garrison of the fort of Chilas would be compelled to surrender if it could be deprived of water, dug a mine, and caused all the water to flow out from the only tank in the fort, whereon the garrison drank oil for three days, and was from thirst under the necessity of beginning negotiations for surrender. While these were going on the people of the fort began gradually to leave it, whereon most of them were slain or retained as prisoners. The grain stored in the fort relieved the troops from the miseries of hunger but before they departed they burnt the place, taking with them some chiefs of the district whom they had made prisoners, such as Duri Khan, Rajmatullah and others. They were however, set free on promising to pay tribute, but their sons were retained as hostages.

As already noticed Gulab Singh became sick during this campaign, but when the information reached him that his troops were suffering from hunger, he averted that his malady had disappeared and insisted on marching in person to the scene of hostilities. His courtiers dissuaded him, and suggested that any one of them would gladly undertake the duty, whereon he appointed for that purpose Dwan Nihal Chand and the Paqdir Rajah Khak. On that occasion also Jotishw Brajal, who was a perfect astrologer, came forward, and told him to be of good cheer, because the fort of Chilas had been, or would be, taken on that day by his brave warriors, who would find in it boundless stores of grain. The Mahuraja was incredulous, but the prediction was nevertheless fulfilled, and he rewarded the astrologer amply.

Having partially recovered from his diabetes, Gulab Singh left Srinagar and went to Jammun. He was joined during the march by Mott Singh, who had a grievance against the Rajah Jawahir Singh and met him at a distance of one farans from Jammun. The two Rajas, Mott and Jawahir, were brothers, and as their dispute could not be settled locally, it was submitted to the English authority, for which purpose they departed to Lohur. From Jammun Gulab Singh went to Rias, which is four farans to the north of it, and there he was informed that Santokh Singh, the Thanadar of Gilgit, had left the fort with the garrison, trusting to the false promises of the Rajah of Nagar, and was slain by the rebels. But Devi Dass commanding the fort of Manwar held out for some time, and at last saliled forth to be killed by his antagonists, who amounted to more than 4000. He had, however, taken the precaution of slaying all the women to save their honour, and then sacrificed his own life, fighting bravely. The same fate overtook Bhup Singh who held the fort of Pur, for he too was compelled by hunger to come out and give battle to the Rajah of Nagar, who had sworn that he

* A.D. 1850.
would spare the lives of the garrison, but treacherously attacked and slew it, as soon as it came out from the fort. The ringleader of the rebellion was one Gauhar Rahmán who had conquered Gilgit and sold his captives into slavery. He was ultimately subdued.

Just at this period, when Gułab Siṅgh's troops were fully occupied at home, Colonel Lawrence sent him a khārīza to the effect, that as the rebels of the Hazāra district were again disturbing it, he ought as quickly as possible to despatch some forces there. He sent four regiments which acquitted themselves so well that they earned the approbation of the British government. Meanwhile Jawāhir Siṅgh, who was of an ambitious turn of mind, had been reminded by some of his turbulent friends, that when the English authorities settled the government they had not increased his jagār by adding to it Juarotā with other estates that had belonged to the late Rājā Hīrā Siṅgh, and that his journey to Lāhōr had remained fruitless. Maulavi Maṅghār 'All, who was in the service of Gułab Siṅgh and had become intimate with Jawāhir Siṅgh through 'Abdullāh Kháṁ the Afghān, also persuaded him that he might obtain one-half of the dominions of Gułab Siṅgh. This man's intrigues, however, ended in his capture by the English when he was in Peshawār for the purpose of enlisting men in the Swāt district and his deportation to the Paṅjab, where he was imprisoned. Jawāhir Siṅgh then went again to Lāhōr in the hope of inducing Sir John Lawrence to make him independent of Gułab Siṅgh, whose vassal he was, but could not succeed, and so he at last made preparations for hostilities which proved to be of no avail in consequence of the precautions taken by Gułab Siṅgh.

The Māharājā Gułab Siṅgh had, on a former occasion, when suffering from his chronic malady, informed Colonel Lawrence of his wish to entrust Raṇbhār Siṅgh with the entire administration of the government, and had met with the Colonel's acquiescence. Accordingly he placed, on the 6th of the month Phāgūm, St. 1912, his adopted son Raṇbhār Siṅgh upon the throne of dominion, and put with his own hand the saffron-mark on his forehead. The same day also the author of this book was elevated to the rank of Diwān, received a costly dress of honour, and a handsome inkstand from the Māharājā Gułab Siṅgh. The ceremony of installation, to which also the officers of the cantonment of Si.nlmāt had been invited, took place at Maṅgūḍ, where a darbār was held, in which all the notables were present, and the father of the author delivered a speech, reminding the young sovereign of his duties towards his subjects, and recommending him to be loyal to the British government. After that day the Māharājā Gułab Siṅgh altogether retired from public affairs, and abandoning all worldly pursuits prepared himself for death. He departed to the delightful abode of Kaśmīr, and being troubled also by gout in the hip, fainted one day from weakness whilst bathing. Raṇbhār Siṅgh, having been apprised of his condition, at once hastened from Jammān to pay him a visit. Just then the Pūrūḥā troops in the service of the English burnt the cantonments of Mārāth (Meerut) and Dohl, killed their officers, and mutinies were spreading all over India. The Māharājā Gułab Siṅgh immediately despatched his Diwān to Rāwal Piṅḍī, where Sir John Lawrence, the Chief Commissioner of the Paṅjab, happened to be at that time, in order to place the whole of his army and treasure at the disposal of the British government as a proof of his loyalty. He also placed the forts in his possession, but more especially the stronghold of Mangūḍ at the disposal of the English troops, and promised to give a cordial welcome to the ladies sojourning in the mountain retreat of Maṅgūḍ (Murree), who were invited to Kaśmīr to remain there in safety. Sir John Lawrence accepted the offer, desired the Diwān Hari Chand to take command of the troops, and to send ten lāḥās of Srinagarī rupees.

When the Māharājā Gułab Siṅgh felt his end approaching, he one day gave instructions to the Paṅḍit Sīb-Sāṅkar for the arrangements to be made for his funeral. He also reminded the author of this book that he had been ordered to write a biography of the Māharājā, but had not yet found time for the work, and hop. d that he would not fail to execute it after his demise. The condition of the Māharājā gradually became worse, and a burning fever attacked

---

* A. D. 1555.  
* On the 11th May 1837.
him repeatedly, which his physicians were unable to subdue; whereon he gave away as alms one ḍāk and twenty-five thousand Srinagar rupees, a ḍāsīr with a revenue of Rs. 10,000, as well as beautiful gardens, fleet horses, mountain-like elephants, jewellery, and costly garments. He expired on the 20th of the month Sāwan in St. 1914, regrett and lamented by all.

FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY PANDIT NATESA SASTRl, M.F.L.S.

No. 36. — The Wise Men of Puṅganūr; the Madrās Gotham.

A generation or two before Mahāmudrā, there lived in the kingdom of Puṅganūr a king named Niruddhi (the 'witless'). Beyond eating, sleeping, and hunting wild beasts, he knew of no pleasures. He was extremely weak in intellect, and as usual was surrounded by equally stupid ministers. Stupidity was the sole possession of His Majesty and the officers of his court; stubbornness and ready execution of orders, their rule of life; and as to knowledge of any thing but what came before their eyes, they had none. One virtue of Niruddhi's court was — if it may be termed a virtue — that, whatever the sovereign commanded, the court was ready to obey, and that too at the cost of life!

It is the custom at courts, in villages, and at bathing ghāts in India, for a Brāhmaṇ to read out of a palm-leaf book, generally called the pañcāhāṇg, the asterism, lunar date, &c, of each day, so that people may know them and be careful to perform the prescribed rites so essential for a Brāhmaṇ and others of the twice-born caste. In accordance with this rule, a poor Brāhmaṇ of Puṅganūr used to proceed to the palace and read out the particulars of each day from the pañcāhāṇg. This he did of hereditary right, as his father and grandfather had done before him, and so there was nothing unusual about it.

On a certain day, just as the king had got out of his bed and sat outside his palace on a cot with a big vessel full of water to wash his face and teeth in, the pañcāhāṇg-reading Brāhmaṇ appeared at his regular morning duty, and read out from a palm-leaf book which he carried under his left arm, thus:

"Ôm! This day is Sunday, the fifteenth day of the month of Māgha in the year Khara. The lunar day (tithi) today is Ekādaśī. Ekādaśī lasts up to the eleventh ghāṭikā. Then Ekādaśī goes out, and Dwādaśī comes in. The rāhu-kāla (evil time) today is at twenty-six and a quarter ghāṭikās. May there be prosperity to all!"

Having thus read out, the Brāhmaṇ was slowly closing his oblong book with a stealthy look at His Majesty's face to see how Niruddhi appreciated his remarks. But the storm had already begun. The royal face changed colour.

"Stop, you mischievous Brāhmaṇ!" he said.

The unfolded book dropped down, and the timid creature stood shivering with fear and confusion.

"What is the meaning of this stuff that you are daily muttering? You cannot deceive me as you deceive the public, by the holy ashes so profusely smeared over you and your rudrākṣa beads. You come to my court daily in the morning and mutter that Dwādaśī goes out, Trīḍīya goes in; Ekādaśī goes out, Dwādaśī comes in; and so on, and so on. I understand! Some one goes out daily and some one comes in without my knowledge; I do not like such a state of affairs in my kingdom. So I now order that neither shall Ekādaśī go out, nor shall Dwādaśī come in. Will you see to it or not?" roared out the king.

11 A. D. 1837.
1 Related by a friend from North-Arcot who had spent a great part of his life at Puṅganūr in the North-Arcot District.
2 See Tale No. 35, ante, Vol. XX. p. 78.
3 The eleventh day of a lunar fortnight.
4 The 2nd, 3rd, 11th and 12th days of a lunar fortnight.
The harsh tone of His Majesty made his numerous ministers assemble round him and wait with impatience for the Brāhmaṇ's reply!

After bowing, he said respectfully: — "Most gracious sovereign!, permit this mean dog from your wide kingdom to say that Ekapāsa and Dvādāsa are tithis, not to be perceived by mortal eyes, and that it is altogether impossible to prevent the one from going out or the other from coming in."

"Stop your mouth! you vile Brāhmaṇ," roared out many voices, and for very fear he had to do so.

"Neither shall Ekapāsa go out, nor shall Dvādāsa come in," roared out His Majesty, and when the Brāhmaṇ again said that it was impossible, he was at once ordered to jail. A hundred hundreds were at once at his throat, and he was pushed out of the palace and thrown into prison.

Then His Majesty thus addressed his chief minister: — "Did you hear what that vile wretch said? That Ekapāsa and Dvādāsa are tithis, not to be perceived by mortal eyes. Do you think that there is anything in this world which would escape our sight?"

"No, my most gracious sovereign!" said the chief minister.

"Then to business," continued the king; "you must set a strict watch over the town and guard every nook and corner, and see that no person goes out of the town at the eleventh ghatikā to-day, and that no person enters the town at that time."

"Agreed," said the minister, "I shall keep so strict a guard that even the breeze will find it difficult to move in or out."

"Again," said the king; "Ekapāsa and Dvādāsa may be jugglers, and they may assume some curious shapes, and thus, defeating our vigilance, may go out or come in. Take care that no object, either animate or inanimate, brute or mortal, comes in or goes out at the eleventh ghatikā. Let the time-announcers be strictly warned to give out every second of each ghatikā to-day, that you and your soldiers may have your eyes wide open at that exact time."

"All this shall be duly attended to," nodded the chief minister. And many voices were heard extolling the king to the skies at his sagacity in giving such very strict injunctions. His Majesty, not to take up any more of the precious time of his chief minister, ordered him off to his duty, and went into his palace.

The chief minister was entirely lost in admiration for some minutes at the forethought with which the king had given him so many valuable instructions, congratulated himself on his good fortune in having been placed under the benign rule of such an intelligent monarch, and, not to lose any more time in mere praises, got up from his seat. Every soldier in Puṇganūr was proud of his service that day, and of shewing his zeal and energy in guarding the kingdom, and swore an oath that he might be called a bastard if he allowed the Ekapāsa to escape. The minister too was very proud to see so many faithful followers, and, assembling all the soldiers, arranged them in a circle round the city. Every inch was thus most carefully guarded, and the minister, as he rode round and round, saw many a soldier stretching out his hands and swearing that he would break the head of Ekapāsa just as he would a ripe cocoanut, if he would only pass his way. Thus was the town most carefully guarded. The minister went his rounds, and the time-announcers bawled out every second with all their might all day long, and there was only one second more for the eleventh ghatikā to be finished!

"Attention! Care!" roared out the minister. There was no stir anywhere. Even the elements dreaded on that occasion the power of the minister and his zealous soldiers!

"Eleventh ghatikā," roared the time-announcer. Just at that moment a rat ran out close by the minister.
“Ekādaśī is going out in the disguise of a rat,” he shouted.

“Catch him, pull him to pieces,” responded many voices. But alas! the rat had already disappeared into his hole in the ground!

“Out upon you, fools! What will our sovereign say when he comes to know that so many of us were on guard to-day, and still allowed Ekādaśī to escape?” mourned the minister.

“No, my lord, let us bore holes and trace out the disguised Ekādaśī,” said many voices, and at once the operation commenced.

The news, that, at the exact time declared by the Brāhmaṇ, Ekādaśī in the disguise of a rat had escaped and thus gone out, spread like wild-fire throughout the town. Cursing himself for not being on the spot, the king appeared on the scene, and it was a great consolation to him that Ekādaśī had entered into a hole, for, wherever he might have gone, he would trace that hole to its very source and take Ekādaśī prisoner. Thus consoling, after a volley of abuse, he told his minister to go and govern his kingdom in his stead, exercising paternal care over every one, until he came back bringing Ekādaśī prisoner. It might be the work of a few hours or weeks or months or years, but until the return of the sovereign the minister was to reign over Puṅganūr. Thus was the matter settled. The minister cursed himself for his carelessness at the eleventh ghāṭikā and his failure to catch the runaway tīthi. However, he consoled himself that he had yet ample opportunities of regaining his lord’s favour by good government during his absence in pursuit of Ekādaśī.

The king set to work with two hundred of his most faithful soldiers, and went on tracing the holes, for one led into another, and before the close of the day he was over five hās away from his kingdom. First a rat, then a mouse, and then a bandicoot, would run out and hide itself in another and yet another hole.

“There goes Ekādaśī disguised as a mouse, and now as a bandicoot,” bawled out the soldiers.

Thus the search continued for several days. Every one worked hard from morn to eve, and rested his weary limbs all night, to begin work with renewed energy the next day. Still Ekādaśī remained uncaught, and the soldiers undiminished in their zeal and energy as long as the runaway was yet at liberty and the king in the camp.

Meanwhile the minister, true to his master’s orders, governed Puṅganūr as a father would his family. The oppressors were punished, the weak were protected, and justice in the peculiar fashion of Puṅganūr was administered to every one who asked for it. The ladies in the seraglio of the king were carefully attended to. Orders were issued that the minister was keeping watch over the kingdom day and night, and that every soul might go to him freely at any time, day or night, and claim his attention and service. Thus was the government of Puṅganūr carried on in excellent fashion, and no one felt for a moment the absence of their gracious king who had gone out in pursuit of Ekādaśī. In this way a full month passed, till there came the first night of the second month, and about the eleventh ghāṭikā, when the minister was sitting on the outer verandah of his house, chewing betel-leaves after his supper all alone, and revolving in his mind certain new plans and methods of government to be adopted next day,

Suddenly there came running a maid-servant of the queen, gasping for breath.

“What is the matter? Is the Rāṇī Ammā well! Quick! Speak!” said the minister, changing colour at the sudden appearance of the woman, and his body perspiring profusely, partly at the fear excited by such an unexpected visit, and partly from the chewing of warm betel-leaves.

“Oh, great minister,” gasped the maid, “God alone must protect us. Our Rāṇī always sleeps soundly every night, and as usual went to bed at the fifth ghāṭikā to-night and soon fell into a good snore. We stood round her, fanning her, as is our duty, when at the seventh ghāṭikā her snoring stopped and she said ‘hā,’ and turning on her left side, began to snore again
as usual. We have never heard her say 'hā' before in her sleep; so I have come running to consult you as to the cause of it,” gasped the maid.

The minister pondered a while and said: — "The utterance of 'hā' usually succeeds a poisonous bite. I fear that some serpent has stung Her Majesty. But let us not be rash. You had better fly back to her again and continue your strict watch. If again you observe her say 'hā' in her sleep and turn on her side, report it at once to me. Be off at once to your duty."

The maid ran away, and the minister, thinking it unwise to sleep that night, kept wide awake. If a leaf was stirred by the breeze, he imagined it to be the maid coming in again. And at last even so it was, for she appeared again at the fifteenth ghafikā, and reported that a second ‘hā’ was uttered in her sleep by the Rāṇī.

"Be not confused! Patience is the motto of great men! Let us hear it a third time, and then we shall be certain that the poison is working. And it won't be too late to commence the cure. Go and watch over Her Majesty."

Thus the minister again dismissed the maid, but two ghafikās were scarcely over before the maid appeared for the third time, with tears in her eyes and said: — "Alas! minister, God is cruel! We are all undone! The Rāṇī uttered 'hā hā' twice, this time! What shall we do?"

The minister did not know what to do, and despatched a hasty messenger to fetch the serpent-doctor.

"Say that the minister requires his services to attend on the Rāṇī, who has been bitten by a serpent," said the minister, and off the messenger flew with the swiftness of a kite.

The doctor's house was reached, but he was not at home, for he had gone out on the previous evening to a neighbouring village five kās off, and a messenger went in pursuit of him. Meanwhile the doctor's son, who was also a serpent-doctor on a smaller scale than his father, came to the minister.

"Your father is not here then?" said the minister.

"No, my lord; but he will be here early in the morning; but what does your lordship require? My services are at your disposal. I have been for the last ten years a regular student at the feet of my venerable father," replied the boy-doctor.

"Then," said the minister; "the Rāṇī is stung by a serpent. You must cure Her Majesty at once of the poison."

"Alas," continued the boy, "I have not yet come to that chapter of the book, but I have heard my father say often that the curing of poisonous bites is an extremely easy thing, provided that the poison has not ascended up to the head. So, as a precaution, I would advise that the head be separated from the body, so as to make sure that the venom has not ascended there. If this advice is followed, the cure may be commenced at any time."

"You are a clever doctor, though still a boy. It is most unfortunate that your studies have not yet reached the chapter on poisons. But let us not be wasting time. Well, maid, go back at once to the seraglio, and without the least disturbance sever the head of the queen from her body and keep it detached. We shall know if the poison has killed her, when the doctor arrives in the morning. Here is my signet-ring, which will stop any one who might want to prevent you from carrying out my orders."

Thus, giving his signet-ring to the maid-servant and sending the boy-doctor home, the minister retired for a short sleep.

The head of the Rāṇī was, alas!, in strict accordance with the orders of the minister, severed from her body, and in a second life went out of her, for no other cause but that of the
extreme stupidity of the Puṅgaṅṉūr State! Morning dawned, and the old doctor with the messenger returned home, bringing with him his bag containing the rare medicines. He was no doubt a clever man in his profession, but his son, who had reached the Puṅgaṅṉūr standard of wisdom, reported to him the advice he had given. The father cursed himself for having begotten such a son, and his only thought now was how to rescue himself and his son from the consequences of the murder of the Rāṇī. Luckily, nothing was impossible in the kingdom of Puṅgaṅṉūr. So, hiding his confusion, he stood before the minister, who took him without the loss of a moment to the seraglio. There the body of the queen lay in its blood, minus its head.

“What do you say now? Put the head straight at once and begin your cure,” cried the minister.

“Alas! most mighty minister! The maids have been a little careless in placing the severed head. It should not have been placed exactly opposite the trunk. The poison has taken the opportunity to travel into the head by the direct road left open! There is no hope of life now! If they had kept the head in any other direction but that exactly opposite, I could have opened my bag and ground my medicine. Now even Dhanvantari himself would find it impossible.”

Thus said the old doctor, and put on a mournful face. The minister believed every word he had said, and so did the maids, and fell to quoting the fatalistic argument that the queen had lived out her destined life. So what was the use of mourning over the past? The dead body must be cremated.

“The dead close their eyes in peace: the living have to undergo all the trouble and expense of cremating the body,” as the proverb has it, argued the minister to himself. “The queen is dead. The king is now absent in the pursuit of Ėkādaśī. He won’t return till that wretched tīthi is caught. The corpse cannot wait till then. I cannot cremate it in the ground reserved for that purpose; for this is not an ordinary corpse. The king might think himself insulted. She was his queen, while living. I shall not diminish her honour in death, but will cremate her body in the palace, at the very spot where she died. If a portion of the palace is burnt down, I can easily have it repaired; but it is impossible to repair the displeasure of an enraged king.”

Thus pondering and pondering over the subject, the Puṅgaṅṉūr minister gave orders for the funeral pile to be heaped upon the very spot where the queen had died. Sandal-wood, black-wood and every costly wood were used; gṛha was poured on the pyre in profusion, and none had the courage to gainsay the orders of the minister, or the sense to foresee the evils they would produce. The body was set on the pile, and the fire lighted, and not only the pyre but the whole palace was in flames!

Now, it is considered the greatest of insults in Hindu society, to put out the fire of the funeral pyre until the body is consumed. So, notwithstanding that the whole palace was in flames, the minister never thought of putting out the fire.

Pondered he: “What would the king think of me if I, his minister, — his servant, — put out the fire before the body of the queen was consumed? Let the palace, or even the whole town, be burnt down; but let no one dare to quench the funeral fire.” Thus did he order, and almost half of the town was in flames by the time the body of the queen was entirely burnt. By that time, the fire raged so severely that no one dared to approach it. No amount of ordinary water could quench it. What was to be done?

Just then a thought came into the mind of the minister, that it would be the wisest course to break open the embankment of a big lake five kāśs long and five kāśs broad, situated at the western end of the town and on a higher level! The order was executed in a moment, and a huge volume of water rushed down in full force, and in the twinkling of an eye had carried...
away almost the whole town, and of course quenched the fire. The minister and other high
officials of the State, guided by the instinct of self-preservation, had located themselves, with
many others who were destined to live, on the embankment, and were thus saved.

When the body of the queen had been thus cremated, and the fire quenched, the minister
thought it his duty to send a full report of his administration to the absent king. He
filled several pages with a florid account of his good government, in terms which may be left to
the imagination. He dwelt at length on his administration of the Puiganur kingdom since his
master had left it, on the queen's death from the poisonous bite, on the remedies he adopted,
on the supremacy of fate, on his own ideas of cremating her body, on its success, on its success
accomplishment, on the iron hand of fate that had set the town in flames, on the course he followed to
quench the conflagration, and on the procedure he adopted to relieve the sufferers.

He had two very trustworthy peons under him: one a Nāyak, named Kondal
Nāyakan, and another a Muḥammadan named Miraṅ Sā. These two were jealous of each other,
and each wanted to have the honour of carrying the report in person to His Majesty. The
minister chose Miraṅ Sā, and giving the document to him, ordered him to proceed to the king.

Great was the joy of Miraṅ Sā, not that he himself was chosen, but that Kondal Nāyak was
not chosen. He took the huge document, tied it a kerchief round his loins, and marched off in
haste. In his joy at the special honour conferred upon him, he walked fast the whole day and
almost the whole night, till at last nature began to exert its influence and overpower his zeal.
Just at the third ghafikā before the dawn of the second day of his journey, he lay down under a
tree to rest a while, and fell into a profound sleep. The spot where he slept was near the
kingdom of Kārvēnagār, and in a neighbouring village there lived a barber, who used every
morning to go to the palace of Kārvēnagār to shave the king; but, however fine and sharp his
razor might be, the king always found fault with him for being a bad hand at his work. Now
the barber happened to pass by the spot where Miraṅ Sā was asleep, and thought he to
himself:—

"The king always accuses me of being a bad hand at shaving. I shall just test the
truth of his remarks. Here is a person asleep, and if I successfully shave him without rousing
him, what doubt will there be then that I am a first-rate barber?"

Thus resolving, he placed his cup with water in it before the sleeping peon and set to work.
First he shaved Miraṅ Sā's board clean off, and twisted up the Muḥammadan's moustache
into the form and out of a Nāyak's. He then applied the Nāyak caste mark to
Miraṅ Sā's forehead, and setting a glass in front of the sleeper, replaced his razor and cup in
his bag, and, glad at heart that he had shaved a sleeping person without disturbing him and that
he was a very clever hand at his work, he proceeded to Kārvēnagār.

A ghafikā or two after the barber had left, Miraṅ Sā awoke from his sleep. He saw his
face reflected in the glass in front of him. The Nāyak cut of his moustaches, and the mark on
his forehead, were prominently noticed by him.

Said he in amazement to himself:— "What, after all, the minister has deceived me! I
prided myself yesterday that the minister had sent Miraṅ Sā to the king. Now I see that
the person that goes to the king is not Miraṅ Sā, but Kondal Nāyakan! Ah! vile minister.
You have deceived me. You have not sent Miraṅ Sā, but Kondal Nāyakan, to the king. However,
I shall soon have an opportunity of carrying tales to the king. I shall report to His Majesty
how you deceived me, by sending Miraṅ Sā first and Kondal Nāyakan afterwards."

Thus argued the transformed Miraṅ Sā, and rose up and proceeded to the king and
handed him the administration report. The king read over the whole document with the
greatest imaginable pleasure, and was apparently satisfied with every act of his minister! What

---

* This is an extremely fine specimen of Puiganur wisdom, where a person, forgetting his own identity, imagines to
himself that he is a different person, and argues to himself as if he were sometimes himself and sometimes another.
else could the reader expect from a fool who was in pursuit of Ekāḍāśi? At the last page His Majesty stopped and said:—

"What a fool the minister is! He has filled so many pages with every possible information, but is silent on a most important point. There were several kinds of fish in the Puṇganur lake. He has not said a word about them. Where did they go when the embankment was cut open? What became of them? Why has the fool not put in a word about it?"

Just as the monarch finished his last sentence, the transformed Mrāṇ Sā said:—"Most gracious sovereign, I can give Your Majesty the information needed, for I was that day on the very spot. As soon as the embankment was cut open and the waters rushed out, all the fish in the lake climbed up the babul trees which are so numerous on the bank, and building their nests there, are living safe in them at this very moment!"

Thus said Mrāṇ Sā, or Koṇḍal Nāyakan, as you may choose to term him. The king was highly pleased, as he was sure to see his fish in their nests on the babul trees on his return to his kingdom! For the great consolation thus given him in good time, he appointed Mrāṇ Sā to the minister's post and ordered him to govern Puṇganur in his absence, and degraded the minister who had omitted to remark on the fish in his report. Thus Mrāṇ Sā, without any effort of his own, got the minister's place, and receiving the order, started back for Puṇganur:

But all the way he was in great doubt as to who had been made minister — Mrāṇ Sā or Koṇḍal Nāyakan! "God must descend from his high place in heaven to clear up such a doubt!" said he, as he returned to Puṇganur, and took his seat as Viceroy of Puṇganur.

While all these changes were taking place, Ekāḍāśi remained uncaught. The more they searched, the more distant seemed the hope of ever catching him. Sometimes he took the form of a bird and flew away, and sometimes he was transformed into a hare. Thus there was no end to his jugglery, transformations and transmigrations. The king had already been in pursuit of him for nearly a year, and there was still no hope of Ekāḍāśi being caught, and in all the king returning to Puṇganur.

In the Kārvēṭnagar State, there lived an intelligent Brāhmaṇ who had long been witness of the mad acts of Nirbuddhi, and it seemed to him that there would be no end to them.

He pitied the stupidity of the monarch, and wanted to convince him of his foolishness by a simple example. He hired a palanquin and half a dozen bearers. Seating himself in it, he ordered the bearers to carry him with a loud sing-song howl through Nirbuddhi's camp.

"If the king asks you who goes in the palanquin, tell him that Ekāḍāśi, the Brāhmaṇ, rides in it."

Thus instructing the bearers, the Brāhmaṇ proceeded in his palanquin, and Nirbuddhi heard a great sing-song howl near his camp.

"Stop that palanquin! Who is that he dares to ride in it so boldly, notwithstanding that Our Majesty is encamped here?" Thus said the king, and the bearers replied as already instructed by the Brāhmaṇ.

Thought the king: — "Blessed be my life today! I have been searching almost a whole year for Ekāḍāśi! This Brāhmaṇ, who is named after him, must be able to give me some clue as to how to catch him."

Thus thinking, he saluted the Brāhmaṇ, and requested him to help in catching Ekāḍāśi.

The Brāhmaṇ came down from the palanquin, and said: — "Most gracious monarch! We are all men. Ekāḍāśi is a god. We cannot catch him. Since you have been in pursuit of him, he has been to Puṇganur twenty-four times, and returned back to his palace."

"What!" said the astonished king. "How can he go to Puṇganur, while so many of us are pursuing him? I saw him last evening running away as a hare."

* Quite true: there had been 24 Ekāḍāśis in the interval.
“No, my supreme lord! you are wrong. Can you prevent the sun from going to Puṅganur by all your vigilance? It must go and return every day: is it not so? Even so Śkādasi travels with the sun, and appears once on every fifteenth day at Puṅganur as the sun appears there every day.”

This simple illustration at last convinced the king, that . . . his efforts to catch the Śkādasi were a mad-man’s project after all! He returned to his kingdom, and, appointing Śkādasi, the Brahmā, as his minister, reigned for a long time. Owing to the intelligence of this minister, the kingdom improved a little, but they say that it took several generations for it to reach the level of the intelligence of its neighbours!

MISCELLANEA.

THE SINES OF ARCS IN THE PANCHA-SIDDHANTIKI.

I have just seen Prof. Thibaut’s Pāṇchāsiddhāntikī, and would call attention to ch. IV., translation, pp. 23, 34. In all 6–11 we are told that the ‘sines’ of the twenty-four arcs are — 7 minutes 51 seconds, 15 minutes 40 seconds, &c. Comparing these values with those given in the Sārga-Siddhānta, we remark that, if we read degrees and minutes instead of ‘minutes’ and ‘seconds,’ we have rather more than double the values given for these sines in later astronomical works; in fact we find that the radius sine of 90° is in the Sārga-Siddhānta made equal to 3438° or 57° 18' or the chord of 60°; but in the Pauliṣṭha-Siddhānta it is made equal to 120° (or perhaps degrees). Now we find Ptolemy, in his table of right-lines or chords, divides the radius into 60 parts (or degrees) and subdivides them sexagesimally for the values of the chords of each arc. The Pauliṣṭha-Siddhānta had followed the same system, if it did not derive the actual values from Ptolemy, by the shortest and best way, dividing the arc by 2, while retaining the values of the chords as the simplest method of preserving the exact values of these ratios without fractional parts of a minute. The agreement is shown in the following table, where the ‘arcs’ are multiples of 3° 45' in the Hindu table of sines, and of 7° 30' in Ptolemy’s table of Chords:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of arc</th>
<th>Paṅga-Siddhānta (sines)</th>
<th>Ptolemy’s chords</th>
<th>No. of arc</th>
<th>Paṅga-Siddhānta (sines)</th>
<th>Ptolemy’s chords</th>
<th>No. of arc</th>
<th>Paṅga-Siddhānta (sines)</th>
<th>Ptolemy’s chords</th>
<th>No. of arc</th>
<th>Paṅga-Siddhānta (sines)</th>
<th>Ptolemy’s chords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7° 51'</td>
<td>7° 50' 54''</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66° 40'</td>
<td>66° 40' 7''</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>107° 38'</td>
<td>107° 37' 30''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15° 40'</td>
<td>15° 39' 47''</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73° 3'</td>
<td>73° 3' 5''</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>110° 53'</td>
<td>110° 51' 42''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23° 25'</td>
<td>23° 24' 39''</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79° 7</td>
<td>79° 7' 18''</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>113° 33'</td>
<td>113° 32' 54''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31° 4'</td>
<td>31° 3' 30''</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84° 51'</td>
<td>84° 51' 10''</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>115° 56'</td>
<td>115° 54' 40''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38° 34'</td>
<td>38° 34' 22''</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90° 13'</td>
<td>90° 13' 15''</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>117° 43'</td>
<td>117° 41' 40''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>45° 56'</td>
<td>45° 55' 19''</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95° 13'</td>
<td>95° 13' 9''</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>119° 0'</td>
<td>118° 58' 22''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>53° 5'</td>
<td>53° 4' 29''</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99° 46'</td>
<td>99° 46' 35''</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>119° 45'</td>
<td>119° 44' 36''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60° 0'</td>
<td>60° 0' 0''</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>103° 55'</td>
<td>103° 55' 23''</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120° 1'</td>
<td>120° 0' 0''</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this it will be seen that most of them agree to the nearest minute, and only a very few differ by a full minute; in the case of the 24th we must suppose an error in the text, as it differs from the radius. The others may have arisen from errors of construction when fractions are rejected, or from inaccuracies in the MS. Whether the values are to be expressed in minutes and seconds, as Prof. Thibaut has rendered his text, or in degrees and minutes, must depend on the manuscripts; all that is meant by these in Ptolemy and this Śārga-Siddhānta is equal parts of the radius or diameter, and nothing of the nature of arcs.

The differences too of these sines, given in all 12–15, are also included in Ptolemy’s table, and he explains their use for interpolation. No use is assigned to them in the Siddhānta; but if the second differences are noted it will be seen how irregular they are, especially towards the end of the series, — a proof of slight errors in the sines themselves.

From ch. 1 of this chapter IV., we find $\pi = \sqrt{10}$ or 3.1623, and the circumference being 360° this gives the radius equal to the arc of 50° 55' of the Sārga-Siddhānta makes this 57° 18' or 3438', and employs this as the sine of 90°, which is a distinct and important advance on the method of the older Siddhānta.

Lastly, the ratio of 57° 18' to 120° being nearly as 21 to 44, or, better, as 191 to 400, the Pauliṣṭha-Siddhānta values of the sines may be compared with those of the Sārga-Siddhānta, by multiplying the former by 21 and dividing by 44; or more accurately, by multiplying by 191 and dividing by 400.

J. Burgess.

Edinburgh, 24th March 1891.
THE INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI.

BY E. SENART, MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT DE FRANCE.

Translated by G. A. Grierson, B.C.S., and revised by the Author.

(Continued from p. 170.)

CHAPTER IV.

THE AUTHOR AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE INSCRIPTIONS.

It has been my intention, when undertaking this re-investigation into the epigraphical monuments left by Piyadasi, that it should not be concluded without bringing together the conclusions to which they lead or of which they furnish the essential elements, both from the point of view of history and chronology, and also from that of paleography and grammar. It is the varied problems which these curious inscriptions raise, and to the solution of which they contribute, that give them such inestimable value. We cannot well leave them aside. We shall have, in turn, not only to sum up results arrived at, but sometimes, also, to offer new remarks.

The task divides itself naturally into two parts; the first devoted to the author of the inscriptions, his date, his character, his administration, his moral and religious ideas, — in short, his place in historical development; and the second dealing with paleographic and linguistic facts, and the information derived therefrom regarding the literary culture of ancient India.

I. — THE AUTHOR OF THE INSCRIPTIONS.

A number of chronological and historical problems are connected, directly or indirectly, with our inscriptions and their author. The end which I have in view does not compel me to take up all, and I desire to limit myself as much as possible to summing up and classifying the items of information that the edicts, which we have passed in review, contain.

Three questions force themselves at first upon our attention as being of importance for further investigations. We must know if all the inscriptions, on which we have commented, belong certainly to the same author; who that author really is; and in what chronological order the epigraphic documents which he has left us range themselves.

Regarding the first point, doubts can only arise with respect to the inscriptions more lately discovered at Sahasaram, Rupnath, and Bairat. The author calls himself simply by the epithet of Devananipiya, and omits the proper name Piyadasi. No one can doubt that all the others emanate from one and the same person. Wilson has indeed put forward a singular theory on this subject. According to him, the different inscriptions were probably engraved by local sovereigns, or by influential religious personages, who, to give themselves more authority, have usurped the celebrated name of Piyadasi; but this hypothesis depends upon so many errors of translation and apprehension, is so evidently contradicted by the unity of tone which reigns throughout all the edicts, by their perfect agreement and the natural way in which they complete each other, and has besides found so little echo, that it appears superfluous to pause for its consideration.

The same is not the case with regard to the doubts which have been raised by competent judges touching the origin of the Edict of Sahasaram and Rupnath. It is known already that I do not consider these doubts to be any better founded than the others. Dr. Bühler, when publishing this edict for the first time, clearly shewed most of the reasons which lead us to refer

---

1 It is, of course, impossible in such a matter, when new contributions are frequently issuing from competent hands, to keep one's own particular work up to date. In these concluding chapters, however, I have tried to avail myself of such new comments as have appeared since the conclusion of my own, whenever they bore upon some topic which necessarily came under consideration. I refer specially to the article, throughout at once learned and ingenious, which Dr. Fischel has devoted to my first volume in the Göttinger Anzeigen, and to the Beiträge zur Erklärung der Asoka inschriften published by Dr. Bühler in the Zeitschrift der D. Morgenländischen Gesellschaft which are here quoted according to the continuous pagination of the reprints.


3 ande, Vol. VII. pp. 143 ff.
this inscription to the same Piyadasi as he who was the author of all the others; and it is useless to go again over the considerations which he has so well put forward. I have in the examination just concluded, indicated a new reason, drawn from chronological considerations, which could not have struck Dr. Bühler, because it depended on an interpretation altogether different from that which he has proposed. I must here repeat and complete my demonstration, and this will be an opportunity for passing in review the dates, unhappily too rare, which the king furnishes for certain events of his reign.

According to the 13th Edict, the conversion of Piyadasi should date from the ninth year after his coronation. It was immediately after the conquest of Kaliśga that there awoke in him, under the direct impression of war and its horrors, the intense desire for the dharma. With this it is important to connect a piece of evidence in the 8th Edict, of which every one, myself as well as other interpreters, has hitherto misunderstood the bearing.

Since my commentary appeared, this passage has been the subject of two revisions, one by Paṇḍit Bhagwânâlî Indrají and the other by Dr. Bühler. The important sentence is the third. It runs as follows at Girnar: so dévānapriyā priyadasī ṛṣiṇa dasavaśādhaṃ suhū ṛṣiṇa saumōhiḥ. The text is practically the same in the other versions, only the difference consisting in the substitution of nikhami (or nikhannihā) for the verb ayāya. The construction and translation of the Paṇḍit cannot be sustained, but Dr. Bühler has made some very just objections against my interpretation, although in his turn he has missed the translation which I now consider to be the true one. It is impossible to credit Piyadasi (as I have indeed always carefully abstained from doing) with pretending to have attained to the Perfect Intelligence, and it would be hazardous to admit that a term so important as saumōhiḥ could have been used, at the date of Piyadasi, in a sense so widely different from its technical employment, which is testified to by the whole range of Buddhist literature. It is also certain that the phrase saumōhiḥ nikhannihā could hardly be rendered as meaning 'to attain to the Intelligence.' I translate it, therefore, exactly as suggested by Dr. Bühler himself (der König) zog auf die saumōhiḥ aus, — '(the king) put himself on the way, set out for the saumōhiḥ.' But we must adhere to this translation, and not substitute for it, as my learned critic does immediately afterwards, another interpretation which spoils the sense, — 'he put himself on the way, with a view to, on account of, the saumōhiḥ.' We recognize here a simple variation of an expression familiar to Buddhist phraseology, saumōhiḥ prastādham, 'to set out for the Perfect Intelligence put oneself on the way for the dhiḥ.' As is proved by the passages of the Lotus, the expression is commonly applied to men who, tearing themselves from lukewarmness and indifference, engage seriously in the practices of a religious life, or, as we should say, of devotion, the final aim of which is, in the eyes of every orthodox Buddhist, the conquest of the Perfect Intelligence. It is to this idiom that the king here refers; he himself applies it to himself; and, if he has slightly modified it, it is to render more obvious the double meaning which he had in view. He wishes to connect more clearly this ideal march towards perfection with the tours and excursions of former kings, by means of the very real tours and excursions to which he had been inspired by his religious zeal. It is, therefore, to his conversion that Piyadasi here alludes, and thus the fact is explained that he can give a positive date to 'tours' which he would often have to repeat.

---

4 I have only to make reservations concerning some of the details where my interpretation differs from that of my learned predecessor. For instance, the word dhiḥa, which means simply, as I believe I have shown, 'nourishment, alimentation,' cannot be quoted to establish the Buddhist inspiration of the passage, although that inspiration is incontestable and proved by more solid arguments. I do not now speak of the chronological question, with which I shall shortly deal.


6 I now believe that this is certainly the correct reading, and that the anusāsaṇa is only imaginary. This idea of reading ayāya, which agreed badly with the nikhami of the other texts, contributed not a little to lead me astray at first as to the true sense of the passage.

7 Burnouf, Lotus de la Bonne Loi, pp. 316 and ff.
We henceforth find ourselves, so far as regards the conversion of the king, in the presence of two dates; the 13th Edict giving his ninth year, and the 8th his eleventh. Now, it is just the Edict of Sahasarām, the meaning of which we have already explained on purely philological grounds, which does away with and explains this apparent contradiction. We have seen that the king, after a first conversion, remained 'during more than two years and a half,' in a lukewarmness with which he subsequently bitterly reproached himself. If we admit that the conquest of Kaliṅga and the conversion which accompanied it ought to be placed eight years and three months (i.e., in the ninth year) after the coronation of Piyadasi, his actual and decisive conversion, being more than two and a half years later (say, for example two years and seven months), would exactly fall in the eleventh year, as indicated by the 8th Edict. The agreement is so perfect, and accounts so completely, not only for dates, but even for the expressions (prabhābhūtā nīvakṛśmṛtaḥ) designedly employed by the king, that I am persuaded that the verbal interpretation on which it rests is this time really definitive. We shall shortly deal again with other features which appear to me to furnish further verification of it, but at present we are entitled to draw one conclusion, that it must be admitted that the 8th and the 13th Edicts refer to the same person as the Edict of Sahasarām-Rūpāṅṭh, and that this edict certainly emanates from the same sovereign as all the others.

But as I have already shewn in explaining the 6th Columnar Edict of Dehli, this is not the only coincidence. The king declares that he only commenced having his religious edicts engraved in the thirteenth year after his coronation; as a matter of fact, none of the group of inscriptions formerly known either carries or implies an earlier date. The Sahasarām tablet itself (cf. Sah. n. 2.), being written 'more than a year' after the second conversion of the king, ought to belong just to the commencement of the thirteenth year. Now, it alone speaks of the religious edicts as in the future, and, as can be seen from my translation of its concluding words, it contemplates their execution. It directs the representatives of the king to engrave them both upon rocks and upon columns, and it is thus almost certain that this edict and its fellows were the first — they are certainly among the first — which their author had engraved. They relate to his thirteenth year, and this is another strong reason for believing that this author is no other than that king, the author of the inscriptions of Dehli, who commenced in his thirteenth year to have inscriptions of the same class engraved.

Regarding the two other dates with which the king supplies us, we have at present nothing to say, except that they agree very well with the preceding ones. He mentions the thirteenth year of his coronation (3rd Edict) as that in which he organized the anūmanāgāma, which was thus one of the first manifestations of his religious zeal; and he tells us that he created in the fourteenth year the office of the dharmānūkāhātras.

These chronological indications are, it is true, too rare to satisfy our curiosity, but they at least suffice to allow us to answer with full confidence the first of the questions which we have just put. It is certain that all the inscriptions which we have examined* must be referred to one and the same author. Who was that author?

He gives himself no other name than that of Piyadasi, = Priyadarśin, usually accompanied by the adjective dēvānāṃpitriya, 'dear unto the dévas.' Sometimes this epithet alone is used to designate him. Whether, during the epoch of the Mauryas, this title had the extended application conjectured by Dr. Bühler* or not, it is certain that it is only an epithet, and

* viz., the 14 Edicts; the Columnar Edicts; those of Dhauli and Jaungada; of Sahasarām, Rūpāṅṭh and Bairāṭ; and of Bahra; and the inscriptions of Bārbār.

* Bühler, Beiträge, VIIIth Edict, n. 1. In the first line of this edict (at Khāla, Dr. Bühler's new materials allow him to read: atkāvantiṣṭhati dēvānāṃpitriyaḥ viśāntyatiḥ nāma vikramasena (at Kapur do Giri, also, the true reading is dēvānāṃpitriyaḥ instead of jiva janapado). It looks as if dēvānāṃpitriyaḥ corresponded here purely and simply to the rājāḥ of Girnāke and Dhauli. Dr. Bühler, adopting the opinion of Paṇḍita Bhagwānālāl Indraji (J. Bo. Bn., R. A. S., Vol. XV., p. 210, and Ind. Ant. Vol. X. p. 196) considers that this epithet was a title which, at the epoch of the Mauryas, all kings bore without distinction.
that the real name is Priyadarsin. This name, which does not appear in any known list of kings, naturally much embarrassed Prinsep. Since, however, Turnour\textsuperscript{12} showed that Asoka, the grandson of Chandragupta, received sometimes, and specially in the Dipavamsa, the name of Piyadassi or Piyadassana, I do not believe that the identification proposed by him has ever been seriously doubted.\textsuperscript{14} The publication of the complete text of the Sinhalese chronicle has only given his proof a higher degree of certainty.\textsuperscript{15} Although all the reasons which he advances are not equally cogent,\textsuperscript{16} still the conclusions of Lassen\textsuperscript{17} on this point remain in general impregnable.

Dr. Bühler has attempted to give him a precise date, by shewing that there existed a perfect agreement between the chronology of the Sinhalese books, and that of the inscriptions. These suggestions are founded upon an interpretation of the Edict of Sahasaram-Rupnath, which, as has been seen, I consider inadmissible. Ingenious as they are, they fail in their foundations. Everything rests upon the translation of the text in question, to which I will not revert here; but I must add that, on the one hand, the interpretation of the 13th Edict which has become possible since the article of Dr. Bühler was written, and, on the other hand, the more exact interpretation of the 8th, oppose insurmountable difficulties to his attempts at chronological adjustment.

The only date which we are permitted to take as a starting-point, the only really authentic date for the conversion of the king, is that which the king's own inscriptions give, that is, at the earliest, the ninth year of his coronation and not the fourth as given for the conversion of Asoka by the chronicles. This correction would place the Edict of Sahasaram, if we accept as exact the date of 218 for the coronation of the king, at the earliest in the year 260, and not 256, of the nirvana.\textsuperscript{15} We must, therefore, at the very first give up this exact agreement between the traditional dates and the so-called monumental dates which Dr. Bühler has sought to deduce. I would add here, in opposition to the interpretation proposed by that eminent scholar for the first phrase of the edict, one last observation, which I should have fully developed in my commentary on the passage. Intent on establishing from a chronological point of view harmony between the sense which he draws from the inscriptions and the traditions given in the Sinhalese books, he has not considered the profound contradictions which he creates in other respects, not only between this edict and the traditions concerning Asoka, but between the edict and our other inscriptions, which he nevertheless, like us, refers to the same author. How is he to reconcile the inscription which would shew the king remaining 'more than two and thirty years and a half without displaying his zeal,' and the chronicle which attributes to him, from his seventh year (see below), all the manifestations of the most indefatigable religious activity? What agreement can there be between such an inscription, and all those edicts according to which the most characteristic of his religions institutions, the anusrayana, the dharmaahamadhyata, &c., belong invariably to a long anterior epoch of his reign, — to his thirteenth or his fourteenth year? Was he neither active nor a zealot, when he insisted with so much energy on the necessity of effort and of the most persevering zeal (VI, in fine; X, in fine, &c.)? when he himself proclaimed his efforts (parakrama, parakrama, &c.) as incessant (Gimnari, VI, 11; X, 3, &c.)?

\textsuperscript{12} J. A. S. B. 1857, pp. 290 and ff., 1054 and ff.
\textsuperscript{13} The paper of Latham (On the date and personality of Priyadarsi, J. A. S., Vol. XVII, pp. 278 and ff.) and his whimsical attempt to identify Priyadarsi and Phahale, deserve notice only as a curiosity.
\textsuperscript{14} Cf. Dipavamsa, ed. Oldenberg, VI, 1, 14, &c.
\textsuperscript{15} It is not, for example, in any way certain that the Edict of Bhabra is necessarily addressed to the third council held, according to tradition, in the reign of Asoka. Cf. subter. On the other hand, certain new proofs can be added: for instance, that the tradition of numerous 'edicts of religion,' dhammakaya, is indissolubly connected with the name of Asoka. See the Asoka-avatara in Burnouf, Introduction, p. 371, &c.
\textsuperscript{17} Ind. Alterth. Vol. II, p. 233.

Dr. Bühler, however, clearly recognized that, in the absence of specific statements, the years of Asoka are, in the Sinhalese chronicles, calculated from his coronation. Instances like Dipavamsa, VII, 31, not to cite others leave the point in no doubt.
I should not dwell on this point at such great length, were I not confronted by so high an authority as that of Dr. Bähler. I believe that I have expressed myself sufficiently clearly to shew that the agreement put forward by him rests upon weak and crumbling foundations; but should we, therefore, conclude that we must give up all hope of finding any points of contact, between the details furnished by the monuments concerning Piyadasi and the Sinhalese traditions about Asoka, which would be of such a nature as to confirm the identification of both forces upon us by so many other considerations? By no means. But we must give up the hope, of finding them in a date which is in my opinion imaginary, claiming to be expressed in the era of the niraṇja. On the other hand, I believe that the chronicles have, in certain points of detail, under the name of Asoka, preserved memories of our Piyadasi sufficiently accurate, not only to allow an agreement to appear clearly, but even to contribute usefully to a more precise explanation of certain passages, in our monuments, which are a little vague. The Mahāvamsa and the Dipavamsa note the conversion of Asoka to Buddhism as an event of high importance. They attribute it to the intervention of his nephew Nyagroththa, and surround it with circumstances which are not of a nature to inspire us with an implicit confidence in their account. But the general fact alone interests us here. The two chronicles agree in making it occur in the fourth year after the coronation of the king. That is, as we see from the monuments, an error of four years and a fraction: we shall deal with it immediately. To the same period they refer the conversion of the king's brother, Tishya, who held the position of uparāja, and who betook himself to a religious life. What interests us more, is to find that the tradition, almost void of religious incidents in the interval, fixes at about three years from then, in the seventh year of the coronation, an important and significant event.

It is evident that the capital fact in their eyes, the very kernel of the story, the occurrence which gives it its character, is not the inauguration of the eighty-four thousand stūpas raised by order of the king, which is the part most loaded with miracles, and by itself the least credible. The moment is certainly decisive in the life of Asoka; for from that day, according to the Mahāvamsa, he received the name of Dhammasoka: it is in short the first time that he

16. Dipavamsa, VI. 18, 24; Mahāvamsa, p. 23, 1, 3.
17. Mahāvamsa, p. 34, 1, 7. I may add, so passant, that the Dipavamsa, if it does not enter into any detail regarding this conversion, at least contains a reference to it in a passage of which Dr. Oldenberg appears to me to have misunderstood the meaning. I refer to the mnemonic verse, VII. 81. —

Tūpi vassamānu Nigrothṭha chattavassamānu bhāṣato,
echatvassamānu padbhajito Mahādha Asokatrajā
dr. oldenberg translates and fill up the sense as follows: “When (Asoka) had completed three years (the story of Nigrothṭha happened), after the fourth year (he put his) brothers (to death), after the sixth year Mahendra, the son of Asoka, received the padbhaj ordinance.” There is nothing to object to in the first and third dates, but for the second his interpretation is inadmissible. The two chronicles agree in placing as indeed is probably, the murder of Asoka's brothers immediately after his accession to the throne, and present it as the principal method by which he employed for ensuring his power. We should have to understand 'four years before his coronation,' while the other dates, as is natural, take the coronation as a terminus a quo. That is incredible. It is only necessary to take bhāṣato for a singular, which is nothing extraordinary in the language of which this verse gives a specimen, and to translate 'the fourth year of his coronation, his brother (i. e. Tishya, the uparāja) entered a religious life.'

18. And not in the sixth, as appears from a passage (Mahāvamsa, p. 37, 1, 5), which would thereby contradict perfectly explicit former statements. The same follows clearly from the Samanupaliśākhi (loc. cit. p. 306), according to which Asoka is in the tenth year of his coronation, three years after the ordination of Mahendra. The same conclusion follows on a comparison with the Dipavamsa, according to which Mahendra, who was ten years of age when his father came to the throne (VI. 21), had accomplished twenty at the moment when he renounced the world (VII. 21). Dr. Oldenberg has accordingly well translated the expression chattavassamānu Asokānasa (VII. 22), 'when Asoka had completed six years.' and it is perhaps this phrase, which would make everything agree in the tradition of the Mahāvamsa, which we should substitute on p. 37, 1, 5, for the expression chattavāṣamānu, although the same reading reappears in the new edition of Sumangala (V. 21). As for the propriety of this translation for a phrase like chattavāṣamānu, it can be seen from the Dipavamsa, VII. 31, which we have just been considering, that this idiom can be used both to mark a current year (e. g. in chattavadhamāna, which must mean 'in the fourth year'), as well as to mark the number of years passed, as in tithi (1) vassamāna, which can only mean 'after three years had passed.'

19. The same statement is also found in a verse cited by the Asoka-aracana from the Dīrgha-aracana (Burnouf, Introduction, p. 374), which in the same passage remarks that 'the king had not long been favourably disposed to the law of Buddha,' —a clear allusion to the 'first' conversion.
appears to us making a public profession of his religious belief; it is then that he shews the genuineness of his devotion to Buddhism in the most decisive way, by making his son Mahêndra, and his daughter Sânghamitrâ, enter into the religious order. Everything invites us to consider that here was really a serious evolution in the religious career of the king.

In the narration of these incidents, the principal fact, on which all the others, and in particular the ordination of the king’s son, depend, which is described to us in all detail, and to which the chronicler evidently gives a particular importance, is the State Visit which the king pays to the saîgâha in the midst of which he takes his seat: saîghamajjhamhi satâhâsi vantidhâ saîgham uttamaî.\footnote{In the narrative of Buddhaghûsa (Samantapâliâtikâ, in Suttavibajjaya, ed. Oldenberg, I. 304), the miracle which shows to the king the 84,000 stûpas at once, has for its object to make him altogether believing (atviya buddhayam paññâdhyâyâ ti); at that period, therefore, his faith had great need of being stimulated.}

One cannot help here recalling to mind the passage in the Edict of Rûpnâth and Bairât (perhaps the same expression is also employed at Sahasrârû, but a lacuna renders the point doubtful), in which Piyadasi refers to his second and definite conversion. It will be recollected that the reading proposed by Dr. Bühler is in the one aû sumi hakâ saîghapapiti, and in the other aû mahamâsa saîghâhapatayo. I have already explained why I am unable to accept his translation, as involving the idea that the king entered into the community and became himself a monk. If we take the words, in the meaning I have proposed, as referring without metaphor to a real material entering into the Assembly Hall, then we have here an allusion to the very ceremony which the Mahavamsa describes to us. The king could well refer to it a year subsequently as a known event, for it had been solemn and striking enough for its memory to be preserved living for so long afterwards. All the difficulties which surrounded the first interpretation of the phrase fall together to the ground; and this agreement would be decisive, if the state of the preservation of the inscription permitted an entire certainty. As we have it at present, it appears to me to receive a remarkable confirmation from a comparison with the 8th Edict.

We have seen that the 8th Edict refers to the same moment of the life of the king, to the same date, and the same event. Now, there again, the idea of the conversion of the king is associated by him with the memory of ‘setting out’ from the palace, of an ‘excursion’ out of it. No doubt the expressions used by the king are before all inspired by the Buddhist phraseology about ‘setting out for the buddhi,’ but this word-play, and the comparison with the ‘pleasure excursions’ of his predecessors, only become really natural if his conversion is connected by an intimate and close bond with the ‘excursion’ which he describes immediately. It is clear that this kind of ‘excursions’ must have become habitual to him.\footnote{Mahâr. p. 35, l. 8.} It is equally clear that the commencement of this practice, the first example of these ‘excursions,’ is closely associated in the king’s mind with his active conversion to Buddhism, and in the expression by which he commemorates it, while admitting that the description does not refer exclusively to the visit narrated by the Mahavamsa, several traits (samandhânam dasanâ, hitamapâtiwâdhânu, dhammayusañi, dhammapari-puchhâ) agree perfectly with it, and really appear to preserve its memory. These coincidences of detail between the Sinhalese chronicle and our edicts seem to me to be remarkable and instructive, but at the same time I do not pretend to exaggerate their certainty. What is sure is that tradition has more or less obscurely preserved the memory of two stages which were said to have been traversed in his religious life by the king whom it calls Asoka; the first corresponding

\footnote{I am at present much inclined to believe that this idea is expressly contained in the last sentence of the edict that bhûyañ śought to be taken in the sense of ‘again,’ and that it is necessary to understand: ‘in this future this virtuous pleasure is again (i.e. has been, and will be on occasions) the portion of Piyañ.’ I should then prefer to take dhammayûdhir the preceding sentence as a singular, as a kind of collective which should embrace probably several series of ‘excursions.’ It is true that the pronoun tu of most of the versions seems to indicate the plural, but at all or all of Girinâ, the most correct of all, requires the singular. In any case, and in either sense, it will be necessary, therefore, to admit an inaccuracy.}
to his entry into the bosom of the Buddhist church (upāsakatvam), and the second marked by his State Entry into the assembly of the clergy, by the ordination of his son Mahendra, and by the application to the king of a name at once new and significant. Tradition separates them by an interval which corresponds exactly with that (more than two years and a half) which is vouched for for Piyadasi by his epigraphic evidence. Such a coincidence could not be accidental, and it is perhaps the more striking because it rests after all upon a fact of secondary importance.

It is true that this agreement is not free from certain limitations. The Sinhalese chronicles attribute to the fourth year (always counting from the coronation) the conversion which the 13th Edict attributes to the ninth; and they place in the seventh year, that which, according to Sabasāraṁ and the 8th Edict, belongs to the eleventh. Here there is certainly an error, and the source is not difficult to discover. According to the chronicles, the coronation of Asoka falls in the fifth year, that is to say, four years and a fraction (to us indeterminate) after he took possession of the throne. It is evidently this period which, wrongly deducted, has troubled the figures of tradition. As I have previously remarked in dealing with the Sabasāraṁ inscription (n. 2), this error could be introduced in one of two ways. Either the coming to the throne and the coronation, which may have been in reality simultaneous, have been subsequently separated, or the writers have at some time or other erroneously taken the coming to the throne as the point from which to count the traditional dates, and not the coronation of the king. Then in reducing tradition to a continuous system, with the coronation of the king as its initial point, they have been led to contract one or more of the periods given for the various events of the reign, by the space of time elapsed between his coming to the throne and his coronation. Several reasons lead me to incline to the second explanation. It is hardly probable that Buddhists would have invented in all their details the incidents which, according to them, marked the youth of a king whom they held in such high esteem. The agreement with our inscriptions which we shall prove subsequently, is rather of a nature to heighten in a general way the authority of the Sinhalese tradition. The manner in which Piyadasi dates his inscriptions from his coronation, seems to indicate that that date was not the same as that of his coming to the throne. Finally, if the intermediate period between his accession and his coronation were an arbitrary invention, it would be surprising that there should be allotted to it,— instead of a period expressed in round numbers,— a period evidently very precise, which we are in a position to ascertain with approximate accuracy. For, according to the inscriptions, the first conversion is referred to the first months of the ninth year, say 8 years and 2 months after the coronation, and the second to the last months of the eleventh, say 10 years and 10 months after the coronation. The common quantity which must be deducted from these figures to refer the first event to the fourth year, and the second to the seventh, can only vary between 4 years and 3 months at a minimum, and 4 years and 7 months at a maximum. If, therefore, we conjecturally place the coronation at 4 years and 5 months after the accession, there is a great chance that we shall not be very far wrong.

To sum up:—I believe I am entitled to draw from the preceding discussion a general conclusion; viz., that, in spite of a certain error in the Sinhalese chronology, an error which is

---

25 Dr. Kern, in Geschied. van het buddh. II, 298, wishes it is true, to set the Sinhalese tradition in contradiction with itself. From the passage of the Mahāvamsa (p. 23, l. 3) in which it is said that the father of Asoka supported 60,000 Brāhmans, and that he himself did the same for three years, he concludes that, in reality, the coming to the throne and the coronation occurred at the same time; as, otherwise, it would have been during seven years, and not three, that Asoka would have preserved his preference for Brāhmans. But that is taking an unfair advantage of the chronicler. Everyone, I believe, has always considered that, taking all the dates as starting from the coronation of the king, he did just the same here, and the passage has always been understood as meaning 'during three years, after his abhisheka.' There is no reason for abandoning an interpretation, which every one has found sufficiently natural to accept at once, without even considering it necessary to stop en passant. It will be perfectly justified, if necessary, by comparing with the verse of the Mahāvamsa, the expressions of Buddhaghosha in the introduction to the Samantapādikā (Suttavimāna), ed. Oldenberg, I. p. 309.
clearly explained by a mistake in the starting point of the calculation, there exists between
the written tradition and the monumental data a striking coincidence; and this coincidence
does not allow us to doubt that the events related on one side about Piyadasí, and on
the other side about Ásoka, concern in reality one and the same person, designated
under different names.

It is, therefore, correct to maintain, as has long been done, that the Piyadasí of the
monuments, and the Ásoka of literature, are really the same king. That is the second
preliminary point which we had to establish.

It now remains to determine the chronological order of our inscriptions.

A fixed point from which to set out is given by the 6th (columnar) edict of Delhi. The
king declares that it was in the 13th year from his coronation that he had the first
dharmamaitipis engraved. It is not easy to decide the exact extension which the king gave
in his own mind to this expression. It is allowable to doubt if Piyadasí had intended to include
under this letter, as relating to religion, short inscriptions such as those of the caves of Barábar.
All that we can say is that hitherto none, even of this class, has been discovered which belongs
to an earlier date, the two most ancient dedications of Barábar dating exactly from this
thirteenth year. It is also certain that all the edicts now actually known to us belong to the
category of dharmamaitipis; and as a matter of fact none of them is earlier than this thirteenth
year, which is referred to by so many different monuments.

The Edict of Sahasrám-Rápnáth, later by 'more than a year' than the active conversion
of Piyadasí, also belongs to the commencement of this thirteenth year. It should be the most
ancient of all, because it speaks of inscriptions on rocks and columns as a desideratum,
as a project, and not as an already accomplished fact. The execution of this project, however,
must have soon followed. The fourth of the fourteen edicts is expressly dated the thirteenth
year; but the fifth speaks of the creation of dharmamáusmántras as belonging to the fourteenth.
It is the same with respect to the columnar edicts. The first six are dated in the 27th year, and
the seventh (7—8) in the 28th. Now, this last is missing in most of the versions. It is only
preserved on the Delhi column. It is, besides, less symmetrically engraved than the others
and the greater portion runs round the shaft.

Under these conditions one is tempted to conclude that, on the same monuments, the edicts
have been engraved at various times, according as the king judged it opportune to promulgate
new ones. This conjecture would appear to be confirmed, so far as regards the rock edicts,
by the fact that Dhauí and Jaugada, which agree with the other versions as regards the first ten
edicts, have not the corresponding readings for the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth.
This absence of a portion of the edicts can be explained by the theory of successive additions.

1 I quote here only as curiosities one or two instances of agreement in spirit between certain passages of the chronicle
and certain idioms of our inscriptions. For example, the question which the king addressed to the súmáha (according to
Dipavali, vi. 80), although unfortunately obscured by the alteration of the text, causes us, by the word yevvam, to think
of the final sentence of the 3rd edict. When we read, at verse 23 of the same chapter,
Elvahikdahāsāmde tāthi Việt mānāsthikē
Dhārihrāna gatvamāta putuladdhi nimantayi,
we cannot help thinking of the 12th edict, and we are tempted to translate, after this analogy (értādhā, like phalalā), 'seeking the essence of each doctrine.' This would be a singularly precise remembrance of Piyadasí's manner
of speech and thought. It is again a phrase commonly used by the king which the Śansvānavadikért employs (and
Oldenberg, loc. cit. p. 355), when it represents that Moggaliya, at the moment when he induces the king to cause his
son to enter a religious life, is penetrated by this thought. — dharmavam divya śuddhi bhavissattv,
2 The use of birudap appears to have been at this epoch particularly common. Cf. Jacob, ZDMG. XXXV. 660.
3 The correct interpretation of this phrase shows the error of the opinion expressed by Lassen (Ind. Alterth. II. 227),
according to which this edict would be dated from the 13th year of the king.
4 It may be noted that the Barabar caves possess those inscriptions which are nearest of all to Pithalipurá and
that the Sahasram inscriptions are the next nearest. Barabar is about 40 miles due south of Patába; Sahasram is
about 60 or 70 miles to the south-west of that city. Pithalipurá was situated on the banks of the old river Són on a
narrow spit of land between the Són and the Ganges. Sahasram is close to the upper reaches of the Són.— G. A. G.
But this idea is contradicted by several considerations. The most important is that which results from the presence of the 14th edict, in all the versions, and from its tenor. It suffices merely to allude to this. It is clear that, if the references contained in this edict could have been added to the series of inscriptions which precede them, it is because the whole has been considered as forming one ensemble, and must have been engraved at the same time. The amplifications to which the king alludes, do not appear to refer to verbal differences in the text of any particular edict. The variations of this kind between the different versions which we have noticed are not worthy of being pointed out in this manner. They can only refer to the number of edicts, greater or less, as the case may be, admitted into each series of inscriptions. This pre-supposes a deliberate choice, and excludes a gradual and successive growth of each whole. The presence of the 14th edict moreover implies that the inscription is considered as definitely closed. It leaves no opening for any future addition. There has been discovered at Sopâra,—the ancient Surpâra, a little to the north of Bombay,—a short fragment of the 8th of the fourteen edicts. We have no means of recognizing to which of the categories alluded to by the king,—amplified versions, abridged versions, and versions of moderate extent,—the group of edicts of which this fragment made a part, belonged. But at any rate, there is no appearance that the 8th edict engraved was separately in this locality; and the conviction of the learned and ingenious Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajit, a conviction based on various indications, is that this fragment has been detached from an extended whole, analogous to the other collections of eleven or fourteen edicts. I may add that in general the arrangements of the edicts is too symmetrical to raise the idea of accidental and successive additions. The changes of handwriting even are hardly apparent, or at least, where they can be allowed to exist, for example, at Khâlsâ from the 10th edict, they do not correspond to the grouping which would depend on internal arguments founded on dates (group composed of I—IV), or on comparison between different versions (group composed of XI—XIII).

There is, therefore, every reason to believe that, where a certain number of edicts are united in a series, the whole has been engraved at one and the same time, and that, as a consequence, the inscription cannot be older than the latest date mentioned in the whole. Thus the 3rd edict, which bears the date of the 13th year, was probably, in the versions which have come down to us, not engraved before the 14th, to which the 5th edict refers.

Whatever may be the result of this argument, it appears to be without practical importance. There is no reason for believing that the king ever ante-dated or committed an anachronism, and we are, therefore, entitled to maintain that the edicts, supposing them to have been reproduced at any epoch of his reign, have been faithfully given under their original form; and that so far as their dates go, they have the force of documentary evidence for the date which each carries. I may add that the indications furnished both by the fourteen edicts and by the columnar edicts, entitle us to conclude that the different tablets follow each other in the exact order of their original promulgation.

This settled, we have little else to do than to record the dates which are given, directly or indirectly, for each of our inscriptions. The edict of Sâhasrâm-Rûpnâth is the most ancient of all, and goes back to the thirteenth year dating from the coronation. The 4th of the fourteen edicts being dated in the thirteenth year, edicts 1 to 3, which precede it, belong certainly to the same time, and, in the third, we have, in a manner, the deed of institution of the anusânyâna, which this edict, therefore, refers to the thirteenth year. The conclusion is not without interest on account of the 3rd edict, so important as regards the foreign relations of Piyadasi.

\[28\] Lassen (Ind. Alterth., IV, 253 ff.) has justly remarked that the inscriptions in which Piyadasi congratulates himself on religious successes gained in foreign countries and above all in the Greek kingdoms, suppose a sufficient interval between the conversion of the king and the date of the inscription. We shall shortly see what kind of influence it must have been that Piyadasi exercised over the Greek kingdoms. It will suffice for the present to observe that as his conversion, even if we take as the starting point his active conversion, dated from the end of the 11th year, there remains, between this time and the most ancient inscriptions (2nd edict) which refer to his foreign relations, an interval of two years, which is sufficient.
If the 3rd edict constitutes this contemporary foundation charter of the anusāyaṇa, there is every reason to believe that it is the same with the 5th edict with respect to the dharmamahāmātrās, and that both the tablet and the office date from the fourteenth year. The following tablets up to the 14th contain no more chronological indications. They can all belong to the fourteenth year, and are certainly not of earlier date. The 12th, for example, mentions the dharmamahāmātrās. As for the 8th, which alludes to the second conversion of the king, and places it in the eleventh year, nothing compels us to consider it as contemporary with that fact, any more than the 13th is contemporary with the conquest of Kaliṅga: my corrected interpretation of the passage gives on the contrary, in the last sentence, a positive reason in favour of its later origin.

Taking it altogether, the date of the fourteenth year for the group of the 14 edicts appears to me to be very probable. The detached edicts of Dhauli furnish us in this respect, if not with a decisive proof, at least with a presumption of value. Towards the end of the first of these edicts, Piyadasi declares that he will cause the anusāyaṇa (see below) to be held every five years. This manner of speaking is only intelligible if the inscription is contemporary with, or at least very shortly posterior to, the origin of this institution. Now the date of this origin is fixed by the 3rd edict as the thirteenth year. The fourteenth year would, therefore, be a very probable date for the passage in which the king thus expresses himself, and this would necessarily imply that edicts 5 to 14 which precede it, are themselves not posterior to it.

As for the columnar edicts, the six first belong certainly to the twenty-seventh year, because the first, the fourth, the fifth, and the sixth bear this date. The last (VII. — VIII.) belongs to the succeeding year. They give us the last expression which is accessible to us of the ideas and intentions of the king.

Between them and the series of the 16 edicts, we have nothing but the dedicatorly inscription, No. 3 of Barābar, which is dated in the twentieth year. It is much to be regretted that there is no date given in the inscription of Bhabra. I know no means, as yet, of supplying this silence of the text. All that I dare to say is that, judging from some details of phraseology, it gives me the impression of being nearer to the rock edicts than to the columnar ones. If it is not contemporary with the 16 edicts and with the edict of Sahasaram-Rūpanā, I cannot think that it is much posterior. At any rate, it is altogether arbitrary to defer it to the later times of the reign of Piyadasi, and to place it, as Mr. Thomas has done, without any proof other than a pre-conceived theory to which we shall subsequently refer, after the edicts of the twentieth year.29

These facts, however incomplete, have a great value for us. It is important to bear them well in mind, in order to avoid more than one cause of confusion. They suffice to clear away, by impenetrable arguments, certain adventurous theories.

The ground now seems sufficiently cleared to allow us to pass to the examination of the historical questions which interest us.

The first is naturally the question of date. All literary sources, of whatever origin, agree in representing Aśoka as the grandson of Chandragupta. The double identification, of Chandragupta with the Sandrokottos of the Greeks, and of Aśoka with our Piyadasi, only allows us to search towards the middle of the 3rd century for the epoch of our inscriptions. So far as I can see, they themselves only offer us a single clue for arriving at a more precise date. I refer, as will be readily understood, to the synchronism furnished by the names of the Greek kings. Its exact value cannot be appreciated without forming a general opinion as to the relation entertained by Piyadasi towards foreign nations, and as to the degree of authority which we should accord to his evidence on this subject.

This evidence is scattered through the 2nd, 5th and 13th of the fourteen edicts, and in the second separate edict of Dhauli-Jaugada.

In this last passage, Piyadasi expresses himself in a general manner, and without specifying any nation; he describes to his officers the conduct which they should observe towards the frontier populations, not incorporated in his dominions.

These instructions are summed up in the expression of his will that his representatives should learn to inspire his neighbours with an entire confidence in his sentiments and his intentions, that they should persuade them that he only wishes for their welfare, that he desires, so far as he is concerned, to assure them happiness and peace, and that he is like a father to them; he wishes that this conviction may dispose them to observe the dhamma, so that they may thus deserve happiness, both in this world and in the next.

Elsewhere, in the 13th edict, the king contrasts with his forcible conquests the peaceful conquests of the dhamma, — of the Religion. It is on these last that he congratulates himself. They are possible, both in his own dominions and amongst all foreign nations (sāvēsātaitēs).

"Among them are the Greek king named Antiochus, and to the north of (or beyond) that Antiochus, four kings, Ptolemy, Antigonus, Magas, Alexander; to the south, the Chōdas and the Panḍyas as far as Tāmbāpanṇi; in the same way, Hidariyā (?). Amongst the Vīsas and the Vrijas, the Yavanas and the Kambōjas, the Nabhakas and the Nabhapāntas, the Bhōjas and the Pētānikas, the Andhras and the Pūlindas, everywhere are followed the teachings of the religion spread by Piyadasi. And wherever messengers have been sent, there also, after having heard the teaching of the dhamma . . . people practise the dhamma . . . ."

In the 5th edict reference is made to a more direct action, to the duties of the newly-created dhammasahāmātāras. They must occupy themselves with all sects, for the establishment and progress of the dhamma, and for the advantage and benefit of the faithful of the [true] religion; amongst the Yavanas, the Kambōjas and the Gandhāras, the Raṣṭikas and the Pētānikas, and the other frontier populations (dāpamātā), they should occupy themselves with the soldiers, with the Brāhmaṇas and with the rich, with the poor and with the old, for their advantage and their well-being, so as to put away obstacles from the faithful of the [true] religion. 30

30 I cannot join in the opinion of Dr. Büßler (p. 38), either as to the manner of dividing the sentence or as to the interpretation of the term dhammayutā. The word occurs three times in a few lines: and each time Dr. Büßler gives it a different application, or even a different meaning. At line 35 (of Khālā) he understands hitamkīkētā dhamma to mean ‘for the happiness of my faithful subjects; in the same line, dhammayutā apāsitōddāya, ‘for suppression of obstacles referring to the law; and in the following line, viśītāsamā dhammayutā, ‘in my faithful kingdom.’ In itself this method is perplexing. There is no special information to be deduced from the 1st passage. The construction at least is perfectly clear. As for the 2nd, one should not forget that, instead of dhammayutāya, G. has the genitive plural, dhammayutānam, and K. the genitive singular dhammayutena; the inevitable conclusion is that in Kh. and in Dh. we must take the dative in the sense of the genitive (we know how these two cases have been confounded in the Pāli), and translate ‘for the suppression of the obstacles for the faithful people.’ In the 3rd passage we cannot construe together viśītāsamā and dhammayutā. This is forbidden by the position of the two words separated by māna, by the certain reading of Dh., saṃvapatiyavā dhammayutāsi, and by the construction of the rest of the sentence, both members of which, being terminated by iti, refer certainly to persons and consequently suppose in dhammayutā a collective noun of person. (For the juxtaposition and, if I may use the expression, the super-position of two locatives, cf. higher up in Dh. l. 26, a passage which will be shortly explained, and Col. Ed. IV, 9, baḥūn pāṇiṣṭaṣaḥहaṇayān janaḥ . . .). I confess that hesitation appears to me to be impossible. I would add that the above, joined to a comparison with Col. Ed. VII, 1-2, where the same construction occurs, confirms me in the explanation which I have given of Col. Ed. IV, 6. It remains to determine the exact sense of dhammayutā. Dr. Büßler sees it in a title of the people who lived ‘under the law’ of Piyadasi, — of his subjects in fact. The constant use of dhamma in a different sense in the first place renders this interpretation somewhat unlikely; but the expression of Dh., saṃvapatiyavā dhammayutāsi, proves that the dhammayutā (he or they) did not belong only to the empire of Piyadasi; the same conclusion necessarily follows from the former passage which places the dhammayutās among the dāpamātā. I can hence only adhere to my translation. It appears to me to be borne out by the recommendation made on the columns to exhibit the dhammayutās, and elsewhere, ‘to teach, to exhibit, the yutac.’ From the passage in Dh. l. 26 (18 in Kh.), it is clear that the dhammayutās comprise men ‘zealous for the dhamma, firmly established in the dhamma, addicted to almo-
The name of Antiochus reappears in the second edict, — 'Everywhere, in my empire and also among foreign peoples (pr̥chāmisita) such as the Chōdas, the Pāḍyas, Satiyaputa and Ketala-puta, as far as Tambapaṇṇī, Antiochus, the king of the Yavanas, and the kings who are his neighbours, everywhere there is a Pisayasa spread abroad remedies of two kinds everywhere useful plants have been imported and planted. So also with regard to roots and trees. On the roads, wells have been sunk and trees have been planted, for the convenience of animals and men.'

The last passage is most vague of all. I mean that phrase in the edict of Sahasaraṇa-Rūpaṇṇā which declares that the proclamations (sāvāna) of the king have for their aim, that all 'great and small may display their zeal, and that foreign peoples (aṇīta) themselves may be instructed.'

I have laid all these extracts before the eyes of the reader, as it is important to compare them carefully in order to decide what conclusions may follow from them.

In the first place, one cannot fail to observe two groups of peoples who are evidently intentionally distinguished. They comprise, on the one part:

2nd Edict.
The Chōdas, the Pāḍyas, Satiyaputa, Ketala-puta, Tambapaṇṇī, Antiochus and his neighbour-kings.

And on the other part:

5th Edict.
The Yavanas, the Kambōjas, the Gandhāras, the Rāṣṭikas, and the Pēṭēṇikas.

The members of the second set are distinguished by the epithet āparāntas, that is to say 'westerns,' while those of the first set are called pratyantes or simply antas, and it is permissible to believe that it is particularly to these that the instructions given by the king, in the second detached edicts of Dhauli and Jagada, refer.

giving.' The passage cited in the text shows an instructive shade of difference; among all the religions, the dharma-mahādātivas must occupy themselves with the well-being of the dharma-mayutastas. This refers to the dominions of Piyadsa; amongst āparāntas, who were, as we shall just now see, less strictly dependent on the king, they had to watch that they met no obstacles, or in other words that they enjoyed complete religious liberty. This observation agrees exactly with the sense which I have maintained for dharma-mayutastas. The punctuation which Dr. Bührer proposes after apālādhā appears to me to be inadmissible. It is not possible to construe yānādhiṣṭhata jagnādhiṣṭhānaḥ with hitavakṣhāya, because, in Dh., we have the locative ghatadhiṣṭhāna. This locative shows clearly that the genitive has only been introduced in the other texts to avoid an accumulation of locatives in the same sentence. It becomes certain that yānādhiṣṭhata jagnādhiṣṭhānaḥ depends on bāhūkhasihāḥ, etc. As for making it depend, as genitive or as locative, on dharma-mayutastas, that is repugnant both to the ordinary flow of the construction and to the analogy of parallel sentences: they all commence with the indication of the object or of the scene of action imposed upon the dharma-mahādātivas; saṃvātādhiṣṭhānaḥ . . . bāhūkhasihāḥ . . . hīnduḥ . . . yānaḥ dharma-mayutastas . . .

Dr. Bührer contests the reading  saṃpād in G., but his reading  saṃjna cannot be admitted. After a new direct inspection of the stones I see no reading more probable than  saṃpād, so that I can but abide by my interpretation.

2 The sense of 'medicine' and not of 'hospital' (Bührer) is alone admissible here. Not only is there proof wanting of the equivalence of chikīkāha and of antīgyāśāla, but the erection of hospitals by Piyadsa in Greek territory is hardly likely: the analogy of the words following, viz. roots, medicinal plants, useful trees, is altogether in favour of the first translation. We should, I think, adhere to it.

3 It is impossible to take, with the learned Pavpīd Bhagwānī Indraṇi, āparāntas as an ethnic term designating some particular province (J. Br. R. A. S. XV, p. 374); the expression  yānādhiṣṭhata āparāntas forbids this. It should not be forgotten that the spelling, at least at G. and at Dh., is āparānta; by this long  the word is marked, just like prchāmisita, as a secondary derivative. It may be remarked, on  parant, how well the special meaning attributed to āparānta (Cf. Lassen, I, 649; II, 983) agrees with the position which I assign, under the sceptre of Piyadsa, to the populations composed under this term.
The two groups are nowhere mixed up in the same sentence, and the relations of the king with each appear to have been perceptibly different. Amongst the ἀπαράντας, the Yavanas, &c., Piyadasi expressly gives a positive protective mission to his dharmanahādītras (4th Edict). He affirms that they (that is to say, without doubt, a number of individuals amongst them more or less considerable) conform to his teaching of the dharma. Towards the antas, on the contrary, he only directs his representatives to show themselves as kindly neighbours (Dh. J. det. Ed. II.), or refers to them (XIII) as an object of religious conquests. He marks them sharply as exterior to his empire (avājanaḥ avajitaḥ, Dh. J. det. ed. II.; viśalakhiḥ... evam vi prācitraḥ... 2nd Ed.). The direct action, with reference to them, on which he congratulate himself, is limited to the communication of medicines and useful plants. This could be carried out by merchants or ambassadors, and does not argue, like the institution of dharmanahādītras, a tie of dependence, nor does it imply any very close connexion. It is evident because the antas include the most distant populations that he says at Sahasaram, — 'that the antas themselves should be instructed.' In short, I believe that this category, included in the first group, represents the foreign nations, completely independent of Piyadasi. The second, that of the ἀπαράντας, is made up of the tribes distributed along the western frontier of his empire and over which he exercised, not an absolute dominion (for he appears to dread obstacles to the free expansion of his co-religionists), but a suzerainty more or less effective. The best proof that the two sets of people were not in identical situations with respect to the king, is that he distinguishes between the Yūnārijus, i.e. the Greek kings, with their subjects, and the Yūnas, whom he classes with the Kambūjas. These last, not being included in the independent kingdoms, must necessarily have been more or less immediately dependent on the power of Piyadasi.

I hence conclude that, if the language of Piyadasi is not always sufficiently clear and explicit, it is at least exact and truthful. He does not seek to exaggerate the degree of his success. For example, regarding the Greek kings, in one passage he states simply that he has distributed medicines and useful plants even over the dominions of Antiochus, which is in no way improbable; and in the other, he mentions the five kings amongst the lords of foreign countries in which he has endeavoured to spread the dharma. Regarding them he affirms nothing as to the practical results which followed. This reserve induces us to be circumspect in the interpretation of his words, and to refuse to admit lightly hypotheses which are based on alleged inexactness or misunderstanding on his part.

We can then safely take, as a point of departure in the chronology of Piyadasi, the synchronism which the enumeration of the five Greek kings offers to us. Only the most decisive arguments would authorise us to conjecture, as has been done by Lassen,44 that the king has mixed up different times in his inscriptions.

The texts are perfectly simple and distinct. In the 2nd Edict, he speaks of Antiochus and of kings his neighbours, in the 13th of Antiochus again, and of four Greek kings who are to the north of (or beyond) his kingdom — Turāmaya, Antēkina, Maka, and Alikasadam. It is impossible for us to decide whether the "neighbours" of Antiochus are the same kings as those who are mentioned by name in the 13th Edict. In itself that is hardly probable, for, as we shall see, those would be very remote neighbours indeed, to whom it would have been by no means easy to despatch medicines and useful plants, and moreover it is not specified that Greek kings are intended. The reading aλαμφ of Khalisi, and aραμφ of Kapur di Girī, would do away with all hesitation; but it appears, according to the revision of Dr. Bühler, that Khalisi had not aλαμφ but aκιν, and that the other reading depends only on an error of General Cunningham. The same is the case with regard to K. It nevertheless appears to me more probable that the ‘neighbours’ of Antiochus in the first passage are not the four kings specified in the second. However that may be, the transcription of their names has not been controverted;
there has always been recognized, in them, a Ptolemy, an Antigonus, a Magas, and an Alexander. One is immediately tempted to seek for them, at least for the two last, in the countries which would not be too inaccessible to Hindus and to their sovereign, but the royal qualification, which is expressly attributed to them, forms an obstacle even if we could (which has not been done) find these names as those of governors or Satraps in a region somewhat in the neighbourhood of India. We have no knowledge of Greek kingdoms of which they could have been the sovereigns.

It is certain that the relations of Piyadasi with the Greek world were not posterior to the revolt of Diodotus, and to the creation of the Greek kingdom of Bactriana (about 256 B.C.); for he would have found this prince upon his way, and would have mentioned him; and the proposed identifications, which have hitherto been universally accepted agree with this postulate. Antiochus II. of Syria (260-247), Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247), Antigonus Gonatas of Macedon (278-242), Magas of Cyrene (d. 258), and Alexander of Epirus (d. between 262 and 258), were all alive and reigning contemporaneously between 260 and 258 B.C. On the other hand, the efforts of Piyadasi, whatever may have been their extent, to spread abroad his moral and religious ideas, must, as Lassen (loc. cit.) justly remarks, have been posterior to his conversion, — we can now add, to his active conversion, that is to say, the second one at the end of the eleventh year after his coronation. As the 2nd Edict belongs to the thirteenth year, we are inevitably led to conclude that his twelfth year corresponds to one of the years 260-258 B.C., say, to take a mean, to the year 259. This calculation would fix his coronation at about 260, and his coming to the throne at about 273 B.C.

If we add to these figures the period given for the reigns of his predecessors, Bindusara and Chandragupta, even by the authorities who prolong them the most; i.e. 28 and 24 years, we come to the date 326 B.C., as that of the usurpation of power by the latter. This date is in no way incompatible with the statements of classical writers: we do not know the precise year in which Chandragupta assumed the title of king, and if we accept the tradition related by Justin to be correct, he should have been in a position to do so from the moment when, having escaped from Alexander’s camp, he commenced to collect bands of men around him. The statements of the Hindus regarding the two reigns agree too little amongst themselves, to counterbalance the authority of the synchronism which we derive from the evidence of inscriptions. If we take as a basis of calculation the period of only 24 years given by several Puranas to the reign of Chandragupta, we come to 322 as the year in which he seized his power. At any rate, in my opinion, the calculation which would be the most arbitrary and the most venturesome one, would be to suppress the interval of four years between Ashoka’s coming to the throne and his coronation, which is borne witness to by the Sinhalese chronicles. I have already shown my reasons for this. As for Lassen’s procedure, which commences with giving, without any positive proof, the commencement of Chandragupta’s reign in the year 315, in order to calculate the date of our inscriptions, and thenceupon to charge Piyadasi with alleged inaccuracies, — it is evidently the reverse of a sound method.

Unfortunately we get no information regarding the details of the relations which Piyadasi held with the kings of the Grecian world. It is probable that they were specially close with Antiochus, his neighbour of Syria. The connection between the two kingdoms had been traditional since the time of Chandragupta and Seleucus. Although ancient evidence has preserved for us the name, Dionysius, of an ambassador, or at least of an explorer, sent to India by Ptolemy Philadelphus, — the Ptolemy to whom Piyadasi alludes, — it may be doubted if this allusion refers to direct relations, which appear hardly probable any more than with Magas, or with

---

28 It may be remarked here that, as a feasible exchange for the light which its history receives from Greece, India, by its monuments, lends here a useful indication to Greek chronology. It becomes, in fact, certain that the doubtful date of the death of Alexander, the son of Pyrrhus, is not anterior to 269.
29 Justin, XV, 4.
30 Wilson, Vishnupar., Ed. F. E. Hall, IV, 186, note 5.
31 Ind. Alterth, IX, 264.
Antigonus and Alexander. It may be asked, whether it was not through Antiochus as an intermediary, that Piyadasi had knowledge of the other kings whom he enumerates. The time available for the journey of his emissaries, if they were specially despatched by him, — say about a year and a half. — would scarcely allow them to push so far forward into Hellenic soil, and just about the period to which our edict relates, between 260 and 258, Antiochus II. found himself, by his designs upon Thrace and by his struggles in the Mediterranean, brought into relations more or less unfriendly, but certainly very active, with the sovereigns of Egypt and Cyrene, and of Macedonia and Epirus. 29

Whatever may have been the details, one point appears to be reasonably uncontestible, — that the thirteenth year from the coronation of Piyadasi corresponds nearly to the year 258 or 257 B.C., and that consequently the coronation occurred in 269 or 270. This date, and the correlative dates of the conversions of Aššu, of his inscriptions, &c., are the only ones which appear to me to be legitimately deducible from our texts; for the alleged date in the era of the nārūgā at Sahasaram-Rūpūnath rests, in my opinion, on an illusion and a mistake.

To sum up: — It is now possible to assign to Piyadasi, with sufficient precision his chronological position. That is one of the principal reasons for the great interest which attaches to these monuments; but it is more especially to the history of religious ideas that they appear to promise valuable items of information. It is strange that documents, relatively of such extent, and in which the religious sentiment is so overruling, should not have long ago cut short all hesitation regarding the inspiration by which their author was guided. Yet not only has Wilson 40 ventured to dispute the Buddhist faith of Piyadasi, not only, in much later times, has Mr. Edward Thomas 41 endeavoured to prove that, before becoming a follower of Buddhism, Piyadasi had been subject to other convictions, that he had at first adhered to Jainism. — (these attempts partly rest on grossly inaccurate interpretations and are moreover anterior to the last discoveries at Khālī, Sahasaram and Rūpūnath, which have imported new elements into the debate), — but, which is much more serious, Dr. Kern has also, in spite of his greatly superior knowledge of the documents, and subsequently to the publication of the last edicts, appeared to be dangerously near to ascribing himself to the opinion of Mr. Thomas. 42 He has at any rate sought to prove, in the doctrinal evolutions of Piyadasi gradations, the last expression of which, in the Sahasaram edict, manifests, according to him, all the symptoms of a veritable madness. Here again the suggestion results from certain incomplete interpretations; for Dr. Kern too hurriedly adopted the first translation proposed for the text of Sahasaram-Rūpūnath. It must, nevertheless, be admitted that our monuments suggest a religious, as well as a chronological, question regarding which it is necessary for us to be explicit. This question appears to me to be susceptible of categorical answers.

I can only, in several respects, refer to the results arrived at in the foregoing, and to what I have already attempted to demonstrate, especially with regard to the chronological classification of our inscriptions. It is clear and uncontested that, at the period to which the edict of Bhabra refers, Piyadasi is a declared Buddhist. Unfortunately, as we have seen, this edict bears no expressed date, and contains in it no element of information, which would allow us to date it with certainty. It is nevertheless of essential importance for deciding the question with which we are now dealing. It is evident that, until reasons — positive objections — are discovered to the contrary, a piece of evidence so precise should be accepted. It would be conclusive even if the absence, elsewhere alleged, of documents, of categorical statements, awoke suspicion. But there is no room for even this uncertainty.

Our inscriptions divide themselves into two principal groups; the first, including the Edict of Sahasaram, and the fourteen edicts, belongs to the thirteenth or the fourteenth year; the second, consisting of the columnar edicts, refers to the twenty-seventh or the twenty-eighth. We

29 Droysen, Gesch. des Hellenismus, III, p. 314 and ff.
42 Kern, loc. cit. p. 869 note.
have seen that the former group of these inscriptions alleges two successive evolutions in Piyadasis religious life, the first in the ninth, and the second towards the end of the eleventh year after his coronation. We have now to determine the two poles, the point of departure, and the point of arrival. Regarding the former, I believe that no one has any hesitation; the leading statement in this respect, in the text of Sahasaram-Rupath, has not perhaps all the clearness we should wish; but, whether the translation proposed by me, or that of Dr. Buhler is accepted, it cannot be doubted that, in this first period of his reign, previous to the prohibition of bloody sacrifices (1st edict), Piyadasi had, as the written traditions affirm, accepted the supremacy of the Brahmanas. On the second point, there is no longer the same agreement. The king declares that he has become an upasaka; this word can indicate a Jain layman, as well as a Buddhist one; nevertheless, the manner in which we find it used at Bhabra, where it is certainly applied to Buddhism, ought a priori to incline us towards the same interpretation here. Doubts have been inspired by the use of the word vivutha at Sahasaram, and by the idea that this inscription might not emanate from the Piyadasi who was author of the other edicts. The latter are dissipated by the certainty we have now acquired, that all our edicts must be referred to one and the same author; and the former must fall with the purely arbitrary interpretation proposed for vivutha. Whatever reserve may be advisable with regard to the expression saihhe papayite, or whatever be its true reading, it is clear that the king mentions here certain relations which his conversion has established between himself and the saingha; that word can designate nothing but the Buddhist clergy; the Edict of Bhabra shews moreover, that this application of it was well established from the time of Piyadasi.

We have, however, another proof still more decisive, — the passage of the 8th edict, in which Piyadasi speaks of his practical and active conversion. He defines it by saying that, in the eleventh year from his coronation, he set out for the saihbhldhi. No doubt as to the meaning is here possible. The word saihbhldhi inevitably links Piyadasi with Buddhism. Before it was fully understood, the expression appeared to imply a usage of the word different from that which is authorised by literature; but the more exact interpretation, which I have given above, does away with all difficulties; it establishes, on the contrary, a curious agreement with the literary use of the equivalent phrase saihbhldhi prasthadatu, to which the passage refers.

It is, therefore, certainly to Buddhist ideas that Piyadasi was converted. But did he become unfaithful to them? Did he subsequently vary in his opinions? The second group, that of the columnar inscriptions, is very far from furnishing the slightest pretext for such a conjecture. The one which it was deemed possible to draw from the first phrase of the 6th edict, is quite illusory. Nay more; the passage in question, understood as I believe I have shewn that it should be understood, turns directly contrary to any hypothesis of this description. If the king referred expressly to his dharmalipis of his thirteenth year, it is certainly a proof that his ideas regarding the dharmas, his religious opinions, had not in the interval undergone any essential change. Besides, when the two series of inscriptions are compared, the absolute identity of tone and style, the common allusions to the same deeds and the same institutions, the perfect resemblance between the moral exhortations, are such that only the strongest and

43 I do not speak of the word sneats which Dr. Buhler restores at Rupath. I have already explained why I do not consider this restoration as admissible.

44 It will be understood that I have refer to the translation of Dr. Oldenberg. I may be permitted to take this opportunity to add, with regard to that of Dr. Buhler, a remark which I had omitted in the proper place. One of the arguments which he brings forward to uphold the meaning of the 'passed,' which he attributes to vivutha, is the use of the phrase vivutha vas in the Kushalagiri inscription (l. 5). This argument must be abandoned. It is to be feared that this important monument, which is in so bad a state of preservation, will never become perfectly intelligible to us. One thing is visible, that it contains, year by year, an enumeration of the actions of the king: dutty vas (l. 4), prashmam . . . . vos (l. 6), salam vas (l. 7), atham vas (ib.), &c. In line 5 where the facsimile of Prinsep gives tatha vivutha vas, that of the Corpus gives a-tha vas. It ought certainly to be read a-tatha (7) chatutha vas, 'in the fourth year.' This indeed is the reading given by Bibi Rajendralala Mitra, History of Orissa, II. p. 22.

45 See above, p. 234 and ff.
most convincing proof could lead us to consider as probably a change of belief in the common author of both. All indications contradict such an idea.

But not only do certain columnar edicts form the natural development of the principles contained in the older tables,—(thus, the 5th Columnar edict is directed to the protection of animal life, and may be compared with the prohibition of bloody sacrifices and of samājas ordained by the first of the fourteen edicts),—but the days set apart in this same 5th edict are consecrated as holidays amongst Buddhists, and the uposatha, to which he appeared to show a special respect, is known to every one as their weekly festival. The 8th Columnar edict extends the supervision of the dharmamahāmdāras over every sect, from the Brahmins to the Nirgranthas or Jainas; but, when he refers to the saṅgha, to the Buddhist clergy, the king changes his expression. He desires that his officers should watch 'the interests of the saṅgha' (saṅgha-thāsi); it is evident that here, and here only, his sympathies are specially aroused. I will only allude to one more fact, which in the light of the preceding, takes a definite meaning, and becomes really instructive. It will be remembered that, at Khālsī, the second part of the 14th edict is accompanied by the figure of an elephant, between the legs of which one reads, in characters the same as those of the tables gajatamē; I have proposed to translate this, 'the elephant par excellence.' This inscription is in a fashion commented upon by that which we have referred to as at Girnār, in nearly the same place, and which probably accompanied also the figure of an elephant, which has been worn away from the surface of the rock;—'the white elephant who is in truth the benefactor of the entire world (or of all the worlds). It is the less permitted to imagine an arbitrary and accidental addition, because, at Dhauli, we again find the same figure of an elephant beside the edicts. It is impossible to doubt that these images and these legends are contemporary with the inscriptions. Nor is the meaning doubtful. Not only are we here in the presence of a Buddhist symbol, but the accompanying legends contain a clear allusion to the history of the birth of Buddha descending in the form of a white elephant into the womb of his mother.

In conclusion;—It is certain that Piyadasi, at least during the entire portion of his reign to which our monuments refer, from the ninth year after his coronation (and more particularly from the thirteenth, in which he began having inscriptions engraved) to the twenty-eighth, and very probably up to the end of his life, was a declared adherent to Buddhism. This is the fixed point, the necessary starting point, for all legitimate deductions. Doubtless a certain difference of tone may be suspected between the Edict of Bhabra, or even that of Sahasrarām, and all the

46 I content myself with transcribing the term used by Piyadasi: I am not convinced that a definitive translation of it has yet been discovered, in spite of various ingenious attempts. The meaning 'bhatta' (bhesjīya) proposed by Dr. Pachet (Göt. Gel. Anz., 1881, p. 1324) has not the authority of the known usage of the language. Dr. Bühler has clearly shown that samāja must have a meaning connected with 'festival, rejoicing,' but the meaning must be more precise and circumscripted than this. In the sentence in the 1st edict it cannot well be admitted that with the very positive and precise prohibition na...prajāhitasarjanam, should be closely connected one so different, so vague, as 'ye must hold no festivities.' Besides, it is plain that the whole edict is entirely devoted to the protection of animal life. Samāja must refer directly to some act by which that life was compromised. The connexion of the details which the king gives concerning his kitchen would, on any other hypothesis, be altogether inexplicable. It is this exact shade of the meaning of samāja, 'sacrifice, feast,' or some other, which Dr. Bühler has failed to identify. Nor can I accept his translation of the sentence asītī pītā, &c.; for, if Piyadasi had meant to approve of 'certain samājas,' he would have specified to what samājas he referred. He would at least have continued his sentence under the form of an antithesis, as he does under other circumstances, and would have spoken of dharmamamāmājas, or of something of the kind.

47 Cf. Kern, loc. cit., II., 205 and ff.

48 I am afraid that I should injure conclusions, which I believe are firmly established, if I were to bring forward arguments of less value, so I content myself with reminding my readers of, for instance, the use of daśasāra, corresponding to the technical term saracā of the Buddhists, and that of asāman to mean 'to preach,' or 'to teach,' which was familiar to the Buddhists (Burnouf, Lotus, p. 304 and ff.), &c.

49 I can only withdraw, before the corrected readings and the new translation of Dr. Bühler, the conjecture which I hazarded with regard to the 9th edict (in Dh. vii. 2.), in which I believed that I had discovered an allusion to a certain incident of the legend of Śākyamuni. The explanation of Dr. Bühler establishes, with a natural sense, a complete harmony among the different versions. It certainly deserves acceptance, in spite of the little difficulties of detail which exist, and of which a final revision of the texts will perhaps reduce the number.
others. But between these two very unequal groups, there is no contradiction, there is only a mere difference of degree. It is explained by the difference of the persons whom the king addressed: at Bhāra, he spoke to the Buddhist clergy; elsewhere he speaks to his people at large, or at least to all his officers without distinction. Religious toleration is not an exceptional occurrence in India, but is the customary rule of her sovereigns. From the indications of coins down to the direct evidence of the chronicles, from the inscriptions down to the account of the Chinese travellers, there are abundant proofs of this. Piyaḍāsā made no exception to the rule; he forms, on the contrary, one of its most illustrious examples, one of its most positive witnesses. It is therefore, very natural that, in addressing himself to the generality of his subjects, without regard to religion or sect, he should have avoided using too exclusive manifestations of his own private faith, and strictly dogmatical statements. We can at least be certain that none of his inscriptions contains anything contradictory to the Buddhist doctrine, and it is essential to remember this, if we would endeavour to picture to our selves from the monuments the condition of Buddhism at the time of Piyaḍāsā.

Now that we have determined, both from a chronological and from a religious point of view, the ground on which our monuments lead us, it remains to consider the data which they supply regarding the administration, the history, and the religious ideas of Piyaḍāsā and his relations with foreign countries, his life and his religious opinions.

Piyaḍāsā gives us no information regarding his lineage. We only learn from a passage of the 5th (Rock) edict, in which the surveillance exercised by the dharmapālaṃs is under consideration, that he had brothers, sisters, and other relatives, settled both in his capital and in other towns. Moreover (Col. Ed. VIII) he pays attention to the distribution of the alms made by all his children who live, some near him, and others in the provinces (diśkaṇa), and in particular to those made by the 'princes, sons of the queen,' who are thus distinguished as holding a superior rank. It is to this last category that belong 'the Kumāras' who represent

---

50 He exhibits now and then a particular care for his co-religionists, but he does so in order to direct special officers to devote themselves to them, and to give them suitable instruction. It is in this way that I still understand the last sentence of the 3rd edict. Dr. Bühler, following Dr. Kern, combats the meaning which I still continue to attribute to yūḍha, and which is approved of by Dr. Pischel (p. 125). I cannot accept his amendment. Dr. Bühler is compelled to admit a different meaning for the word in each of the two passages in which it occurs in the 5th edict. That is a first objection, but there are more serious ones. It will shortly appear in what close relationship the rājūkas generally appeared with the dharmapālaṃs. This is a first reason for fearing, as has always been the case, that yūḍha is only an abridged equivalent for dharmapālaṃ, 'sealots,' equivalent to 'sealots for the dhamma'; nothing is more natural. What is true for the first yūḍha is not less so for the second. yūḍha associated with the paśchā, which is nothing else than the assembly of the rājūkas. But in the first passage it is wished to take yūḍha as an adjective applied to rājūka and to pāṭaṭa (Dr. Bühler actually approves of my construction of the sentence and defends it against Dr. Pischel). We must then omit the cha which, at G., follows yūḍha. This procedure is in itself violent and ambiguous, but it is still insufficient. The turn of the phrase at Kh., yūḍha lajaka pāṭaṭa, and the corresponding words at K. without cha, imply the co-ordination of the three terms, and not only of the two last; if this were not so, we must have as at D., yūḍha lajaka cha pāṭaṭa cha. It is unnecessary to remark that, on the other hand, this last mode of speaking very well agrees with my interpretation. Yūḍha is therefore a substantive, or at least used substantively. Here we must conclude that it is the equivalent of dharmapālaṃ. So also with yūḍha or yūḍa in the last line. I have given one reason, founded on its being associated with paśchā. The comparison with the sentence of the 8th Columnar edict (l. 1-9), lajaka... pāṭaṭaṃ dhammaṃ dharmapālaṃ, is very striking. There are also other reasons. First, aṣṭaapātaḥ is much more easily translated with a personal subject. It must be admitted that the expression 'the assembly will teach suitable matters' is singularly feeble and vague, even for our inscriptions. Of course, the neuter form yūḍa of several versions offers no difficulty; have we not, at Col. Ed. IV. 8, pāṭaṭaṃ-equivalent to yūḍha? Perhaps yūḍha of G. also represents the neuter; and we shall thus have side by side a use of the singular and of the plural, exactly as dharmapālaṃ is by turns used in the plural and in the singular without alteration in the sense.
the royal authority at Tōsalī (Dh. det. ed. II, 1), at Ujjayini, and at Takshaśilā (Dh. J. det. Ed., I, 23, 24). We find an allusion to his wives in the fragment designated the Edict of the Queen. In it Piyaḍasi gives orders, the meaning of which, owing to the partial destruction of the stone, we are unable to grasp exactly, regarding the acts of liberality of the second queen (dāntādā-devi). Amongst these acts he mentions the granting of mango groves and gardens; it would seem, also, that he praises her religious zeal and her merciful disposition; and she thus appears to us as sharing, as we have a right to expect, the ideas as well as the doctrines of the king.

The royal residence was at Pāṭala-puṭra, as the chronicles say, and as follows from the Rock Edict, G. V, 7, compared with the other versions. With the exception of the four towns of Pāṭala-puṭra, Ujjayini, Takshaśilā, and Tōsalī, which have just been referred to, and of Samāpā (J. det. Ed. I, 1, and II, 1), Piyaḍasi mentions no name of any people or town expressly as being among those which were directly under his rule (vījita). The only exception is Kaśīnga, the conquest of which he mentions as having taken place in the ninth year after his coronation. The towns of Tōsalī and of Samāpā cannot be precisely identified. It is, however, almost certain that Tōsalī, which formed the residence of a prince of the blood royal, must have been a considerable centre, possibly the capital of the whole province. Samāpā was probably a town of secondary importance, and cannot have been very far from Jangada, the site where the inscriptions which mention it were engraved.

Although Piyaḍasi gives us so few explicit geographical data, the indications regarding his neighbours on different sides, with which he supplies us, allow us to form some idea of the extent of his vast dominions. I believe that I have shown above that the enumerations unfortunately both vague and brief, of the frontier populations, which are contained in the inscriptions, are of two kinds: one set refers to the provinces situated to the west and south-west of the empire over which Piyaḍasi was suzerain; the other includes the independent bordering nations. Both contain many names of which the identification is more or less hypothetical, and even with regard to those about whose identification we need not be in doubt, we have too incomplete information regarding the exact boundaries to which they extended in the time of Piyaḍasi, to arrive at very precise conclusions.

In the first category, that of populations subject to the suzerainty of the king, appear the Yavanas (V and XIII), the Kambājas (V and XIII), the Pāṭepikas (V and XIII), the Gandhāras (V), the Ristikas or Rāṣtikas (V), the Viśās and the Vṛjjas (XIII), the Nābhapaṇīs (XIII), and finally the Bhājas (XIII), the Andhras and the Pulindas (XIII). The Gandhāras and the Kambājas certainly belonged to the tract of the river Kābul; it is probable that these Yavanas, subjects of a Hindū power, formed a province still further off in the direction of the Greeks of the independent kingdoms, and that the list, commencing with them and continuing through the Kambājas and the Gandhāras, follows a regular course from exterior to interior. We have, however, no certainty with regard to this, and this same Yavana could here, if necessary, designate not a particular country, but the elements of the population which were of western origin, and which were at this epoch scattered throughout this part of India. 54 I may remind my readers of the Tushaspa, styled ‘Yavaranāja of Asoka the Maurya,’ i.e., probably, under the suzerainty of Asoka the Maurya, whom the inscription of Rudrādāman at Gīr dar mentions as having repaired an embankment in the neighbourhood, and who consequently held sway in the peninsula of Kāthiāwā. I would also remind them of the considerable number of dedications which, in the Buddhist caves of Western India, emanate from Yavanas.

53 Lassen, Ind. Alterth., I, 599; II, 159.
54 Lassen, Ind. Alterth., I, 592.
55 Cf. Lassen, Ind. Alterth., II, 245 and ff. One is reminded of the eastern territories of Gedrosia and Arachosia, which Seleucus ceded to Chandragupta (Droysen Gesch. des Hellenismus, IV, 129 and ff.)
As regards the Rāṣṭikas, the very name is doubtful. The word has usually been read Rāṣṭikas (transcribed Rāšīrkas), and understood as meaning 'the inhabitants of Suraśṭra.' Dr. Bühler points out that the reading Rāṣṭika, which at G. appears to be certain, goes against this interpretation. The identification would, according to him, be in any way inadmissible, 'for the Rāṣṭika-Pāṭēṇikas must be amongst the independent neighbours of Aśoka, whereas Suraśṭra and Lāṭā were incorporated in his kingdom.' This difficulty would not appear to us to be decisive, after what we have said regarding the position of the provinces in the enumeration of which the Rāṣṭikas find entry. If the king delegated officers to them, he could very well have also had inscriptions engraved among them. In fact, if we may attribute some authority to the tradition of which we notice an echo in the inscription of Budadama, we should find in it direct evidence in favour of the régime which, on other grounds, I believe to have been, under Aśoka, that of Suraśṭra. There remains the orthographical difficulty, but, as against the rāṣṭika of G., we find the lathika of Dh. and the rathika of K., that is not easy to solve. I cannot admit that the two last forms could represent rāṣṭika as well as rāšīrkas; the wearing away of the rock might certainly have caused the sign for t to have disappeared at Dh. and at K.; but the same sign at G. might equally well be only some accidental scratch in the rock. While, therefore, I cannot pronounce between the Rāṣṭikas proposed by Dr. Bühler, and the Rāšīrkas, I still do not think that, in the present state of our knowledge, the latter reading deserves as yet to be absolutely abandoned. We must, moreover, take into consideration the opinion lately expressed by Prof. Bhandarkar. In the 13th edict, the Rāṣṭikas or Rāṣṭikas are replaced by the Bhōjas, who are similarly associated with the Pāṭēṇikas. Although the territory of this tribe cannot be exactly defined, and has certainly varied from time to time, the name of the Bhōjas, nevertheless, carries us either towards the Narmada, or towards the coast of the Konkana.

If the two names are not simply equivalent, they agree in bringing us towards the same part of India. Prof. Bhandarkar reminds us that in several inscriptions of the Western caves there appears the name of the Mahābhājās; while others have similarly the name of the Mahārāṣṭras. Our Rāṣṭikas would be to these Mahārāṣṭras, as the Bhōjas are to the Mahābhājās, and the Rāṣṭikas of Piyadasī would in that case be simply the Mahārāṣṭras or Marāṭhas of the Dekhan. The Pāṭēṇikas, being connected with the Bhōjas, should be sought for in the same direction; and, in this respect, their identification with the inhabitants of Paśṭhāna, i.e. Pratishṭhāna, towards the source of the Godāvāri, is extremely tempting; so tempting indeed, that I am inclined to pass over the phonetic scruples which Dr. Bühler (p. 32) opposes to it. The Andhras of the 13th edict would well continue the line of enumeration towards the east. The name of the Pulindas is too widely spread, for it to be possible to localise it with precision in the present case. It is certainly met towards the centre of the Dekhan, in the very locality where the continuation of the enumeration would lead us to expect it.

Regarding the Nābhakas and the Nābhapunthis of the 13th edict, supposing these names to be correct, which is still doubtful, Dr. Bühler (Ed. XIII, n. 5) has cited from the Vaivarttpurāṇa the city Nābhikapura as belonging to the Uttarakurus. He thence concludes that these Nābhakas may have dwelt in the extreme north of India, in the Himālaya. He comes to an analogous conclusion regarding the Vīṣas and the Vṛtis, whom he supposes to have been the early predecessors of the Bais and Lichchhavīs of Nāpāl. All that is, of course, extremely doubtful. If we take into account the general direction, as I consider it has been followed by our enumerations, it could well be admitted that the king begins with his northern frontiers before going westwards. But the position of the Nābhakas, coming after the Gandhāras, should be sought for, not so much due north, as somewhat towards the north-west.

The peoples whom the king enumerates as his independent neighbours (ānātā avijitā) are, together with the Greeks of the kingdom of Antiochus and his neighbours, the Chōdas
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47 Cf. Lassen, Ind. Alterth., I, 216.
(II, XIII), the Pāṇḍyas (II, XIII), Satiyaputa, and Kēralaputa (II.) I do not refer to Tambapanni (Ceylon), which is each time named at the conclusion, and as the extreme limit (dvāra tambapanniya). The general situation of the Chōdas and the Pāṇḍyas on the east coast and at the south extremity of the Dekhan, is sufficiently well known. As for the northern boundary, which divided the Chōdas from Kaliṅga which was conquered by Piyadasi, it is difficult to fix it. Judging from the terms of the inscription, the territories acquired in this direction by the king would seem to have been of very great extent. They must have gone far to the south. On the other hand, the existence at Dha-nil and at Jangada of an edict specially referring to foreign nations, and to the duties in regard to them which are incumbent on the representatives of the king, leads us necessarily to the conclusion that these inscriptions cannot have been any great distance from the frontier of the empire. Satiyaputa and Kēralaputa would appear to correspond in some way, on the east, with the Chōdas and Pāṇḍyas on the eastern side of the Dekhan. That at least would be the result, on the one hand, of the learned and ingenious conjecture of Dr. Bühler (pp. 12-14) regarding Satiyaputa, and, on the other hand, of the reading Kēralaputa — (according to Dr. Bühler the correct reading at Dha is Kēralaputa) — instead of Kēralaputa at G. Such a conjecture is too convenient not to be a little subject to suspicion, but it has, nevertheless, since Benfey and Lassen, secured general acceptance, and it is difficult to make any other suggestion.

To sum up; — The empire of Piyadasi is in its main features sufficiently delimited. It embraced the whole of Northern India, although his exact frontiers, both to the east and to the west, remain, more or less, undetermined. It is equally certain that the influence of the king, if not his full authority, extended to the central plateau of the Dekhan, and went even farther to the south along the coasts. Moreover, we have proved that, at least towards the west, the south-west, and the south, his kingdom, properly so called, was bordered by provinces over which he exercised a suzerainty which was certainly active and effectual, but of which we cannot precisely measure the extent.

Piyadasi tells us on the whole but little regarding the system under which he administered these vast dominions, his inscriptions being almost exclusively devoted to religious subjects. He only mentions his administration so far as it deals with religious and moral progress. It is merely in that direction that he would appear to have carried his personal reforms. These fall under two main classes; according as he further extends the power and the duties of functionaries already existing; or as he creates new functionaries and new institutions.

The title purusahas, 'men of the king,' would seem to be the most comprehensive term under which Piyadasi used to include all the representatives of his authority, to whatever rank they belonged. He himself distinguishes them (Col. Ed. I) as superior, inferior, and of middle rank, and he evidently refers to them as officers, for they are mentioned together with the antamahāmdtaras. He desires that they should conform to his instructions, and that they should direct the people in the good way. They are moreover, in one passage (Col. Ed. IV), contrasted in some degree with the rajākas. We shall shortly see by what characteristics these last require to be classified outside the category of functionaries properly so called.

Mahāmdtaras is also a generic term, analogous to undiya, though perhaps with a more extended signification. It should designate functionaries of every order, but of high rank, and was applied to 'bodies' (sikaya) of various officers (cf. XII, 9). Piyadasi, like his predecessors, was surrounded by them, and when he speaks of mahāmdtaras in general, it is impossible for us to specify what class of officers he had in view, or even to say for certain that he did not address
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63 Rjānasiyākata, as Kullākā explains the word in Mann, viii, 43.
64 Regarding the Kērala, cf. Lassen, I, 126 note. I do not refer to the Hīdarāya mentioned in the 13th edict. As he is separate from the general list, we are without any index as to the direction in which we are to seek him, and the reading itself is still very doubtful.
himself to all functionaries whose rank corresponded with this designation. In this sense there are mahādmātras in all provinces (Edict of the Queen), whom the king represents as charged with the responsibility of conducting urgent matters (VI). At the commencement of the first detached edict at Dh. and J., he addresses the mahādmātras who are at Tōsail (or at Samāpi), and who are charged with the administration (probably with the judicial administration in particular) of the town,—nagolaviyāldhakas. It is to similar functionaries that the Edict of Kauñambi is directed. But there were also other mahādmātras, each entrusted with the special superintendence of a religious sect, one with that of the Buddhist sahyaha, another with that of the Brāhmaṇas, of the Ājīvikas, or of the Nirgranthas (Col. Ed. VIII, 5). The word was thus naturally chosen to form, in composition with special determinatives, the title of functionaries of various orders; such are the ithyakamahādmātras, or officers charged with the surveillance over women of the harem (XII), the antakamahādmātras, the frontier officers, or more exactly, the officers appointed to communicate with the populations across the frontiers (Dh., J. det. Ed. II);[66] such, finally, are dhvanamahādmātras. As regards these last Piyadasi expressly claims the credit of the institution of the office (IV), and it is natural to conclude that the others existed before his reign. The case is the same with the pratīvdakas[67] (VI), whose reports he arranges to receive at all moments of the day, and with the vachabāmikas (XII), a class of overseers whose duties we have no means for precisely indicating. But in the case of all, the king has enlarged and in some way or other remodelled their duties, adding to the special functions of these officers those of a moral surveillance, of a sort of religious propaganda, on which alone he insists in his rescripts.

The same idea pervades all his new institutions, at least all those which are borne witness to by the inscriptions. As far as regards the dharmamahādmātras, the name itself is significant. Their creation goes back to the fourteenth year of Piyadasi's coronation (V). He also claims the credit of the institution of the rajjukas: kṣan mama ḫukā katā jñapadya kalitaṇḍikā (Col. Ed. IV, 12). The functions and the hierarchical grade of these officers are enveloped in some obscurity. It is probable that the true form of the word is rajjuka, and that Prof. Jacobi has rightly connected them with the rajjus of the Jain texts, whose title the commentators explain by ḫukā 'scribe.' The Kalpasūtra appears to bear witness to their habitual presence, and to their importance at the courts of kings. Dr. Bühler (p. 20), while approving of this derivation and of this meaning, also asks whether we are to see, in these rajjukas, clerks fulfilling the functions of scribes, or a caste of scribes from which the king may have specially recruited the personnel of his administration. The sentence of the 4th Col. edict which I have just quoted, hardly leaves any room for doubt; it is incompatible with the second hypothesis: but the nature of their functions, even taking as a foundation the translation of the word by ḫukā, is capable of diverse interpretations; and it is, therefore, the more necessary to examine our texts as closely as possible.

The rajjukas are mentioned on three occasions,—in the 3rd of the fourteen (Rock) edicts, and in the 4th and the 8th of the Colombari edicts. Of the last passages, the first contrasts them with the whole range of royal functionaries, grouped collectively under the designation of 'men of the king.' The second tends to the same conclusion; the king, after having stated, without specification, that he has appointed over his people a number of persons, evidently officials, to teach them, adds immediately, 'I have also appointed rajjukas over hundreds of thousands of living beings, and they have been ordered by me to instruct the faithful in such and such a manner.' In the 3rd edict, the rajjukas, together with the prāddāsika and the faithful, are invited to proceed every five years to the anuvānaṅg. These rajjukas must in short have had a position apart from all these functionaries, for the king, in the 4th of the
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[66] Bühler, p. 47.
[67] The word vanta has been, I think, definitely explained by Dr. Bühler, who takes it in the sense of vinātha, to mean litter or palanquin. This hypothesis satisfies the desideratum which I pointed out in my commentary on the passage, and on account of which I rejected various tentative interpretations; it furnishes a designation of place.
Columnar edicts, stipulates for them, and for them alone, an altogether special privilege, that of
being only subject to his direct jurisdiction. Although this edict does not, strictly speaking, make them
superior in the hierarchy to the purushas, still it attributes at least an authority, a
special importance, to the teaching conveyed by them. The king considers it their duty to
stimulate the zeal of his functionaries properly so called, so as to make them in their turn active
propagators of the good doctrine.

It will be remarked that wherever the raĳākas are mentioned, they are put in close
relationship on the one hand with the teaching of the dhanaına, and on the other hand with the
yutas or the dhańmayuta. It is for them alone that the king reserves the technical term for,
'preaching' (va-ra-va-va, pa-ra-ra-va). They are to instruct specially the dhańmayutas people,
that is to say the faithful, but with them also all people (Col. Ed. IV and VIII); if they,
proceed to the anusmayunas, it is in company with the yutas. In the last sentence of the 3rd
edict, yutas are spoken of, without apparently any mention being made of raĳaknas; but, even
here, nevertheless, I think that they are directly referred to. The parishad is charged
with the duty of instructing the yutas or the faithful. I originally understood parishad as an
equivalent of saṅgha, and I was not, I think, much mistaken. The two Jain texts which mention
the raĳās, refer them in the compound raĳāsabha (Kalpasutra I, 122, 147). Judging
from the context, sabha cannot mean specially the assembly itself, but rather the place of
the assembly; it, however, supposes a meeting, a college, of raĳās, for the use of which the sabha
was set apart. I feel little hesitation in identifying the parishad of the 3rd Edict with this
meeting of raĳaknas. It will be recognised that the position which the word occupies, beside an order
given to the raĳaknas, is favourable to this opinion. The parishad reappears in the 6th
edict. According to the division of the sentences which has been established by Dr. Bühlcr, the
king says, — 'With regard to all that I personally order to be given away or to be promulgated,
or to everything that, in urgent cases, the mahānātron have to undertake on their own
responsibility, every dissent or blame which may arise concerning that must be immediately
reported in the parishad.' It would be unreasonable to contend, a priori, that this parishad
is different from that of the 3rd edict. This assembly of raĳaknas thus appears to constitute a
sort of council, of a more specially religious character, on which the care of the propagators
and of religious works specially devolved, and to which the piety of the king gave a
considerable influence over his own actions. The expression of the 8th edict, according to
which the raĳaknas were appointed over many thousands of men, and, still more, the indications
of the 3rd edict, which applies to all parts of the vast empire of Piyadasi, go far to prove that
there was not only one of these colleges, but that they existed in more or less number. The
peculiar functions of these persons, perhaps also their religious character, clearly explain both
the importance which Piyadasi attaches to their creation and their actions, and the privileged
position in which he endowed them, as compared with his other officers. It would be
interesting if we could establish a palpable agreement between their name and their office,
but unfortunately, though the form raĳāka appears to be certain, the etymology of the word
remains obscure. The very meaning which the Jain commentator attributes to it, even if we
admit that he is right, cannot be the primitive one, and can be no authority for the time of
Piyadasi. All that we can state positively is this, that between the meaning of 'scribe,'
however it arose, and the application of the word to persons whose duties as teachers suppose
a complete religious education, the distance is far from impassable.

It now remains to say a word regarding a last category of persons, the pradēsikas.
According to Prof. Kern, they were probably local governors. This interpretation is conformable
with the use of the word in the classical language, and, basing his inquiries on this use,
Dr. Bühlcr (p. 20) seeks in them for the local princes, in whom India, with its feudal system

---

69 It is unnecessary to remark how this allusion favours my interpretation of the words yuta and dhańmayuta. It
proves at least that, in translating, we cannot separate the two terms from each other.

and its caste organization, has always been rich,—the ancestors of the Thâkurs, Râos, Râwals, &c., of the present day. In itself the explanation is very plausible. The only passage in which they are mentioned by name, associates them with the rajjôkas in their characteristic functions. If my conjecture of yathâvisayajî in the 8th Col. Ed. (1. 1.) is well founded, it is probable that they are referred to in this sentence also, and yathâvisayâ would correspond with prâdêsika. There also, they seem to be closely connected with the rajjôkas, and it is not surprising that the king should devolve upon functionaries of so high a rank, who were in a manner his direct representatives, a share in the mission of preaching.  

Piyadasi, while not expressing himself very clearly regarding the character and hierarchical position of his functionaries, is also not as explicit and precise as we could wish regarding their duties. He is more occupied with giving them counsels of humanity, of imparting to them moral exhortations, than with detailing their professional work.

So far as concerns the officers, probably of various kinds, grouped together under the generic title of mahâmâtrâs, we see clearly enough that they existed in all parts of his kingdom (Edict of the Queen), and that they were expected, in urgent matters, to come to the necessary decisions on their own responsibility (VI). Some of them, in towns such as Tôsai and Sâmâpâ, acted as governors and judges (Dh. J., Det. Ed. I.); they had to prevent arbitrary prosecutions and imprisonments; but, as we have seen, it is, above all, the practice of the virtues most necessary to their positions which is recommended to them; they must flee envy, impatience, want of application. In the frontier provinces, the antamahâmâtrâs (Dh. J., Det. Ed. II) are only encouraged to convince the foreigners, beyond the border, of the pacific and benign intentions which Piyadasi holds in regard to them, and are charged to bring them gradually by these sympathetic feelings to the practice of those virtues, dear to the king, which must assure their welfare both in this world and in the next. All this is very vague. From the 8th Col. edict, it appears that we must conclude, that to each sect, orthodox or dissenting, there was attached a mahâmâtra, specially entrusted with its superintendence.

According to the same passage, the dhammahâmâtrâs, created by Piyadasi for the diffusion of the dhamma, would appear to have had a more extended sphere of action. They were to busy themselves in a general way with all the sects. A reference may be made to the 5th and 12th Rock edicts and to the 8th Col. edict, where the king recapitulates more or less explicitly the services which he expects from them. It is a mission of mercy and charity, unfortunately without positive details, which is entrusted to them. Amongst the vassal populations (V) they appear to have been invested with particularly multifarious duties, amongst others, the special protection of the co-religionists of the king. They are readily confused with the mahâmâtrâs, named thus in a general fashion, for example, in what concerns the distribution of the alms of the king, his wives, and his children (Col. Ed. VIII and Ed. of the Queen). They are charged with a kind of oversight of the king’s palace and of all his property, both at Pûpakapûl, and in the provinces (V), but they evidently share this task with other functionaries, probably of inferior rank, such as the तिहjâkâmahâmâtrâs and the vachabhûmikâs (XI). The king connects all his bodies of officers with each other, as all working together to aid, by mutual tolerance and religious preaching, the progress of the moral ideas which form the essential basis of all sects. We cannot draw many precise ideas from language so vague as this.

The duties of the pratîvâdakâs are a little better defined by their name alone. They are the officers whose duty it is to report everything to the king (VI), and Dr. Bühler (47) has

10 I think that, in any case, Prof. Kern goes beyond his authorities, when he finds the creation of the rajjôkas and the pradêsikas as occurring in the 13th year (loc. cit. p. 329). The date given in the 3rd edict evidently refers to the foundation of the anusumânyâs, and not to the creation of the officials whom the king directs to participate in it.

11 In the edict of Kâshânâ, the word suâkhâs, which is very distinct, seems to indicate that the mahâmâtrâs of the town received, in this instance, orders regarding the Buddhist community. This is an additional reason for regretting that the fragment is so damaged. Should we consider that we have a trace of the continued existence of this organisation in the inscription of Nâîk (West, No. 6, Archæol. Surv. West. Ind., IV, p. 99) . . . . nâîkâkânaâm rîsakas/mahâmâtrâs rîsakâs kîtâ? We might easily translate it ‘the mahâmâtra of Nâîk, set over the Śrânapas.’
certainly good grounds for comparing them with the charas (or chātras) whose employment is recommended to Hindū princes by the Dharmaśāstras. So far as regards them, probably Piya-
dasi's only innovation was the zeal with which he required and heard their reports.

As for the rajjūkas, we have seen that their principal, but not their only (yathā añāya pi
kauśādyā, Ed. III) duty, was the preaching of the dhāma, and that chiefly for the benefit of the
dhāmaṁayinās. Although, it is true, the text is not absolutely explicit, it appears likely that to
them also was entrusted the execution of the will of the king with reference to those condemned
to death (Col. Ed. IV). Piyadasī determined to give these unhappy people a respite of three
days before their execution, so that they might prepare themselves for the punishment by
fasting and alms, and might practise meditation with a view to their salvation in the world to
come. We have here an inspiration which is entirely religious; and the intervention of the
rajjūkas would perfectly agree with what has been said above regarding the character of their
office.

I would have little to add regarding them, did they not play an important part in an institu-
tion peculiar to Piyadasī, the anusāmyāna, which is very characteristic, but the nature and
ritual of which are unfortunately not explained with the accuracy which we should desire.

I desire to draw the attention of the reader to two decisive passages. Their translation
is, I believe, certain as regards its general lines. We first read in the 3rd edict, — 'Every-
where in my empire let the faithful of the religion, the rajjūka and the governor, set out every five
years for the anusāmyāna, for this reason — for the teaching of the dhāma, as well as for any
other duty. The teaching of the dhāma, that is to say, “It is good to obey one's mother and
one's father, etc.”' The first detached edict of Dh. and J. concludes as follows:—'It is also
for this purpose that regularly every fifth year I shall summon [to the anusāmyāna] every
mahāmātra who will be mild, patient, and a respecter of life, in order that, hearing these things,
he may act according to my instructions. The Prince [Governor] of Ujjayinī also will for this
purpose summon an assembly of the same nature, but he shall do so every three years without
fail. So also at Takshaśilā. While repairing to the anusāmyāna, without at the same time
neglecting their other particular duties, these mahāmātras will learn these things. Let them
act in accordance therewith, following the instructions of the king.'

It is the exact meaning of the word anusāmyāna which makes the difficulty. Instead of
the 'assembly,' which I have sought for in it, Prof. Kern (loc. cit.), and after him Dr. Bühler
(p. 21), understand it as a 'tour of inspection.' Dr. Bühler relies on its etymological mean-
ing, and also on the fact that the word is really used in Sanskrit to signify 'to visit in turn.'
I willingly admit that, at first sight, this translation would appear to be the most natural one.
At the same time, Prof. Kern himself admits that my interpretation is not impossible, and that
as a matter of fact, as samy-ṣya certainly does mean 'to meet together,' anusāmyāna, could easily,
with the addition of the distributive meaning contained in anus, express the idea of 'meeting;
assembly.' On the other hand, the translation which my learned colleagues propose for the
word seems to me to be irreconcilable with the passages which have just been cited.

In fact, it follows from the first detached edict at Dhauli, that the mahāmātras, whom the
king intends, or orders, to 'set out for the anusāmyāna,' are supposed to go there to seek for them-
selves, and not to carry to others, teaching and moral instruction. I believe that I have shown
in my commentary, that the text can bear no other interpretation. Moreover, that is the only one
which logically fits into the general bearing of the whole edict. It is addressed to the
mahāmātras, and only contains exhortations, a kind of sermon, regarding their duties. 'Fail
not,' concludes the king, 'to satisfy me by acting in this way. It is for this purpose (that is to
say, quite clearly, to obtain every satisfaction from you) that this inscription hath been engraven

... It is also for this purpose (that is to say, again evidently, to remind you of your duties)

72 The plural which follows, mahāmātras, justifies this translation.
73 Geschied. van het Buddhisme, II, 220 n.
that regularly every fifth year, etc.' If we compare closely the two passages which relate to the anusamāyana, what do we find? In the first, the yutas, the rajjikas and the prādēsikas are every five years, to set out for the anusamāyana. In the second, it is only stated that the mahāmātras are to set out for it. It has been rather hastily admitted that the two categories must necessarily be equivalent; I myself have fallen into the mistake. It was under this impression that, in order to establish a complete concordance between the two passages, I originally proposed to take,74 in the first, the phrase indu dhanumānusatiya in a passive sense, but I should never have admitted this conjecture, which I have since withdrawn.75 It is, indeed, an arbitrary supposition that these two recommendations, which are intended for different persons, should necessarily be identical. The second is addressed to the mahāmātra who are destined, in the anusamāyana, to receive instruction and encouragement, while the first can very well be addressed to the functionaries charged with imparting them, — to the prādēsika, the governor, as immediate and direct representative of the king, and to the rajjikas, of whom we know that the proper function was religious and moral teaching. From this point of view the passage of the fourth columnar edict, which has been discussed several times, shows itself under a new light. It becomes clear why the zeal of the officers is there considered as guaranteed by that of the rajjikas, as these are specially charged with reminding them of their duties. Under these circumstances it is evident that the anusamāyana to which the king wishes the mahāmātras to repair, can only have been an assembly. Perhaps, after all, both theories might be reconciled, if we suppose that reference is made to a series of meetings convoked by the rajjika and the prādēsika on tour, for the king certainly supposes a considerable number of such assemblies. It will be admitted, at any rate, that a tour of inspection could hardly be changed into a tour of instruction, except with the convocation of numerous successive meetings. Is not also a special assembly necessarily implied by the king's command that his edict should be read (Dh., J., Ed. det., I) on the day of the festival in honour of Tisya? I may add that the agreement, established by this explanation, with the custom mentioned for a more modern period by the Chinese pilgrims (and to which I have drawn attention in my commentary), does not appear to me, supposing it necessary, to be an argument by any means to be despised.

There is, too, another agreement which is even more to the point. The 3rd edict invites to the anusamāyana the yutas. I have stated above my opinion as to the meaning of this word. If I am right that we must consider it as equivalent, in a general sense, to 'all the faithful of the true religion,' it is clear that the anusamāyana to which they are invited cannot be a 'tour of administration.' But, even supposing that my explanation of the word is not considered convincing, and that the translation is not admitted without some reserve, it appears to me that it is impossible to seriously contest the identity of the yuta of the 3rd edict with the jana-dhanumāyuta of the 8th columnar edict. That name must designate at least a considerable category of people, and not merely officials, and would consequently exclude every kind of idea of a 'tour of inspection.'

These assemblies had therefore, in my opinion, the altogether special characteristic, that they were not meant for the entire population. Besides the superior officials who were responsible for them, and who took an active part in them (rajjika and prādēsika), they comprised only the yutas, that is to say, the faithful Buddhists. This furnishes the key to a difficulty which occurred to me in the first detached edict at Dhauli (n. 25), and of which I did not originally offer a sufficient solution. The reader will remember the phrase, 'I shall summon to the anusamāyana every mahāmātra, who will be mild, patient, and a respecter of life.' It, as the reader can see from my revised commentary in this translation, appears to me that we must understand the phrase as having a shade of 'possibility,' — every mahāmātra who may be endowed with these qualities; and in these qualities I only see a development of the idea.

74 Dh., det. Ed. I, n. 28.
75 The constant use in our texts of dhanumānusati in the active sense, entirely condemns such an hypothesis.
which is expressed in an equivalent manner by the compound dhāraṇīmayuta. In the 3rd edict, addressed to every one in general, Piyaḍāsi convokes to the anuvāsaṇyāνa all the faithful without distinction; here, where he addresses himself specially to the mahāvīras, he specifies those only among them who fall under the category of dhāraṇīmayutasa. The two passages agree in establishing that the anuvāsaṇyāna was reserved for Buddhists. It was one of the principal occasions when the rajjikas were given the mission of exercising their ministry of teaching, which was specially conferred upon them over those of the people who believed (Col. Ed. VIII, 1). It will be remarked that this peculiarity agrees very well with the purely religious name of mūkṣaṃpariṣad, 'assemblies of deliverance,' given by Huen Tsang to those quinquennial or annual annuals which we compare with our anuvāsaṇyāna.76

It is curious that these assemblies of the anuvāsaṇyāna should have been convoked at different periods,—every five years in the countries directly administered by the king, and every three years or less in the provinces governed by the princes who lived at Ujjayini and at Takshaśila. For Tōsa, which we see to have been also ruled by a kumāra (Dh. J., Det. Ed. II), we find no special instructions, and it is therefore probable that the convocation took place there only every five years. It is difficult to see the reasons for this variation. One conjecture only appears to me to present some probability, viz. that towards his west and south-west frontier the king wished to multiply the occasions of meeting and instruction, in the interests of his co-religionists belonging to the vassal populations surrounding his borders, and over whom his usual action would necessarily be less direct and less efficacious.

Of the other measures of which the initiation belongs to Piyaḍāsi, some have already been noticed,—such, for instance, as the three days respite which he gives to the condemned, before their execution, that they may prepare for death; while others,—such as the planting of trees along the roads, the construction of wells and tanks,—are common to most of the kings of India.

We have spoken of the suppression of bloody sacrifices (I). The 5th of the Columnar edicts states the restrictions imposed by the king upon the slaughter and mutilation of animals, and on the consumption of their flesh, and we know that in this respect, he practised in his palace what he preached (I). We have already discussed the honour which he claims of having spread abroad, in all places, medicines and useful plants (II). As for certain acts of an altogether religious character, such as the sending forth of missionaries, they will be considered in the concluding portion of these observations.

We learn that he entertained certain relations with foreign countries, and more especially with the Greek kings. It is unfortunate that he gives us no particulars concerning this subject. The employment of ambassadors (dētas), whom he mentions in the 13th edict, is to be expected and teaches us nothing. These relations with other lands, and the influences which resulted from them, were certainly no new thing, and our inscriptions, unless I am mistaken, preserve a piece of evidence regarding them, which, although indirect, is worth drawing attention to.

The rescripts of Piyaḍāsi commence, all or nearly all, with this phrase,—'Thus saith the king Piyaḍāsi, dear unto the Dēvas.' Now, so far as I know, this formula is an absolutely isolated example in Indian epigraphy. It makes its appearance with our inscriptions, and, after them, appears no more, in spite of the influence which the example of so powerful a sovereign would be expected to exercise. The fact is curious, and is worthy of having its explanation sought for. Now we do find this formula elsewhere. In the entire series of the inscriptions of the Achemenides, from Darius to Artaxerxes Ochus, the phrase thātīvā Dhrayaravāvah kahayātīya, 'thus saith the king Darius,' or its equivalent, thātīvā Kshayarāvah, &c., inevitably forms the frame of each of the proclamations. In both cases, this phrase in the third person is immediately succeeded by the use of the first person, and we are still further justified in drawing attention to this curious

76 Beal: Si-yu-ki, i, 52, &c.
coincidence by the fact that, again in both cases, the same word (dipō, līpī) is used to designate the inscriptions, and that, as we have seen, we are led to admit, on altogether independent grounds, that the Indian form of the word was originally borrowed from Persia. The very idea of engraving long inscriptions upon rocks is neither so natural nor so universal that the coincidence in this respect between Piyadasi and Achaemenide kings should easily be considered to be fortuitous. I certainly do not pretend to discover here a direct and conscious imitation of the Achaemenian inscriptions, but the protocol employed in both cases must have been consecrated by an older custom of the royal chanceries, and in this imitation I cannot refrain from noting a trace of the influence exercised by the Persian conquest and administration in north-west India. It was Darius who first carried thither his rule and his arms, and the organisation of the Satrapies,77 which he instituted about the same time, was exactly of a nature to spread abroad the usages and formulas of administration peculiar to his empire. This remark naturally agrees with a conjecture which I have made elsewhere.78 It tends to confirm the influence which I thought myself justified in attributing to the Persian administration over the palæographical history of India. It is a subject to which I shall have to return.

The literary traditions are strangely silent regarding the various governmental and administrative measures, which are known to us through the evidence of these monuments. We have, it is true, proved coincidences or points of agreement between the two classes of documents, which are characteristic enough, and from which we can be certain of the identity of the Piyadasi of the inscriptions, with the Aśoka of the books; but it must be admitted that, beyond these valuable concordances, the two series of accounts diverge in a singular manner. It is seldom that they refer to the same facts, so as to render one a direct check upon the other. It is not that they are contradictory or incompatible with each other, but that, simply, they do not speak of the same things. The chronicles, for instance, do not even mention the conquest of Kalinga, or the relations of the king with foreign princes. This circumstance is capable of explanation. In the writings of the Northern Buddhists we only possess fragmentary accounts of Aśoka, and the Sinhalese chronicles do not profess to give his biography in detail. If this prince interests them, it is because he is considered as the principal author of the diffusion of Buddhism in Ceylon, and it is only the religious aspects of his life which are of importance in the eyes of the monkish writers.79 Moreover, it has long been recognized that these traditions, both those of the north and those of Ceylon, are deeply imbued with legendary elements, which are, at least in great part, apocryphal, and which were certainly composed long after the epoch of the history of which they reflect. The sphere of religion is almost the only one with regard to which some comparisons are possible; and that which gives some interest to the comparisons, limited though they be, which we are able to institute, is, that from them we may hope to recognize in what direction, if not in what degree, tradition has gradually deviated from the truth.

According to the Sinhalese chronicles, the coronation of Aśoka did not take place till four years after his coming to the throne, and we have no means for certainly checking this statement. There is nothing to show its improbability, and we might even say that the care with which the king, agreeing in this with the practice of the chroniclers, expressly dates from his abhisēka the facts about which he informs us, appears rather to indicate that his coronation, as a matter of fact, could not have coincided with his taking possession of his power. The tradition is most liable to suspicion so far as it deals with the events which are said to have accompanied this act of taking possession, or at least which are said to have preceded the coronation. If we are to believe the Sinhalese, Aśoka seized the throne after putting to death ninety-nine of his brothers, and is said to have spared one only, Tishya, who entered three years later into a monastic life. The commission of this crime is contradicted by the inscriptions, in which he speaks of his brothers, and of their residence in various towns of his empire; indeed,
### System of Transliteration

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal for Sanskrit and Kannarese, (and, for the sake of uniformity, submitted for adoption, as far as possible, in the case of other languages), — except in respect of modern Hindu personal names, in which absolute purism is undesirable, and in respect of a few Anglicised corruptions of names of places, sanctioned by long usage, — is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kannarese</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>rī</td>
<td>rī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>rī</td>
<td>rī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Visarga**

- **Visarga**
  - H
- **Jihedunyā, or old Visarga**
  - H
- **Visarga before**
  - H
- **and**
  - H
- **Upadhyāyā, or old Visarga**
  - H
- **before प**
  - H
- **and र**
  - H

**Anuvrata**

- Anuvrata
  - N

**Anuvāsika**

- Anuvāsika
  - N

---

A single hyphen is used to separate words in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen is only used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, as divided in the original Text, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line; intermediate divisions, rendered unavoidable here and there by printing necessities, are made only where absolutely necessary for neatness in the arrangement of the Texts.

A double hyphen is used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the euphonic rules of saunāthi. Where this double hyphen is used, it is to be understood that a final consonant, and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel, are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it is to be understood of the orthography of the original, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the final consonant either has the modified broken form, which, in the oldest stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the śrūva attached to it; and that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form. In the transcription of ordinary texts, the double hyphen is probably unnecessary; except where there is the saunāthi of final and initial vowels. But, in the transcription of epigraphical records, the use of this sign is unavoidable, for the purpose of indicating exactly the paleographical standard of the original texts.

The avagraha, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial a, is but rarely to be met with in inscriptions. Where it does occur, it is most conveniently represented by its own Devanāgari sign.

So also practice has shown that it is more convenient to use the ordinary Devanāgari marks of punctuation than to substitute the English signs for them.

Ordinary brackets are used for corrections and doubtful points; and square brackets, for letters which are damaged and partially illegible in the original, or which, being wholly illegible, can be supplied with certainty. An asterisk attached to letters or marks of punctuation in square brackets, indicates that those letters or marks of punctuation were omitted altogether in the original. As a rule, it is more convenient to use the brackets than to have recourse to footnotes; as the points to which attention is to be drawn attract notice far more readily. But notes are given instead, when there would be so many brackets, close together, as to encumber the text and render it inconvenient to read. When any letters in the original are wholly illegible and cannot be supplied, they are represented, in metrical passages, by the sign for a long or a short syllable, as the case may be; and in prose passages, by points, at the rate, usually, of two for each akṣara or syllable.
agreement is far from existing amongst the different sources of the tradition, and according to Taranātha, it was six brothers whom the king made away with. According to other authorities there was no murder at all, but it is replaced by other acts of cruelty. In the Aśoka-avatāra, the prince slays his officers and his wives, and sets up a "hell," in which a number of innocent people are submitted to the most refined tortures. According to a Sinhalese account, Aśoka sends a minister to re-establish regular practices amongst the Buddhist clergy, who are troubled by the treacherous intrusion of a great number of false Brāhmaṇical brethren. Infuriated against the monks who refused under these conditions to celebrate the upāsakas, the minister decapitates several with his own hand. He only stops, when the very brother of the king offers himself to receive the fatal blow. The king, being informed of what has occurred, falls a victim to cruel anguish of conscience. In the north, we are told how Aśoka, to punish profanation committed by Brāhmaṇical mendicants upon a statue of the Buddha, sets a price upon their heads, and how he only desists from his executions when his brother, who is here called Vitasāka, is, in mistake, slain as one. All these accounts are at the same time very analogous, and very different. It is equally impossible to accept any of the versions as good historical coin. We can recognise them, without difficulty, as more or less independent developments of two ideas common to both sets. The first is the antithesis between the criminal conduct of Aśoka before his conversion, and his virtuous conduct subsequently to it. In this way the Aśoka-avatāra places the conversion of Aśoka in direct relation with his "hell," by the intermediary of the pious Samādhi. The other is the memory of a certain opposition between the king and the Brāhmaṇas. It reappears in the southern account of his conversion, and is there attributed to the comparisons, unfavourable to the Brāhmaṇas, which arose in the heart of the king, between him and his nephew, Nigrodha the śramaṇa.

In his inscriptions, Piyadasi himself enlightens us as to the origin of his conversion. He draws for us a mournful picture of the deeds of violence which accompanied the conquest of Kalinga, the thousands of deaths, the thousands of harmless people carried off into slavery, families decimated, Brāhmaṇas themselves not escaping the miseries of the defeat. It is this spectacle which filled him with remorse, and which awakened in him a horror of war. Here we are upon a solid ground of history. It is very probable that the literary versions are only later amplifications of this kernel of simple and certain truth. The sentiments which Piyadasi expresses to us in the 13th edict, would appear to exclude the idea of a career of cruelties and crimes pursued through several entire years. So much for the first point of view.

As for the second, Piyadasi himself, if I correctly translate the difficult passage at Sahasaraṁ declares to us that, after his conversion, he proceeded to deprive the Brāhmaṇas of that almost divine prestige which they enjoyed throughout the whole of India. Without any doubt, he did not persecute them violently; at the same time he approves of the alms which were given to them; but he must have marked his preference for the Buddhist religion by various means which it is not difficult to imagine. It is this proceeding, doubtless, which has been transformed in the literary tradition into an absolute banishment, — nay rather, a bloody persecution of the Brāhmaṇas.

In both cases, a comparison of the monuments with the legends and the chronicles tends to show, 1st, that the traditions are marked by grave exaggeration, and are full of arbitrary amplifications, and 2nd, that they are dominated by religious and specially by monastic possessions, — possessions which were infinitely more precise than any which ever existed in the mind and at the time of Piyadasi. All other observations lead to a similar conclusion.

We know, from the 2nd edict, that Piyadasi claims the credit of having spread abroad
everywhere medicines and useful plants both for men and even for animals. According to the story of Buddhaghosha, Aśoka, on learning that a bhikṣu has died for want of medicine, has four tanks (poksarāṇi) dug out at the four gates of the city, which he fills with medicines, and offers to the monks. Here, on the one hand, the exaggeration is carried to an absurdity, and, on the other hand, the monkish prepossession stands clearly confessed. Piyadasa takes measures to give to those who are condemned to death, before their execution, a respite which will allow them to meditate with a view to their religious preparation for the event. We also see that, on several occasions, he exercises his prerogative of mercy with regard to criminals. If we now turn to the Aśoka-vañchadeva, we learn that Aśoka absolutely prohibited the putting of any one to death, and he takes this resolution owing to the death of a bhikṣu who turns out to be no other than his own brother. Here, again, we see the exaggeration and the religious colouring.

The legends of the north, and the southern traditions, each represent Aśoka as an adherent to what appeared respectively to each to be the only orthodox Buddhism. Nothing is more natural. But what we want to know, is, to what degree these pretentions were justified.

Since Kittoe's time, it has been generally agreed, that the Bhābra inscription appears to reproduce a letter from the king to the council, which, according to the Sinhalese annalists, is said to have been held at Pāṭaliputra in the reign of Aśoka. I must except Prof. Kern, who, in his criticism of the data relative to this occurrence, comes to purely negative conclusions, and considers the alleged council as an invention. It is at least certain that the coincidence which has been accepted as self-evident, is met by more than one difficulty. The king explains with entire precision the aim which he has set himself in this letter: viz., that certain lessons should be spread abroad as much as possible, both among the monks and among the laity. He mentions neither a general collection of teachings current under the name of the Buddha, nor any of the circumstances which, in the southern tradition, characterized the council of Pāṭaliputra. Can it be admitted that the king designated simply by the name of Mahāpadha-sāhāga a solemn meeting, assembled under exceptional circumstances, as is depicted by the Sinhalese books? The very manner, too, in which the king puts nearly on the same level the authority of his own orders and the authority of the words of the Buddha, renders it little likely, granting the piety and orthodoxy of which he boasts, that he should be addressing himself to a council assembled to codify those very words of the Buddha. The king, on so solemn an occasion, would assuredly not have employed language so even, so entirely devoid of all allusion to the circumstance which provoked his intervention. I think, therefore, that, in this letter, Piyadasa addresses simply the clergy of Magadha, or, as I have conjectured, the Buddhist clergy in general, in order to recommend to them the active dissemination of the lessons attributed to the Buddha. Moreover, far from admitting that the edict shew the historic reality of the council, I would be rather disposed to think that, in this case also, the memory of the efforts made by Aśoka to extend the Buddhist doctrines and to stimulate the zeal of their natural preachers, amplifying and acquiring definite form as time passed on in the traditions of the schools, has been either the origin or the foundation of the tradition regarding the alleged council.

One of the two chief works attributed by the Sinhalese to this synod, is the initiative which it is said to have taken in sending forth, in all directions, missionaries charged with propagating the Good Law. In this, again, everything points to the conclusion that the chronicle confuses to the profit of the clergy an honour which, in reality, belongs to the king. The Edict of Sahasārām-Rūmapā (amū ṣī cha jānāvatu) proves that, independently of any council, Piyadasa was devoted to the propaganda in foreign parts. If I have rightly interpreted the conclusion of the edict, he must have, within a little more than a year of religious zeal, sent forth missionaries (vivutthas) as far as possible in all directions. We see, in any case, from the 13th edict, that he sent forth envoy's (ādgas) to spread his religious ideas, and that, from that period, he prided himself with having, in this respect, obtained a certain amount of success.

70 Burnouf, pp. 423-424.
71 Kern, II, 278 and ff.
There can hardly be any doubt that the monkish tradition, under the influence of its special prepossessions, has transferred to the clergy, an action which, in truth, should be credited to the sovereign.\textsuperscript{99}

According to legend, Aśoka would appear as a fervent adorer of the relics of the Buddha, and as a great builder of stūpas. In this respect the monuments do not permit us to be affirmative. I can only adhere, in spite of the objections of Dr. Bühler, to my explanation of the 4th edict. Piyadasi there, in my opinion, describes religious festivals celebrated after his conversion. In connection with these processions, I applied the word śimāna, in śimānānāsā, to shrines filled with relics; but I confess that this interpretation, which was of necessity conjectural, appears less probable to me to-day. It would be hardly consonant with the zeal of a neophyte to put, if we take the word in this sense, the śimānānāsā, on the same level with the hastānāsā, the agākhanā, &c. I think then that in the monuments we have no proof that Piyadasi practised the cult of relics, though we have still less proof to the contrary.

There is, on the other hand, one point with regard to which we are entitled to strongly charge the literary tradition with an anachronism. According to the Sinhalese, the canon of the sacred writings is said to have been fixed, as early as the time of Aśoka, by two successive councils. This appears to me to be irreconcilable with the language which the king uses at Bhabra. No doubt, several of the titles which are quoted in this inscription, are to be found in the Pali scriptures, and the example of the rāhulovādanutta is of a nature to lead us to maintain à priori, with respect to the other titles, that the king really did refer to lessons very similar to those of which the text has been preserved to us. Dr. Oldenberg\textsuperscript{91} on the other hand, remarks that the king did not necessarily profess to cite all the lessons of the Buddha, the authority of which he recognised. Nevertheless, it must be confessed that, if there existed, besides them, a defined and consecrated body of scriptures, it would be quite extraordinary that Piyadasi should choose, in order to sum up the mass of Buddhist lessons, pieces so little characteristic, so short, and so devoid of dogmatic importance, as those which he cites appear to be, and that too, without even alluding to the great collection of which the title alone would have been infinitely more significant, and to which it would be so natural to appeal when addressing the highest representatives of the clergy and of the whole Buddhist church. It will be remarked, besides, that the terms employed by the text, — suṇāyu, upadhistayēyu, — refer only to oral transmission.

These remarks would be incomplete without an examination as to the degree to which they are confirmed by the doctrines which the author of the inscriptions professes.

In the special Edict of Bhabra, the language of Piyadasi is, in several characteristic points, in agreement with the terminology of literary Buddhism. Not only does the king address the clergy (saṅgha), but he salutes it by a formula sanctioned on such occasions by the canonical writings. He commences with a profession of faith (pasāda) in the Buddhist Trinity, — Buddha, dharma, and saṅgha. He alludes to the four-fold division of the faithful into bhikshus and bhikṣhunī, upāsakas and upāsikās, and finally he refers to certain religious lessons of which, as we have seen, several at least are to be found in a more or less equivalent form in the Tripitaka.

In the other inscriptions the points of contact with the Buddhism of our books are less apparent.

\textsuperscript{99} On one important and interesting point. — I mean the introduction of Buddhism into Ceylon, — our inscriptions do not assist us to come to any certain conclusion. Piyadasi never mentions Taṁbapāṇi, except as an extreme limit of his influence. It would appear, however, that we must include this great island amongst the countries evangelised under his direction. It is altogether another thing to decide whether it was really converted then, or whether this was done by his son, &c.; and in this respect, the silence of the monuments seems hardly favourable to the authority of the traditions.

\textsuperscript{91} Mahāvēra, pref. p. xi. n.
The great aim of Piyadasi is to teach, to spread abroad, and to encourage the dharma. This word appears so frequently in his inscriptions, and has so characteristic an importance, that it is indispensable to fix its exact meaning. From the definitions or descriptions which the king gives us, it follows that to him dharma ordinarily implies what we call the sum of moral duties.

According to the definition given in the 2nd Columnar edict, the dharma ‘consists in committing the least possible ill (śina); in doing much good, in practising mercy, charity, truth, and also purity of life.’ The eighth adds ‘gentleness.’ Several enumerations sum up the principal duties which constitute the essential points of the teaching of the dharma: obedience to fathers, and mothers (Ed. III, IV, XI, Col. Ed. VIII), to the aged (Ed. IV, Col. Ed. VIII), to gurus (Col. Ed. VIII), respect to gurus (Ed. IX), to brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas (Ed. IV, Col. Ed. VIII), to relations (Ed. IV), and even to slaves and servants (Ed. IX, XI, Col. Ed. VIII), charity to brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas (Ed. III, IX), to friends, to acquaintances and to relations (Ed. III, XI), and in one passage (Ed. III), besides apavargatā (?), of which the meaning has not yet been satisfactorily determined, — moderation in language; above all, respect for the life of animals (Ed. III, IV, IX, XI).

Here there is nothing exclusively Buddhist, and hence Piyadasi was able to say (Col. Ed. VII) that the kings who preceded him have laboured in order to cause the progress of the dharma.

The 13th edict contains an enumeration altogether similar to those which sum up elsewhere the teaching of the dharma, yet made in order to prove that the virtues which it records are often practised indifferently by adherents of all religious dogmas: — ‘Everywhere,’ says the king, ‘dwell brāhmaṇas, kṣatriyas or other sects, ascetics or householders: among these men, there exist obedience to superiors, obedience to fathers and mothers, tenderness towards friends, comrades and relations, respect to slaves and servants, fidelity in the affections.’ The dharma is here attributed to all sects. It is that śāra, that ‘essence,’ which is common to all, as Piyadasi says in the 12th Edict, and the universal progress of which he desires. ‘That is why harmony is to be desired. All should hear and learn to practise the dharma from the mouth of one another.’

At the same time, the Edict of Bhābra shows that the special Buddhist use of dharma was familiar to Piyadasi, and that the word was already in his time associated with the two other terms, — buddha and saṅgha, — to constitute the trinitary formula of the Buddhists. Nay, more than that, Piyadasi everywhere puts the idea of the dharma in direct relation with his positive conversion to Buddhism. His first conversion he defines in the 13th edict by the words dhanumavāyē dhanumakāmatā dhanumāṇavaṇṭhi. As for the second, his ‘setting out for the saṁbodhi’ is described by the words dhanumayātā. In the fourth edict, in the sentence, vamadassanaḥ cha,

32 The explanation proposed by Dr. Bühler satisfies me neither as regards the form (the locative would be unique in the inscriptions), nor as regards the suggested meaning which is entirely hypothetical. As for the translation ‘modesty,’ proposed by Dr. Pischel, he has himself made the suggestion with the most express reservations.

33 The moral ideas which Piyadasi expresses elsewhere, as when he contends that virtue is difficult to practise (Ed. V, VI, X, &c.), or when he declares that he considers it his duty to promote the happiness of the world (Ed. VI), and that in his eyes no glory is equal to the practice of the dharma (X), and no conquest to the conquests made for the gain of the dharma, and when he maintains (Col. Ed. III) that rage, cruelty, anger, and pride are the sources of sin, — all these observations are of a very general character, and add nothing to what we know from elsewhere.

34 Ed. XII. I now think that it is thus that we should understand this phrase (l. 7). The king never distinguishes between different dhammas, and does not take the word to express indifferently any belief whatever, and it is difficult to maintain that he should do so in a solitary passage. I prefer therefore to make dhamma depend not on dhamma, but on sāmyaks and sāmyakatva; the adjective thus taking a force equivalent to that which the ablative would have, — an occurrence which is not unusual. In the concluding sentence of the edict, I cannot but accept the correction of Dr. Bühler, and I take sāpaḥsāmade as meaning, ‘the belief peculiar to each person,’ and not ‘my own belief.’
... dhaímañchañca necessarily refers to the conversion of the king, specifically signifying his adhesion to the Buddhist dhaíma. It finds its expression in the ceremonies peculiar to the cult, though, almost immediately afterwards, dhaímañchañca signifies merely the practice of moral duties, in accordance with the ordinary value which the word dhaíma has in the month of the king.

Ought we, therefore, to conclude that dhaíma, in our inscriptions, takes successively two different meanings. They would, in that case, be brought together and confounded in such a manner that, a priori, such a theory is hardly probable. On the other hand, Piyañada certainly does profess a large spirit of tolerance; he desires that all religious sects may live everywhere in perfect liberty, because all of them aim at the subjection of the senses and at purity of soul (VII). But, however liberal his intentions may be, they do not reach to indifference. He does not hesitate to interdict bloody sacrifices, dear as they must have been to those very Brāhmans to whom he boasts that he made alms, and he dissipates from, and ridicules, the rites and ceremonies consecrated by Brāhmanical usage, which were celebrated at marriages and births, in cases of sickness, and at the moment of setting out on a journey.

In the Edict of Sahasaram, the sentence regarding the micañcañca and the unicañcañca, supposing that my translation is accepted as correct, certainly expresses an idea of polemics in regard to beliefs differing from that of the king. It is true that, as Dr. Bühler has remarked (p. 15), respect for the life of animals is a trait common in India to several religions, but nevertheless appears to me to be proved, by the very care with which the king limits and points out his desires in this respect (Col. Ed. V), that he did not obey a general feeling, but a dogma dear to his personal doctrines, and the practice of which he imposed even on people who did not consider themselves bound by it. The choice of days reserved is specially characteristic, referring as it does to the festivals of the religious calendar of the Buddhists.

This conflict of opinions, or of expressions, is only apparent. There is means, and I think only one means, of reconciling them. It is certain that the meaning of dharma or dhaíma has been gradually circumscribed and brought within definite limits by the Buddhists as a technical term. In place of "law, moral law, virtue," in general, the word, taking for them a special bearing, signified at first "the law peculiar to Buddhists," -- the moral rules and the dogmatic principles as they understood them, and finally the writings themselves in which these principles and these rules are recorded. But nothing compels us to assume that such an

---

55 Dr. Bühler, who disputes certain details of my translation, is in substantial agreement with me on this point. Whether we translate with him, "in Folge seiner (Bekrohung zur) Erfüllung der Gesetze," or, as I have done, literally, "thanks to the observance of the religion by Piyañada," the meaning is essentially the same, and, in both cases, it is considered that the allusion is to the king's conversion to Buddhism, and that, consequently, the expression dhaímañchañca is, in the eyes of the king, sufficiently characteristic of the practice of the Buddhist religion. It is in regard to the way in which we ought to understand the conjunctive participle dañcañca, that Dr. Bühler and I cease to be at one. He lays stress on the past sense which the form implies, and refers the allusion to the festivals given by the king before his conversion. The point is, indeed, of moderate importance, but I cannot refrain from adhering to my original interpretation. It seems to me to be indisputable that, if the king had intended to lay stress on the distinction which is maintained between the actual bhikshas and his former religious feasts, he would have marked it more clearly by his language, and by the turn of the sentence. As for the use of the conjunctive participle with a sense equivalent to that of a participle present, Dr. Bühler knows better than I do that it is of every day occurrence.

56 The new readings furnished by Pāḍjāli Bhagawānāli and Dr. Bühler put beyond doubt the interpretation which they have given of prañabhiñvanasons and its equivalents. In this respect, it is necessary to correct my translation.

57 Prof. Kern (pp. 312 and ff.) considers that the terms in which Piyañada expresses himself in regard to the Brāhmans, entitle us to reject the statement of the Sinhalese chronicles, according to which Asoka is said to have, at the moment of his conversion, ceased to feed brāhmans, and to have substituted in their place ramanas. This is, I think, going too far. It is one thing to tolerate the Brāhmans and to give them alms, and another thing to surround oneself with them regularly and constantly, even in one's own palace. For my part I see no absolute incompatibility between the language of the king and the reminiscences of the Southern Buddhists. It is unnecessary to add that I do not attach any great importance to this matter of detail. The disfavour which I believe the king himself admits to have shown to Brāhmans, could evidently have been manifested in other ways.

acceptation had become fixed in the time of Piyadasi, nor that, in those days, even in the formula buddha, dharma, saṅgha, the word had any other signification than 'the moral law.' From this point of view, the literature accepted as orthodox offers us, in a work recognised as one of the most ancient, instructive parallels, and I am surprised that writers have not before this thought of comparing our inscriptions with the language of the Pāli Dhammapada.

Taking first the use of the word dhañña, the Dhammapada, like our texts, uses it in the entirely Buddhist formula of the trikārata (verse 190). At the same time, the epithets by which it is usually accompanied, — ariyappavādī (v. 79), sammadakkhatā (v. 86), uttama (v. 115), sammāsambuddhādēsa (v. 392), — clearly show that it is not yet crystallized into a narrow and technical acceptation. We may also form a judgment from verses 256 and ff., where the word is applied exactly as Piyadasi might have done, and from verse 393, which is so entirely in the tone of our monuments: — yamhi sacccha cha dhammā cha sō sukhi sō cha bhīmaṇā.

The meaning is still more generalised in passages like verses 167-169, and in the cases in which the word is employed in the plural, as in verses 1, 82, 273, 278-279, 384. Saddharmas serves more especially to designate the Buddhist law (verses 60,182); but, we may judge from verse 364 how far the two words dhañña and saddhañña are mixed up and confounded: —

Dhammārāmaṇo, dhammaratā, dhammaṇa anuvichintayaṇa dhammaṇa anussaraṇa bhikkhu saddhañña na parihāya

Verse 183,—

Sabbapāpassa akaraṇaṃ kusalaṃ upasampadā saccittaparīyodapananā: etāṃ buddhāna sāsanaṃ,

cannot fail to remind us of the passage in the 2nd Col. Ed., in which Piyadasi defines the dhañña, — apāsinaḥ bahukayōṇaḥ, &c.

The general tone and the main points of the moral teaching present in the two cases the most evident analogies. I can only quote a few examples. The king again and again dwells upon the necessity of persevering efforts to advance in moral life (Ed. VI, X, &c.), with an insistence which is quite equalled by that of the Dhammapada. It will suffice to refer to the chapter on appamāda (verses 21 and ff.). Compare (verses 7, 116, &c.). I cite again verse 23, in which the epithet dāñṭa parakkama recalls the word parakkrama employed by the king with such visible preference; also verses 24, 168, 280, to show a view of the base uṭhā parallel to that which we find in our inscriptions (G. VI, 9 and 10, and perhaps, J., Det. Ed., I, 7); finally verse 163, in which the remark sukarvāṇi asaddham is an exact fellow of the ideas expressed in our 5th edict. Both authorities inculcate the necessity of self-examination (Dhammap., verse 50; Col. Ed. III) regard for all, and in particular respect to the aged (Dhammap., verse 109; Ed. IV, V, IX, &c.) and moderation in language (Dhammap., verse 133; Ed. III, XII). Verse 234, which makes truthfulness, mercy, charity the three cardinal virtues, can be compared with the two passages of the 2nd, and of the 7th — 8th Columnar edicts, which bring together the same triad of sace dayā, dānā. While the king recommends ahiṃsā and abolishes the use of animal flesh at his table, the Dhammapada exhals the ahiṃsaka muni (v. 225) and recommends a strict temperance (v. 7, al.)

The most striking coincidences are perhaps those which deal with details of form. The formula frequently used by the king, — sādhu dāsā, &c., — is found also in the Dhammapada, verse 235, chittasam domathā sādhu; verse 360, chakkhaṇa mānusvari sādhu, &c. With the 9th and 11th edicts compare verse 354, sabbadānā dharmadānā jīvati, &c.; with the frequent use of the base ārūḍh, the expression of verse 281, ārūḍhaya maggam; with the phrase dhammaṇa nuvasati, the dhammaṇuvasatā of verse 86; with dhammaṇudhiṇā at Dhauli (verse 26), dhamaṇṭaka of verses 217, 256 and ff.; with dhammaratā at Kh. and K. (XIII. 16 and 12 cf. the end of the 8th edict, the recommendation of verse 88, tatttal[ecil, dhammā]bhikṣati ikekkhāya.

The verses 11-12, — astā tāramatiṇā śārā cha asraradassino, &c., — at least bear witness to a use of the word śārā extremely analogous to that which we find in the 12th edict, à propos of
the śravādhi. Piyadasi aims at the teaching of the dhāma, dhāmasa dūpaṇā (12th Ed.), and according to verse 363, the duty of the bhiṣkha is the same, attān dhāmaṁśa dīpāti; the only true glory which he sees lies in the diffusion of the dhāma (10th Ed.), and according to the Dhammapada (verse 24), — . . . . . dhāmaṁśāyāṁ appanattasu yasā bhicavādhati; it is in the dhāma that he fixes happiness (Col. Ed. I., 9, &c.), and according to the 333rd verse of the Dhammapada — yamhi sahākhi cha dharmo cha sā suhā . . .

To the king, happiness is both happiness in this world and in the world to come. It is the very formula of reward which he unweariedly promises; it is found less often in the Dhammapada, verses 132, 165, 177.

The spirit of tolerance shown by the king is not itself altogether unknown to the canonical book. Not only does verse 5 in a general way recommend mercy and the forgetting of hatreds, but, far from treating the Brahmaṇa and Brāhmaṇism as enemies, it puts the name in close connection with that of the bhiṣkha: —

Santō dantō niyatō brahmāchāri
sabbēsu bhūṭsen nīdhyā na ḍaṇāṇ
so brahmāṇo sō samaṇo sa bhikkhu (verse 142).

By the side of the Bhikkhuwagga, it devotes a whole chapter to exalting, under the name of the brahmāṇa, perfection such as it conceives it, while at the same time it does not forget that the brahmāṇa is the representative of a different cult (verse 392). The author does not violently denounce this cult, but, as Piyadasi does with regard to ceremonies (maṅgala), he proclaims its inutility (verses 106-107). Finally, he compares the sāmaṇāṭa and the brahmaṇāṭa, the quality of the ēramaṇa, and the quality of the brāhmaṇa (verses 332), just as the king himself associates brahmāṇas and ēramaṇas.

These comparisons are far from exhausting the number of possible points of contact, nor can they give one that general impression which has also considerable value, and which can only result from a parallel study of the two texts. Such as they are, they appear to me to be of a nature to justify an important conclusion: that the ideas and the language which are brought to light, from a religious point of view, in our inscriptions, cannot be considered as an isolated expression of individual convictions or conceptions. A book of canonical repute lays before us an equivalent sufficiently exact to allow us to consider that they correspond to a certain stage of Buddhism, earlier than that which has found expression in the majority of the books which have come down to us — that they correspond to a certain stage in the chronological development of the religion of Sākyas.

It thus happens that certain indications appear to be of a nature to connect Piyadasi and the Dhammapada.

We are so accustomed to see Indian kings carrying several different names, that the double nomenclature of Piyadasi and Abāka need not surprise us. It would still, however, be interesting to discover its reason; the more so as the word Abāka is not, either by its meaning or by frequent use, one of those which would appear suited to be used as a surname. We have seen, on the authority of the Sinhalese chronicle, that Abāka at the time of his conversion took the name of Dhammasāka. It is probable that his real name was Priyadarśin, for that is the only one which he applies to himself, and we are thus led to conclude that the king took only at his conversion the name of Abāka or Dhammasāka, though he judged it to be inopportune to employ it in his monuments, as he would thus cause in the middle of his reign a very considerable change in the protocols of his chancery. But, on the other hand, this name, naturally dear to the Buddhists whose triumph it commemorated and of which it was the sign, became so established in their memory, that it threw into the shade the one that the king bore in his first years before his conversion, which the literary tradition paints in such sombre colours. This conjecture, which appears to explain sufficiently the facts under consideration, has been suggested to me by two classes of passages which I quote from the Dhammapada. The word ēka, 'grief,' is
used by the Dhammapada with a certain amount of insistence, for instance in verses 212-216: —

Piyatō jāyatā sōkō piyatō jāyatā bhayaṁ
piyatō vippanmutassa nattthi sōkō kutō bhayaṁ; etc...  

or again in verse 336: —

Yō vē taṁ saṁhatī jammīṁ tanhaṁ lōkā dūracchayaṁ
sōkā tamhā papatanti utāvinda va pōkkhanaṁ.

In verse 195, the Buddhans and the Sārvākṣas receive the epithet dhammadāna.

From this use of sōka is deduced the adjective asōka, as in verse 412: —

Yōdha paññāṁ cha pāpāṁ cha ubhā saṁgaṁ aparāhāga
asōkaṁ virajāṁ saddhuṁ tam ahaṁ brūmi brahmānaṁ.

The word is again found in verse 28: —

Paṁādaṁ appamādeṁa nondi pāpāṁ
paññāpādāṁ āruhyā asōkaṁ sākinīṁ pājaṁ
pabhataṁ va bhumaṁ dhūrō bālī avēkkhaṁ.

The same thought is expressed in verse 172: —

Yō cha pabbā pamajītvā pabhāṁ sō nappamajītvā
sū imaṁ lōkaṁ pabhāṁ abhaṁ mutū va chandīṁa.

The last stanza but one contains six pādas, which would lead one to suppose at first that there has been some interpolation; and, indeed, the middle double pāda, — paññāpādām, &c., — could be suppressed without in any way altering the general sense; it would appear, moreover, to be wanting in the version which is reproduced by the Chinese translation. To tell the truth, it does not fit in well in meaning with the rest of the passage; we should at least expect a va or an ida. I cannot help thinking that this half-verse is an addition intended to explain and complete the general idea, by an allusion to our Aśoka-Piyadasi. Under these considerations, the use of pañcaḥ, which may signify the 'subjects' of the king, and the use of the rather rare metaphor, paññāpādām, 'the palace of wisdom,' take a new meaning. Although we are driven to admit that the half-verse in question is an addition, which did not originally form an integral portion of the stanza, I consider that it does not spoil the sense, and that perhaps the first author had, as a matter of fact, the allusion, which it expresses, in his mind's eye. The theory of a similar allusion in verse 178 explains well what would, under any other hypothesis, appear excessive and too emphatic in the words imaṁ lōkaṁ pabhāṁ in this and in the following verse. I may add that the above seems to me to suggest, in regard to verses 212 ff., which have just been quoted, an analogous idea, and it may be asked whether in the first, which has served as a prototype for the others, the contrast between piyā and sōka has not similarly been inspired by a pun on the double name of Piyadasi and Aśoka.

These passages are scattered almost throughout the work. Each confirms the other, and I think it may be inferred that the general composition of the book, — I do not say its definite taking of shape, or, in any case, its form as we have it now, — goes back to a time not far from that of Piyadasi, to an epoch when his memory was yet alive. This is not the place to seek if we can discover other grounds of a nature to confirm those which we have just suggested, and it will be sufficient to point out that, for entirely different reasons, it has been generally considered that the Dhammapada is one of the most ancient Buddhist texts. At the same time I do not presume to attribute to the hypothesis which I have been led to suggest, either more certainty, or more importance, than is due to it.

To return to my general conclusions regarding the Buddhism of Piyadasi: — In my opinion, our monuments are witnesses of a stage of Buddhism sensibly different from that to which

it developed in later times. It appears to us as a purely moral doctrine, paying little attention to particular dogmas or to abstract theories, little embarrassed with scholastic or monkish elements having but little tendency to insist on the divergencies which separated it from neighbouring religions, ready to accept consecrated forms and forms when they did not offend its moral ideal, and as yet without texts fixed by writing, or, we may be sure, a regularly defined canon. As far as we are in a position to judge, the character of the texts enumerated by Piyadasi at Bhabra, entirely agrees with such a stage of Buddhism.

One other remark also has its value. Nowhere, amongst the rewards which he offers in the future for virtue, does Piyadasi make any allusion to nirvāṇa. It is always svaṅga of which he speaks (Ed. VI, IX; Dh., Det. Ed., I). Doubtless the king may have deliberately preferred to choose a term familiar to all intellects, and more conveniently suited to all doctrines. But, in spite of all, this absolute silence appears to me to be significant, as clearly indicating an epoch anterior to the metaphysical and speculative developments of the Buddhist religion.

The history of Buddhism implies, if I am not mistaken, a period, still near its source, marked by a popular character, less determined in its dogmas, less isolated in its legends, in which the essential originality of the doctrine had room to manifest itself freely, an originality which is founded on the pre-eminence attributed to the due carrying out of moral duties over the execution of liturgical forms and practices. Such a period appears to me to be a kind of necessary historical postulate, and I think that the inscriptions of Piyadasi preserve for us not only a trace, but direct evidence of it.

Things soon changed their aspect; and the peculiar features of this ancient epoch were quickly lost by tradition. This follows from the few comparisons which we have been able to make, between the evidence of the monuments, and the data given by literature. The very character and person of Aśoka have undergone, both in legend and in chronicle, alterations analogous to the evolution which followed his time.

Aśoka became in them a type without individuality and without life, his history a subject for edifying legends, and his name a peg on which to hang theories of moral development. His early life has been extravagantly blackened, to serve as a counterfoil to the virtues which inspired him after his conversion. He has been depicted at the end of his career as entirely under the feet of the clergy, as a sort of maniac in alms-giving, and as an ideal of monkish perfection, which, however admirable it may appear to Hindus, cannot seduce us to similar applause. His inscriptions furnish no confirmation whatever of these statements. Prof. Kern,102 influenced by the legends, considers that towards the end of his life Piyadasi showed himself to be intolerant and a bigot. He discovers in his last edicts the expression of an actual fanaticism, and maintains that the tone and course of ideas suggest that the intellect of the prince must have deteriorated, and that, while all the edicts bear more or less traces of a troubled mind, the last ones are specimens of insensate babbling.103 This judgment is based on the false idea that the Edict of Sahasrām belonged to the final period of the reign of Piyadasi, and I confess that, so far as I am concerned, I can discover no pretext for such vehement conclusions. But Prof. Kern is, in general, very hard on the poor Piyadasi. When he considers that the 13th edict, the one which deals with the conquest of Kāliṅga, leaves on the mind an impression of *hypocrisy*,104 I cannot refrain from fearing that he is yielding to a bad opinion preconceived against a king whose clericalism annoyed him.

The character of Piyadasi has generally been more favourably appreciated. It cannot, I think, be denied, without injustice, that he exhibits, in his edicts, a spirit of moderation, a moral elevation, a care for the public good, which merit every praise. He possessed from his birth a taste for enterprise and energetic qualities, borne witness to by the conquest of Kāliṅga. Did his conversion injure the native vigour of his temper? The thing is more possible, as being the

103 Ibid. p. 319.
104 Ibid. p. 315.
effect which Buddhism generally has produced, not only upon individuals, but upon entire nations; but that does not yet entitle us to view him as the childish and helpless being he has been represented. It was the sentiment of religion which inspired him with the idea of engraving inscriptions throughout his empire. We usually only see him under this aspect, but the desire which he expresses in so great detail, to be kept continually informed regarding his affairs, and to expedite them without any delay, does not give us the idea of an idle prince.

I am afraid also that, in some respects, he bears, more than is justly due, the responsibility for the somewhat clumsy and awkward language which he uses in his inscriptions. It is plain that the style, — at least the style of prose language, — had in his time not yet achieved that experience, that freedom of manner, which give to the thoughts a turn at once elegant and precise. His sentences are often short, even abrupt, and are always wanting in variety. His language is a "prentice sailor, afraid to venture far from shore. When in an unlucky moment, he ventures on a period, he only makes his exit with great difficulty. The ill-fitting garment does injustice to the intellect whose movements it encumbers. That intellect was not, perhaps, very vast or very decided, but it was certainly animated with excellent intentions, and full of the idea of moral duty and of the sentiments of humanity. By the various efforts with which he was inspired in his religious zeal, by his relations with nations not subject to his empire, may, with peoples the most distant from the Peninsula, and finally, by the monuments, epigraphic or otherwise, of which he was the creator, Piyanasi rendered services to the general civilization of India, and the credit of these merits we are in justice bound to render to him.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE EASTERN CHALUKYA KINGS.

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

(Concluded from p. 164.)

10. — Amma I.; Vishnuvardhana VI.

Seven years; A.D. 918 to 925.

He was the eldest son of No. 15, Vajayaditya IV. In S. his name is given as Amba; in all the other grants, commencing with K., it is Amma. He had the epithet of svaralokabhaya, 'refuge of all mankind;' the second name of Vishnuvardhana VI.; and the biruda of Raja-Mahendra; the latter occurs in one of his own grants (L.), and in U.; and it suggests that the city of Raja-mahendrapuram or Raja-mandri was first occupied, by the Eastern Chalukyas, under him, and was renamed after him (see page 94 above). In his own grants, he uses the title of Maharaja. The seals of his grants bear the motto of suri-tribhuvanabhaksa (see page 100 above). M. and all the subsequent grants agree in stating that he reigned for seven years.

L. states that he used his sword against some feudatory relatives who had joined the party of his natural adversary, and won over to himself the subjects and the army of his father and his grandfather. This intimates that some of the members of his family had entered into an unsuccessful conspiracy with the Bakhtrakutas, to prevent his accession.

Of his time we have two records:

K. — A grant from Madurai in the Kistna District; edited by Mr. Sewell, ante, Vol. VIII. p. 76; I have also my own reading of the original plates. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya. This grant, or L., is the earliest record that gives the full historical genealogy, with the lengths of the reigns. It gives the opening passage in its final form.

1 prakriti-sapata-paksha. Compare the description of the Pallava king, as the natural enemy (prakriti-sapata) of the Western Chalukya king Vikramaditya II. (ante, Vol. VIII. p. 56, Plate III.a, last line.)
2 I have taken K., first, because it was published first.
which was followed, with only a few trifling differences, in all the later grants, and which runs thus: — "of Satyāśraya-Pulikēśin II., the favourite (vallābha), — who adorned the family of the Chālukyas, who are glorious; who are of the Mānava gōtra; which is praised throughout the whole world; who are Hārtītipuras (i.e. descendants of an original ancestress of the Hārtī gōtra); who have acquired sovereignty through the excellent favour of (the goddess) Kauśikī, who have been protected by the assemblage of (divine) Mothers; who meditate on the feet of (the god) Svāmi-Maḥāśeṇa (Kārttikeya); who have had the territories of (their) enemies made subject to them on the instant at the sight of the excellent crest of a boar which they acquired through the favour of the divine Nārāyaṇa (Vishṇu); (and) whose bodies are purified by ablutions performed after celebrating the avamādha-sacrifice, — the brother, Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana I., (reigned) for eighteen years.” The only substantial difference in this passage, subsequently introduced, is the addition, e.g. in M., of the words Veṅgi-maṇḍalam anvaya-playat, or, in P., of the words Veṅgi-dēsavam apālayat, — "the brother, Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana I., reigned for eighteen years over the Veṅgi country;” as has been noted above, M. is the earliest grant that makes this specific statement. Minor differences are, the variations in the spelling of the dynastic name and of the word Hārtītipura; and the fact that Satyāśraya-Pulikēśin II., who here and in L. is called ‘the favourite (vallābha),’ is usually called ‘the lord of favourites (vallābhēndā).’ The charter was issued by Amma I. himself. It records a grant of the village of Drujjūru in the Punnātavadi viṣhayā, to Maḥakāla, who had been a general of Bhīma I. The Dūtaka was Kaṭakaraja.

L. — A grant from ‘Idara’ in the Kistna District; edited by Pandit S. M. Natesa Sastrī, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 50, and by Dr. Hultsch, South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 36, No. 36; I have also my own reading of the original plates. — The dynastic name is given as Chalukya. The genealogy commences with Kubja-Viṣṇuvardhana I., the brother of Satyāśraya, ‘the favourite.’ The charter was issued by Amma I. himself. It records a grant of the village of Goṇṭūru in the Kaṇḍeruvāḍi viṣhayā, to Bhaṇḍanāditya, otherwise called Kuntāditya, of the Paṭṭavardhini family, who has been mentioned above in connection with Viṣṇa-pāditya IV.

17. — Viṣṇa-pāditya V.; Bēta.

Fifteen days; A. D. 925.

He was the eldest son of No. 16, Amma I. In T. and X. he is not mentioned at all; but, with these exceptions, M. and all the subsequent grants speak of him, and give his name as Viṣṇa-pāditya; I take his other name of Bēta, — which was probably the original appellation bestowed at the naming-ceremony after his birth (see page 95 above, note 9), — from the two records noted in the next paragraph. M. and N. say that, having been anointed, as a child, by the binding on of the kaṇṭhīkā (see page 103 above, and note 27), he was ejected by Teḍapa. P., Q., R., U., V., and W., record his ejection by Teḍapa; but make no mention of the kaṇṭhīkā-paṭṭabandhā-ebhishēka. O. and S. allude to neither the installation nor the ejection; but S. states that Teḍapa attacked and imprisoned him. The only records which speak of him as actually reigning, are O. and S.; they state that he reigned for one fortnight.

There is nothing in the records to indicate that he died as a child. And, on the contrary, two later inscriptions represent him as attaining to manhood, and as founding a separate line of descent, which subsequently came to hold the Veṅgi country again. One of them is a Piṭāpnam stone inscription, dated Saka-Saṅvat 1124 (Teṅgu Sasanam, p. 501); the other

3 See page 90 above, note 16. 4 See pages 96, 96, above, notes 16, 11.

Whether this is a proper name, or an official title (= ‘governor of the town or village’), is not apparent. The word occurs again, just as it is here, in P., R., and S. In U. we have Kaṭakākūṭa; apparently for metrical reasons. In V. we have Kaṭakākūṭa; without any metrical necessity.

5 See page 101 above, note 20.

7 One would expect this Goṇṭūru to be Guṇṭūru in the Kistna District. But, from a note by Dr. Hultsch (loc. cit. p. 38, note 9), it appears that this point is doubtful.
is a copper-plate grant from the Gōḍāvari District (No. 77 in Mr. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Madras, Vol. II. p. II). The copper-plate grant states, in the regular place,—between Amma I. and Tāḍapa,—that Vijayāditya V. had the other name of Bēta. Both the records continue the genealogy, in the usual manner, down to the time of Vikrama-Chhōḍa, who, they say, went to govern the Chōḍa instead of leaving Veṅgi without a ruler or king of its own (nāyaka-rāhita; virājaha); and at that point they introduce this new line of descent. They record that the son of Amma I., ejected by Tāḍapa, was Bēta. His son was Satyārāya. His son was Vijayāditya, who married Vijayamahādēvi the Solar Race. Their son was Vishnuvardhana. His son was Mālappādēva, "an ornament of the Lunar Race (i.e. the Chaulukya family);" he married Chandaladevi. Their son was Vijayāditya, who is described as "a very moon to cause the increase of the ocean which is the Chaulukya line, and as the king of the Veṅgi country" (Veṅgi-dēsa-canaṇḍhavarō);" his wife was Lakṣhamidēvi. And their son was Vishnuvardhana. The Pīṭhāpuram inscription stops here. The transcription of it is imperfect; it does not actually include the name of Vishnuvardhana, and it seems to call him by the second name of Malla; but it speaks of him as "a portion of Vīṣṇu (Vīṣṇu-aṅka), and there seems to be no doubt that he is the person who is specifically called Vishnuvardhana in the Gōḍāvari grant; it states that he was appointed in Saka-Saṅvat 1124, on the tenth tiṣṭha in the dark fortnight of Jyāṣṭha, on Sunday, and under the Aśvinī nakṣatra; here the given Saka year has to be applied as an expired year, and the corresponding English date is Sunday, 18th June, A. D. 1202. The Gōḍāvari grant, also, does not continue the descent any further. At the above point, it introduces the mention of a 'king' named Bhīma, of the Solar Race, whose wife was Chandaladevi, and who acquired the hereditary sovereignty of his grandfather and other ancestors, through the favour of the glorious Chālukya-Chhōḍa. His son was Vishnuvardhana, who married Gāṅga. And their son was Mahādēva. The charter, addressed to the officials of the Bēngurunāṭi vishaya, was issued by Mahādēva, who is described as "a Mahāmāṇḍalēvara who had attained the pāṇḍha-mahāsādabu;" as "born in the Solar Race;" as "a supporter of the Chaulukya sovereignty;" and as the refuge of all the Brahmans of the town of Veṅgi;" he was plainly a feudatory of the Vishnuvardhana, son of Vijayāditya and Lakṣhamidēvi who was descended from Bēta-Vijayāditya V., son of Amma I. This grant also contains a date; but the passage is partially destroyed, and I cannot make anything satisfactory out of it.

18. — Tāḍapa.

One month; A. D. 625.

He was a son of Yuddhamalla I., mentioned above just before No. 14, Bhīma I.; according to O. and S., he succeeded Vijayāditya V.; according to the other grants, he came immediately after Amma I. His name occurs,—in M. and N., as Taha; in O., as Tāḍapa; in P., R., T., and U., as Tāḍapa; in Q. and S., as Tala; and in V., W., and X., as Tāḍapa. He attained the throne by ejecting the child Vijayāditya V., No. 17; and, in his turn, he was conquered and ejected.

8 The Pīṭhāpuram inscription names six younger sons of Satyārāya; but the names of some of them are not quite certain in the transcription. — It also names the wife of Satyārāya; apparently as Gaṅgāmē-Gaṅgā. 9 The year is given in numerical words,—āhā-sūl ṣaṇ-gn̄a-thā-sūkṣma-saṅvat; and is not distinctly specified, either as current, or as expired. Taking it as an expired year, with Prof. K. L. Chatterjee's Tables, the tiṣṭha ended on the Sunday, at about 32 6tha, 5 padas, after mean sunrise (for Bombay). With Prof. Jacob's Tables, it ended on the Sunday, at about 23 hrs. 16 min. := 58 gh. 10 p., for Ujjain; but with reference to apparent sunrise, and at Rējamāhendri, it would probably end on the Monday, and so we should have an instance of the use of the current tiṣṭha of the week-day on which it began. By all the three systems for the longitudes of the ending-points of the nakṣatras, the moon was in Aśvini at sunrise on the Sunday, and up to about 11 hrs. 10 min., := 27 gh. 55 p. — In Saka-Saṅvat 1124 current, the tiṣṭha began at about 57 gh. 45 p. on Sunday, 27th May, A. D. 1201, and ended at about 51 gh. 25 p. on the Monday. But this cannot be the real day; because the tiṣṭha did not include any hours of daylight on the Sunday; moreover, the moon did not enter Aśvini till about 19 hrs. 4 min. := 47 gh. 40 p., on the Monday.

10 The extant words are . . . . . . . rā-āyana-mātṛ-ganitā-Saka-saṅvat. Phalgunī-m. . . . . . . . which seem to point to Saka-Saṅvat 721. The syllables must be a mistake for something meaning 'eleven.'
— and, M. says, slain — by No. 19, Vikramāditya II. M. and the subsequent grants all state that he reigned for one month.

19. — Vikramāditya II.

Eleven months; A. D. 925 to 936.

He was another son of No. 14, Chālukya-Bhima I., and a (younger) brother of No. 15, Vijayāditya IV. He succeeded No. 18, Tāḍāpa. In M. and all the subsequent grants, his name occurs as simply Vikramāditya. They all agree that he acquired the sovereignty by conquering Tāḍāpa; M. adds that he slew Tāḍāpa; and O. states that he ruled over the Vēṅga manḍala and Tīrkalea. U. states that he reigned for nine months; M., N., P. to R., and V. to X., say eleven months; and O., S., and T., one year. We may take the statement of the majority, — eleven months.

20. — Bhima III.

Eight months; A. D. 926 to 927.

He was another son of No. 16, Amma I., and a younger brother of No. 17, Vijayāditya V. He is mentioned only in M., which gives his name as simply Bhima; it states that he conquered No. 19, Vikramāditya II., in war; that he reigned for eight months; and that then he was slain by Yuddhamalla II., No. 21, son of Tāḍāpa.

21. — Yuddhamalla II.

Seven years; A. D. 927 to 934.

He was a son of No. 18, Tāḍāpa; M. and U. say that he was the eldest son; but, with these exceptions, no reference is made to his having brothers. In M. his name appears as simply Malla, for metrical purposes; elsewhere he is always called Yuddhamalla. M. represents him as slaying and succeeding No. 20, Bhima III.; but P. and the subsequent grants represent him as the immediate successor of his father Tāḍāpa; N. and O. omit to mention him at all, the reason suggested by Dr. Hultsch being, that his conqueror and successor, No. 22, Chālukya-Bhima II., probably considered him as an usurper, and purposely ignored him. In his turn, he was conquered and expelled by Bhima II. M. and P. to X. all agree in stating that he reigned for seven years.

22. — Chālukya-Bhima II.; Vishnuvardhana VII.

Twelve years; A. D. 934 to 945.

He was another son of No. 15, Vijayāditya IV., and a younger brother of No. 16, Amma I.; O. and U. say that he was a half-brother (deśinātura).11 His name occurs as simply Bhima in M. line 33, and in P. to X.; U. further calls him Baja-Bhima (l. 41); M. also calls him Chālukya-Bhima, in line 45, and O., line 17, gives this name as Chālukya-Bhima; in N., his proper name is not given at all. He had the epithet of sarvalokāsraya, "refuge of all mankind;" and the second name of Vishnuvardhana VII. M. gives him the bīruda of Ganda-Mahendras; and O., that of Baja-Martanda. S. also gives him another second name, or bīruda, — Karayalladāta; and describes him as "the lord of Vēṅga (vēṅga-nātha)." In his first grant, M. uses the paramount title of Mahārājadhīśa; in N., the title of Paramāravara is added; and in O. he uses also the third title, Paramahatṛaksa. The seals of his grants bear the motto of ātri-Tīrbhuvanāṅkura. M. describes him as a paramamahā-āvara, or 'most devout worshipper of the god Mahāvara.' His wife was Lōkamahādāvi; she is mentioned in six records, P. to U. He acquired the succession by expelling Yuddhamalla II., and, according to P., by also successfully resisting some other claimants, who will be referred to below. P. and the subsequent records all agree in stating that he reigned for twelve years.

11 R. describes him as a son of Yuddhamalla II., as well as of Vijayāditya IV. The introduction of the words atadpura may, as Dr. Hultsch has suggested, be intended to show that he belonged to the next generation after Yuddhamalla II.; but it seems more likely that the insertion of them is purely a mistake.
U. tells us that he slew the glorious Rājamayya; the mighty Dhālaga, or Vajaga; the fierce Tātabikki; Bijia, who was always ready for war; the very terrible Ayyapa; a great army that was sent by king Gōvinda; Lōvabikki, the ruler of the Chōjas; and Yuddhamalla, with his arrays of elephants. Here, Yuddhamalla must be his predecessor of that name, the son of Tājapa. Gōvinda is the Bāshrakata king Gōvinda V.; he and the others appear to be the "other claimants" spoken of in P. Tātabikki is also mentioned in O., by the name of Tātabikyan; and the same record seems to mention Dhālaga or Vajaga and one other opponent whose name does not occur in the passage in U. Ayyapa is very probably the Ayyappadēva of the Bēguīr inscription of the Western Gāṅga king Ereyapparasa (Epigraphia Indica, p. 347 ff.); from the Atākūr inscription, which I shall shortly publish, it is now known that his period was just before A. D. 950, and it becomes quite possible that he really was the Western Chalukya Ayyaṇa I.

Of this reign we have three records:

M. — A grant from Pāganavaram in the Madras Presidency; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 213. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya. The genealogy commences with Kubja-Vishnuravardhana I., the brother of Satyāraṇya, the lord of the favourites (വാളബ്ബേണ്ടാ); and this record is the first to state that he reigned over the Veṅgi mandala. The charter was issued by Bhima II. himself; and it records a grant of the village of Diggubarru in the Pāgunavara vishaya.

N. — A grant from apparently Masulipatam in the Kistna District; not yet published; I quote from my reading of the original plates. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya. The genealogy commences with Kubja-Vishnuravardhana I., the brother of Satyāraṇya, the lord of the favourites. The charter was issued by Bhima II. himself; and it records the grant of a field at the village of Akulamannaṇḍu in the Gudravara vishaya, made on an occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-Saṅkrānti.

O. — A grant from Kolavennu in the Kistna District; edited by D. Hultzsch, South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. page 43, No. 37. — It gives the dynastic name as Chalukya. It commences with a verse in praise of the water-lily, which grew from the navel of Vishnu, and was the birth-place of Brahman. Then follows the usual introductory passage, opening the genealogy with Kubja-Vishnu, the brother of Satyāraṇya; but the words which state that he reigned over the country of Veṅgi, are not included. The charter was issued by Bhima II. himself; and it records a grant of the village of Kodhatali in the Kandeśuṛavti vishaya, made on an occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-Saṅkrānti. The grant was made at the request of a prince named Vājyaṇa, of the Pānara family, who had helped to protect the kingdom of Bhima II.

23. — Amma II.; Vijayāditya VI.

Twenty-five years; A.D. 945 to 970.

He was a younger son, and the successor, of No. 22, Bhima II. His name occurs throughout as Amma. He had the epithet of samastabhavanākaraṇa, 'asylum of the universe'; the other name of Vijayāditya VI. ; and, like his uncle of the same name, the birula of Bāja-Mahendrā (see Q., and S., line 36, 37). In his grants P. and R. to U., he uses the titles of Mahārāja-Virāja, Paramēṣvara, and Paramahāṭhāraka; in Q., instead of Mahārājādhirāja being used, Mahārāja is attached to his name of Vijayāditya, and is followed by Bāja-dhirāja, with the other two titles. The seals of his grants bear the motto of sīri-Tribhuvanākura. There is a corrupt passage in V., line 46 f., which seems to hint that he had a struggle for the crown with Yuddhamalla II.; but, with this exception, it would appear that the family dissen-

12 In this case no epithet, neither vallabha, nor vallabhendra, is attached to Satyāraṇya's name.
13 The records with which I am dealing in full, mention only two sons, Dānavara and Amma II. But the Pātāgarām inscription of Śaka-Saṅsvat 1124 states that he had three sons; and seems to give their names as Bhima (IV.), Amma, and Dānvarā.
sions, which had existed from the time of Vijayāditya V., were now at an end, and that henceforth the succession went peaceably. U. calls him “the lord of Veṅgli (veṅgli-rādhaka).” V., W., and X., state that he reigned for twenty-five years. The actual date of his coronation is given in one of his own grants (P.); the dates are, Saka-Samvat 867, the month Mārgaśīrṣa, the thirteenth day in the dark fortnight, Bṛiguvarā or Friday, when the moon was in the Amrādha nakshatra, when the sun was in Dhanu, and during the rising of the sign Kumbha; and the corresponding English date is Friday, 6th December, A. D. 945 (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 102 f.); he was then in the twelfth year from his birth.

Of his time we have six records:

P. — A grant from an unknown locality; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. VII. p. 15. — It gives the dynastic name as Chālukya. The genealogy commences with Kubja-Vishnuvardhana I., the brother of Satyāśraya, “the lord of favourites.” The charter was issued by Amma II. himself. It records a grant of the village of Parānkaluru in the Penatavadi vishaya, made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon. The Dātaka was Kaṭakarāja. The charter was composed by Mādhavabhaṭṭa, and written by Jontāchārya. This is the record that gives the date of the coronation of Amma II.

Q. — A grant from Masulipatam in the Kistna District; edited by Mr. Sewell, ante, Vol. VIII. p. 73; I have also my own reading of the original plates. — It gives the dynastic name as Chālukya. The genealogy commences as in P. The charter was issued by Amma II. himself. It records a grant of some fields at the village of Pāmbūrū in the Gudrāvara vishaya, to the Yuvarāja Ballaladeva-Vāḷābhaṭṭa, also called Boddiya, son of Pammavā of the Pātavardhini family.

R. — A grant from ‘Yalivaru’ in the Kistna District; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XII. p. 91. — It gives the dynastic name as Chālukya. The genealogy commences as in P. The charter was issued by Amma II. himself. It records a grant of the village of Elavaru in the Venuṇāṇḍu vishaya, made on an occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-Saṁkrānti. The Dātaka was Kaṭakarāja. The charter was composed by Potanabhaṭṭa, and written by Jontāchārya.

S. — A grant from an unknown locality; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 248. — It gives the dynastic name as Chālukya. The genealogy commences as in P.; but the words “reigned over the Veṅgli country” are not included. The charter was issued by Amma II. himself. It records a grant of a field at the village of Guṇḍugolanu or Guṇṇugolanu in the Veṅgiṇāṇḍu vishaya, made on an occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-Saṁkrānti. The Dātaka was Kaṭakarāja. The charter was composed by Mādhavabhaṭṭa, and written by Konjāchārya. The grant was made at the request of the prince Kāma and his wife Nāyamānbha, who were the father- and mother-in-law of Amma II.

T. — A grant from Masulipatam in the Kistna District; edited by Dr. Holtzsch, South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 49, No. 38. — It gives the dynastic name as Chālukya. The genealogy commences as in P. The charter was issued by Amma II. himself. The order contained in it is issued to the officials of apparently the Gudravāra vishaya; but the other details are lost.

U. — A grant from an unknown locality, not yet published; I quote from my own reading of the original plates. — It gives the dynastic name as Chālukya. The genealogy commences as in P., except that a verse is substituted for the usual prose ending of the passage. the verse gives the name of Kubja-Viṣṇu, for Kubja-Viṣṇuvarṇahana I., and it does not include the name of Veṅgli. The charter was issued by Amma II. himself. The order contained in it is addressed to the officials of the Mattindanaṇḍu vishaya; and it recites that, on an occasion of the Uttarāyaṇa-Saṁkrānti, a Jain Śrāvakā named Chāmekā, belonging to the Addakali or Āḍakali gachchha and the Vālahāri gaccha, and born in the Pattavardhika
lineage, the members of which were servants of the Chalukya kings, gave the village of Kaluchumbarru to her Guru Arhānandī, for the purposes of the charitable dining-hall of the Jain temple named Sarvalokāśraya-Jinabhavana. The Dātaka was Kāṭakādhīsa; which name is apparently substituted, simply for metrical purposes, for the customary Kāṭakāraja. The charter was written, and apparently also composed, by Bhaṭṭadēva.

24. — Dānārṇava.

Three years; A. D. 970 to 973.

He was the elder brother by a different mother, and the successor, of Amma II. V. gives his name as Dānārṇava; and W., in the same way, and also in the form of Dānārṇipa; and both of these records describe him as the devimātura or ‘half-brother’ of Amma II., without any statement as to seniority. X., which again gives his name as Dānārṇava, states specifically that he was the elder brother, but does not describe him as devimātura. The Pittāpuram inscription of Saka-Saṅvat 1124 appears to give his wife’s name as Āryādēvi. V. and W. state that he reigned for three years; while X. says thirty years. Reckoning forward from the established actual date of the coronation of Amma I., the accession of Dānārṇava is to be placed in A. D. 970.

An Unexplained Interval of Thirty years.

A. D. 973 to 1003.

What ensued after the three years allotted by V. and W. to the reign of Dānārṇava, has not as yet been made clear. X., indeed, states that he reigned for thirty years, and was succeeded immediately by Saktivarman. But V. tells us that, after him, “for twenty-seven years a feverish desire, to obtain a suitable lord, consumed the earth, which was without a leader (anāyikā);” and that then “her fever was assuaged by Chālukya-Chandra, i.e. Saktivarman.” The same statement, in almost identical words, is made in the Gōḍāvari grant which has been noticed above under No. 17, Bēta-Vijayāditya. V. W. says that “for twenty-seven years, through the spite of fate (daiva-durkāya), the land of Vēngī was without a leader (anāyikā).” And another record (Sir Walter Elliot’s Telugu Sťānams, p. 777) says that the Andhra country, together with Kalīṅga, was without a master (avāmika). In these passages, the period is twice distinctly specified as twenty-seven years; and the same implication is made in the passage in X. which, omitting this period, puts the reign of Dānārṇava at thirty years. Nevertheless, as Dr. Hultsch has pointed out (loc. cit. p. 32, note 10), if the lengths of the immediately preceding and following reigns, — two on either side, — are stated correctly, this period must have extended to thirty years. This is determined by the actual dates of coronation recorded for Amma II. and Rājarāja I. And the period can be limited to twenty-seven years, only if we assume that the coronation of Rājarāja I. was deferred for three years after his actual accession; which does not appear very probable.

This period has been assumed to have been a time of anarchy (Dr. Burnell’s South-Indian Palæography, pp. 22, note 6, and 53, note 4); with the suggestion that the anarchy may be fairly attributed to Chōḷa invasions. I suspect that the country was in fact conquered and hold for a time by the Chōḷas; probably under the immediate predecessor of Gaṅgaikonda-Kō-Rājarāja-Rājakēśarivarman. He himself claims a conquest of Vēngī (South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 63); but, as his initial date was in A. D. 1063 or 1064 (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 72), that would not account for the period in question. Moreover, the people of Vēngī then had a ruler of their own again, in the person of Chālukya-chandra-Saktivarman. It would seem, therefore, that his claim is merely an honorary one, based on an event that really occurred before his time.

14 Evidently identical with the Paṭṭavardhinī family, which has been mentioned in two or three places above.
15 See page 307 above, note 5.
16 In line 48, labhim is a mistake, of the original, for labham.
25. — Saktivarman.

Twelve years; A. D. 1003 to 1015.

He was the eldest son of No. 24, Dārārāya, and he succeeded to the throne of Veṣi after the unexplained interval of the preceding paragraph. W. and X., and the Gādāvari grant, give his proper name of Saktivarman; V. mentions him by his biruda of Chalukya-Chandra. The Pitisāpura inscription appears to mention him by the name of Kirtivarman; but there is nothing to prevent this being a mistake on the part of Sir Walter Elliot's copyist. Some gold coins of his, obtained from Arakan and Siam, have been described by me, ante, Vol. XIX. p. 79 ff.; they are stamped with his biruda. V., W., and X., agree in stating that he reigned for twelve years.

26. — Vimalāditya.

Seven years; A. D. 1015 to 1022.

He was the younger brother and successor of No. 25, Saktivarman. His name occurs as Vimalāditya in V., W., and X.; in the Gādāvari grant it is given in the same way, and also in the form of Vimalāraka. His wife was Kandavamahādevī, who is mentioned in the Eastern Chalukya records as the younger sister of Rājendra-Choḍa, and the daughter of Rājarāja of the Solar Race. V. calls her specifically a Choḍa (i.e. Chōḍa) princess. And her father was plainly the Chōḍa king Gaṅgaikonda-Kūrī-Rājaraṇa-Rājakēśarivarman, with the initial date of A. D. 1003 or 1004 (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 72). V., W., and X., agree in stating that Vimalāditya reigned for seven years.

27. — Rājarāja I.; Vishnuvardhana VIII.

Forty-one years; A. D. 1023 to 1063.

He was the son and successor of No. 26, Vimalāditya. In V. and W. he is called Rājarāja; X. gives his name as Rājarājadēva. His wife was Ammanāgadēva, the daughter of Rājendra-Choḍa, i.e. of his own maternal uncle. He had the epithet of sarvalokāśraya, 'refuge of all mankind;' and the other name of Vishnuvardhana VIII. His titles were Mahārājadhirāja, Paramāśvara, and Paramabhaṭṭaraka. The seal of his reign bears the motto of sri-Tribhuvanānākusa. The date of his coronation is given in his grant, (V.); the details are, Saka-Saṅvats 1124, when the sun was in Simha, i.e. in the solar month Bhadrapada, the second tithi in the dark fortnight, Gaurīvara or Thursday, when the moon was in the Uttarā-Bhadrapada nakṣatra, and during the rising of the sign Tula; and the corresponding English date is Thursday, 18th August, A. D. 1023 (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 129 f.). Some gold coins of his, obtained from Arakan and Siam, have been described by me, ante, Vol. XIX. p. 79 ff.; they are stamped with his name. The exact length of his reign is a little doubtful. X. states that he reigned for forty-one years. But W. states that he reigned for "forty years, and again for one." While the Pitisāpura inscription of Saka-Saṅvats 1124, and the Gādāvari grant, state that he reigned for forty years; and they add one year to the reign of his successor, Kūlottuṅga-Chōḍadēva I. This looks somewhat as if there was a break in the full period assigned to him by X. But, for the present, we may assume that the duration of his reign was forty-one years.

17 Of his time we have inscriptions in Dr. Hultzsch’s South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I., pp. 63, No. 46; 66, No. 41; 84, No. 59; and 140, No. 146. As he reigned for at least twenty-six years (No. 41), his final date cannot be placed before A. D. 1028.

18 When I edited his grant (ante, Vol. XIV. p. 45), I rather inconveniently called him Rājarāja the second, by way of distinguishing him from his maternal grandfather of the same name; and I spoke of him in the same way in connection with his coins, and with the date of his coronation (ante, Vol. XIX. pp. 79, 129). But, as already pointed out (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 42, note 3), he was the first king of this name in the Chalukya family; and it is more correct and expedient to speak of him as Rājarāja I.

19 His full name appears to be Kō-Parākṣasivarman, otherwise Ujjayi Śrī-Rājendra-Chōḍadēva. Of his time we have inscriptions in Dr. Hultzsch’s South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I., pp. 85, No. 67; 100, No. 83; and two more noted on p. 97. As one of the latter is dated in his twenty-fourth year, and as his initial date cannot be placed before A. D. 1028 (see note 17 above), the end of his reign was not earlier than A. D. 1061.
The extant grant of this reign gives us, for the first time, the complete genealogy of the Eastern Chalukyas, mythical, legendary, and historical. It was probably devised in rivalry of the Solar genealogy of the Chōlas, with whom the Eastern Chalukyas were now becoming very intimately connected. And it may be conveniently taken in the following divisions:

(1) **The Purānic genealogy.** This commences with the god Brahman, as born from the water-lily that grew from the navel of the god Vishnu, as a result of which the Chalukyas were comprised in the Vishvamitra or lineage of Vishnu; and it is taken through Soma or the Moon, so that they belonged also to the Somaṇa or Lunar Race, as is expressly stated in lines 64 and 73 of this grant, and still more explicitly in W., line 49. As far as the name of Yayātī, it agrees with the Purānic genealogy of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga (ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 170); and the last specific name in it, is that of Udayana, the son of Satānika. Another Purānic genealogy of the same style seems to be followed in some of the Kākatiya records (see Wilson's *Mackenzie Collection*, Introduction, p. 74). An earlier indication of the reference of the Eastern Chalukya family to the lineage of Vishnu, but one that is hardly pointed enough to lead to the supposition that the idea of the full Purānic genealogy had been then contemplated, is to be found in the opening verse of O., of the time of No. 22, Chālukya-Bhīma II., which is in praise of the water-lily that grew from the navel of Vishnu, and was the birth-place of Brahman. W., again, though not containing the Purānic genealogy, opens with a verse in praise of Vishnu under the name of Mukunda; followed by another in laudation of the Lunar Race. Descent from Brahman is claimed for Pulikēśin I. in the Mahākāla pillar inscription (ante, Vol. XIX. p. 19). And in the grants of the Western Branch of the family an allusion to the traditional descent of the Chalukyas in the Lunar Race, is probably to be found in the passage which mentions Vikramaditya I. as “defeating the lord of the Pallavas, who had been the cause of the humiliation and destruction of the family which was as pure as the rays of the moon” (e. g., ante, Vol. XIX. p. 151).

(2) **The legendary connection of the Chalukyas with the preceding.** Without any specification of names, we are told that, including Udayana, fifty-nine emperors sat on the throne at Ayōdhya, in unbroken lineal succession. This statement is also preserved in some of the Western Chālukya records (e. g., ante, Vol. V. p. 17; also Vol. VIII. p. 12, where, however, after the fifty-nine emperors of Ayōdhya, sixteen other unnamed kings, in the south, are introduced before the beginning of the real genealogy). And with it we may compare the statement in the Gaṅga grants, which connects their real with their Purānic genealogy, by saying that, after Kōlāhala had founded the city of Kōlāhalapura, his son and seventy-nine other kings reigned there, and then were followed by the historical members of the family, commencing with Vrāsimha. When the fifty-nine emperors had reigned at Ayōdhya, a member of the family, named Vijayaditya, came to the south, from a desire for conquest, and attacked Trilōchana-Pallava, but lost his life in the attempt. His queen, who was pregnant, escaped with some of her attendants, and, being preserved by a saint named Vishvabhāṭa-Sōmayājin, gave birth to a posthumous son named Viśṇuvardhana. The young prince was nourished; and, having done worship to the goddess Gaṅgī on the mountain called Chalukya-giri, he at length assumed all the royal insignia of his family, conquered the Kaḍamba, Gaṅga, and other kings, and established himself as emperor of all Southern India, from the Bridge of Rāma, i.e. Adam's Bridge or the ridge of rocks connecting Ceylon with the Coromandel coast, up to the Narmāḍa. His son, born of a queen of the Pallava lineage, was another Vijayaditya. With the mountain Chalukya-giri that is introduced here, we may compare the Nandagiri fort which, according to the Kākatiya legend, was founded by Nanda, the son of Uttīṅgabhuja; Nanda's father, in a similar manner, came from Upper India, and settled to the south of the Gōdāvari (loc. cit.). And in very similar fashion, the mountain Mahēndragiri, — in this case
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This lineage is mentioned in some of the Dēragiri-Yādava inscriptions; e. g., *Jour. Be. Br. R. As. Soc.* Vol. XII. pp. 9, 35.
a really existent mountain, — is introduced into the traditions of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga. The foundations for this portion of the genealogy are plainly the facts, that the Chalukyas did come originally from the north, and found the Pallavas in possession of some of the territories afterwards acquired by themselves; coupled with a Kadamba tradition, that the founder of that family was Trinētra or Trilōchana.

(3) The historical Early and Western Chalukya genealogy, as far as it is given; being confined to three names; — those of Pulikēśin I, Kṛtvirman I., and Satyārāya or Pulikēśin II. According to this account, Pulikēśin I. was the son of the second Vijayāditya of the preceding paragraph. In reality, he was the son of Raṣarāja, who was the son of Jayasimha I.

(4) The historical Eastern Chalukya genealogy, starting with Kubja-Vishṇuvardhana I., and carried on to the time of the reigning king.

The second part of the above genealogy specifies the Eastern Chalukya insignia. They are enumerated as the white umbrella, the single conch-shell, the paśchamahābaka, the pulikēśan, the double drum, the boar-crest, the bunch of feathers of a peacock's tail, the spear, the throne, the mākaraśālā, the golden sceptre, the Gaṅga and Yamunā, and others which are not particularised. Lithographs of the seals of this grant and of X. have been given, ante, Vol. VII. p. 253, Plate, Nos. 1 and 2. The seal of the present grant shows, across the centre, the legend sri-Tribhuwanadākāśa; above it, a boar, half standing and half couchant to the proper left, the sun and moon, an umbrella, a conch-shell, a double drum, and two objects which are usually interpreted as chawris or fly-flaps made from the bushy tail of the Bos Grunniens, but which may perhaps be intended for fly-flaps made from the feathers of peacocks' tails; and in the lower part, an elephant- or ox-goad, an expanded water-lily, the bud of a water-lily on its stalk, and a device resembling the letter ga which may be intended either for the throne or for the mākaraśālā. The seal of X. omits the sun, the umbrella, the double drum, the bud of the water-lily, and the ga; and it adds two lamp-stands. A somewhat similar list of insignia is given in the case of the Gaṅgas of Kaliṅganagara (ante, Vol. XVIII. pp. 164, 175). The terms Gaṅga and Yamunā probably denote the images of two goddesses, as personifications of the rivers. These were also Rāṣṭhākāṭa insignia; thus, Gōvinda III. is described as "taking from his enemies the Gaṅga and the Yamunā, charming with their waves, and acquiring at the same time that supreme position of lordship (which was indicated) by (these rivers in) the form of a visible sign" (ante, Vol. XII. p. 163); and the rivers are spoken of again, as doing service to the palace of Gōvinda V. (id. pp. 248, 253). These two emblems must have been derived, by some means or another, from the Early Guptas, in the temples of whose period the Gaṅga and the Yamunā, as goddesses, constantly appear as an architectural embellishment (see Archi. Surv. Ind. Vol. IX. pp. 43, 70).

Of this reign we have one record:—

V. — A copper-plate grant from Korumelli in the Gōḍāvāri District; edited by me with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIV. p. 48. — This grant gives the complete genealogy, commented on just above. The historical Eastern Chalukya genealogy commences with Kubja-Vishṇuvardhana I., as the brother of Satyārāya, ' the lord of favourites;' and this passage gives the name of the family as Chalukya. The charter was issued by Rājarāja I. himself; and it records a grant of the village of Korumelli in the Gūḍdavāḍi vishaya, on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon. The Dūtaka was Kāṭakāśa, the son of Rāchiya-Pedderi-Bhima, the composer was Čhitānabhaṭṭa; and the writer was Gaṇḍāchārya.

21 i.e. the sounds of five kinds of musical instruments; or perhaps, here, five kinds of loud-sounding musical instruments (compare page 96 above; and see Gupta Inscriptions, p. 296, note 9).
22 An arrangement of flags in rows (see ante, Vol. XIV. p. 104).
24 Probably an ornamental arch (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 423, note 3).
25 As regards the name of this vishaya, see page 97 above, note 13.
26 See page 97 above, note 8.
Vijayaditya VII;
vicecy of Veṅgi.
A.D. 1063 to 1077.

All that is known about this person is derived from W., which tells us that he was a
paternal uncle of No. 23, Kulōttunga-Chōḍadēva I, and consequently a brother, — probably a
younger brother, — of No. 27, Rājarāja I; and that he was a vicerey of Veṅgi, under his
nephew, for fifteen years, — A.D. 1063 to 1077 (see page 277 below). His name occurs as
simply Vijayaditya.

To this period belongs the statement, in one of the Gaṅga grants (ante, Vol. XVIII.
p. 171), that, "when Vijayaditya, beginning to grow old, left the country of Veṅgi, as if he
were the sun leaving the sky, and was about to sink in the great ocean of the Chōḍas,"
Rājarāja of Kalīṅganagara (A.D. 1071 to 1073) "caused him to enjoy prosperity for a
long time in the western region."27

28. — Kulōttunga-Chōḍadēva I.
Forty-nine years; A.D. 1063 to 1112.

He was the son of No. 27, Rājarāja I. From W., we learn that his original appellation was
Rājendra-Chōḍa; but that subsequently he received the name of Kulōttunga-Chōḍa, on being
anointed to the Chōḍa (i.e. Chōḍa) sovereignty; also, that he had the bijruda of Rāja-Narāyana.
X. speaks of him by the name of Kulōttunga-Chōḍadēva; and this is the most expedient
form to use. By the name of Rājendra-Chōḍa, he is mentioned in two of the Gaṅga inscriptions
(ante, Vol. XVIII. pp. 164, 175). In the Vikrama-kalā-muṣṭikarmacita (see page 280 below), he is called
Rājiga; which name is a colloquial form of the first part of his original appellation. And he is
probably mentioned as Rājiga-Chōḍa in two inscriptions at Chitaldurg and Harihar.28
According to W., his wife was Madhurāntakidēvi, the daughter of Rājendra-dēva of the Solar
Race, i.e. apparently of the Chōḍa king Kō-Parakānāravarman, otherwise called Udaiyār Srī
Rājendra-dēva (Dr. Hultsch's South-Indian Inscriptions, pp. 112, 134);29 and they had seven
sons;30 the eldest was Vikrama-Chōḍa, who ultimately succeeded to the throne; the second
was Rājarāja II., who was vicerey of Veṅgi for one year; the third was Vira-Chōḍadēva,
who also became vicerey of Veṅgi; the others are not named. In addition, they appear also
to have had a daughter, named Rājasundari, who became the wife of Rājarāja of Kalīṅganagar
reigned for forty-nine years. The Pīṭapuram inscription, however, dated in Saka-Samvat
1124, states that he reigned for fifty years, and reduces his father's reign from forty-one years
to forty (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 427). In connection with this we may note, in the first place,
that this same Pīṭapuram inscription appears to mention Kulōttunga-Chōḍadēva I. as being

27 I. e. in the west as regards Kalīṅganagara; not in the western part of Southern India.
28 Pāli, Sanskrit, and Old-Kaṇare Inscriptions, No. 146, line 9, and 111, line 6. — They are inscriptions of
Mahamitravirya, named Vijaya-Pripūdayāva, who was governing the Nalambākha Thirty-two thousand at
Ucaṇḍi. The expression applied to Vijaya-Pripūdayāva is rājiga-dēva-mahā-khaṇḍa, 'who frustrated the wishes
of Rājiga-Chōḍa,' and, as the inscriptions are dated in A.D. 1123 and 1171, it appears to be an ancestral title,
not indicative of any contemporaneous event.
29 Of his time we have one inscription, loc. cit. p. 134, No. 127. His earliest date cannot be placed before
A.D. 1061 (see note 19 above); and this inscription is dated in his fifth year; consequently he cannot be
placed earlier than A.D. 1051. His connection with his predecessor has not yet been made clear.
30 See ante, Vol. XIX. p. 433, note 84.
31 It is, however, not quite certain that Rājasundari's father was the Eastern Chalukya king. Her father
is mentioned as Rājendra-Chōḍa (pp. 164, 175), and as the Chōḍa king (p. 171). My assumption is that the
Chōḍa king denoted not a real Chōḍa, but the Eastern Chalukya after the annexation of the Chōḍa kingdom.
As his predecessor reigned for at least twenty-six years, the accession of the Chōḍa Rājendra-Chōḍa cannot be placed
before A.D. 1028; and as he himself reigned for at least twenty-four years, the end of his reign cannot be placed
before A.D. 1051, and it may approximate much more closely to the period of Rājarāja of Kalīṅganagar. Still,
I think the probabilities are more in favour of the identification that I have made; especially since a daughter of
the Chōḍa Rājendra-Chōḍa was the wife of Rājarāja I. in the period A.D. 1022 to 1033.
at first a Yuvaraja; and in the second place, that W. does not say exactly that Rājarāja I. reigned for forty-one years, but that he reigned "for forty years and again for one." The passage in W. is in verse. Still, there is no apparent reason why forty-one years should not have been specified in it in a plain and ordinary manner, if that was the real unbroken length of his reign. And the facts are somewhat suggestive of a break in the full period. For the present, however, we may as well take it that Rājarāja I. reigned for forty-one years, and Kulottuṅga-Chōḍadēva I., for forty-nine years; and so, reckoning forward from the established actual date of the coronation of Rājarāja I., the accession of Kulottuṅga-Chōḍadēva I. is to be placed in A.D. 1063.

We have as yet no inscriptions which can be with certainty allotted to this king. But W. belongs to his time; and from it we gather some facts of leading importance. We have seen that there was an intermarriage of the Eastern Chalukyas with the Chōjas two generations earlier; when Vinalāditya took to wife Kūndavāmahādevī, the daughter of Rājarāja, and the younger sister of Rājendra-Chōja. It is plainly from this, that his son was named Rājarāja I. The latter, again, found a Chōja wife, in Aṃmaṅgadēvi, the daughter of Rājendrā-Cōja; i.e. of his maternal uncle, just mentioned; and in a similar way, his son, Kulottuṅga-Chōḍadēvā I., was first named Rājendrā-Chōja. He, again, did as his immediate ancestors had done, and married Madhurāntakadēvi, the daughter of Rājendrādēva. As the result of these intermarriages, the members of this family were, from this time, plainly Chōjas at heart, far more than Chalukyas. Not only is this indicated by their names; but it is proved by their personal history. Kulottuṅga-Chōḍadēvā I. was first anointed, like his ancestors, to the sovereignty of Veṅgī, "which was the cause of the rising of his splendour;" and this, as we have just seen, is to be placed in A.D. 1063. But subsequently he assumed the Chōja crown, and had Veṅgī governed for him by viceroys. In W. no clear statement is made as to the circumstances under which this happened; it is simply said that "wishing for, being desirous of, or preferring, the Chōja sovereignty (Chōḍa-rajy-āchārdinā)," he transferred the sovereignty of Veṅgī to his paternal uncle Viṇaya-dēvi. A more definite statement, however, is made in the grant of the twenty-third year of Vira-Chōḍadēva, which states that he transferred the sovereignty of Veṅgī to Viṇaya-dēvi because he himself was "desirous of subjugating various countries (āy-viṇaya-ācārīn)." Putting the two statements together, it seems clear that Kulottuṅga-Chōḍadēva I. acquired the Chōja crown by hostile invasion and conquest; not, at any rate entirely, by a failure of the Chōja succession. And, as we shall see further on, there are indications that what really gave him the opportunity, was the death of the Chōja king in a rebellion which entailed a state of anarchy. Now, W. names three viceroys of Veṅgī, appointed by Kulottuṅga-Chōḍadēva I.; one was Vira-Chōḍadēva, the actual date of whose installation was the 23rd August, A.D. 1078; his predecessor was Rājarāja II., for one year only (A.D. 1077-78); and his predecessor was Viṇaya-dēvi VII., for fifteen years (A.D. 1063 to 1077). Therefore, as he assumed the Chōja crown at the time when he appointed Viṇaya-dēvi as viceroy of Veṅgī, it follows that Kulottuṅga-Chōḍadēva I. attacked and annexed the Chōja kingdom in A.D. 1063, — in the very first year of his reign. The statement quoted above, connecting Rājarāja of Kakuga-anagaras with Viṇaya-dēvi VII., and another remark in the same passage to the effect that he was victorious in battle against the Dramilas, i.e. against the Chōjas properly so-called, — and a further statement, in the same record, that Rājarāja's son and successor, Aṇṇavarma-Chōḍa-gaṅga-dēva (A.D. 1078 to at least 1135) "replaced the waning lord of Veṅgī in the western region, and propitiated his failing fortunes," — seem to indicate that this annexation of the Chōja kingdom was not completed quite at once, and was not finally completed without extraneous assistance.

To this period belongs the only epigraphical evidence known to me, indicative of either a settlement of the Eastern Chalukyas in Western India, or an intermarriage between them and the Western Chalukyas. It is contained in an inscription at Dāvangere in Masīr
(Pāli, Sanskrit, and Old-Kanarese Inscriptions, No. 135), which refers itself to the time of the Western Chalukya king Sōmeśvara I., and is dated in A.D. 1066. Three sons of Sōmeśvara I. are very well known; viz., Sōmeśvara II., Vikramāditya VI., and Jayasimha IV. This inscription purports to give the name of a fourth son, called Vishnudvara-namahāraja-Vijayādityadēva, who was governing the Nāmbavāli Thirty-two-thousand, and by whose Daṇḍayudha and Mahāanayakaprabha, Dēvapāpya, the grants recorded in the inscription were made. The inscription describes this Vishnudvara-Nāma-nāyaka as "a ruby of the Chalukyas (Chalukya-māyūra; 1, 8, 9);" and it gives him the epithet of sarvalokākāra, or 'refuge of all mankind' (1, 5), the bhūtaś of Ahavamallan-Aṅkakir (l. 7) and Sahasamalla (l. 10), and the hereditary title of "lord of the province of Vēṇ① (Vēṇṇ-mādala-śiva; 1, 11)." It is quite plain, therefore, that he was of Eastern Chalukya descent, on one side at least. Now, this person is mentioned in no other inscription as yet known; the sphere of his government lay south of the river Tungabhadra, which is considered to have formed the boundary between the Western Chalukya kingdom and the Chōla dominions, whether under the Chōlas themselves or under the Eastern Chalukyas after them; and, though he is called the son of Sōmeśvara (kau-nandana), yet no expression such as devo putta, 'born to him,' is used. And these points may indicate that he was simply called the son of Sōmeśvara I. through courtesy, being in reality a distant kinsman, in the next degree of descent, in the Eastern Chalukya family. On the other hand, the fact that, in an inscription at Deśīr in the Bijapur District, dated in A.D. 1064-65 (Sir Walter Elliot's Korāṭakas-Devī Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 173), Jayasimha IV., while governing the Tārāevi-Thousand for his elder brother Vikramāditya VI., is described as "born in the Pallava lineage," and as having the title of "lord of Kāčēli, the best of cities," may be used as an argument that Vishnudvara-Nāma-nāyaka was in reality a son of Sōmeśvara I.

An account of this reign would be incomplete, without a somewhat detailed reference to two contemporaneous literary records of more than ordinary historical interest; one is the Sanskrit Vikramāditya-vaccharita or Vikramāditya-vaccharita of Bilaśa, of which an analysis has been given by Dr. Bähler in this Journal, Vol. V. page 317 ff.; the other is the Tamil Kālīgattu Parani of Jayakōnga, extracts from which have been published by Mr. V. Kanakasabhai Pillai, in this Journal, Vol. XIX. p. 329 ff. The Sanskrit poem gives an account of the events that occurred during the early career and the subsequent reign of the Western Chalukya king Vikramāditya VI., who, reigning apparently from the early part of A.D. 1076 up to about A.D. 1126, was contemporaneous, almost throughout, with his kinsman of the Eastern Branch. The Tamil poem refers to the reign of Kūlottungas-Chōda-dēva I. himself.

The special subject of the Kālīgattu Parani is an expedition to Kālīgā, ending in the re-subjugation of that country. The ruler of North Kālīgā was claimed as a vassal of the Eastern Chalukya crown. The cause of the war was his omission, for two years, to present

---

23 This is a very common custom in the Kanarese country. For an epigraphical instance of an analogous kind, see Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 45, note 1.

24 This at first sight, nothing should be easier than to fix the exact commencement of this reign; since one of the dates for this king purports to give—whether it refers to the actual day or to an anniversary, the very vitki of his prāṇabandha or coronation, with full details for calculation. But all that I can say at present is that his first reign year seems to have been Saka-Satvat 999 current. Of the forty-three dates given by me in this Journal, Vol. VIII. p. 157 ff., thirty-nine give that result. But two (Nos. 2 and 30) give the proceeding year; one (No. 19) gives Ś-S. 1000; and one gives ŚŚ-S. 1002. And the details for the prāṇabandha do not work out correctly for the year for which they are given; but can be applied correctly for Ś-S. 999. I shall go into this question more fully on a separate occasion.

24 The poem speaks several times of "the seven Kālīgā" (lo. cit., pp. 334, 1, 16, 335, l. 28, 336, II. 6, 9, 90); but I have not been able to obtain the names of the seven divisions of that territory, or of the five divisions of the Pāṭa country, which also seem to be indicated here (p. 335, l. 13), and a conquest of which is mentioned also in an inscription, at Chidambaram (Hultsch's South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 168), of a Kūlottungas-Chōla who has not as yet been identified with any certainty.
himself with tribute before the king. And the expedition was led by a minister or general of Kulottunga-Chôjâdêva I., named Karunâkara, of the Pallava lineage, who had the titles of Toḍâjâmân and king of Vaṇḍainâgara, and the banner of a bull. Arguing on the grounds that it is not mentioned in inscriptions up to the twentieth year of the king’s reign, whereas it is mentioned in those dated in the twenty-sixth year, Mr. V. K. Pillai has placed the date of this campaign between those years (loc. cit. p. 333, l. 23); i.e. in the period A. D. 1082 to 1088. But I am not satisfied as to the correctness of this. The ruler of Kaliâng at this time was Anantavarna-Chôjâgannâgadêva of Kaliânganâgar, whose coronation took place on the 17th February, A. D. 1078 (ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 162). And, as the expedition was directed against a chief who was claimed as a vassal, I should think that it must be placed at least before the time when we find Anantavarna-Chôjâgannâgadêva in possession of the paramount titles; i.e. before April, A. D. 1081 (loc. cit.). A previous conquest of Kaliâng, in A. D. 918, is claimed for Kollâbigândha-Vijayâditya IV. (see page 104 above). And Vikramâditya II. is said to have ruled over Trikaliâng or the three Kaliângs (page 269 above).

The poem is extremely interesting, in a general way, on account of its graphic language, the full list that it gives of the chiefs who were claimed as vassals, the geographical and historical details mentioned in connection with the march of the army and in other passages, and the spirited description of the battle. But it includes also some special points, to which particular attention has to be directed.

The first is, that nowhere is any mention made of the Veigil country, of the Chalukya family, or even of the boar-crest of the Chalukiyas; Kulottunga-Chôjâdêva I. is treated throughout as purely a Chôjâ king. The introductory genealogy (p. 330 f.) is that of the Chôjâ family, traced through Sûrya, the Sun, up to the gods Brahma and Vishnu; thus it is the pedigree of a branch of the Solar Race; and the first historical names in it are the names of Chôjâ kings of the Chôjâ mandala. Kulottunga-Chôjâdêva I. is there introduced, under the title of Abhaya (the fearless), as if he was the direct lineal descendant, on his father’s side, of those kings; throughout, there is connected with him the tiger-bearer of the Chôlas (e.g. pp. 329, last line; 332, line 3 from the bottom; 333, l. 28; 334, l. 18), the origin of which seems to be attributed to the first of the two Râjakâsarins (p. 331, l. 8); and, where he is not referred to by the title of Abhaya, which is mostly used for him in this poem, or by his name of Kulottunga-Chôla, which occurs twice (pp. 335, l. 26; 337, l. 4), he is called the Chôla (p. 332, l. 29), the Chenni (Chôla; pp. 330, l. 17; 333, l. 14), and Kâmakâ-Chôla (p. 337, l. 16), which last appears to be peculiarly a Chôla name. The conclusion of the genealogy reads as if Kulottunga-Chôjâdêva I. succeeded naturally to a hereditary throne, that of the Chôlas. There seems, indeed, to be a hint of the truth somewhere else in the poem; viz. that there was a time of anarchy just before his accession (see p. 333, line 7 f. from the bottom). But, in the published extracts, his real identity and descent are indicated only in the passages which describe him as a prince of both the Lunar and the Solar Races, born from the wife, belonging to the Solar Race, of a king of the Lunar Race (p. 332, l. 2 f.). This shews plainly that by paternal descent he belonged to the Chalukya family; and though the names of his parents are not given, still, — taken in connection with the epigraphical passages which state the birth of Kulottunga-Chôjâdêva I. and describe how he first succeeded to the throne of Veigil and then assumed the empire of the Chôla kingdom, and with the occurrence of the name Kulottunga-Chôla in the poem, — the mention of the mother of the reigning king of this poem, as a daughter of Râjarâja of the Solar Race, establishes conclusively the point that his parents were the Eastern Chalukya king Râjarâja I. and his wife Ammaûgadâri, daughter of Râjâ-

56 Reference is made to a banner of a boar (p. 330, l. 1); but that is a different thing. — The practice appears to have been uniform, of having one device for the crest (ûdhyâhana) to be also used on coins, and another for the banner (dhaṃga); note, for instance, the elephant-crest and the Garuda-banner of the Râjas of Sandât and Belgaum; the lion-crest and the monkey-banner of the Kâdambaras of Banâwâsi; and the monkey-banner of the Kâdambaras of Goa, and the lion on their coins.
and that he himself is the Eastern Chalukya Kulôttunga-Chôødâvé I., otherwise called Kulôttungadéva, Râjendra-Chôşa, and Râja-Nârâyana, of the inscriptions. From this same passage we obtain Gaṅgaikôṇḍa-Chôşa, as another name of his maternal grandfather, the Chôşa Râjârája, i.e. Râjârája-Râjâkâsirvarman. And elsewhere we find his father spoken of by the title of Pañjita-Chôşa (p. 337, l. 2).

According to the poem, the capital of Kulôttunga-Chôødâvé I. was Gaṅgâpur or Gaṅgaikôṇḍa-Chôójapuram (pp. 331, last line; 339, line 7 from the bottom), which has now dwindled into a small village, still bearing the name of Gaṅgaikôṇḍa-Chôójapuram, in the northeast corner of the Trichinopoly District, and his court was held at Kâñâchî, i.e. Conjeeveram (pp. 331, last line; 333, l. 20). His wife's name is given as Thiyâkâvalî (p. 333, l. 13). Whether this is another name of the Madhurântakâdâvé, daughter of Râjârája, of the inscription, is uncertain; especially as the poem alludes to more wives than one, or perhaps to specifically two wives (p. 333, l. 29 f.). But Thiyâkâvali was plainly the Agramâhkâshî, or 'queen-consort;' being mentioned as having "the right of exercising equal authority" with the king himself (p. 333, l. 14).

We turn now to the Vikramâditya-charita, which, though it tells us but little actually about the Eastern Chalukyas themselves, gives very plain indications as to the circumstances which enabled them to seize the sovereignty of their most powerful neighbours, the Chôsas. The historical part opens with a short genealogy, which is brought down to the time of the Western Chalukya king Sômâsvara I., or, as he is called in the poem, Âhavamala-Trailâkya-alamala (ante, Vol. V. p. 318 a, l. 1 f.). His sons were Sômâ, i.e. Sômâsvara I. (p. 318 b, l. 15), Vikrama or Vikramâditya VI. (p. 319 a, l. 5), and Jayasimha IV. (îbid. l. 16). Sômâsvara I. was appointed by his father to the office of Yuvârâja (îbid. l. 30 f.); and Vikramâditya VI. was deputed on a series of warlike expeditions (îbid. l. 37 f.). In a northerly direction, he is said to have conquered a place of some prominence and importance, named Châkrâkôta (p. 319 b, l. 10), — a point which seems worthy of note here, because I suspect that it is in imitation of this fact that another conquest of the same place is claimed on behalf of Kulôttunga-Chôødâvé I., it is stated by Mr. V. K. Pillai (îoc. cit. p. 340) that certain inscriptions enable him to say that this place was a fortress in the Dharâ territory; and though I cannot find any evidence of Kulôttunga-Chôødâvé I. having really sent any expedition in that direction, yet in the case of Vikramâditya VI. the alleged fact is likely to be true, because an inscription at Sîhâbaldâ near Jhalpur, refers itself to his reign, and shows that he not only attacked, but also held a time, part at least of Central India. In connection, however, with what we have specially in view, the more important statements are, that he repeatedly defeated the Chôsas (p. 319 a, l. 3 from the bottom), plundered Kâñâchî (îbid. last line), and conquered Gaṅgaikôṇḍa and Venâlî (p. 319 b, l. 9, 10). Gaṅgaikôṇḍa is evidently the Gaṅgaikôṇḍa-Chôójapuram or Gaṅgâpur of the preceding paragraph. Kâñâchî is constantly spoken of in the poem as if it were the capital, or the city of the next importance after the capital. In support of the alleged conquest of Venâlî, it may be noted that there are inscriptions, dated in the reign or era of

36 The author of the poem seems to be guilty of a slip, in calling him Râjârája. Still, we may obtain epigraphical evidence that this was a variant of his name. And anyhow the slip is excusable, considering how many persons there were, bearing very similar names, in that period, and how complex were the relationships between them; thus, there were, at least, the Eastern Chalukya Râjârája I. and II.; the Chôşa Râjârája (called, in the fullest form of his name, Ko-Râjârája-Râjâkâsirvarman, Hultsch’s South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 65; his accession was in A. D. 1063 or 1064, id. p. 129, and ante, Vol. XIX. p. 72), whose daughter married the Eastern Chalukya Vîminâditya; the Chôşa Râjândra-Chôşa, whose daughter married Râjârája I.; and the Chôşa Râjândradéva, whose daughter married Kulôttunga-Chôɵdâvé I.; and Râjëndra-Chôşa was also a name of Kulôttunga-Chôɵdâvé I. himself.


38 In the Kûlôguttu Parâsi, loc. cit. p. 333, l. 30; where the name is given in the Tamilised form of Chakrarakkoddam. — In another Tamil inscription it is mentioned as Skakaramoço, and a conquest of it is claimed by a king named Râjëndra-Chôşa (Hultsch’s South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. pp. 97, 98). — It is also mentioned, by the name of Chakrakoça, in connection with the Hysala king Vîshnupurdana, who, again, claims to have conquered it (Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 60).
The wars with the Chōḷas had commenced, as a fact, before this time; for, the poem claims that Sōmēśvara I. stormed Kāśchikī, “the capital of the Chōḷas,” driving its ruler into the jungles (p. 318 a, l. 8, 18 f.); and certain inscriptions establish, on the one hand, that the Chōḷas successfully invaded the territory of Sōmēśvara I., as far as Lakṣmēšvar, and, on the other hand, that the Western Chāluṣya king repulsed them, and gave them a serious defeat in a battle in which the Chōḷa leader apparently lost his life (see Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p. 46). And, though of course in the Vikramāditya Chāluṣya the victory is always claimed for the Chāluṣyas, it is doubtful to his time that we must refer the defeat of the people of Kalyaṇa, and the defeat of the Kuntalas at Kōdāl-Saṅgama, — i.e., in both cases, of the Western Chāluṣyas, — which are claimed for the Chōḷas in the Kālīgattu Pavaṇ̄i. The most interesting, however, of the events between Vikramāditya VI. and the Chōḷas, occurred, according to the poem, after the death of Sōmēśvara I. (p. 319 b, line 6 from the bottom) and the accession of Sōmēśvara II. (p. 320 a, l. 9). Vikramāditya VI. was then contemplating another campaign against the Chōḷas (p. 320 a, l. 3 from the bottom). The Chōḷa king, feeling himself unable to resist, sent an ambassador asking for friendship, and offering his daughter’s hand in marriage to the Chāluṣya king (p. 320 b, l. 12). By an amicable arrangement, Vikramāditya VI. retired to the Tuṅgabhadra; and there the marriage was celebrated (ibid. 1. 21 f.). Hardly was this done, when the Chōḷa king died, and the kingdom fell into a state of anarchy (ibid. 1. 25 f.). Vikramāditya VI. proceeded at once to Kāśchikī, and subdued the rebels there; next he visited Gāṅgakundā again, and secured the Chōḷa succession for his wife’s brother; and then, after a further stay of a month at Kāśchikī, he returned to the Tuṅgabhadra. Within a few days, however, after his return, the news reached him that his brother-in-law had lost his life in a fresh rebellion (ibid. 1. 2 f. from the bottom), and that Rājiga, the lord of vengi, had taken possession of the throne of Kāśchikī (p. 321 a, l. 1). Vikramāditya VI. marched at once against Rājiga. The latter induced Sōmēśvara II. to combine with him; and a battle was fought. But the victory rested with Vikramāditya VI.; and Rājiga fled, and Sōmēśvara II. was taken prisoner (p. 321 b, l. 4). This lost Sōmēśvara the throne; and shortly afterwards, according to the poem, Vikramāditya VI. allowed himself to be proclaimed ruler of the Dekhaṇ (ibid. 1. 11). Subsequently to this, the Chōḷas are mentioned again in a passage which says that, after a variety of wars against unnamed enemies, Vikramāditya once more had to “extinguish” the Chōḷa (ibid. 1. 21). Whether this refers to the Eastern Chāluṣyas, as holders of the Chōḷa crown, or to an attempt on the part of the real Chōḷas to reassert themselves, is not apparent. But we may note that this event

39 See, e.g., Sewell’s List of Antiquities, Madras, Vol. I. p. 25 ff. — The fact of the existence of the inscriptions seems certain. But what historical deductions may be drawn from them, is not clear, because the dates appear, in many instances, to be so capricious; thus Nos. 10, 100, and 155, which connect the fiftieth and forty-fifth years of the era with Śaka-Saṃvat 1053 and 1045, are approximately correct; but it seems inexplicable how, in Nos. 34, 35, 94, and 157, the ninth year is connected with Ś.-S. 1067, the fifth year with Ś.-S. 1043, and the seventh year with Ś.-S. 1054 and 1655.

40 loc. cit. p. 331, l. 16, 10, from the bottom. — Kōdāl-Saṅgama is the junction of the Krishña with the Tuṅgabhadra (p. 540, l. 7). — Mr. V. K. Pillai has referred this event, first to Kulōṭṭunga-Chāluṣya I. (p. 338, l. 4 f.), and secondly to his maternal grandfather Gāṅgukonja-Rājendrā-Chōḷa (p. 339, l. 31 ff.). But I think that the translation (p. 331, l. 10 f. from the bottom) plainly refers it to the last real Chōḷa king, the immediate predecessor of Kulōṭṭunga-Chāluṣya I. — The Tuṅgabhadra seems to have formed part of the southern frontier of the Western Chāluṣya kingdom, separating it there from the Chōḷa territory (aite, Vol. V. p. 326, notes l, l’).

41 It is unfortunate that the poem gives no indication as to the names of the Chōḷa father-in-law and brother-in-law of Vikramāditya VI. But it is plain that they were real Chōḷas; and also that they were the last two kings of that dynasty. For an identification of them which cannot be upheld, see the next note. My own impression is that they were respectively Rājendrā-Chōḷa (the father-in-law of Rājärāja I.) and Rājendrādeva (the father-in-law of Kulōṭṭunga-Chāluṣya I.). But, pending further elucidation of the Chōḷa history, it is useless to make any pretence to certainty on this point. — Among the wives of Vikramāditya VI., one was Sālaladhī, who is described as being born in the Solar Race (Sir Walter Elliot’s Karnātaka-Dēśa Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 277). This is suggestive of a Chōḷa intermarriage. But her father is mentioned as the Mahānāpā-śvara Jōgamasa; and her mother was Tālīdēvi (id. p. 449).
is placed just before the entrance of Vikramāditya VI. into his capital of Kālīmā (ibid. l. 21). Subsequently to this, the Chōlas were attacked only once more: after a long time of peace, they again became proud and insolent; Vikramāditya's army marched on Kālīmā, and took the city; and Vikramāditya amused himself there for some time, before returning to his capital (p. 323 b, l. 6 ff. from the bottom). Here the expression "the Chōlas" seems to denote really "the Eastern Chālukyas."

Such is the story given in the poem. Doubtless, in its general outlines it is correct. But the inscriptions show that it requires adjustment in several points, in order to bring it into accordance with the historical sequence of facts. And most notably is this the case in connection with Rājīga, who, fortunately, is a person of very definite identity. The poem stamps him unmistakably as an Eastern Chālukya, by calling him "the lord of Vēṅgi." It also shows that he was the Eastern Chālukya who first seized the Chōla sovereignty. This, we know, was done by Kulottungaga-Chōdadēva I. And the name by which he is mentioned in the poem is easily accounted for; because we know that he received the name of Kulottungaga only when he was anointed in the Chōla sovereignty, — of course, after his seizure of it; consequently, at the time when he came in conflict with Vikramāditya VI., he was only known as Rājendra-Chōda, of the first part of which name Rājīga is plainly a more familiar form.42 Here, however, we are brought face to face with a very marked anachronism in the account given in the poem. We know (see page 277 above) that Kulottungaga-Chōdadēva I. annexed the Chōla empire in A. D. 1063. In the poem, on the other hand, this event is placed, not only after the death of Sēmēvara I., for whom we have dates ranging up to A. D. 1068-69, but some considerable time after that occurrence, and apparently only just before the time when Vikramāditya VI. had himself proclaimed ruler of the Dēkkha. Here there must be an error of at least five years, and probably of much more.43 The fact, however, remains clear, from the poem, that Kulottungaga-Chōdadēva I. was enabled to seize the Chōla crown through internal disturbances in the Chōla kingdom, which culminated in the death of the last Chōla king.

28. — Vikrama-Chōda.

Fifteen years; A. D. 1112 to 1127.

He was the eldest son, and the successor, of No. 28, Kulottungaga-Chōdadēva I. X. states that he reigned for fifteen years. The Gōdāvāri grant and the Pittāpuram inscription, which have been noticed above in connection with Bēta-Vījāyāditya V., seem to imply that, like two at least of his brothers, he held at some time the office of viceroy of Vēṅgi; for they state that he went to govern the Chōla mandala, leaving Vēṅgi without a ruler or king of its own. If this was really the case, his term of office as viceroy must doubtless be placed after the latest date that can be obtained for Vira-Chōdadēva. The point, however, requires further investigation.

42 We may compare 'Gōjīga' as a more familiar form of 'Gōrinda' (ante, Vol. XII. p. 249). — Dr. Bühler (ante, Vol. V. p. 321, note 1, identified Rājīga with Rājārāja II., son of Kulottungaga-Chōdadēva I.; and, from that identification, he deduced that the brother-in-law of Vikramāditya VI. was a brother of Rājārāja II., and that his father-in-law was Kulottungaga-Chōdadēva I. himself. But the grounds for this, quoted by Dr. Bühler from Sir Walter Elliot, are simply altogether wrong.

43 It is not apparent, from the poem, when the patṭabandha or coronation of Vikramāditya VI. took place; whether at the time when he first had himself proclaimed ruler of the Dēkkha; or at the later time when, after once more extinguishing the Chōla, he entered his capital of Kālīmā. I should be inclined to connect the patṭabandha with the entrance into Kālīmā, which would then be referable to A. D. 1067 or 1076 (see page 276 above, note 33). — Dr. Bühler has said (ante, Vol. V. p. 321, note 8) that, according to the inscriptions, the battle with Rājīga and Sēmēvara II. took place in A. D. 1076. This would make a discrepancy of thirteen years. But this date can only have been deduced from the assumption that the patṭabandha took place at the time of the proclamation as ruler of the Dēkkha. And, as a matter of fact, the passage in Sir Walter Elliot's writings, referred to by Dr. Bühler, does not mention the battle at all; simply because there is, as far as I can ascertain, no mention of it in any of the Western Chālukya inscriptions.
Genealogy of the Eastern Chalukya Dynasty.

1; Kubja-Vishnuvardhana I.
(18 years; A.D. 615 to 633)

2; Jayasimha I.
(30 years; A.D. 633 to 663)

3; Indra-Bhatjandra.
(7 days; A.D. 663)

4; Vishnuvardhana II.
(9 years; A.D. 663 to 672)

5; Manjri-Yuvraj.
(25 years; A.D. 672 to 696)

6; Jayasimha II.
(13 years; A.D. 696 to 709)

8; Vishnuvardhana III.
(37 years; A.D. 709 to 746)

7; Kokkili.
(6 months; A.D. 709)

9; Bhatjandra-Vijayaditya I.
(18 years; A.D. 746 to 764)

10; Vishnuvardhana IV.
(36 years; A.D. 764 to 799)

11; Narendra-Bhandari-Vijayaditya II.
(44 years; A.D. 799 to 843)

12; Kali-Vishnuvardhana V.
(19 months; A.D. 843 to 844)

13; Gunaka-Vijayaditya III.
(44 years; A.D. 844 to 888)

14; Chalukya-Bhima I.
(30 years; A.D. 888 to 918)

15; Kollabargha-Vijayaditya IV.
(6 months; A.D. 918)

19; Vikramaditya II.
(11 months; A.D. 925 to 936)

21; Yuddhavallana II.
(7 years; A.D. 927 to 934)

16; Amma I, Vishnuvardhana VI.,
Raja-Mahendra.
(7 years; A.D. 918 to 925)

22; Chalukya-Bhima II., Vishnuvardhana VII.
Gajja-Mahendra;
married to Madamba.
(12 years; A.D. 935 to 947)

17; Betsa-Vijayaditya V.
(15 days; A.D. 925)

18; Bhima III.
(3 months; A.D. 926 to 927)

24; Dantavara.
(3 years; A.D. 970 to 973)

23; Amma II, Vijayaditya VI.,
Baja-Mahendra.
(25 years; A.D. 945 to 974)

30; Kulottunga-Chodadeva II.
Malla-Vishnuvardhana.
(A.D. 1127 ff.)

19; Satyavarya.
m. to Gaugama-Gauri (?)

After an interval of 30 years:

26; Vimaladitya.
(12 years; A.D. 1005 to 1017)

25; Saktivarma.
m. to Kuntavamahadevi.
(7 years; A.D. 1015 to 1022)

27; Rajara I., Vishnuvardhana VIII.
m. to Amma-gaddevi.
(41 years; A.D. 1022 to 1063)

28; Raja-Indra-Choda, Kulottunga-Chodadeva I.,
m. to Madhura-saktidevi.
(40 years; A.D. 1063 to 1112)

29; Vikrama-Choda.
Mallapadeva, m. to Chandadeva.
(A.D. 1112 to 1127)

Raja-ra II., Vira-Chodadeva.
Vishnuvardhana IX.;
viceroy of Veergi.
(1 year; A.D. 1077 to 1078.)

Four other: Rajasundari,
Kalinganagara.

(A.D. 1073 and 1100.)
Rājarāja II.;
vicecy of Veṅgi.
A.D. 1077-78.

He was the second son of No. 28, Kulaṭṭunga-Chōḍadēva I. From W. we learn that, after the death of Vijaykīrtīya VII, his father appointed him as viceroy of Veṅgi. But the appointment was unwelcome to him; and he held the office for only one year,—A.D. 1077-78; then, being homesick, he threw it up and returned to his parents.

Vira-Chōḍadēva; Vishnuvardhana IX.;
vicecy of Veṅgi.
A.D. 1078 and 1100.

He was the third son of No. 28, Kulaṭṭunga-Chōḍadēva I. In addition to his proper name, which appears both as Vīra-Chōḍa and as Vira-Chōḍadēva, he had the second name of Vishnuvardhana IX., and the epithet of sarvalokākāśaya, 'refuge of all mankind.' In both his grants he uses the paramount titles, Mahārajaikara, Raja-Paramēsvara, and Paramabhattachāraka. And W. describes him as a paramanāhāvīvara, or 'most devout worshipper of the god Mahēśvara.' The seal of his grant bears the motto of tri-Tribhuvanākusa. After the return of his brother Rājarāja II., he was appointed viceroy of Veṅgi; but, like his elder brother, he was not very willing to take the appointment, and only accepted it after some persuasion. The date of his installation is given in W.; the details are, Saka-Saṅvat 1001, when the sun was in Sinhu, i.e. in the solar month Bhādrapada, the thirteenth tiṣṭha of the bright fortnight, Guruvarā or Thursday, when the moon was in the Sravana nakṣattra, and during the rising of the sign Vrīchika; and, the given Saka year having to be applied in this case as a current year, and the tiṣṭha as a current tiṣṭha used with the week-day on which it began, the corresponding English date is Thursday, 23rd August, A.D. 1078 (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 426). The duration of his term of office is not yet known; but we have a grant dated in his twentieth year, i.e. in or about A.D. 1100. We learn from his grants, that his seat of government was at the city of Jananāthanagari, in the Veṅgi country; this place has not yet been identified.

Of his time we have one record at present available:—

W.—A grant from Chollārī in the Gōdāvarī District; first edited by Dr. Hultsch in his South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 49, No. 39, and subsequently, but from a prior reading of the original plates, by myself, ante, Vol. XIX. p. 423. This grant gives again the complete Eastern Chalukya genealogy, mythical, legendary, and historical, which has already been noticed in connection with Rājarāja I. (page 274 f. above). The historical portion commences with Kuba-Vishnuvardhana I., as the brother of Satyārāya, 'the lord of favourites;' and this passage gives the name of the family as Chalukya. The charter was issued by Vira-Chōḍadēva himself. It is addressed to the inhabitants of the Gudda-vādi vishaya (see page 97 above, note 13); and it records the grant of a village named Koḷeru, by Vira-Chōḍadēva himself, to a temple of Vishnu which his Sūraya or General, a Vaiṣṇava Brahman named Mōdāmārya and otherwise called Gunaratnamabhāsha, had built at the Chollārī agrahāra. The Dātīkas were the five Pradhānas or Ministers. The composer of the charter was Viddaya-bhūta; and the writer was Pennōchārī. The grant is dated in the twenty-first year of the reign, i.e. of the government of Vira-Chōḍadēva; it should, therefore, be placed in A.D. 1098; but no details are given by which the exact English date can be determined. The Chollārī agrahāra is of

44 With this we may compare the fact that in an inscription at Dēdār, dated in A.D. 1066 (Sir Walter Elliot's Karnāṭaka-Dēla Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 173, the Western Chalukya Jayasimha IV., while governing at Tardavādi in the time of his father the Mahārājaikara, Paramēsvara, and Paramabhattachāraka, Sūraya I., himself uses the titles of Mahārājaikara, and Paramēsvara.

45 Dr. Hultsch kindly placed the grant of his twenty-third year at my disposal, for editing. But I have not had leisure to deal with it fully.
course, the modern village of Chellur itself, — the 'Chelloor' of the map, Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 94, in Lat. 16° 49', Long. 82° 3'. And Kolluru appears to be the 'Kaliroro' of the map, two miles south-west of Chellur; there is some room for doubt as to the exact vowel in the first syllable of the name that is given in the record.

30. — Kölöttünga-Chōḍadēva II.

Date of Accession in A.D. 1127.

He was the son and successor of No. 29, Vikrama-Chōḍa; and, as far as our information goes at present, he was the last of the dynasty. His name is given both as Kölöttuṅga-Chōḍadēva (X. line 21), and as simply Chōḍadēva (id. line 47). The seal of the grant of his time bears the motto of ṛṣṭi-Tribhuvanānūkṣaṇa.

Of this reign we have one record: —

X. — Another grant from Chellur in the Gaddavari District; edited by me, with a lithograph, ante, Vol. XIV. p. 55. — It opens with a verse in praise of the god Vishnu under the name of Mukunda; followed by another in lamentation of the Sōmanūṣa or Lunar Race (see page 274 above). It then gives the historical Eastern Chalukya genealogy, commencing with Kuba-Vishnuparvadhana I., the brother of Satyākṣara, 'the lord of favourites,' this passage gives the name of the family as Chalukya. The formal wording of a charter is not used in this record. It states how the Dandhākñandha Kaja, otherwise called Kolani-Kāṭamanṣyakya, an officer of Kölöttuṅga-Chōḍadēva II., bestowed the Manḍadorgu agrahāra, together with the village of Ponduvagrama, in the Savantilī dēsa, upon a number of Brāhmaṇa. The writer was Pallāchārya (?). The record is dated in Saka-Saṅvat 1056 expired, on a tilhī on which an equinox occurred while the moon was in the Ardra nakṣatra; but the details do not work out correctly for that year, and they seem to indicate that the year really intended is Saka-Saṅvat 1055 current, with a date corresponding to the 23rd March A.D. 1132 (see page 191 above).

TIRUNELLI COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF BHASKARA-RAVIVARMA.

BY E. HULTZESCH, PH.D.; BANGALORE.

For the loan of the original plates which contain the subjoined inscription, I am indebted to Mr. A. E. Castlereagh Stuart, M. C. S., who received them from their present owner, Colonel Wooldridge, of Manantoddy. After I had transcribed the text, Mr. Fleet kindly placed at my disposal a transcript, with a translation and short notes, which he received in 1885 from Dr. Gundert, and which had remained unpublished because Dr. Gundert considered it capable of improvement. As was to be expected, both the transcript and translation of Dr. Gundert proved of the greatest help. Wherever I have had to differ from him, it has been done only after careful consideration of his readings and renderings.

The plates belonged originally to the Tirunelli temple in the Vayanadu (Wynad) taluk of the Malabar district. The Tirunelli temple, eight miles north of Manantavadi (Manantoddy), is dedicated to Perumal (Vishnu). It is placed on a branch of the Kaveri river at the foot of the Bramagiri plateau in Wynad; the people of North Malabar used to resort to it for the performance of ārddha-ceremonies, until by the opening of the railway it became easier for them to visit Perū on the Neyelli river in Coimbatore for this purpose. "The temple is locally believed to have been dedicated by Brhma himself to the worship of Vishnu, whose image had appeared to him there on a nelli tree. Its walls are built of granite, and its roof is

46 With this concluding paper I give a genealogy of the family. Owing to the smaller space available, I have not been able to include quite all the details given by Dr. Hultzsch (South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 32); but I think that nothing of any leading importance has been excluded.
1 Mr. B. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Vol. I. p. 34.
2 Ibid. p. 217.
thatched. The present structure is merely the remains of a former building which was partially destroyed by fire during the invasions of Tūpū Sultan. Pilgrimages to it are considered by the Malayāliṣ to be as efficacious as similar expeditions to the holy city of Banaras. Malayāliṣ who cannot afford the time or money for longer journeys, go thither to perform the irāddha-ceremonies and commit the ashes of their fathers to the stream which, as it eventually flows into the Kāvēri, is one of the sacred streams. The name Tīrūnelli is a compound of tiru, 'sacred,' and nelli, 'the embllic myrobalan tree (Phyllanthus emblica, L.).' The Sanskrit name of the temple is Amlakam' or SahyAmlak, from āmalaika or ṛmauāka, 'the embllic myrobalan tree,' and Sahya, 'the Western Ghās.' According to Mr. Castlesrau Stuart, it is also called the Siddha temple.

The Tīrūnelli inscription occupies two thin copper-plates, which are strung on a plain ring. It is written in that ancient Tamil character, the modern Malayālam name of which is, according to Dr. Burnell, 'Vaṭṭelutu' or 'round hand,' and which, from the documents in which it is employed, might be termed the Chēra-Paṇḍya alphabet. A few Sanskrit words (evasti ेर, line 1, and sabhad[k], lines 33 f. and 37) are, however, in the Grantha character. This co-existence of the Grantha and the Chēra-Paṇḍya alphabets is also noticeable in the previously published ancient deeds from Malabar and in two Paṇḍya copper-plate inscriptions which Mr. V. Venkayya is about to publish in the pages of this Journal. The language is Tamil. But, as in Malayālam, the double nasal appears in the words śaika (line 2), śaṅkara (line 5), vana (line 7), tāñṭi (line 14), śāri and atri for śārya and ātri (line 16), kalī (line 19), and aṁkara for aṁkara (line 26). These peculiarities suggest that, like the deeds from Cochin and Koṭayam, the inscription must belong to a period during which Malayālam had not yet branched off from Tamil, but was just beginning to develop a few distinguishing characteristics.

The contents of the Tīrūnelli plates are as obscure and difficult as those of the previously published ancient copper-plates from the Western Coast; and the translation which I am able to offer, is merely tentative. Of the concluding portion (from the middle of line 30 to the end) even the transcript must not be considered as final. The characters of this passage, which seems to be a later postscript, are smaller, more developed and less carefully executed than those in the preceding part. In particular, lines 31 to 33 are altogether unintelligible. But so much is certain, that the plates contain an order which regulated the income of the Tīrūnelli temple and which was issued by Sāṅkara-Kōḍavarman of Purāgiriānādu, — the division of Palakkādu (Pālghāt), — who must have been a vassal of the king, Bhāskara-Ravivarman, with whose name the document opens. The date of the order was the forty-sixth year (aṅgu) opposite to the current year (aṅgu) of His Majesty king Bhāskara-Ravivarana, — the month of Makara (of that year) during which Jupiter was standing in Siṁha, (and which was identical with) the above year (aṅgu). This date cannot be considered without a reference to the three ancient deeds from Malabar, which were so ably interpreted by Dr. Gundert. These are:

— Abstract from an official report, kindly communicated by Mr. Castlesrau Stuart.

9 Yule and Burnell’s Hobson-Jobson, s. v. Myrobalan.
7 Some of these changes are registered in Dr. Gundert’s Malayālam Grammar, 2nd edition, p. 11.
10 Dr. Caldwell (Comparative Grammar, 2nd edition, p. 90 of the Introduction) remarks with reference to these deeds: — ‘Though words and forms which are peculiar to Malayālam may be detected in them, the general style of the language in which they are written is Tamil, the inflexions of the nouns and verbs are Tamil, and the idiom is mostly Tamil; and we are, therefore, led to infer that, at that period, Tamil was the language at least of the court and of the educated classes in the Malayālam country, and that, what is now called Malayālam, if it then existed at all, was probably nothing more than a patois current amongst the inhabitants of the hills and jungles in the interior.’
11 See note 39 on the translation.
No. I. an inscription on two copper-plates in the possession of the Jews at Cochin; No. II., an inscription on a single copper-plate in possession of the Syrian Christians at Koṭṭayam; No. III., an inscription on five copper-plates in possession of the same. I subjoin transcripts and translations of the opening sentences of these three documents:

**No. I.**

**TEXT.**

1 Svasti śri śri Kōgōnmai koḍan kō śri-Pārkaran
2 Iravivānmar tīruvaḍi pala-nūrāyira.
3 tt-āṇḍum ṣengōl nāṭṭāiy-āḷā-niṅga yāṅ-
4 ḍu iruṇḍam-āṇḍaiṅk-edir muppatt-āṇām-āṇḍu.

**TRANSLATION.**

Hail! Prosperity! In the time (yāṇḍu) during which he who had assumed the title of king of kings (kōgōn), His Majesty (tiṟuvaḍi) the king (kō), the illustrious Bhāsakara-Ravivarman, who wielded the sceptre in many hundred-thousands of places (āṇḍu), was reigning,— in the thirty-sixth year (āṇḍu) opposite to the second year (āṇḍu).

**No. II.**

**TEXT.**

1 Huri [ū*] Sri-Mahāgaṇapati[ay*]ē namāḥ [ū*] Sri-Bhūpālanarapati śri-Vira
2 Kōrāla-
3 sakrava[r*]ēti ṣidāyāyi muru-muraivyē pala-nūrāyiratt-āṇḍu
4 ṣengōl nāṭṭāiy-āḷā-niṅga śri-Vira-Rāghava-sakravarttikku tiṟuvarā-
5 yaṁ chellāy-āḷā Maṇgattuṟū Valīḷal Muṇa-hāyaru irubatt-oṅṟu
6 ēnu Sāṅī Rōhaqī-nil.

**TRANSLATION.**

Hari! Adoration to the blessed great Gaṇapati! On the day of (the nakshatra) Rōhiḷ, Saturday, the twenty-first of the month of Mīna (of the year in which) Jupiter (was) in Makara, (within the time) during which the sacred rule of the illustrious Vira-Rāghava-chakravartin — who wielded the sceptre in many hundred-thousands of places (āṇḍu) in regular succession from the illustrious king of kings (bhūpāla-narapati), the illustrious Vira-Kōrāla-chakravartin, — was current.

**No. III.**

**TEXT.**

1 Svasti [ū*] Kō-Tīṭu[r]* Iravikkutta pala-nūrāyiratt-āṇḍumma-ṅṟu talai=
2 chchirand-naḍī-ppaṭutt-āḷā-niṅga yāṁ-ūcchellā-ṅṛga yā-
3 ṣad-āṇdu iruvāṇḍa.

**TRANSLATION.**

Hail! In the fifth year (yāṇḍu) which was current within the time (yāṇḍu) during which king (kō) Śṭhānu-Rāvivgupta who, gloriously trod under his feet the heads of tigers, was reigning in many hundred-thousands of places (āṇḍu), — in this year (āṇḍu).

---

13 A translation of this inscription by Mr. Ellis was published after his death, ibid. Vol. XIII. Part II. pp. 1 ff. Dr. Burnell’s translation (ante, Vol. XIII. p. 333 f.) is based on both Dr. Gundert’s and Mr. Ellis’ versions, which are independent of each other.
14 From the photograph, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 334, and Dr. Burnell’s South India Paleography, 2nd edition. Plate xxxii.
15 From Dr. Gundert’s Tamil transcript, Madras Journal, Vol. XIII. Part I. p. 117.
16 From Sir Walter Elliot’s tracings, ibid. Plate iv.
17 The vowel ū, which is not visible in the tracing, is taken from Dr. Gundert’s transcript.
A comparison of the commencement of the deed No. I. with that of the Tirunelli deed shows that the name of the king whose reign each of them was issued, is the same in both inscriptions. The close agreement of the alphabet employed in both makes it very probable that they have to be referred to one and the same reign, and not to two different kings of the same name. Taking this point for granted, we must turn our attention to the curiously worded dates. That of the Tirunelli deed is “the forty-sixth ḍaḍu opposite to the current ṣaḍu” of the king, and that of No. I. “the thirty-sixth ḍaḍu, opposite to the second ḍaḍu.” Various attempts have already been made to explain the meaning of the two different ḍaḍus and of the term ‘opposite’ (edir) in No. I. The word ḍaḍu or ṣaḍu signifies 1, ‘a place’; 2, ‘time’; and 3, ‘a year.’ Through a play which is undoubtedly intentional, it has the first meaning in the compound pala-nūrgyiratt-āṇḍum in Nos. I., II. and III., and the second meaning in No. I. (āḷā-ṇinga ṣaḍu) and No. III. (āḷā-ṇinga ṣaḍu). The words tirandām-āṇḍaikk-edir muppatt-āṇḍam-āṇḍu in No. I. were transliterated by Mr. Whish “the thirty-sixth year of the second cycle (of Parāśāra) = 139 B.C., and by Sir Walter Elliot “the thirty-sixth year opposed to or in contradistinction to the second which would be the third cycle (of Parāśāra) = 861 A.D.” Dr. Burnell suggested that the first ḍaḍu might refer to the year of the reign, and the second to that of the king’s age, while Dr. Caldwell took the second ḍaḍu for the year of the reign and the first for the year of the sixty-year cycle of Brihaspati. To all these theories the dates of certain Pāṇḍya inscriptions prove fatal, and they might have been done away with before if anybody had taken the trouble to closely examine the Tiruppuppanam grant of Kulaśekharadēva, a facsimile of the first five plates of which appeared in this Journal in 1877. This grant contains no less than five dates:

A. Plate i. a, lines 13 to 15.

Sṛkṣu-kō-Chacaṭaivarmanmaṇḍya Tribhuvanachchakravarttikā sṛkṣu-Kulaśekharadēvaṇaḥ ṣaḍu 13vadu nāl nālāyirattu-ṣannuṭṭar-ṣurubadigai.

“The four-thousand-three-hundred-and-sixtieth day of the 13th year of the illustrious king (kō) Jaṭavarmman, alias the emperor of the three worlds, the illustrious Kulaśekharadēva.”

B. Plate i. a, lines 3 to 5.

Svasti Sṛkṣu-Sundarāsēd-avagata-samaya-svabhidbhiṣṭavayasya 
gravasay-ābhoga[k-āptim prati sapadi nijē vatsarē paśchavimeś [18] 
chaṭāṃsav-Aṭṭa-Chāpē Kanaśakati-tithan kṛishṇa-pakṣa-Arkī-vāra- 
Svāt-yōga karēṇa muniyatāvādān-Rājakambhīrdāvaṇa 11

“Hail! In his twenty-fifth year, while the Sun was in Chāpa, on the lunar day of Kanakapati, in the dark fortnight, on Saturday, at the Svāt-yōga, — Rājakambhīrdāva instantly ordered an elephant to let loose, in order to fix the extent of the village, which received his name in accordance with an injunction emanating from the god Sundarēsa.”

C. Plate v. b, line 2 f.

Padhin-mugravadin-edir parrindam-āṇḍu Dhanu-nāyantu nālān-ṣiyadiyam 22 apara- 
pakshattu ekādatiṣiyam Sanikkalamayum peṭa Śōdi-nāl.

“The day of (the nakṣattra) Svāt which corresponded to Saturday, the eleventh lunar day of the second fortnight, and the fourth solar day of the month of Dhanus in the twelfth year opposite to the thirteenth.”

D. Plate i. b, line 3 f.

Padhin-mugravadin-edir padin-onrām-āṇḍu. 

“The eleventh year opposite to the thirteenth.”

21 ante, Vol. VI. p. 142.
22 i.e. Viṣṇu, the lord of Lakṣamā, to whom the eleventh tithi is held sacred.
23 Read t'diyum.
The real date of the grant is the first of the five (A.). In his treatment of the Tiruppüvaqm grant, Mr. S. M. Natōra Sātrī had got so far as to recognize that the thirteenth year of this date must be taken as a year of the king’s reign, as, dividing 4360 by 360 according to the usual rough calculation, the 4360th day is found to be the 40th day after the expiration of the twelfth year. The remaining four dates, which are incidentally referred to in the grant, were all anterior to the real date (A.). Three of them (C., D., E.) are the 12th, 11th and 10th åndu opposite to the 13th, and two other inscriptions of Kulaśēkharadēva are dated in the 10th opposite to the 13th year (yandu 13vadin=dir 10vadu), and the 8th opposite to the 13th year (yandu 13vadin=dir 8vadu). Among these five dates, the first (C.) gives the day on which an elephant was let loose, in order to mark the boundary of the village of Rāja-gambhāra-chaturvēdīmaṅgalam, which Kulaśēkharadēva intended to bestow. Fortunately, this day is not only specified in Tamīj in date C, but every detail of it is repeated in Sanskrit in date B, with the only difference that here the year is the twenty-fifth of Rāja-gambhiradēva, while in C. it is the twelfth year opposite to the thirteenth of Kulaśēkharadēva. The natural conclusion is that Rāja-gambhāra, after whom the granted village was called, must be taken as a biruda of Kulaśēkharadēva, and that the twelfth year opposite to the thirteenth in C. is identical with the twenty-fifth in B. As 13 + 12 is 25, it further follows that, in those dates, where two different years are recorded, the word edir, “opposite,” has to be translated by “after,” and that the different years which occupy the second place (the 8th, 10th, 11th and 12th) are the years of the reign of Kulaśēkharadēva. The first-mentioned (thirteenth) year might be at first sight referred to his age at the time of his accession to the throne. As, however, the first figure is rather low, viz. 13 in the present case and only 2 in the Cochin deed, it will be necessary to connect it with some event subsequent to the birth. This was most probably the date of the appointment as heir-apparent (yauvārāja). The 25th year in date B. would accordingly be the year of the king’s yauvārāja in the 12th year of his reign. In date A. we have the year of his reign without any reference to his yauvārāja.

Having thus determined the meaning of the double åndu, we find that the Tirunelli deed is dated in the forty-sixth year after the year which was current (at the coronation) of Bhāskara-Raṅgvarman, and the Cochin Jēva’s deed in the thirty-sixth year of the coronation, which took place) after the second year (of the yauvārāja) of the same king. Dr. Burnell has attempted to fix the date of the Cochin deed and of the two Koṭṭayam deeds in the following manner: — Dr. Haug had assigned No. III. to the early part of the ninth century A.D. on palaeographical grounds. No. III. presupposes Nos. I. and II., as it mentions the Jewish and Christian principalities of Aṇṭjuvaṁgam and Maṇigrāmam, which had been established by Nos. I. and II. Accordingly Dr. Burnell assigned these two deeds to the eighth century A.D. Further, he placed No. II. in A.D. 774 as the only year in which the astronomical details of the date are possible. Though this statement rests on the authority of the ablest native astronomer of Southern India, it will perhaps be unsafe to accept it before the calculation has been verified by a competent scholar, whose consideration I would also recommend the double (Tamīj and Sanskrit) date of the Tiruppüvaqm grant.

24 Compare Hultzsch’s South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. II. p. 75, note 5, and page 76, note 1.
26 Compare Hultzsch’s South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. II. p. 75, note 5, and page 76, note 1.
27 Dr. Burgess’ Arch. Survey of S. India, Vol. IV. p. 30, note 4. Mr. Natōra misreads arushadi as arushadi, which he further seems to have mistaken for arubattu-wili, as he translates it by 64.
28 Ibid. pp. 10, 11, 12.
29 Ibid. pp. 16 and 17.
30 A further double year is contained in an inscription of the Kērāla king Bāna, which is dated in the fourth opposite to the fourth year. See Dr. Gundert’s translation in Mr. Logan’s Malabar, Vol. II. p. ccxxii.
31 See page 207, above.
First Plate; First Side.

1. Svasti śrī [a] Kō Pākkaraṇ-Īravivarman tiruvadikkē chechellā-nīṛṇa
2. yādi-kēdir nałppatt-āram-ājaḍu avvaṅḍu Siṅsattīl Vīyāḷañ-an-
3. ne Magara-śāyirāl Tirunelli-Perumalidaiya śirikāriyam āva-
4. du [a] Tirunelli-kkoḷam udānaḍu Tirunelli-Perumālkkē a-
5. ūṭi-kkoḍuttān Saṅkaraṇ-Kōdavarmanām-aṅga adigā Puraṅgirā-
6. rum [a] niḷālam pāṇiyum kūdiy ążi koḍuttār [a] Puraṅgirā-
7. nāḍu mudugūrā vājumavār vannu ti[ru]* vajñiyā stoludal mūmā-
8. nāḷiṅā āyina niḷiṅā āyiri koḍutā iraiyyppī [k] kkaḍ-
9. var [a] Tirunelli-Perumalidaiya śirikāriyam kuḍā [k] kkaḍaviyavā-
10. gaḷ kūdiy=allādu oruttān ēkkāyikam oru-sūvāmiyōdu kūdi dē-

First Plate; Second Side.

11. vaṅkariyam kekkukum urāḷan niḷiṅu udāiyadu
12. sūvāmi kōḷa=kkaḍavār [a] urāḷaṇam őr-ǒttāri oli devaṅkariyā-
13. m āyirāt-ēṭtu kānām poṇ daṇḍam pada=kkaḍavān [a] i- 
14. ttānattinu tan=nāṭigaḷam yēyigaḷam uppininūm[31]
15. ēluttī kōḷa=kkaḍavār [a] ipperumalidaiya śirikāri-
16. y āraṅṇu āriṅṇu ēluttīcheḷu koḷa=kkaḍavār [a] i-
17. vvūrvaṅgattu urāḷar=āṅga kōyil maṇuḷačheḷer=āṅga sēdu-
18. m[26] āyinum vilakkummaṅvagāl urāḷan vilakkil i-
19. rubattu-nāl=kkaḷaiṅṇu poṇ daṇḍam pada=kkaḍavār [a] kōy-

Second Plate; First Side.

20. l maṇuḷačheḷer vilakkil niḷai=vvagaiyāra kōy-
21. lkku pōṁ [a] āṭṭai=ttisiā koḍattavagāl daṇḍa-ppada=
22. kkaḍavār [a] ippaniṅa śāṅkētam adigā Puraṅg-
23. riṃ niḷālum pāṇiyum mūṛhrām=kkuḍī Tirun-
24. lli mukkālvaṅgatu niṅgru tan=nāṭigaḷu[m]* yō-
25. gigaḷam ūrāḷ kaiyilum āṭi=kkoḍut-
26. tār [a] Puraṅgirānāṭtu Aṁṇṛtvarkkum Aiyā-
27. yirvaṅkkum kī-ľa [a] ichchaṅkētam aḷiṅk-

Second Plate; Second Side.

28. mvaṅgāl Māḷikkalattu kachheṃ [a] i-śirikāriya-
29. m uningrū seyyichōn Malaiyampalli
30. Āriyam=Kuṭṭanā[27] [27] [27] vilakkku nāṭṭā[k]*ku maṅvāiññ
31. naidyaṅdkkule=naiḍyaṅdkkile kulaṃ kuḷattin īṅnagān-
32. da kōl=kkukaj mukkōṅam vaṇṇina va jai karaṇḍam tvagaiy-
33. ēguminiṅna niṅgagāṅa kalattāṟu ōdāṟu Karaiṅnānṭu sa-
34. bha viṭṭa pūmī nūṛru-aṅyembatt-ēl arai kāsu pong-

---

21 From the original plates and Mr. Fleet's impression.
22 This mark of punctuation is now called Piṅkāyṛ-ṝḥ, i.e., 'the curve of Gāpāṇa,' and considered by the Vaishnavas as a representation of the holy monosyllable ōm. The same sign occurs in line 30 of this inscription, and in line 1 of the Cochinn Jews' deed.
23 Read irāi-ppāḍa?
24 Read kāḍā.
25 Read yēyigaḷam uuśīngu.
26 Read dēdam ?
27 Instead of the two vertical lines, the original has a sign which resembles the vīṣāra of the word śrī in line 1. Between the Piṅkāyṛ-ṝḥ (see note 22) and the second mark of punctuation, it has representations of two Vaishnava symbols, the discus and the conch. These symbols are even now represented on the coins of the native states on the Western Coast.
Tirunelli Plates of Bhaskara-Ravivarman.
Hail! Prosperity! In the forty-sixth year after the year which was current (at the coronation) of His Majesty (rírawdl) king (kô) Bhaskara-Ravivarman, — in the month of Makara (of that year) during which Jupiter was standing in Sûhha, (and which was identical with) the above (forty-sixth) year, — the worship (érkârya) of Tirunelli-Perumâl was regulated as follows: — An agreement referring to Tirunelli was given with libations (of water) to Tirunelli-Perumâl by His Highness (adigal) the Puraigîlâr, who called Saûkara-Kôdavarman, and, having joined together, his followers and servants gave (it) with libations (of water). If the ruler of the old branch of Puraigîlânû (Pratâgâma) comes to worship the feet of the god, he shall give and pay as tribute one thousand ūdî of rice (measured) with a measure containing three times four (i.e. twelve) ūdî. If those who are bound to join (in) the worship of Tirunelli-Perumâl, do not join, the whole property of each patron, who damages the worship of the god (érkârya) by singly joining some (other) temple (svâmin), shall be taken by the temple. And if a patron performs the worship of the god without (employing) a priest, he shall pay a fine of one thousand and eight kânam of gold. Those of his relations and connexions, who stand under this temple, shall (also) make payments (to the temple). The worshiping priest (érkârya) of this Perumâl shall cause the payments to be made after having enquired into and ascertained them. Those among the patrons within this town (and among) those belonging to the servants of the palace (kôgil), who destroy (and) obstruct (this agreement), — if a patron obstructs (it), he shall pay a fine of twenty-four kâlâñju of gold; if one belonging to the servants of the palace obstructs (it), the followers and so forth shall go to the palace (and complain). Those who do not give . . . . every year, shall pay a fine. His Highness
the Purāṇigalā, (his) followers and servants, who had all joined together, and those of his relations and connexions, who were under the Tirunellī temple, gave the agreement thus made with libations (of water) into the hands of the patrons. (This agreement) is placed under (the control of) the Five-hundred and the Five-thousand of Purāṇigalāṇu. Those who destroy this agreement, (shall incur the sin of those who commit) a murder at Moḻikkalām. Ārya-Kutṣaṇ of Malaiyamalai, who was engaged in the worship of this (god), caused (this agreement) to be drawn up.

POSTSCRIPT.

The land given for establishing lamps by the assembly (sabha) of the village of Karaināṇu is (a piece of) land which enjoys (i.e. which is valued at) one hundred and fifty-seven and a half kūsu of gold. With the proceeds of this land, the assembly of Karaināṇu shall maintain three perpetual lamps, without failing to supply them with oil at the proper times.

On the right margin of Plate ii. b:—

Tirunellī-Añvaṇ.

MISCELLANEA.

THE MEANINGS OF Vyātipāta.

While discussing certain dates which contain the term vyātipāta, and which do not appear to work out satisfactorily, Mr. Fleet suggested that vyātipāta, in addition to being a name for one of the yogs, may perhaps indicate also other astrological conditions which the writers of the dates in question probably were referring to. The suggestion thus thrown out by Mr. Fleet induces me to draw attention to some passages in Hēmādri's Chaturvarga-chintāmaṇi and Mādhava's commentary on the Parāśara-smṛti, in which the term vyātipāta has been fully explained, and from which it becomes quite clear that vyātipāta does indeed denote several astrological conditions other than the well-known yoga Vyātipāta.

Both writers, in commenting on the verse I. 218 of the Yājnavalkya-dharmādstra, in which the vyātipāta is enumerated among the times prescribed for the performance of a Śrāddha, are agreed that vyātipāta in the first instance is the yoga Vyātipāta (yoga-viśeṣah, or Viskambha-dāśinu yogīsthu saptadakā yagah). But Mādhava adds that vyātipāta may also denote a mahā-vyātipāta, and he quotes two verses which explain this term in two different ways. And Hēmādri similarly cites three verses from different works, one of which adds one more meaning of vyātipāta to the meanings given by Mādhava. The result of the discussions of the two scholars is as follows:—Vyātipāta has three meanings, in addition to denoting the yoga Vyātipāta.

1. According to Yṛiddha-Manu, as quoted by Hēmādri,—

Sravaṇa-avāsī-dhanisāṭh-ārāṇāgadāvata-mastakāni
yad-alpi Ravi-vārṣeṣa vyātipātah as uchayati

To this verse Hēmādri appends the note, that ndga-dāvata = Alāḍhā; that mastaka, 'the head, beginning,' must be construed with each of the preceding words, but that others take it to be equivalent to Mrīgāvīrhah; and that amā = amāvasya, 'the new-moon śīlī.' Mādhava quotes the same verse, but reads mastakāh, and explains the word only by Mrīgāvīrhah. The meaning of the verse accordingly is:

When the new-moon śīlī, at the commencement of (one of the nakshatras) Sravanā, Āsvini,

---

28 See Dr. Gandert's Malayāḷam Dictionnary, s. v. maṇikāvarṣam.
29 The 500 and 3,000 are divisions of the Nāyār or landowners in each principality; higher and lower noblemen.—H. Gundersen. Compare the Six-hundred (Aravīṭāva) in the deed No. III. and in Mr. Logan's Malabar, Vol. II. p. 852. 1.
30 Easakham means to stand for the Sanskrit kātyām, which is another form of kātyām.
31 Compare Māshikākuṇām, one of the villages referred to in the Kṛṣṇipattā; Mr. Logan's Malabar, Vol. I. pp. 222 and 227.
32 Here three lines, which I do not understand, are left untranslated.
33 This colophon may be a synonym of Tirunellī-Porūnāl or the signature of a private person.
34 ante, Vol. XVIII. pp. 128 and 272.
35 Chakara, Parācāśakhalāṭ Sṛddhakalāpa, pp. 241-244; and Parāśarānādha, p. 656.
It is clear that the vyātipāta here described by Hēmādri (together with vaiḍīkītī, with which we have no concern) is the same vyātipāta which in the Sūrya-Siddhānta XI. 2, is defined thus:—

‘When the moon and the sun are upon opposite sides of either solstice, and their minutes of declination are the same, it is vyātipāta, the sum of their longitudes being a half-circle.’

Vyātipāta, then, is here the time at which the sun and the moon, standing in different ayanas, have the same declination (krantī-ānyāma). It would be easy to shew that, were it not for certain attending circumstances, the sum of the longitudes of the sun and the moon at that time would be 180°, and the yōga Harsha (No. 14); but I am not myself sufficiently versed in astronomy to pursue this matter further.* According to Hēmādri, it is possible that in reality the yōga at the time may be any one from the second half of Gaṇḍa (No. 10) up to Vaijra (No. 15); but it can never be the yōga Vyātipāta (No. 17).

If I may venture a remark about the two dates which have induced me to write these lines, I would say that the date given ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 127, may perhaps, to a certain extent, furnish an example for vyātipāta in the first sense here explained, and the date ib. p. 274 an example for vyātipāta used in the third sense. But this I leave Mr. F. Y. to settle.

Göttingen.

F. KIELHORN.

PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP.

No. 24.

Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft for 1889 (Vol. XLI.)

Dr. K. Jacob commences the third part of the volume with a paper on the Caspian-Baltic trade in the middle ages, with special reference to amber.

He is followed by Signor Guidi on East Syrian Bishops and Bishops’ See in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries.

An article of more general interest, continued in the following number, is by Herr K. Himly, on the Eastern or Western origin of certain games. After giving some additional information regarding chess, his former article on which has been already noticed in the Indian Antiquary, vis., that he has at length succeeded in tracing the name chaṭāranga as far east as Cambodiam where it becomes chhaṭārāng, he takes up the question of playing cards. In two 2

---

2 The verse was well-known to Colebrooke; see Misc. Essays, Vol. II. p. 284. It also occurs in the Nirgajasūdana, p. 37.

* It has been fully explained to me by Professor Jacobi.
interesting papers the author materially adds to our knowledge regarding the origin of the latter, and the games played with them. The subject, however, hardly concerns the object of this Journal, beyond the fact that a theory which gives an Indian origin to playing cards is shown to be unfounded. Briefly stated the main result arrived at is to take away the credit of the invention from the French. As far back as 1308 cards were known in Spain as a Moorish game, and playing with them was known as ‘lo foch de naibs.’ The army of Bertrand du Guesclin probably brought them from Spain to France in 1369 or thereabouts. Herr Himly considers that the most probable derivation of the word naibs is from the Arabic nāhib, ‘a robber.’ Other proposed derivations are from adhib, ‘a representative,’ and from nāhit, ‘a prophet.’ It is unnecessary here to trace the further steps, by which the author shows that, most probably, cards had their origin in China, where mention of playing implements resembling them occurs as far back as the year 1072.

Prof. Hermann Jacobi contributes a short article on the Udgata metro, which is found in its oldest form in the Kirdtâryajitsu, and in the Sîndhvadadhâ. An analysis of the verses in these works enables the author to add to Pingala’s rule. He defines the Udgata as a system, in three unequal members, of 14 gañas and one syllable. In each even gana there is an amphibrachy (\(\text{\text{-}}\)), except in 4th and 8th, which have each a procelesmaticus, with a caesura after the first short syllable (\(\text{\text{-}}\)), and in the 10th, which has an anapest, followed by a caesura (\(\text{\text{-}}\)). In the uneven gañas there are anapests (\(\text{\text{-}}\)), except in the 7th, which has a spondee with caesura after the first syllable (\(\text{\text{-}}\)). The last caesura is always marked by the end of a complete word and not by the ending of the first member of a compound, and divides the verse into two nearly equal portions. It is to be noted that the first syllable of the 7th gana which ends the second pada, thus,

1 0 2 3 4 5 6
7 8 9 10
11 12 13 14
15

in the poems already referred to always long.

That is to say, it is long by nature, or ends with a short vowel plus a consonant or visarga, in which case the first word of the third pada must commence with a consonant, or ends

with a simple short vowel, in which case the first word of the third pada must commence with two consonants. In later authors, however, in whose time a living knowledge of the metre was lost, such as Manikha, the author of the Śrīkauhyāchārā, and Parimala, the author of the Śrīvāsaśāchārā, both of whom lived at least five hundred years after Māgha, the last syllable of the second pada is common, as would be expected from the analogy of other metres.

This is followed by a paper by the present writer, entitled selected specimens of the Bihâri Language, which gives the Bhojpuri poem entitled Gît Naikâ Bantîkâ’wâ, together with grammatical introduction, notes, and translation.

Next comes an essay on the Achemenian inscriptions by Dr. W. Bang. It consists of short notes on readings and translations of disputed passages.

The number concludes with two Reviews, one by Prof. Noldeke on Mau’s Researches into the Manichaean Religion, the other by Prof. Ed. Meyer, on Noldeke’s Essays on Persian History.

Part IV. commences with the continuation of Herr K. Himly’s article on playing cards already referred to.

It is followed by Dr. Geiger, who gives us some most valuable Bâlûchi texts with translations. Better still, he promises us a Bâlûchi dictionary at an early date. Three texts illustrate the North Bâlûchi dialect, and are taken from Hîtû Râm’s Bâlûchinâmâ. The fourth text illustrates South Bâlûchi, and is taken from an unpublished MS. in the British Museum. The extracts are valuable alike to the student of Iranian languages, and to the student of folklore, and the author expresses a hope, in which I cordially join, that his essay will encourage local students to dig into the rich, but hitherto unexplored mine of the folklore, fables, songs and historical traditions of the Bâlûchis.

Prof. von Roth follows with a short, but most interesting essay on Indian fire implements. Kâtyâyana’s account of the Mântana-yantrâka is well-known, if not well understood, but he describes a comparatively modern machine, in which metal is employed. The two friction pieces, - arûni, are made of aśvāthâ (ficus religiosa) wood, and are two boards, one cubit, i.e., 24 inches (mûgulas) long, six inches broad, and four inches thick. A special variety of the aśvâthâ is recommended when obtainable. The boards are carefully prepared beforehand and dried. The under (adhar) board is laid on the ground

and hence the first and second padas are really only one pada.
directed towards the north. From the upper (uttarā) a piece eight inches long, and two inches broad is split off. This latter forms the friction-staff (pramanthā). The lower end is cut to a blunt point, and the upper end is made four-cornered to fit the corresponding square hollow of the spindle (chātra). This spindle is made of the hard wood of the Acacia catechu (khadira), twelve inches long, with iron fulers at each end. At the lower end is the square hollow for the friction staff, above is fixed an iron pin (ktaka). It is round or nearly so, and has running round it an oblique groove to receive the driving string (nātra). The latter has three strands and is made of cow-hair and hemp. It is wound three times, from right to left, round the spindle. In the lower friction-piece, a space of four inches is measured off, twelve inches from the head and eight from the foot, in which a furrow (Artha) is cut out; and a smaller cross channel (eśhiṅa) is cut from this towards the east side to form an exit for the fire. Above the machine goes a cross piece (bhillī or oruvillī), which keeps the whole together. It is half as long as the lower board, and probably half as broad. It is also of Acacia wood, and is flat below, and furnished with an iron plate. Above, it is round to allow it to be held easily by the hands. A hollow in the iron plate receives the iron pin of the top of the spindle. When all is ready, the holder of the sacrifice (yajamāna) sits by the apparatus facing the east, by the west side of the lower friction piece, places the cross piece, in the same direction as the lower piece, on the pin, presses it down as hard as he can, and endeavours to keep the whole as steady as possible, while his wife puts the string on the spindle, and commences to drill. The priest (adhavya) subsequently continues the work begun by the wife. The sparks produced are received in a dish filled with dried triturated cowdung, and are blown upon and cherished till the fire can be placed upon the hearth. In the above description, several minor details have been omitted to save space. Note that both the friction boards, the upper as well as the lower, are called araṇī. From the upper is split off the friction staff, which in the machine takes the place of the upper araṇī, which keeps its name only because it provides the wood for the former. Originally the upper araṇī cannot have been a board, and must have been made of hard wood, which was applied to the lower soft wood and worked by hand. This must have been a business requiring a considerable expenditure of labour and strength, and in fact numerous passages in the Vēdas refer to fire as the child of energy: e.g., sahasā yā matītiṣṭāyāt nrihiḥ, “the fire that comes to life, rubbed out with energy by men.” This friction process was naturally only used for producing fire when no other method was available. Usually, no doubt, fire was carefully preserved from day to day, and when it went out, was borrowed from a neighbour. The use of the cowdung cakes in India of the present day, which remain aglow for several hours, need not be described to the reader of the Indian Antiquary.

The burning-glass, and the burning-mirror, appear to have been known in very early times in India. The Nirukta mentions how dried cowdung takes fire when the rays of the sun are thrown upon it by means of a maṇi (i.e., a precious stone or glass) or by means of a metal vessel. In later times the burning-glass is frequently used by poets in similes, but neither it nor the burning-mirror appears to have been in frequent household use.

No mention of flint and steel, or simpler flint against flint, has been noticed by Prof. Roth in his reading: the asmayprastara, of the Sābdakalpadruma, is a modern coined word, and the flint appears to have been unknown. Pyrites were known, being mentioned in the Nīghanṭu under the name of maṇikhiṅa, but apparently not their use as a means for producing fire. At the same time it must have been known in the most ancient times that sparks issued also from stone, for the Vēdas say that fire dwells not only in wood, but also in water and stones (Rī. V. 2, 1, 1; Ath. V. 3, 21, 1: 12, 1, 19).

Another ‘old man eloquent,’ Dr. Roth’s great fellow-worker, Prof. O. Böhtlingk, next contributes four short pithy articles. He first deals with the question, ‘Who is the author of the Hṛitpadāsa?’ Professor Peterson maintains, on the authority of the concluding verse found in three old MSS., that that work was composed (rūpa) by Nārāyaṇa, and blames Lassen and Schlegel for not giving this verse, which is found in the St. Petersburg MS., in their editions. As a matter of fact the St. Petersburg MS. does not contain the word rūpa; but chātra, so the two scholars are freed from the reproach. Dr. Böhtlingk views the verse with great suspicion; it is added in a very awkward way, being introduced with the words anyachchāstu. It is awkward, in this position, immediately after a benediction commencing with tāthādayaparam- tādamastu, to put this verse into the mouth of Vīhaṇsārman, and if it is meant for an addition by Nārāyaṇa, or some one else, then the anyachchāstu is not required. He prefers, as the three MSS., which have the verse, all agree closely
with each other, and at the same time widely differ from the other codices, to consider Nárāyaṇa not as the author of the work, but as the arranger of a certain recension; just as Sivaśaivāraṇḍī vētālapaśaśaivāniśaṭiki, means the Vētālapaśaśaivāniśaṭiki, in the recension of Sivaśaiva. In conclusion he considers that we have still to seek for the name of the author of the Hitopadēśa.

The next article is a critical one dealing with alleged irregularities in the language of the Grihyastra of Hiranyakṣiśī. The paper deals with details, and cannot be reproduced here. The main conclusion arrived at is that most of the alleged irregularities are non-existent.

In explaining the puzzling śakah kehara pra-tyaśakham jagāra, of Rig-Veda 10, 28, 9, Prof. Pischel, in his Vediche Studien, quotes the following verse of the Mahābhārata (Ed. Bomb. 2, 68, 8):

Ajo hi sāstramagaliṭkičiśā
gatā prāpam śāśana bhūman 1
naṃ pranātena kṣiṣhaśya gharām
dvadviśar mā kṛṭhām Pāṇḍuputraḥ.

This passage is almost as puzzling as the Vedic one. Nilaṅkhaṇa in his commentary interprets it with two kathās, and Dr. Pischel, closely following his explanation, translates it as follows:—
A goat, they say, swallowed a knife, and as the knife stuck (crossways) in his throat, he cast it (asya), gerund of yas, on the ground with his head, and (thus experienced) a terrible cutting of the throat. Make thou not thus enmity with the sons of Pāṇḍu.

Dr. Böhltingk in his third paper combatsthis translation, preferring to take asya as the pronominal genitive, and disputing the meaning given to vipanā. He paraphrases the passage as follows:—'A goat attempted to swallow a knife by the pointed end. The knife stuck in his throat, as the broad handle prevented his swallowing it; moreover it was so firmly stuck in his throat that he could not get it out. In order to free himself he butted with his head against the ground, whereby the knife was disabled (vipanā), i. e. broken. Then all that remained for the goat to do was to swallow the blade, and thereby to cut his throat.' Besides the above, in the first kathā, Dr. Böhltingk proposes to correct the phrase tatataśādakṣarṇaṇhānu māa, to tataśādakṣarṇaṇhānu māa, to stātraīn.

The fourth paper is on a peculiar attraction of gender in Sanskrit. The attracting words are general terms for literary works of various kinds or their divisions, also for certain ideas of class; while the attracted word is the name of a specified work or of the division, or for certain components of the class. Thus, names of works, smrīchhakata-nāma prakaraṇam, abhijñānasaṅkuntalānāma nāṭakam, lit. toangaśvam (sc. kavyam). A feminine in it does not appear to suffer attraction, e.g., vikramaśāni-nāma ṛṭakam. Names of acts, madanāhāreśvarakā (dvandva) nāma chaturthi 'nāka, ṭakuntalapraśastha (but v. l. -prasthaa), nāma pāñchama 'nāka. Titles of chapters in the Rāgahavanā and Kambūrambhāva, vasiṣṭhāhramagamanī nāma prathamakā sargah, upadradnā nāma ṣhāṅkhaḥ sargah. This attraction does not seem to occur in the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, or the Purāṇa. Thus in the second book of the Mahābhārata (G 1.1.2) we have śakrasabhāvaranī nāma saptamā 'dhvyāh, in the first book of the Rāmāyaṇa brahmaṅgamānamā nāma devītyāḥ sargah. An example of a noun of class occurs in the Pāli dakkhamiṅghānaḥ ariya-saṅghaṁ.

Dr. Paul Horn follows with a paper on the Pahlavi papyrus, Dr. Franz Presterius with one on the prolongation of certain short final vowels in Arabic, and Dr. Kuhn with a short note on Dr. Hüschmann's article on kinship marriages amongst the ancient Persians, already referred to. None of these are of a character to interest Indian scholars.

Next, Dr. Zubaty gives us an article on the Triṣṭubh and Jagati metres in the Mahābhārata. In this paper the various irregularities in these metres are minutely examined, and compared with the corresponding irregularities occurring in the Rig-Veda as summarised by Prof. Oldenberg.

Prof. Fritz Hommel follows with a paper on the word for 'wine' in South Semitic, with special reference to Glaser's Sabean Inscription No. 12. Next comes a series of short notes on Aryan Philology by Prof. Bartholomae. The first relates to Rig-Veda 3, 33, 106. Taking śćavachā as 1 sg. pres. conj. and pipyānd as a dative singular, he establishes a complete parallelism between the two lines. Pipyānd he identifies as a present participle of pād, to drink, and means 'drinking,' hence 'a sucking child,' and translates the whole couplet, 'low will I bow to thee as a mother to her sucking child. As a maiden before her beloved will I open myself to thee (cf. R.-V. 10, 8, 5, 37c.).'

The second deals with Rig-Veda, 6, 71, 2cd. Nivṛtīnd prasvānta chaśi, is equivalent to nivṛtī- yasti prasvānta cha, 'thou givest rest, and again awakest to life.' The writer does not know another

2 Compare the use of pāṣyamātī (for pipyāndā) in the Aśoka Inscriptions, Col. Ed. V. 8, 'giving suck.' — G. A. G.
instance of this kind of circumlocution in the Veda; but there is a parallel example in old Persian to which he draws attention.

Bīg-Veda, 1, 92, 4ab. Benfey and Grassman translate the second line 'she uncovers her bosom, as a cow her udders' (urī vā bārjāham). Dr. Bartholomew connects bārjaka with bīrjānta, and the Zend bērēz, bārešak, baresata &c., 'projecting, high.' He takes it as an adjective qualifying vāsaka, the breast. Ustrd also does not mean 'cow.' It should be read ustrd, equivalent to ustrā, 'a girl desiring her lover.' He translates the couplet 'coloured garments cast she round herself, like a dancing-girl. Like a damsel enticing her beloved, she uncovers her swelling breast.'

The two last notes refer to points of criticism in the Aesesta.

Dr. Von Stackelberg follows with notes on Ossetic, which are followed by short notes by Mr. Rehatzke on Dr. Jacob's article on the Caspian-Baltic trade in the Middle Ages already referred to, and by Dr. W. Bang on former articles on the religion of the Achaemenians. Three Reviews on Semitic subjects, and one on a Chinese subject come next, and the volume concludes with an obituary notice, by Prof. A. Sozin, of the late Dr. Thorbecke, the eminent Semitic scholar, whose regretted death on the 3rd of January, 1890, has left a void which it will be difficult to fill.

G. A. GRIERSON.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

A VERSE ON TOBACCO.

Tobacco is greatly used in Southern India, sometimes in chewing with betel-leaves, sometimes in smoking, and greatly in the shape of snuff. The following is a witty extollation of it by an admirer:

रस पुष्पांजलां विबेकिता।
धानंद्राम वर्षासर विधित।
चुलुलं भक्ष्यसरं तेन व्यं नक्कित।
पत्रता: पाँसुक: हरिलोपी परेरले।

"Once Indra asked Brahman, what is the best thing in the world? And he replied, by his four mouths: tabāku, pogāku, hōgōsoppu, and pogēlo, meaning 'tobacco, tobacco, tobacco, tobacco' in Hindustani, Telugu, Canarese and Tamil respectively. The point consists in the words from several languages being so arranged in the last line, as not to break the rhythm of the metre; otherwise there is nothing special in the verse."

S. M. Natesa Sastri.

BOOK-NOTICES.

The Mahabharata of Krishna-Dvaipayana-Vyasa; translated into English prose. Published by Protap Chandra Roy; the Bharata Press; Calcutta.

We are glad to find that Protap Chandra Roy's translation of the Mahabharata, which we noticed first five years ago, ante, Vol. XV. p. 216, is still being successfully carried on. The last installment that we have before us is Part LXIV, which carries us into the commencement of Section 67 of the Santi-Parva; and this and the intervening parts show that the work is being continued with the same fidelity and careful attention to details. About three-fourths of the whole translation have now been issued; and as, from a notice on the wrapper, it appears that the earlier parts are becoming scarce, scholars will do well to complete their sets before it becomes too late to do so. The same gentleman has published also a Sanskrit Text of the epic, which presumably gives the recension followed in this translation.


We have before us another of Mr. Man's careful publications, the contents of which have become all the more valuable owing to the withdrawal of an English Resident from the Nicobar Islands.

For linguistic purposes the Nicobar Islands may be divided into six groups, viz. Car Nicobar, Chowra, Teressa with Bom ponds, the Central embracing Caroks, Nancowry, Trinkut and Katchal, the Southern Group comprising Great and Little Nicobar, Condol and Milo, and the inland tribe or Shom Pen of Great Nicobar. The book under consideration deals with the Central Group. The total population is about 8,000, of which something over 1,000 live in the Central Group.

The custom of tabu has had a peculiar effect on the Nicobarese dialects, and is in some measure responsible for the complete diversity of tongues now existing between the different groups. Any person may adopt any word of the language as his or her name, and after death that
word is tabued for a generation for fear of raising a ghost. Consequently a new word has to be invented to take its place, and this process is naturally perpetually going on. This embarrassing custom is common to several semi-savage peoples.

The Nicobarese dialects belong to the languages of Further India, or what Mr. Man calls the Tibeto-Assam family. They are agglutinative in development, and similar in structure to Malay, Peguan and Burmese, differing from Burmese and the allied tongues in the absence of homonyms differentiated only by intonation.

Very few words are borrowed from other tongues, although the men (but not the women) of the various groups can converse in Burmese, Hindustani, English and Malay.

Mr. Man, in writing the language, has adopted the system he pursued in his former well-known work The Aboriginal Inhabitants of the Andaman Islands, and the point of speech that chiefly comes out therein is the great variety of nasal vowels and diphthongs. The stopped sound of many Burmese final consonants shown in the Burmese character by उ, ड, and ज, and which makes such a word as let-няуат (sign manual) sound like trenum to Europeans, is also common to Nicobarese. The consonants specially liable to it are क, ज, and ज, but Mr. Man’s remarks show that partially, as in Burmese, ड, ड, p, झ, g, झ, and झ may probably be added to the category.

As is the case with all rude forms of speech, the Nicobarese languages are rich, within certain limits, in specific, and poor in generic terms: but in expression by gesture the Nicobarese have no prescribed methods.

Their structure may be roughly described as follows: — The roots of the languages are easily traceable. The explanatory parts of speech (prepositions, postpositions, adverbs, etc.) stand separately, and are not combined with other words in the sentence. Words can be used as adjectives, which properly belong to verbs, substantives, adverbs, and so on. Prepositions, suffixes and particles are freely used. Compound words are very common, composition being attained by simple agglutination without any mutilation of the components.

As regards the Grammar, the following remarks will be found to indicate its outlines. Substantives do not undergo grammatical alteration to denote number, gender or case. If the nomina-

tive does not commence the sentence, en or on is prefixed to denote it. Possession is shown by making the possessor follow the thing possessed. What is called “case” in ordinary Grammars is denoted by prepositions.

Derivative nouns are formed thus: —

Firstly from Verbs: —
(1) oknó, to eat: oknó, food. honkwó, to give: omnó, gift.
(2) hóhat, to hook: henheat, a hook. het, to chisel: henet, a chisel.
kapd, to die: takapd, a casket. tomkik, to lance: tenkik, a lance.
(3) pahó, to fear: pamaõa, coward. enlánana, to exercise: menlánana, a shaman. ñdha, to eat: ñdha, a whetstone.
pem, to drink: pemem, a drunkard.
(4) põya, to sit: enpõya, a bench.
löpp, to cover: opöpp, a shawl.
(5) tsop, to drink: tsop, beverage.
(6) Irregular derivatives on the above principles.

osma, to open: osma, a window.

Secondly from Adjectives: —
(1) huó, drunk: mahuó, a drunkard.
káre, large: kamar, an adult.
ehl-tashe, old: shanttashe, age.
(2) Irregular additions, as, —
hoï, far: kalaõi, the sky.

Thirdly from Substantives: —
(1) Irregular additions, —
hentain, a basket: mentainya, a basketful.
háhe, moon: kamakehua, a lunation.

Fourthly, Compounds: —
(1) These are agglutinated as above explained.

A peculiar class of grammatical derivatives of a similar structure to those already noticed exists, which is worth noticing: —
enkóína, a man: menkóína, a man of a particular race.
enkána, a woman: menkána, a woman of a particular race.
kenyám, a child: kamenyám, a child of a particular community.
Paiyó, a Nicobarese: Pamenyó, a Nicobarese of a particular community.
kánó, a foreigner: kamalénó, a foreigner of a particular community.
nó, a pig: memno, a pig of a particular village.

1 The Mwíl-ngé, lit. Little River, in Upper Burmah was always known to the engineers building the Railway bridge over it as “the Mingy.”
placing the pronoun after the thing possessed, as in the case of nouns above-mentioned, or by turning it into a derivative adjective, after the manner already explained. Thus, dūs chūna, my canoe, or dūs tachū. Honorific forms are unknown, owing to the communistic condition of the social relations of the people. Relation is expressed as in the Indo-European languages: thus, following the English order, paīyāh ke liūt-chūh, the man who went home. Reflexive action is also expressed by dēl or vērē: e. g. an of the meaning he is beating (to)-himself.

Like the other parts of speech, many verbs are formed out of nouns, &c., by a process of alternation in form, by simple compounding, or by the addition of syllables. Examples are:

- showyo, to fill a sack, from shīyo, a sack.
- chē-kailēh (shiver-tongue), to stammer.
- hēvān, to net fish, from wēn, a net.

The prefixes ka and ka are those most commonly used in thus forming verbs; the prefix wa expresses causation, as yōm, a garden, to cultivate: yō expresses tendency, as tōng, pas, to fester; aldē expresses completion, as aldēbeit, to become healed: ken expresses action, as tōknyo, to break; v. u., but hēlōknyo to break, v. a.

The prefix kāha is peculiar and may be compared with the form of the class-nouns already explained. It may be best illustrated by an example: kichō, to meet by the arrival of one of the parties, kāha-kichō, to meet by the arrival of both parties.

Continuative action is expressed by alteration in form and the suffixing of vānade, as top, to drink, tennopayande, to continue drinking.

In many cases the passive is the more primitive form of the verbs, as harikhātaka, to burn, harikha, to be burnt; but the passive form is often expressed by prefixing ta as mandyā, to inherit, tamandyā, to be inherited.

There is no inflection of the verb whatever, the grammatical relations being expressed by auxiliaries.

Of the minor parts of speech, the adverbs, prepositions and postpositions call for few remarks, and the language is poor in conjunctions and interjections.

The formation of many prepositions shows the same peculiarities as that of the other parts of speech: e. g. we have kō or its head, lakō or, lakō, above; fōp, side, tafōp, beside, kōlafōp, at the side of, yōtafōp, to the side.

The Nicobarese reckon by the pair, score, and score of scores, and the only puzzle is that
the words used in counting coconuts (the staple product) and money, differ from those used in counting other objects. From the simple numerals, derivatives, formed on the principles already largely illustrated, are in use to denote a limit in enumeration, e.g. heeding, one, hemang, only one; isedt, seven, misdnt, only seven.

Numerical co-efficients are used as fully as in Burmese and other Further Indian tongues, but with the difference that, as in Persian, the co-efficient is between the numeral and the article enumerated, instead of the article preceding numeral and co-efficient, e.g. Persian, chahar-samiti flt, four chains of elephants; Nicobarese, loe kót kian, three head (of children); but Burmese la kna yout, men two human-beings; ngot le jut, silver four flat-pieces (= 4 rupees). In the rare instances of the use of numeral co-efficients in English the Nicobarese system is followed: four head of cattle; two and half couple of snipe; two leash of grey-hounds.

Concrete expressions are used to denote time in the manner common to all barbarous and semi-barbarous peoples: e.g. "you could reach that place in three betel-quids (chews) time."

As regards suffixes, prefixes and infixes, their use has been mostly illustrated already, and we need not specially notice any here except an interesting class which refers to the human body and its parts, and which bear a remarkable analogy to a like peculiarity in the Andamanese languages. The system appears to be to attach the actual words for hand, foot, leg, head, ear, face, voice and surface to other words to modify the sense of the base and form fresh expressions for ideas from the compound, e.g. gai, hand; kwepta-tai, clutch (through fear or rage); lāh, foot, leg; engelāh, depart: kòh, head; kānākō, copulate: nang, car; hinggaing, caution: chakā, face; ychakā, intend; ngē, voice; pāmangē, echo: mat, surface; et-lat-mat, wipe.

The collocation of words is similar to that of English, except that the adjective usually follows the noun and that in assertive sentences the verb "to be" is generally omitted.

Simple interrogation is expressed by the inflection of the voice, or by prefixing ka, kët, kan to the subject of the sentence, or when an affirmative reply is expected, by so prefixing an. Negation is expressed by the insertion of particles of negation indicating it under the various circumstances of life, like the English "not, none, not any, nothing, don't, isn't, never, never more, and no."

The various moods and tenses of the verb are expressed by auxiliaries which are worth recording here:

- ye (to wish) = future intention (intend going).
- alde (just now) = immediate future (just going to).
- emydh (afterwards) = simple future (will).
- eat (already) = simple past (was).
- leit-agare (entirely) = long past (dead and gone).
- yanga (from) = immediate past (just finished).
- yuansh-shit (busy) = imperfect, (having, being).
- yuansh-shit-yanga = pluperfect (had).
- leep and dòh (ability) = ability (can).
- dòh (ability) = unknown intention (may).
- dòhta (obligation) = obligation (should).
- ka (indeed) = obligation (must).
- okidkangate, (permission) = permission (let).
- kaiyāh teoshe (power) = power (you may).
- dòh (ability) = power (you may).
- horeh-ta-yaude unknown intention (might).
- lāk and shōk = invitation (let us).
- wot = negative precaution (don't).

Finally there is a curious class of intensive particles in use which are best explained by illustrations thus:

- ka (indeed): an, he, enka, he himself; an, that.
- ane ka, the very same; chud, silver, chud ka, real silver; kai, a ladder, kai, ka, a proper ladder; chaling, long, chaling ka, very long.

- endah, pendah, with adjectives, verbs and adverbs has the same force as ka.

- past (much), tokord (very), tawhehate (excessively), ka ka, indeed, can also intensify adjectives and adverbs.

We have thus dwelt at length upon Mr. Man's explanation of the Nicobarese tongue, for two reasons, viz., the remarkably clear exposition given by him of a most interesting tongue, and because it is not likely that we shall ever be favoured in this generation at least with any further light on it.

Mr. Man's energy and clear grasp of grammar as a science have given us an insight into a class of languages of the greatest value to philology as a study; for we have now had an exposition of a group of tongues that is agglutinative in verbal structure and analytical in its syntax, and which expresses cognate ideas by the expansion of its simple radices by means of a series of regularly used prefixes, suffixes and infixes, and occasionally even by pure intermutation after the fashion of the Semitic languages. Could a series of facts of greater interest be placed before the philological student?
SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION.

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal for Sanskrit and Kanares, and, for the sake of uniformity, submitted for adoption, as far as possible, in the case of other languages, — except in respect of modern Hindu personal names, in which absolute purism is undesirable, and in respect of a few Anglicised corruptions of names of places, sanctioned by long usage, — is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanares</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanares</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अं तु</td>
<td>अं तु</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>अं तु</td>
<td>अं तु</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ri</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visarga: Visarga
Jhāmāñiya, or old
Visarga before क
and ः
Upadmañiya, or
old Visarga
before ः
d and ः
Anuvṝṇa
Anuvṝṇa
Anuṣṭhāna

A single hyphen is used to separate words in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen is only used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, as divided in the original text, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line; intermediate divisions, rendered unavoidable here and there by printing necessities, are made only where absolutely necessary for neatness in the arrangement of the Texts.

A double hyphen is used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the euphonic rules of sandhi. Where this double hyphen is used, it is to be understood that a final consonant, and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel, are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it is to be understood of the orthography of the original, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the consonant either has the modified broken form, which, in the older stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the virāma attached to it; and that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form. In the transcription of ordinary texts, the double hyphen is probably unnecessary; except where there is the sandhi of final and initial vowels. But, in the transcription of epigraphical records, the use of this sign is unavoidable, for the purpose of indicating exactly the paleographical standard of the original texts.

The avagraha, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial a, is but rarely to be met with in inscriptions. Where it does occur, it is most conveniently represented by its own Devanāgarī sign.

So also practice has shown that it is more convenient to use the ordinary Devanāgarī marks of punctuation than to substitute the English signs for them.

Ordinary brackets are used for corrections and doubtful points; and square brackets, for letters which are damaged and partially illegible in the original, or which, being wholly illegible, can be supplied with certainty. An asterisk attached to letters or marks of punctuation in square brackets, indicates that those letters or marks of punctuation were omitted altogether in the original. As a rule, it is more convenient to use the brackets than to have recourse to footnotes; as the points to which attention is to be drawn attract notice far more readily. But notes are given instead, when there would be so many brackets, close together, as to encumber the text and render it inconvenient to read. When any letters in the original are wholly illegible and cannot be supplied, they are represented, in metrical passages, by the sign for a long or a short syllable, as the case may be; and in prose passages, by points, at the rate, usually, of two for each ākṣara or syllable.
THE COINS OF THE KINGS OF VIJAYANAGARA.

BY E. HULTZSCH, Ph.D.; BANGALORE.

The subjoined list comprises such inscribed South-Indian coins as, judging from their legends, may be referred with some degree of probability to the princes of the last great Hindú kingdom of the South. A considerable number of coins with unintelligible, imperfect or debased legends are excluded. The desirability of attempting a list of Vijayanagara coins was first suggested to me by Captain R. H. C. Tufnell, M.S.C., who courteously placed his extensive collection at my disposal. The same was kindly done by Mr. R. Sewell, M.C.S., and Surgeon D. S. E. Bain, I.M.S. To Mr. E. Thurston I am indebted for the loan of some coins of the Government Central Museum, Madras. The collections, which I have used, are referred to in the list by the following abbreviations:

B = Dr. Bain; M = Madras Museum; S = Mr. Sewell; T = Captain Tufnell; H = self.

Mr. B. Santappah, Curator of the Mysore Government Museum at Bangalore, kindly undertook the preparation of the plaster casts, from which the accompanying Plates were prepared.

The following numismatic publications are quoted in the list by the simple names of their authors:


Sir Walter Elliot, Coins of Southern India; London, 1886.

Lientenant (Colonel) H. P. Hawkes, A brief sketch of the Gold, Silver and Copper Coinage of Mysore; Bangalore, 1856.


Major Edward Moor, Plates illustrating the Hindu Pantheon, reprinted from the work of; London and Edinburgh, 1881. The quotations refer to Plate 103.

H. H. Wilson, Description of Select Coins in the possession of the Asiatic Society; Asiatic Researches, Vol. XVII. 1832, pp. 559 ff.

A list of the first dynasty of Vijayanagara is found in my South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 161, and lists of the second and third dynasty, ante, Vol. XIII. p. 154 and p. 155, respectively.

Regarding the coinage of one of the kings of the first dynasty we possess a contemporary report by 'Abdu-r-raziq, an ambassador of Sultan Shāh Rukh of Samarkand, a son of the great Timūr. 'Abdu-r-raziq stayed at Bijānagar (Vijayanagara), the capital of Dēv Rāj (Dēvārāya II.), from the close of Zu-l-bijja, A. H. 846, = end cf April, A. D. 1443, to the 12th Shāban, A. H. 847, = 5th December, A. D. 1443. He informs us that Dēvārāya II. issued the following coins:— I. Gold: (1) varāha; (2) pariȧh = ½ varāha; (3) fanam = ¼ pariȧh. II. Silver: tār = ½ fanam. III. Copper: jītal = ¼ tār. Pagodas or varāhas of Dēvārāya are described under Nos. 4 and 5. The name pariȧh, which 'Abdu-r-raziq attributes to the half pagoda, is probably connected with the surname Pratāp, which occurs before the names of Vijayanagara kings both on coins and in inscriptions; this surname is also found on No. 6, a half pagoda of Dēvārāya. No fanam with Dēvārāya's name, nor any Vijayanagara silver coin, has been hitherto discovered. But there is a considerable number of varieties of the copper issues of Dēvārāya (Nos. 9 to 23). The name jītal, which 'Abdu-r-raziq attributes to these coins, is the Hindūstāni equivalent of the modern 'pice.\(^1\)

1 See Yule and Burnell's Hobson-Jobson, p. 349.
FIRST DYNASTY.

I. Bukkārāya.

No. 1. MH. Gold. Pagoda.

(Bidie, No. 9.)

Obv. A rude kneeling figure of Garuda, which faces the right.

Rev. \text{Srī-Vi.}
\text{[ra]-Buka.2}
\text{[r]āya.}

Two pagodas of similar type, but with different legends, are figured by Elliot, Nos. 87 and 88. Moor’s No. 8 appears to be an imperfect drawing of Elliot’s No. 87.

II. Harīhara.

No. 2. MSTH. Gold. Half pagoda.

(Elliot, Nos. 96 and 97.)

Obv. God and goddess, seated.

| श्रीम | Srī-Pra-
| हर | हर

Rev. 
\text{tāpā-Hari-

On some specimens of this coin, the attributes of the two sitting figures are distinctly Vaiśṇava; on others it is doubtful, if they are meant for Śaiva or Vaiśṇava ones.

No. 3. T. Copper.

Obv. Bull, facing the right; above it, the moon.

Rev. 
\text{Pratāpa-
\text{Harīhara.3}}

There is a ring in the centre between the two lines of the legend.

III. Dēvarāya.

No. 4. MSTH. Gold. Pagoda.

Obv. Same as No. 2.

Rev. 
\text{Srī-Pra-
\text{tāpā-Dēva-
\text{rāya.}}

On some specimens of this and the next following coin, the attributes of the two sitting figures are Śaiva, on others Vaiśṇava. The pagoda figured by Elliot under No. 106 belongs to Chikk[a]-Dēvarāya of Maibar (A. D. 1672 to 1704).4

No. 5. MH. Gold. Pagoda.

(Bidie, No. 11.)

Obv. Same as No. 4.

Rev. 
\text{Srī-Pra-
\text{tāpā-Dēva-
\text{rāya.}}

2 Read Buka.
3 Read Harīhara.
4 Hawkes, p. 6, mentions a funam with the Kannara legend “Chicka Deo Baj.” In a valuable Memorandum on the Coinage of Maibar by Mr. D. Bulck, M.C.S. (retired), the MS. of which was lent to me by Captain Tufnell, the following copper coin of the same king is figured and described:—Obv. Seated bull, facing the right; above it, the sun and the moon. Rev. [1]Srī [2]Dēva, Chikk[a]-Dēvarāya.
5 Read Dēva.
No. 6. BH. Gold. Half pagoda.

Obv. Same as Nos. 4 and 5.

Rev. Same as No. 5.

No. 7. BTH. Gold. Quarter pagoda.

Obv. Elephant, facing the left; above it the sun and the moon.

Rev. 

No. 8. BMH. Gold. Quarter pagoda.

Obv. Same as No. 7.

Rev. 

No. 9. TH. Copper.

Obv. Elephant, facing the right; above it, the Kanarese letter A.

Rev. 

No. 10. MH. Copper.

Obv. Same as No. 9, with the addition of a couch to the left, and of a discus to the right of the letter A.

Rev. Same as No. 9.

No. 11. T. Copper.

Obv. Elephant, facing the right.

Rev. 

Between the two lines of the legend is an upright sceptre, with a discus on its left and a couch on its right.

No. 12. T. Copper.

Obv. Elephant, facing the right; above it, the sun and the moon, and the Kanarese syllable Dē, which I take to be an abbreviation for Dévarāya. The same abbreviation occurs on Nos. 13, 14, and 23.

Rev. 

Rāyāga- 

Rāyagajagnāda-

bhūrūṇḍa.

Rāyagajagnāda-bhūrūṇḍa, 'the double-headed eagle, which splits the temples of the elephants of kings,' must be taken as a birada of the king. The synonyms Gajagnāda-bhūrūṇḍa and Arjhagajagnādbhūrūṇḍa occur in copper-plate grants as biradas of Vijayanagara kings; see line 45 of Mr. Fleet's grant of Kṛishnārāya, J. Bo. Br. R. As. Soc. Vol. XII. p. 384, and ante, Vol. XIII. p. 131, Plate iv. a, line 10.

No. 13. MSTH. Copper.

Obv. Elephant, facing the right; above it, a couch and the inverted Nāgari syllable Dē.

Rev. 

Underneath the legend is a sceptre, the top of which faces the right.

* In Mr. Buick's Memorandum (see note 4, above) the following similar copper coin is figured and described:

Obv. Elephant, trotting to the right, with an attendant carrying a spear and running before him; above the elephant, the Nāgari syllable Dē. Rev. The same legend as No. 12; underneath it, sun, couch, and moon.
No. 14. ST. Copper.

Obv. Elephant, facing the right; above it, the sun and the moon, and the Nāgari syllable देव.

Rev. 

Above the legend is a sceptre, the top of which faces the right.

No. 15. STH. Copper.

Obv. Elephant, facing the right.

Rev. 

Sir W. Elliot’s No. 92, a copper coin of frequent occurrence, is connected by type with the preceding Nos. 9 to 15. It has, on the obverse, an elephant which faces the right (or, more rarely, the left), with the Kanarese syllable निष् above. The reverse bears the following legend:

Rev. 

Danṣṭyakara is the honorific Kanarese plural of दानष्ट्ययक, which is perhaps a corruption of दानष्ट्ययक, the title of the Hoyala chief of Toṣūr near Srīnagara, see Elliot, p. 81.

No. 16. S. Copper.

Obv. Bull, facing the left; above it, the sun and the moon.

Rev. 

Above the legend is a sceptre, the top of which faces the right.

No. 17. STH. Copper.

Obv. Same as No. 16.

Rev. Same as No. 11.

No. 18. STH. Copper.

(Prinsep’s Essays, Vol. I. Plate XXXV. No. 21.)

Obv. Same as No. 16.

Rev. Same as Nos. 11 and 17, but the conch on the left and the discus on the right of the sceptre.

No. 19. T. Copper.

Obv. Bull, facing the right, with the moon above and a conch in front.

Rev. 

Above the legend is a sceptre, the top of which faces the right.

---

1 The slightly different form दानष्ट्ययक (or, in Tamil, दानष्ट्यक) appears in Danṣṭyakān-kōṭai, the name of a fort in the Satyamanagara Tānkal of the Coimbatore District, and in Danṣṭyakān-kṛṣṭe, mentioned in Mr. Rice’s Gazetteer of Mysore, Vol. II. Appendix I. p. 5.

2 The Madras Museum possesses an unpublished Hoyala gold coin. Its obverse bears the figures of two lions, like Elliot’s Nos. 90 and 91. The legend on the reverse is [I] [II] [III] [IV], Srī-Malapar(o)ka, ‘the glorious hero among the hill-chiefs.’ Malaparo kaṇḍa or Malaparolu kaṇḍa was a surname of the Hoyala king Visvakīliya (Mr. Rice’s Mysore Inscriptions, pp. 307 and 392) and Vaidyuvardhana (bid. p. 203, and Inscriptions of Brāhma Bejose, No. 52, l. 16 f.), and of their successors.

3 Read Danṣṭyakara.
No. 20. ST. Copper.

Obv. Same as No. 19.

Rev. |
| श्रीसर्वदेवराया |
| श्रीमरणीराया |

Sceptre as on No. 19.

No. 21. BMSTH. Copper.

(Prinsep's Essays, Vol. I. Plate xxxv. No. 20.)

Obv. Bull, facing the right; above it, the sun and the moon.

Rev. Same as Nos. 11 and 17.

No. 22. STH. Copper.

Obv. Same as No. 21.

Rev. Same as No. 18.

No. 23. MSTH. Copper.

Obv. Bull, facing the right, with sun and moon above. In front of the bull is the Nāgarī syllable Dē, which seems to be an abbreviation for Dēvarāya, as on Nos. 12 to 14.

Rev. |
| श्री |
| श्रीनिलकान्तीराया |

Nilakantha, 'the blue-necked,' is a name of the god Śiva.

SECOND DYNASTY. 10

IV. Kṛishṇārāyaṇa.


(Elliot, No. 112.)

Obv. Viṣṇu, standing under an arch.

Rev. |
| श्री |
| कृष्णाराय |
| य |

The omission of the surname Pratāpa, which is found on the two smaller gold coins, Nos. 26 and 27, makes this coin doubtful. The same obverse occurs on coins of the third dynasty; see No. 35.


Obv. 'Śiva and Pārvatī, seated.

Rev. |
| श्रीप्रतापकृष्णाराय |

This unique coin is also doubtful, and may have been an earlier issue of the pagoda of Kṛishṇārāyaṇa of Māisūr (No. 32, c).


(Marsden, Nos. 1070 and 1071. Wilson, Nos. 88 and 89. Prinsep's Essays, Vol. II. Plate xlv. No. 13: Bidie, Nos. 12, a and b. Elliot, Nos. 186 to 188.)

---

10 Wilson's No. 20 is an eye-copy of a gold coin with the Kanaresee legend Śrī-Pratāpa-Nīrāsinha. This coin must be attributed to Nīrāsinha, the elder brother and predecesor of Kṛishṇārāyaṇa.

11 Read rāya.
Obv. Vishnu seated, with the discus and the conch.

Rev. { śrī | 
    śāhścithānu } | tāpā-Krishna- 
    rāya.

The ruder varieties of this coin are probably re-coinages of one of the Nāyakas of Chitradūrā (Chitaldrow in Maisūr; see Hawkes, p. 13.

No. 27. MS. Gold. Half pagoda.
(Moor, Nos. 18 to 21. Elliot, No. 175.)

Same type as No. 26. On some specimens of Nos. 26 and 27, the sitting figure looks like a female and might be intended for Lakṣmī. Marsden, p. 737, mentions a quarter pagoda of the same type.

No. 28. STH. Copper.
Obv. A kneeling figure of Gaṇa, which faces the left.
Rev. Same as Nos. 26 and 27.

V. Aṃcaturāya.

No. 29. TH. Gold. Pagoda.
Obv. A double-headed eagle (gaṇḍabherūṇḍa), holding elephants in its beaks and claws.

Rev. śrī | 
    śāhścithānu } | tāpācharya- 
    rāya.

(Wilson, Nos. 92 and 93. Moor, No. 3. Bidie, No. 10, a. Elliot, No. 92.)

Same type as No. 27.

No. 31. SH. Gold. Half pagoda.
(Wilson, Nos. 94 and 95. Moor, Nos. 1, 2, 4. Elliot, No. 98.)
Obv. A gaṇḍabherūṇḍa, which is walking to the left.

Rev. śrī | 
    śāhścithānu } | tāpācharya- | 12 
    rāya.

The name of the king on Nos. 30 and 31 has been read as Prātāpavīra, Prātāpadeva, Pratā- 
pachaturā and Pratāpachaturā. These misreadings were caused by the Nandināgarī group chya 
differing considerably from the corresponding group in northern Nāgarī.

VI. Sadāśivarāya.

No. 32. Gold. Pagoda.
(Hawkes, Plate iii, No. 13. Elliot, No. 100.)
Obv. Vishnu and Lakṣmī, seated.

Rev. śrī | 
    śāhścithānu | pa-Sadāśi- 
    varāya.

The two sitting figures with Vaishnava or Saiva emblems are common to this coin with Nos. 2, 4 to 6, and 25. They were subsequently adopted on three pagodas of later date, on which they have distinct Saiva attributes and are accordingly intended for Siva and Pārvatī:

12 Read Pratāpacharya.
a. The Ikkeri pagoda.


Rev. \{ Sṛ.-Tī.

Sṛ.-Tī.

This is the spelling on two copies in the Madras Museum, one of which is figured by Dr. Bidie. On Marsden's and Elliot's copies the legend is corrupted into Sṛ.-Sadāśiva. Sir W. Elliot attributes this coin to Sadāśiva, the first Nāyaka of Ikkeri. The omission of the surname Pratāpa may be adduced in favour of this supposition.

b. Ḫaidar's Bahaduri pagoda.

(Marsden, No. 1082. Hawkes, p. 4. Moor, No. 16. Bidie, No. 27.)

Rev. Ḫaidar's initial ّ on a granulated surface.

c. The pagoda of Krishnaraja of Māisūr (A.D. 1799 to 1862).

(Marsden, No. 1072. Hawkes, p. 3. Bidie, No. 30. Elliot, No. 115.)

Rev. \{ Sṛ.-

Kṛṣṇa-

rājā.\(^{14}\)

There exists also an Ikkeri\(^{15}\) and a Bahaduri janam; see respectively, J. As. Soc. Bengal, Vol. IV. Part I. Plate vii. No. 10, and Mr. Thurston's Catalogue of Mysore Coins in the Madras Museum. Plate i. No. 7. Dr. Bain possesses a Bahaduri half pagoda and a half pagoda of Krishnaraja of Māisūr.

THIRD DYNASTY.

VII. Tirumalaraya.

No. 33. BT. Gold. Pagoda.

(Elliot, No. 182.)

Obv. Lakshmana standing, Rāma and Sītā seated.

Rev. \{ Nālaka.-

Nālaka.-

Rāvuru is the honorific Telugu plural of rāva.

No. 34. MTH. Gold. Half pagoda.

(Bidie, No. 14.)

Same type as No. 33.

In the Madras Journal, New Series, Vol. IV. Plate i. Nos. 12 to 17, Sir W. Elliot has figured eye-copies of copper coins with a bair on the obverse and with the legend [S]ā[Su]ra-

Tiru[m]sala[r]āya on the reverse. Šāluva, 'the hawk,' occurs as artefacts of kings of the third and second dynasty of Vijayanagara; see my South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. pp. 86, 131, 132.

VIII. Veṅkaṭa.

No. 35. T. Gold. Pagoda.

(Marsden, No. 1073. Wilson, No. 96. Bidie, No. 15. Elliot, No. 105.)

\(^{15}\) In the Sāgar Tālnāk of the Shimoga District in Māisūr.

\(^{14}\) Read rāja.

\(^{15}\) This janam bears the correct legend Sṛ.-Sadāśiva; see the remark on the Ikkeri pagoda.
Obv. Vishnu, standing under an arch.

Rev. 

Sri-Veṅka-

ṭevāri-

ya namah.

'Adoration to the blessed Veṅkaṭēsvara.'

Veṅkaṭēsvara is the deity of Veṅkaṭadri or Tirumalai, the sacred hill of Tirupati in the North Arcot District. As Chandragiri, the last capital of the third Vijayanagara dynasty, is situated near Tirupati, and as the copper-plate grants of the third dynasty (ante, Vol. XII. pp. 128 and 136) open with the invocation Sri-Veṅkaṭēsvaṇya namah, it is very probable that the coin belongs to one of these princes, or even specially to one of the Veṅkaṭas among them, who might have selected the legend, because it reminded of his own name. Wilson's No. 97, Moor's Nos. 12 and 14, Bidie's No. 16, and Elliot's No. 176, a half pagoda, seem to be a later imitation of this coin; the legend has degenerated into a scrawl.

No. 36. S. Copper.

Obv. Same as No. 35.

Rev.  

[Ve]ṅka-

ṭapa.-

rāya.

No. 37. MSTH. Copper.

(Elliot, No. 177.)

Obv. Vishnu, standing; on his right, a fish.

Rev.  

Veṅka-

ṭapa.

Veṅkaṭappa was the name of the sixth Nāyaka of Ikkēri; see Mr. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Vol. II. p. 177. As, however, this coin is frequently met with in the Madura bāzār, and as the fish is the emblem of the Pāṇḍya country, I believe that it belongs to one of the Madura Nāyakas, who issued it in the name of his nominal sovereign Veṅkaṭa, the pageant king of Vijayanagara.

No. 38. MH. Copper.

Obv.  

Tiru-Veṅ-

mga[la].

'Veṅkaṭa.'

Rev.  

Mudū- 

Krishna.19

This is another coin of the Nāyakas of Madura. To Mr. T. Varada Rao, Head Assistant Collector of Tinnevelly, I am indebted for the loan of an inscription on seven copper-plates, which records that the village of Kūnīiyūr (in the Ambasamudram Tāluk of the Tinnevelly District) was granted in Śaka 1556 (expired), the cyclic year Bhāva (A. D. 1634-5). By Vin-

---

16 The vowel of the first syllable of the word Veṅkaṭa is long in Tamil, but shortened in Kanarese.
17 Thus some coins of Akbar bear the inscription Allah akbar jīl jīlāla, which alludes to his names Jīl and Jīlāla.
18 Mr. Bauck (see note 4, above) figures a similar copper coin: — Obv. Krishna, playing the flute and attended by two cows. Rev. Same as No. 37.
19 Bead Mudū-Krishna.
COINS OF THE KINGS OF VIJAYANAGARA.

Plate ii.

From Casts made by Mr. B. SANTAPPAR, Curator, Bangalore Museum.
Veṅkaṭapati-mahārāya (of Chandragiri) at the request of Tirumala (Nāyaka of Madura), whose pedigree is given as follows:

- Nāga of the Kāyapa (gōtra).
- Visvānātha.
- Krīpha Nāyaka.
- Viśapa.
- Viśvapa Nāyaka.
- Muddu-Krishṇa.

Muddu-Vira.

According to Mr. Sewell, Muddu-Krishṇa, whose name occupies the reverse of the coin, resigned from A.D. 1602 to 1609. The obverse of the coin corresponds to the colophon of the copper-plate inscription, Śrī Veṅkaṭēśa, the name of the patron saint of the princes of the third dynasty of Vijayanagara, whose sovereignty was nominally acknowledged by the Madura Nāyakas.

No. 39. Copper.

(Élliot, No. 89.)

Obv. Same as No. 28.

Rev. वेनकष्ट Vēnkaṭa.

In conclusion, I avail myself of this opportunity for correcting Mr. Thomas' remarks on Élliot's Nos. 101 and 102. On the obverse of this half pagoda are, not Śiva and Pārvati, but Nārāyana and Lakṣmi, and the legend on the reverse has been successfully deciphered by my assistant, Mr. V. Venkayya, M. A., as follows:

- [Sri]-Kāṁṭh[1].
- [ra]ya-Nara-
- [sa]ra[ya].

Colonel Wilks states that Kāṇṭhārava-Narasārāya (A.D. 1638 to 1658) was the first ruler of Māsūr who established a mint. Hawkes, p. 2 f., attributes to him the first issue of the Kāṇṭhārava fanam, which bears on the obverse a seated figure of Nārāyana. The legend of the half pagoda and its Nārāyana type leave no doubt that it is an issue of the same Māsūr sovereignty. At the beginning of the present century, accounts were still kept in Kāṇṭhārava pagodas, though these coins themselves had entirely disappeared and were considered by Dr. Buchanan as "an imaginary money." The Kāṇṭhārava fanam was, according to Hawkes, pp. 3 and 8 f., re-coined by Divān Pūrṇārāya during the minority of Kṛṣṇarāja. An examination of a number of picked specimens enables me to add, that the reverse of the fanam reads:

- Śrī Sūri-
- Kāṁṭh[1]a-
- rava.
HARSAUDA STONE INSCRIPTION OF DEVAPALADEVA OF DHARA;
THE (VIKRAMA) YEAR 1275.
BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

The stone which bears this inscription was dug from the ruins of a temple in the village of Harsauda, about 10½ miles from the town of Chârâwa, in the district of Hoshangâbad in the Central Provinces. It measures "13½" in height by 13" in breadth, besides a raised and rounded "margin. It is thick and heavy, and shaped upon the back into some form of which the intent "is not now recognizable. Its material is greenstone," hard and tough in quality. In 1857 the stone was in the possession of Dr. F. E. Hall, who subsequently presented it to the American Oriental Society; and it is now in the Cabinet of that Society, at New Haven. The inscription was first edited, with a translation, by Dr. Hall in the Journal Beng. As. Soc., Vol. XXVIII. pp. 1-8, and the text was afterwards republished, with a photolithograph, in Archaeol. Survey of Western India, No. 10, pp. 111-12. Besides, a valuable note on his text and translation was published by Dr. Hall in the Journal Am. Or. Soc., Vol. VI, pp. 536-7. As the text of the inscription, even after this note, is capable of improvement, I now re-edit it from two excellent impressions which, at Professor Lanman’s request, were kindly prepared for me by Mr. Herbert C. Tohwan, of Yale University, New Haven.

The inscription contains eighteen lines of writing which cover a space of about 11½" broad by 10½" high. Beneath it are eight figures, about 1½" high,—a central figure representing probably Siva, and on his right three and on the left four figures of males and females, engaged in worshipping the god. With the exception of three or four aksharas which are slightly damaged, the writing is well preserved. The size of the letters is about ½". The characters are Nâgarî; and the language is Sanskrit. Lines 4-6 are in prose; the rest of the inscription, excepting the words śun namah Śivâya at the commencement of the first line and some words of auspicious import at the end of the last, is in verse. Some of the verses are irregular, and altogether the inscription, which is styled a prakāśad, shows that its author Dévaśarman (line 18) was neither a great poet nor an exact scholar. As regards orthography, the letter b is throughout denoted by the sign for vi, and the dental sibilant is several times used instead of the palatal; ś is employed instead of s in āsti, line 11, and sh instead of kh in the word lēshāka, line 18.

The inscription, after the words “śun, adoration to Siva,” has three verses in honour of, or invoking the blessings of, Hārâmba (Gaṇapâ), the goddess of eloquence Bhâram, and the three gods Brahman, Vishnu, and Siva. It then records, in the prose lines 4-6, the date,—Saturday, the 5th of the bright half of Mârgâshrâ, the year 1275, while there was reigning at Dhâra the Paramabhojâra Mahârâjâdhirâja and Paramâvara, the devout worshipper of Mahâvara (Siva), Dévapaladeva, endowed with everything auspicious, (jambudvīpa, etc.), resplendent with the decoration of the paîchamaḥâsādha obtained by him, and possessed of majesty through a boon bestowed upon him by the favour of the holy Limbâryâ; and it repeats in fuller detail the astronomical part of the date, in verses 4 and 5. The rest is mainly devoted to the proper object for which the inscription was put up, viz. to record that on the north-eastern side of Harshapura the merchant Kēsava built a temple of Sambhu, together with a tank, and that near it he put up figures of Hanumat, a deity called Kâshâpâ, “the guardian of fields,” Gaṇâsa, Kriyâ and other divine beings, Nakullâ, and Ambikâ. Kēsava, who did all this, was the younger brother of the merchant Dhala, a son of Bilhaṇa, who was a son of Dēsi (or Rûsin), a resident of Undapura.

The really important part of the inscription is its date, and the statement that the inscription was put up when Dévapaladeva was ruling at Dhâra. The date has been already fully

---


2 Literally, “in that direction which is presided over by Śiva.”
discussed by me, ante, Vol. XIX. p. 24, No. 11, and I therefore need only repeat here that the corresponding date is Saturday, the 24th November, A.D. 1218. As regards Dēvapaladeva, I have shown above, p. 83, that at Udaypur in Gwalior there are two inscriptions from which we know this king to have ruled in the Vikrama years 1236 and 1239?]. But only the present inscription connects him distinctly with Dhārā, and our inscription is valuable besides for the epithets samastapraṣastotpāta-samadhitapatacamahāmahādānkalakravirajamāna by which Dēvapaladeva is here qualified. For by using these epithets, which may seem to be somewhat out of place in an independent sovereign, Dēvapaladeva distinctly shows his connection with the Mahākumāra LakshmiVarmaDevā, Hariśchandrādeva, and Udayavarmanādeva, who use exactly the same epithets and who were ruling at Dhārā before Dēvapaladeva. Another epithet, applied to Dēvapaladeva in this inscription, is śrī-Limbāryā-prasadā-vara-labhā-pratāpa, 'who had obtained majesty through a boon bestowed upon him by the favour of ... Limbāryā.' That the word Limbāryā of this phrase must be taken to denote some local deity is highly probable in itself, and is proved by certainty in the words Limbāryā-pātārā(n)am-aṁtā-nam-prasāda-labhā-vara-Mālakṣaṭhānapati, or words to the same effect, in line 2 of the Udaypur inscription of Jayasimha, last mentioned by me above, p. 84, note 3. I have no doubt that the rulers of Dharā adopted the phrase in imitation of a similar phrase employed by the Chaulukya kings of Anhilvād, with whose inscriptions they had reason to be familiar.

Of the places mentioned in this inscription, Dharā is well known; and Harshapura no doubt is the present Harsadā where the inscription was found. Undspura I am unable to identify; in all probability it is mentioned also in the Udaypur inscription of which I have given the date ante, Vol. XIX. p. 28, No. 28.

TEXT.

1 Ōṁ7 namāḥ Sivāya ॥ Sarvavā-karmam-saṃārambhī gīryaqaîtreṇāmaṃkṣaṇalḥ ॥(1) ॥ sa mayā Pārvvat-patrī[ō] Hēmāva[ba]h astāya.-


3 K[ai]11śaḥ kaiś-āli-kāś-ābha hūṇkār-āri-piṇākinaḥ ॥ vi-vīgā-gatayō dadyah śaṁ vōmu-vañā-hūndū-mag-atkasāh ॥ 2 ॥

4 Saṃvat paṁchasaptat-adhika-dvādaśasat-arṇik[ē]12 1275 Mārgga-sudi 5 Sa(b)k[a] nam[ā]13 svasti-śrīnad-Dhārāyaṁ samastapraṣastotpāta-

5 samadhitapatamahāāśav[bd]dālā[ni]kā-virājāmāna-parambhaṭṭāraka-mahārā[ja]- dhārājā-paramāmśvātṝa-ra-paramāmābēṣṭa(vi)ra-ra-śrī-

6 Limvā(mba)ryā - prasāda - vara - lavdhā(bdha) - pratāpa - śrīnad - Dēvapaladeva - charaṇānāṁ mahā-pravardhamāna-kalāyāna-vijayarajye satī


4 The rubbing at my disposal being very faint, I am not absolutely certain about every akṣara of the above phrase.

5 See the Udaypur inscription of the Chaulukya Kumārapaladeva, ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 343, line 3.

6 From the impressions.

7 At the commencement of the line, before this word, is an ornamental device which looks like a flower.

8 Metre of verses 1-3, Śūkla (Anuśūkla).

9 This akṣara might be read ।

10 Originally śamēḥ, but the sign of anusvāra is struck out.

11 The superscript line which turns । into ॥ is very faint, but it is undoubtedly there; Kāśiḥ = Kā-Aṭadvīth.

12 This is what is engraved, and I cannot see that anything has been struck out or altered; read śvavabhuj-adhu...

13 Originally kāṁṣa, but the sign of anusvāra is struck out.

14 One would have expected śatē-śiṅḳē.

15 This sign of anusvāra was originally omitted.
GYA STONE INSCRIPTION : THE REIGN OF SULTAN FIRUZ SHAH :
THE VIKRAMA YEAR 1429.
BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C.I.E.; GÖTTINGEN.

This inscription was discovered by General Sir A. Cunningham, and its contents were referred to by the late Dr. Bhagvânâlî Ùdrâjî, ante, Vol. X. p. 341. I now edit it from two excellent impressions, supplied to me by Mr. Fleet.

According to the information available, the inscription is at the side of the doorway, or in the sanctuary, of a temple which stands on the west side of a masonry tank called Dakshigmânya, near the Vishnupada at Gaya in Bihâr. And from the inscription itself it appears that the temple, where it is, was dedicated to the Sun, worshipped under the name of Dakshinâditya, ‘Sun of the South.’ — The writing covers a space of 2'9\(^\frac{1}{2}\) broad by 5' high, and is throughout well preserved, so that, with the exception of two or three aksharas of little importance, everything may be read with certainty. The size of the letters is between 3\(^{\frac{1}{16}}\) and 5\(^{\frac{1}{16}}\). — The characters are Nâgari, slightly influenced by the Bengali style of writing; and the language is Sanskrit. Excluding the words ãhū Gañapataqey namah and ñīr-Nâryâya.
September, 1891.] GAYA INSCRIPTION OF VIKRAMA-SAMVAT 1429.

Namah, lines 1-5 are in verse; the greater portion of lines 6-8 is in prose; and the remainder, excepting the concluding words siddhi=astu kasya satam=iti, is again in verse. In respect of grammar and orthography it may be noted that two of the verses do not admit of a proper construction, and that the letter b is denoted by the sign for v. As regards lexicography, the word kitri is used in the now well-known sense of 'a temple', in lines 5 and 8; and line 8 furnishes the word sasanaka, apparently denoting an official who had to do with sasana, or charters.

The inscription, after two verses in honour of Gaçapati and the Sun, records (in lines 2-3) that, in the Vikrama year denoted by the (nine) planes, a pair, the (four) ages and the moon, i.e., in Vikrama 1429, while Piyarója=såna, the lord of Dhilli, was ruling the land, Kula-

chanda, then governor (adhistháno) of Gayá, built (or rather, repaired) the temple of Dakshi

nárka, at Gayá. And it relates that Kulachanda was a son of Hémarája, a descendant of the Kshatriya Dalá who lived in the western country and was born in the family of a prince Vyághra, or Vyághrarája. This part of the inscription which is called a praisthá, composed by Sir[ijéna, closes with two verses which invoke the divine blessing on the family of Kulachanda, the prince (nripa) descended from Vyághra.

What is stated before in verse, is repeated in a plainer and more businesslike manner in prose, in lines 6-8. Here we are told that on a certain date which will be given below, in the reign of the western Sultán Piyarója=såna, conspicuous by his bérudas Asimapuruṣa and so forth, the Thakura Kulachandaka, — who held the post of governor of Gayá, who followed in the footstep of the prince Vyághra, and was a son of the Thakura Hémarája and a son’s son of the Kshatriya, the Thakura Dalá, a devout worshipper of Vishnu, — at the sacred place of Gayá, belonging to Dakshinágra, in the country of Udánapura, restored the temple of the holy Dakshipáitya which had fallen into disrepair. The prose portion states besides that this inscription was written by the Sasanaka of Gayá Sirésena (whom I take to be the person named Sir[ijéna above, a son of the Kasyasta, the Thakura Karmapála; and that the architect employed on the repê of the temple was Haridása.

Lines 9 and 10 contain two benedектив and imprecatory verses, and the inscription ends with a short prose passage of similar import.

The date, referred to above, is Sani-vásara or Saturday, the 13th lunar day of the dark half of Magha, of the Vikrama year 1429; and corresponds, as I have shown above, p. 138, — for Vikrama 1429 expired and the purimánta Magha, — to Saturday, the 22nd January, A.D. 1373. For the peculiar way in which the supposed founder of the Vikrama era is spoken of in line 6, we may compare the date of a Bengali MS. of the Vikrama year 1503, which I have given in full ante, Vol. XIX. p. 160, No. 131.

The localities mentioned in the inscription are, besides Dhilli (i.e. Delhi), Gayá, Dakshi

nágra, and the country of Udánapura. Of these, Delhi and Gayá are well-known. The word Dakshinágra, denoting the district in which Gayá was situated, I have not met with elsewhere. Udánapura should perhaps have been spelt Udayánapura, and so the name apparently occurs in another Gayá inscription, ante, Vol. IX. p. 143.; Sir A. Cunningham3 who has recognised the same name, under the form of Otantapura, in Táranátha’s account of the Magadha kings, at first was of opinion that the town intended might be the present Tandwa or Bishenpur Tandwa, about fifteen miles east of Gayá. Later, however, he has adopted Mr. Beglar’s suggestion that up to the time of the Muhammadan conquest Udánapura was the proper name of the town of Bihár in the Patá District of Bengal, which is said to be still known as Dand-Bihár.

3 i.e. Firdús Sháh, A.D. 1851-1888.

TEXT.

1 Ōṁ́ Gānapatayē namaḥ ॥ Ābbiprātē-[mrtha-siddhy-a[ṛ][tha-paṣṭa yah surair-api ]17 sarvva-vighnam-apaharato tasmā Gānāphatayē namaḥ ॥ Śrī-Sūryāya namaḥ ॥ Prasādatē yasya ghan-ādhakārār-viṣṭayukta-nāthaṁ kila chakravākī ṛīvāpēta-sōkā labhāte din-ādau sadā sa vah pātu

2 Sahasrabhānub ॥ Asma-rājyē nripa-Vikramā[ṛ]kkē gatē graha[air?]|]|-yugma-yugendu-kale ॥ Dhanipati-sri-Piyārōjasaḥ bhuvān samāśāstī vairi-dāhē ॥ Gayēti vittē-Ātmabhūvā prithivyām yad-ākhyayā vra(ura)hp maṇḍoṁyā || nivāsa-hēthō khalu nimirjanāṁ-apyōḍha10 vīdhvamsa-pa-


5 kṛttīm va(bh)u-kṛttī-ṛa[th]ah?)11 ॥ Surālayaṁ yah kuruṁ praṣastaṁ chiraya bhuktvēchā sukhāṁ narēshah ॥ samaṁ sad-āiva trīdā-āgānābhir-apāpa-dēhō divi mādātē saḥ ॥ Karotu kalyāpaṁ-salam Dinēsā-schirāṁ sa Vaiyāghra-nra(uru)pasya vāṁśi16 ॥ hataṁ tam bhīn sam̐haṁ-dhāmānā

6 k[r]ītā praṣasti śirī[?]12 seṇa-nāmāṁ ॥ Sarala-likaṁaṁ yathā ॥ Paramabhaṁṣṭarakaṣṭyādi-rājaṁvī purvavstā śrīmad-Vikramaṁdityadāva-uripater-āttī-āvēde(bodē) samvata(t) 1429 Māgha-kṛishṇa-trayōdāsyāṁ tithau Sanivāsa-anvītyāṁ 118 punarśādhaṁ-


4 From impressions supplied to me by Mr. Fleet.
5 Expressed by a symbol.
6 Metro, Śōka (Anushthubh). The third Pāda of this verse is quite incorrect. Probably, the intended reading was sara-vighna-haras-tasmā.
7 In the original, this sign of punctuation is here and in several places below dotted by a small circular line.
8 Metro of this and the two next verses, Upendra-vājā.
9 At first graha-yugma appears to have been engraved, which would offend against the metre. But the signs for at and seem to have been added afterwards. I would translate — 'the time expressed by a pair, the (four) ages, and the (one) moon, accompanied by the (nine) planets,' i.e. 1429; see below, line 6.
10 At first pūṣa was engraved, but it appears to have been altered to po; the following akṣhara may have been originally ṇā or ṇēpa. Instead of pathā, one would have expected -pathē. The general meaning of the verse I take to be that Gayā, which by Brahman was judged to be a fit place of residence for the gods, also bars the ways to perdition for men.
11 Metro, Indravājā; and of the next verse.
12 Metro of this and the next verses, Upendra-vājā. There is an hiatus between the first and second Pāda of this verse; the first half of the verse, besides, is grammatically incorrect; and the verse, taken as a whole, does not admit of a proper construction.
13 This, though it offends against the metre, appears to be the intended reading; the engraver actually put
14 Expressed by a symbol.
15 Originally -ōḍā was engraved, but the last akṣhara has been somewhat altered. It is not absolutely certain that -āṭhā is the true reading intended.
16 Originally -dérē was engraved.
17 Originally Siṃhama was engraved, but the impressions look as if the second akṣhara had been altered to ri, I take the same to be equivalent to Brihēma, line 9, below.
18 These signs of punctuation are superfluous.
19 Here there is what looks like a sign of the antagraha which has been struck out again.
FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

BY PANDIT NATESA SASTRI, M. F. L. S.

No. 37. — The Story of Atirupa.

In the country of the Sêtapatis there lived a famous astrologer named Satyavâk. All through the country he was known as the greatest astrologer living, and it was said that whatever he foretold never proved untrue. Many came from the remotest parts of the earth to consult him, and to every one he imparted his advice gratis, never taking even a hauḍī from any one who came to him. Nor was Satyavâk rich. He was almost a pauper, although he was, at that time, the greatest authority on astrology. His only means of livelihood was begging for alms. He would take a bowl in his hand exactly at the tenth ghâṭikā of the day, and go about from house to house collecting rice. As soon as there was enough in his bowl to feed two people for the day, he would return home and hand over the rice to his wife. His only relativo in this world was his wife. All the others he had lost. She was an extremely polite, contented and educated woman, and whatever her husband gave her she received with a cheerful countenance.

The pair led a happy life, notwithstanding their poverty, till, one day, the wife thought to herself: — "My lord is the greatest authority in a department of knowledge, which is most eagerly sought after by high and low. From the Sêtapati to the meanest subject dwelling in this country all consult him. Daily from early morning to the tenth ghâṭikā of the day he spends his time in giving advice. From the tenth to the fifteenth ghâṭikā he goes out begging, and returns home only with enough to feed him and myself for the day. Again in the evening he spends his time in giving advice. What is his object in thus freely giving away his hard-earned knowledge for nothing? Here we are, husband and wife, and do we not want some money to make ourselves comfortable? When there is every opportunity for his earning a good income and even amassing great wealth, why should he be thus careless of utilizing it and thereby make himself rich? There must be some reason for it. I have been thus patiently bearing up till now. To-night I shall ask him." Thus thought she, and, retaining her curiosity till night should fail, she calmly waited for its approach.

Now, as soon as the heavy work of the day was over, Satyavâk used to retire for the night with his wife, but this night he missed the usual cheerfulness from her face. She seemed a little sad, and he knew very well that he had done nothing during the day, or indeed at any time, to displease her, for they were a most affectionate couple. So, being unable to guess the cause of her sadness, he thus spoke to her: —

"My dear wife! What is the matter with you to-night? We are leading such a holy and innocent life that even the higher powers should dread us! Such being the case, can any
human being have dared to offend us? Who has done you harm? What is the reason of your downcast looks? Speak out, my love, and the offender, whoever he may be, shall cease to live! For, however poor we may be, our influence is so great, that we can soon bring the culprit to justice."

Thus spoke her husband, and ashamed of the weakness which had displeased her lord, who spoke so nobly, notwithstanding their poverty, and who, as she knew, valued wealth as nothing, she thus answered: —

"Most mighty husband, I know very well that, as long as I have the honour of being your wife, no being either on earth or heaven would dare to offend me. Your virtue ever stands by me as my guardian spirit. Your very name enables me to roam over the whole world chaste and pure. Even fire would fear to touch me! Such are the powers conferred on you by your virtue and good conduct; but, for all my happiness in this world in having you for my lord, I was made a little sad to-day from pondering over in my mind as to why my lord should choose to be so very poor, when there is ample opportunity to make himself rich. I could not understand why my husband, while he could afford to live like a king, should go begging every day. It was only this that made me sad and nothing else, and I respectfully request you now to dispel this confusion from my mind."

Thus ended the wife, and Satyavâk, smiling at her womanish simplicity, thus began: —

"My dearest wife! After all, you have shewn yourself to be a very woman! I took you to be much above that kind of thing. Having spent the whole of my life in astrology, do you think that I have been so careless as not to cast our own horoscopes and to foresee our future? If I had known that the acquisition of wealth would have made us happy, and would put us in a better condition hereafter, I should have been the greatest of fools to have disregarded it. What is wealth after all? It is an empty bauble, never steady for even a single moment. The acquisition of a small quantity of it fires the soul with the ambition to acquire more, till life is lost in the pursuit and all other duties forgotten. The last rung of that ladder has never been reached yet by any one. All who have been thus engaged, have given up their lives without ever having attained the full height of their ambition. People amass wealth, — hoard after hoard, — and still they sigh because further hoards are wanting. Wealth is the worst demon that ever lived in this world. In his pursuit sins are committed, to wash away which even the holy waters of the Ganges or of the sacred *Sámodra Bâja* (ocean) have no power. Even wealth honestly got, if minutely examined, would be found to have, here and there, some flaws in it. It is to save ourselves from sins incident to the acquisition of wealth that I have been leading this simple and innocent life. As I have already told you, you are only a woman after all, and have fallen into the weakness of your sex in imagining that it is money that makes one happy, and not other and better things. I have to tell you now that we are to have no children in this world to be of service to us in our old age. Our horoscopes say that. How then would any amount of wealth make you happy? Foreseeing all this, and, not wishing to make our already unfortunate life in this birth (jânma) still more unfortunate at our next birth, I have chosen my present mode of life. These are my reasons. As a sensible woman you must agree with me. What have we to care for in this world? Our own name and fame! I see that my remark, that we are to have no children, has already changed the colour of your face. You need not be so very sorry. I qualified that statement with the remark 'to be of service to us in our old age.' We shall have a boy in our sixtieth year, but he will not be of much use to us! And you must not ask me any more questions!"

Thus said Satyavâk, and his wife, who was all the while listening most eagerly to him, blamed herself for her imprudence in having shewn her weakness to her husband, and, being a good and educated lady, she readily perceived all the various points and arguments which made her lord adhere to the life he was then leading. Notwithstanding her extreme anxiety to know something more about her future son, she did not like to speak a word on that subject. To Satyavâk,
as he had strictly forbidden her. So with a cheerful face she begged pardon, and in a moment became thoroughly reconciled to him. Ever after that memorable night she continued his most faithful and affectionate wife.

Just as he had foretold, Satyavāk had a boy in his sixtieth year. The child was very beautiful, and the parents named him Atirūpa, and in his fifth year his father commenced the onerous task of educating him. After giving him a general training for some years, he educated him in his own art of astrology, and of this Atirūpa soon became a master; so much so that before he had completed his sixteenth year he was much ahead of his own father. So famous became Atirūpa that people took a greater delight in consulting the son than the father about horoscopes and such things. Satyavāk never grudged the honour that was thus being shown to his son. He was growing very old, and liked to be relieved of trouble in the decline of life. Thus, as the son grew more and more famous, the father allowed himself to be eclipsed in reputation.

The same mode of life was continued by the family. At the tenth ghatikā old Satyavāk went out to beg, and returned with just enough rice to feed three.

One day the father went out as usual, and his old wife busied herself in getting things ready for the morning meal. Their son was, meanwhile, sitting outside the house reading a chapter of the Brihadāranyaka, when suddenly there stood before him the king Sētapati.

"Is your father at home?" asked the sovereign.

"No, my lord! He has just gone out. But I see from Your Majesty's face that some enemy has invaded your country, and you are come to consult my old father as to whether it would be advisable for Your Majesty to march against the invader. In other words, whether the attempt would be successful. I say 'no.' Saturn must now be in the eighth mansion of your horoscope, and so all your attempts must prove unsuccessful. You had better calmly retire into a forest with your family and children, and at the close of the third year from this date you may get back your kingdom without any direct attempt. There is no time to waste. The enemy, half a ghatikā ago, entered the town by the East Gate. So run off."

Thus said the boy, and, before the king could open his lips, there came a hasty messenger panting for breath, and said: — "The enemy has entered the East Gate. We are all undone. There was a most sudden and unexpected attack!"

The king ran in haste to look after his family, and, just as he was hastening away, Satyavāk returned, and his son related to him everything.

On hearing the story even the contented and philosophic disposition of Satyavāk gave way. He placed his bowl on the verandah, and wept profusely. Never, in the whole course of his life before had he let fall a tear from his eyes. But now they fell in profusion.

"Why do you weep, my most holy father?" cried out the son.

This brought his mother running out of the house, and when she saw her lord in tears, even without knowing the cause, she began to weep out of sympathy. The son's eyes, too, began to moisten, and, thus, in a moment, all three began to weep without exactly knowing why. This continued for a time, till the mother, sobbing, said: — "Why is the face of the donor of prosperity to the whole world wet with tears to-day? Will my lord explain?"

Said he: — "I bore with my misery calmly till to-day without disclosing it to you and making you a sharer in it; but to-day's misfortunes have been too much for me! I could no longer bear it, and so I wept. Did I not tell you a long time ago that our son would be of no

1 A work on astrology.
service to us in our old age? That was a mild way of saying that his life would be a short
one! I did not like to wound a mother’s heart with so terrible a statement. Only eighteen
years are given to our Atriupa in his horoscope; and already, the sixteenth year is drawing to
a close. He has only two years more to live, and then we shall lose him. The thought of this and
of the vast amount of rare knowledge that he has acquired brought this sorrow upon me. What
child of an astrologer has ever before, in his sixteenth year, so clearly foreseen the fortunes
of the king of the country? Is it because the life of our Atriupa was made so short that
God gave him such superior intellectual powers? O ye gods, how cruel you are towards your
own creatures!"

Thus ended the old man, unable to proceed further, and choking with his sorrow. His wife
fell to the ground, like a tree cut at the root, and the boy perceived that he was the cause of all
this misery of his parents. He consoled them by degrees, and cheered them up, asking his father
for his horoscope. He then began to examine it minutely before his anxious parents, and at
last pronounced it to have been wrongly cast, for certain reasons. His arguments were so
cogent and persuasive that Satyavak, too, began to waver in his opinion. Atriupa, seizing
the opportunity, clearly proved to his father that he would live for a full century; that the
horoscope must say so if it had been rightly cast; and that all this trouble had occurred owing
to its having been wrongly cast. He then corrected and re-wrote his horoscope with very
sound arguments for such corrections, and made his father believe beyond doubt that his
son was to live for a hundred years, and not to meet his death in his eighteenth year. His
mother, too, was pretty nearly satisfied, and, thus, in a few ghatidhas, after a great deal of trouble
on the part of Atriupa, peace was restored to the minds of his parents, and everything went on
as usual.

Now this was all a trick of Atriupa. Finding that his parents were dispirited on
his account, he had, for the nonce, invented a lie; for the moment that Atriupa saw his
horoscope he was more than convinced that death was inevitable in his eighteenth year.
But, fresh from his studies, and actuated with the motive of calming the feelings of his parents,
he had boldly, by reason of his minute knowledge, brought forth arguments to falsify his horo-
scope, and his doting father, who had wavered in his belief, readily took in what he had said.

Although his parents fully believed in what Atriupa had said, he was ill at ease in his mind.
He had really the greatest regard for his father, and extreme confidence in his predictions and state-
ments. Knowledge is one for all. The same principles which had told Satyavak that Atriupa
was not to live for more than eighteen years, indicated to his son also that his life current ran
only up to that point.

His life, then, in the world, was only to be for two years more, but meanwhile he had a
strong desire to perform a pilgrimage to Banaras to perform the prescribed religious
rites for his parents, and he knew very well that, if he spoke about it to his father, he
would be the last person to give him permission. He hardly knew how to act, and, in order
to avoid any suspicions by doing things hastily, he waited for six months more, and spent
that period most happily with his old and affectionate parents.

One day, as Atriupa was sitting in the verandah of the house, he thought to himself as follows:—
"Ever since I expounded my horoscope, my old father believes that I shall live fully a hundred
years. But I know for certain, if astrology is a science at all, that I shall die in a year and a
half. Wherever I go this must happen. I cannot avoid it. If I remain at home and die
here, my parents must also die broken-hearted, but if I run away from home they, who are
still under the illusion that I shall live for a hundred years, will anxiously await my return, and
die a natural death. For I am certain that I shall soon depart to a place from which no one
has ever returned. It is much better to put them to a little trouble and anxiety now and fly
from home, than to stay behind and die in their presence, and thus be the cause of their death for
grief for me. I shall not run away in vain either, for I shall proceed to Banaras, and there
before my end approaches, I shall have performed all the rites necessary for the salvation of my parents and myself."

Thus thought Atrūpa and made up his mind to be off the next morning before dawn, and, as that was to be the last day in his life under his parents’ roof, he was unusually cheerful. But instead of retiring to rest at the usual appointed time, Atrūpa kept his father engaged in conversation to late hour of the night. At length the aged couple retired to rest, and Atrūpa did so, too, with tears in his eyes at the thought of the morrow’s parting. But sleep he could not. He walked round and round the house; handled each palm-leaf volume on astrology, wept over it, and replaced it in its original position; went to the spot where his father used to take his seat while teaching his son; stood there for a short time and wept over it, and thus paid his last visit to every familiar part of his humble dwelling. When the night had almost drawn to a close — “shall I run away or not?” thought Atrūpa. Sometimes he thought it best to go, sometimes that he would stay at home and take his chance. At last the original resolve prevailed, and, packing up a small bundle of clothes and with nothing in hand, he left his home!

“The launch is always difficult and afterwards everything becomes smooth,” runs the proverb. Even so Atrūpa found it in his case. He who had had so much difficulty in quitting his home, found his mind soon made easy. The thought consoled him that in a year and a half he would be alive no more, while his parents would still be expecting his return, and he thus spending their days in less grief than if he had remained and died in their presence. He walked on as fast as he could. He begged his meals on his way, and without showing that he knew anything of astrology, lest he should give a clue as to where he had gone, he went onwards like an ordinary beggar, walking all day and sleeping at night.

After travelling thus for nearly two months he reached the city of Chandragiri. Now Atrūpa was from the south, and the people there did not understand his language, and though he begged in several places, no one would feed him. For the first time in his journey he found it difficult to live. “My difficulties have commenced in earnest now; God knows where they will end,” thought he.

The day was almost drawing to a close, and our hero had not yet had his meal and rest. He wandered about the streets in the evening twilight, when a grand pandal met his eyes. The place had the appearance of marriage festivities, and he thought that if he went there he would be fed along with the rest, and he was not wrong in his expectation. It was the minister’s house, and grand preparations were going on for the marriage of his son with the beautiful princess of Chandragiri. There were yet a couple of days before that happy event would take place; but the preparations had been going on for some weeks. The feasting of poor Brāhmaṇas had also begun, and so Atrūpa, after some difficulty in explaining himself, discovered that the feasting would begin at the tenth ghastī of the night, and that until then he might rest where he liked. Constant walking had made him thoroughly weary, and, though he might lose his food, he did not like to lose the opportunity of resting his weary limbs. Near the pandal there was a big mansion,—evidently belonging to a rich person. No one was outside the house, and it had a big verandah. Atrūpa got on to this, and, retiring to a corner, covered his body with his cloth and fell asleep. The night had just set in, and sleep soon overtook our hero.

Leaving him for a while to rest, let us return to his parents. They got up as usual, and missed their son. At first they thought that he must have gone out early that day to the river to bathe, and as he had not returned after the tenth ghastī, they thought he must have gone to the adjacent village to see a friend. But even on the third day their son had not returned. Thus one day after another passed, and Atrūpa never returned! As the days passed the anxiety of the parents became greater. They searched the whole country to the best of their ability, and obtained here and there slight hints that their son had gone on
a pilgrimage to the holy Ganges, and that he would return in the course of three or four years. These hints had purposely been dropped on his way by the clever Atirūpa, and he had managed so well that he gave hope and yet no hope. So his aged parents, after a good deal of searching, gave up their pursuit as hopeless. Sometimes they thought that Atirūpa had gone to the north on a pilgrimage; at other times that he had gone to some unknown place.

"I told you, wife, that we are so unfortunate in this world that our son would be of no service to us. First I thought that it meant his death, at the age of eighteen, according to my calculations. Atirūpa cleverly proved this to be false, but what of that after all? He may live for a hundred years, but he has left us! Let him prosper somewhere or other happily. Enough if he returns before we die and consoles us. But I do not think that such happiness will ever occur to us."

Thus Satyavāk continued to console his poor wife, and little by little the pair ceased to sorrow for their lost son.

To return to Chandragiri, where we left our hero asleep. Chandragiri was governed by a king, who had a very beautiful and educated daughter. He searched for a suitable match for a long time, and, confiding in his minister, one day he called him to his side, and said to him:

"My good minister, my daughter, the princess, is growing older day by day, and still you have secured no suitable match for her. How long are we to be kept in anxiety?"

The minister replied: — "My lord! Give me leave for a month, and I will go down to the southern countries, and get you portraits of all the princes in that direction. Your Majesty can choose the most beautiful face from among them."

"Very well," said the king, and granted him leave. But the minister was a treacherous rogue, and never utilized his leave for any journey to the south. He spent the whole of it quietly in some distant corner of the king's dominions, drawing from pure imagination half a dozen awkward pictures of several supposed princes of the south. On the expiry of his leave the minister produced these pictures and said:

"My most gracious sovereign, with the nimble feet of a deer I have roamed over all the southern countries, and bring you these pictures. This picture represents the face of the Pāṇḍyan Prince, than whom no handsomer man ever existed in the south. That picture represents the Chēra Yuvarāja. That one represents the Chōlā Prince."

"Throw them all away," said the king, "I do not like even a single face from among them." How could he, when they had been purposely made awkward by the cunning minister?

Again after one or two months the minister took leave for a journey to the north to fetch suitable bridgroomers, and this time, also, the same trick was played. Thus did the minister deceive the Chandragiri sovereign several times, till the old king was entirely disappointed, believing that all his minister had said was truth, and nothing but the truth.

Now, besides his daughter, the king had no child, and so, after her father, the whole kingdom of Chandragiri would devolve upon her; and he who married her would become the King of Chandragiri. The minister of Chandragiri had a fair son, but he was not educated, and his father determined to get him married to the princess, and thus place him on the throne. So he made the king think there was no prince, whom he could choose as a fit bridgroom for his only daughter. The king was lost in meditation, and did not know what to do. But one evening the minister suddenly appeared with another picture in his hand, and with a joyful face.

"What! Have you, after all, succeeded in finding a suitable match?" asked the king.
“I think I have, my lord; but that is what I say every time that I approach Your Majesty. I cannot be certain of my success till Your Majesty has given your own opinion,” answered the minister politely.

In his eagerness the king snatched the picture, and for the first time in his examination of pictures his face smiled, and he said replied, “Whose picture is this?”

The minister replied, “I will tell you, my lord; but are you, in any way, satisfied with it?”

“Most assuredly,” said the king. “Tell me whose picture it is?”

“It is my son, my lord,” replied the minister.

“Then,” said the king, “we are like the old woman in the fable, who went in search of ghee when she had a great quantity of butter in her house. Why didn’t you tell me that you had such a fair son? I would have gladly given him my daughter in marriage long ago, and saved you all the trouble of going now to the north, now to the south, and now to other directions.”

The minister then explained that he did not like to be so selfish; that he had tried his best to find the best bridegroom; and that, when all his efforts proved vain, he had resolved to show his master his own son’s picture!

Now, the minister’s son was, no doubt, fair, but his father had purposely made the portrait more beautiful than the original, and at last his object was gained; for the king, not to lose any more time, at once fixed upon the fifteenth day of the approaching fortnight as the marriage day of his daughter. It was for this marriage that so many grand preparations were going on at Chandragiri when Atirupa arrived there, and it chanced that the place in which he slept was the minister’s own house.

Every one in the town of Chandragiri was rejoicing at the approaching festivity, except the minister. He had, it is true, after so many stratagems, succeeded in his great ambition, and the grand day was approaching fast. There were now only two days more, or rather two nights and one day,—for, on the morning of the third day, the happy marriage for which he had been working so hard was to come on, and still he was sad. For, alas! the day fixed for the wedding was that on which the epileptic fits, to which his son was liable, came upon him. The boy had epileptic attacks every alternate day, of a most virulent type. They began early in the morning, and lasted till late in the afternoon. Every other day the boy was in a most horrible plight from the fifth to the twentieth ghatakka of the day. This was why his education had never been cared for. The minister, however, took such care, that no one in the town knew anything of his malady besides the inmates of his house, on whom he had imposed such strict penalties, should they reveal it, that no one ever dared to open his lips on the subject.

“Let the marriage rites pass off successfully, and then it does not matter much if the king finds out that my son is an epileptic,” thought the minister.

But, unfortunately for him, the day fixed for the marriage was that on which the epileptic attack returned, and he did not know how to get over the difficulty. If he proposed a change of day it might lead to some suspicion or other, and the match might be broken off, and his highest ambition baulked.

After pondering the matter over in his mind for a few days he resolved upon celebrating the marriage on the day fixed.

“What if it is the day my boy is attacked? I shall not let him go through the marriage at all but will put some one disguised in his place. This person shall perform the rites in my son’s stead, and thus the formal marriage will take place. I shall so arrange as to send away the substitute next day, and I shall amply reward the priests, who will be my tools in this affair. Even among them it is only a few that have seen my boy.”
Thus thought the minister, and for a moment care fled from his face. He imagined that he had already successfully accomplished his object; when, suddenly, his face again changed colour, as he thought he had landed himself upon new difficulties.

"Where to find the substitute?" thought he. "First of all, he must be young and beautiful, and he must be a perfect stranger to this place, and he must be entirely at our mercy."

But how to find him and where? For the time was fast approaching! In this state of mind the minister came out of his house on the night on which our hero went to sleep on his verandah.

The minister was so ferocious a personage, that no one dared to approach him or speak to him when he was moody or occupied with his own thoughts. His servants knew him very well, and avoided him always on such occasions. So on the night in question, he was standing all alone in front of his house, near the tenth ghatikā, just as people from several directions were walking to the dining-place behind the pavāl, bent on feeding at another's expense. By and by the bustle of the hastening crowd calmed down, and eating commenced; but the minister's mind still continued agitated. He still saw no hope of his getting out of his difficulties. This brought on such a feeling of disappointment over his mind, that he was almost weeping as he stood there alone. While thus lost in sorrow and misery, he thought he heard some one snoring in a corner of his long verandah.

"Who could it be, sleeping there so soundly? What must be the anaducity of the fool, who had chosen this house to sleep in? But let me see. It may be a poor Brahman, who has lingered here for a meal and fallen asleep. I will awake him, and send him to the dining-hall."

Thus thinking, the minister slowly walked up to the spot. There was a light in the verandah, but the face of the sleeper was covered with a cloth.

"Ah, I see. It must be one of my servants, who has thus fallen asleep at his duty of watching the house. I have caught the wretch now, and will dismiss him."

Thinking thus, the minister removed the cloth from the face. The exhausted Atirūpa never stirred an inch. He slept on, and what did the minister see? A beautiful face, fairer than his own son's, and thus approaching almost the representation he had given to the king. Again, the age of the boy, who was asleep, was almost equal to that of his son. So perfect a duplicate was he, as the minister thought, of his own son, that he was charmed at the discovery. To crown his great success, the boy appeared to be a stranger to Chandragiri.

"Has fortune conducted me to this boy to-night?" thought the minister, and at once roused him from his sleep."

"Who are you, Sir?" asked the minister, and the boy did not reply.

"Do you know Telugu?" asked the minister. The boy nodded his head to indicate that he did not know it.

"Sanskrit?" asked the lord of the house.

"Yes," said the boy.

The minister was overjoyed to find that the person was a perfect stranger, and, without wasting any time, the minister secretly took the boy inside, and told him that he would help him in every way, if he only promised to obey his orders. All that Atirūpa wanted was a sum of money large enough to enable him to continue his journey to Banaras, and perform the intended ceremonies there. That the minister promised, and Atirūpa was well fed and left to rest for the night.

Next morning the minister explained to him his plan, and asked Atirūpa to take the place of his son and celebrate the marriage with the princess. But he must not reveal the secret to anyone, and as soon as the marriage was over he was to proceed on his journey to
Banaras, for which the minister would arrange and amply supply him with funds. Never, again, in his life was Atriopa ever to turn towards that direction. The arrangements were thus successfully made, and to the repeated questions of the minister as to his parentage, &c., Atriopa kept silent, and only gave out that he was a poor Brahman.

Thus, on his pilgrimage towards the north, our hero was detained for a day or two on account of a sham marriage! Refusal would only have endangered his head, for his keen sense told him that he was in the hands of the minister. And our hero also thought to himself:—

"Why should I chide prosperity that throws itself in my way? I am now a wandering beggar, travelling over strange countries, with not a kurdi in my hand. There is this minister, who promises to arrange conveniently for my journey, if I oblige him. In addition to my obliging him and getting myself obliged, there is another object attained by this sham marriage. As long as I remain a bachelor I am debarred from celebrating certain ceremonies at Banaras, Gayâ, and other places. Fortunately, without my ever expecting it, my bachelorhood will also be removed. I can, with full liberty, then perform all the rites at those holy places. So I am, in no way, a loser."

Atriopa thought thus, and freely gave his consent to all the projects of the minister, and at last the marriage day came. Grand preparations went on over the whole town. A great pandit had already been erected between the minister's mansion and the royal palace, along which the bridegroom had to be conducted from his house to the bride's house, where the rites were to be performed, and during the whole of that day the boy could not leave the girl's house. Agreeably to all these rules, Atriopa was cleverly transformed into the minister's son by being profusely decorated from head to foot, whereby only a portion of his face was visible. In this guise he was conducted to the marriage-hall in the royal palace. The princess, who was an intelligent and beautiful girl, was waiting with the greatest eagerness to get a secret glance at her future husband, and was delighted at heart to see that her chosen lord was fair to see and intelligent withal. The marriage ceremonies were gone through, and were very long, tedious and tiresome. Several oblations were offered to the sacred fire, and Atriopa performed them all. Every one there assembled thought him the minister's son, and one or two that knew the secret never opened their lips. They were not only largely bribed, but were threatened with the loss of their heads, if they broke their trust. Thus the marriage was celebrated, and the formal cord of the completion of the marriage ceremony was tied round the neck of the princess by Atriopa — the supposed minister's son — towards the close of the day, amidst the beat of drums and sound of music. The remaining rites were hastily gone through, and the auspicious hour for the entry into the decorated hall to spend the night was fast approaching.

This is a business left entirely to the management of the elder ladies of the household. Neither the priests nor the males of the household have any voice in it. As soon as the ladies appear they must retire from the scene, and according to this custom, and before the minister or the priest had any notice of it, the ladies walked in, and amidst their sweet songs and blessings conducted the newly married couple into the decorated hall. As soon as that was reached and the couple walked in, the queen, who was the mother of the bride, locked the door and carried away the key, as is the custom in Hindu society on the first day of the marriage.

Then, alone in a spacious hall, decorated on all sides, Atriopa had the fortune of meeting a princess! He flung his heavy ornaments down on the ground, and sat silent. The princess, vexed to see her lord so sad, placed before him all kinds of fruits, sweetmeats and other dishes that were in the hall. On seeing them and tasting a little, Atriopa felt his hunger appeased and sang a Sanskrit verse, the meaning of which the princess, though a highly educated lady, was not able to understand. The sweet voice and the majestic tone with which Atriopa had

---

2 On the first day of the marriage and in the decorated hall meant for the couple to sleep in, all these estables are left previously by the elder ladies of the house.
sung it delighted her, and so did the thought that her lord was no ordinary person, and
that he was as fair in mind as in body. She tried her best to arrive at the meaning, but could
not. She fell at her lord's feet, and requested him respectfully to expound the meaning of
the verse he had just sung; and with a clear and silvery tone Atirūpa began the exposition, and
after two hours' commentary concluded it thus:

"Sweetmeats, fruits, &c., to a hungry stomach are like beauty to unchaste women. Rice
alone is the food I now most need to satisfy my hunger, as it is chastity alone which a
woman needs to be called beautiful."

The princess rose up, and without saying a word arranged upside down on the floor in
the form of a hearth, three silver cups, in which scented sandalwood, paste, rose water
and other things had been placed. There was akhata in abundance standing in a platter
at the side of the room. She took it, washed a portion of it in milk, which had been
placed in the room, and, putting it in a silver milk jug with milk in it, set the pot over the
overturned silver cups. Below these she placed scented sticks and sandal wood, which she
found in the room, and in a minute lighted a fire. In less than a ghāṭikā the washed akhata
and the milk were cooked into boiled rice. The princess emptied the rice into a silver platter,
and placed it before her lord. Atirūpa was lost in admiration at the readiness of the princess.
Glad at heart that he was fortunate enough to term that intelligent lady his wife, for a short
time at least (for he was sure to be sent out of the city by the minister the next morning), he
dragged the platter before him. He eyed the princess with joy in his face, and politely requested
her to sit by his side and partake of the meal with him, as she, too, must be hungry.

Now, during Hindu marriage ceremonies, the ritual takes up so much time, that brides and
bridegrooms have scarcely any leisure for a convenient and hearty meal. The princess, proud
of the company of such a beautiful and intelligent husband, sat by his side, but she ate little.
She was so delighted with the verse that she requested her husband to repeat it again, and
carefully copied it on the wall of the hall. After a long conversation about the various
departments of knowledge with which each were acquainted, they retired to rest. Each was
overjoyed, and thanked God, who, in His superior judgment, had brought them together in
this world as husband and wife. Never was there a happier pair in the world than Atirūpa and
the princess.

Leaving our hero to his hard-earned repose after an adventurous day and night, let us
return to the minister. Before he could arrange to substitute his son in the place of the
poor Brāhman boy, the ladies of the palace and Her Majesty the queen herself had outwitted
him. He did not like to display any of his awkward blunders, and returned home a little sad no
doubt, but glad that the marriage had gone off successfully, that throughout the whole cerem-
yony the people assembled there thought that it was his son, who sat as the bridegroom,
and that no suspicion had arisen on that head. He would fetch his supposed son in the
early morning from the decorated chamber, and send the poor Brāhman boy away:

"The secret will be between myself and that fool of a Brāhman. From to-morrow my son
will be the husband of the princess, and the heir-apparent to the throne of Chandragiri."

In this way the minister consoled himself, and before sun-rise sent his palanquin to the
palace to bring home his supposed son, the bridegroom. In accordance with custom the
palanquin from the minister's mansion waited near the princess's bed-chamber. The queen
opened the door, and, seeing her son-in-law enter the palanquin, she entered her daughter's
chamber and conducted her to her own room. Now, though the happy couple had retired to
rest the previous night, they had never a wink of sleep, for one conversation led to another,
and each found the company of the other so sweet, that time flew away without their noticing
it, till the palanquin was announced. To the credit of our hero be it said that he never told

1 Rice grain mixed with turmeric used in auspicious ceremonies.
the princess that he was not the minister's son, nor did he give her any information about his parentage. He had, however, in a careless moment, let out that he was bent upon a pilgrimage to Banaras. At the same time the princess never doubted her lord to be any other than the son of the minister. Thus, each trusted the other, and, expecting to open their hearts more freely the next time they met, they parted reluctantly in the morning.

The second day's rites must commence soon, and so the princess retired in haste to prepare herself for them, and expected to meet her lord, though not to speak with him, in the midst of an assembly.

Let us now follow our hero in the palanquin. As soon as it was set down, the minister conducted his supposed son Atirupa into his chamber, the doors of which were closed behind them. Our hero imagined for a moment that after all he was not destined to live to his eighteenth year, as the hand of some assassin could now put an end to his life; but it was not so. The fortune that gave him the princess gave him also his life. The minister was the first to speak:

"Poor wretch! I meant to use you for my purpose only; but circumstances have carried you further than I intended. It is no blame of yours. Get into the same palanquin. I have left in it six bags, each containing 500 mohers. I have posted bearers on the way, and they will conduct you for two days and nights to the boundary of our empire. Take the coins with you, and fly to any country you like. If you turn back and place your feet in our dominions, your head shall be cut off. I have issued orders to this effect. I have a mind to do so now, but the thought that I had placed you for a day at least in the position of my son, softens my temper. Fly."

Atirupa was not allowed even a minute to reply. He was neither dissatisfied nor murmured. He was glad he was no more a bachelor, and as such had the full privilege of performing all the religious rites, prescribed by the sacred books of his religion, for his parents. There was the money promised for his expenses, and what more did he need? If he was ever destined to live in the world he was sure that the lady, who had given him her company on the previous night, would still own him as her lord. While these thoughts were passing and repassing through his mind, the minister suddenly put him into the palanquin and gave the orders. The bearers, who had been previously instructed, started off on their journey. Without moving a muscle Atirupa sat in the palanquin, and continued his journey; but now and then his mind flew back to the princess and her excellent accomplishments in everything.

While our hero was riding in a palanquin instead of walking on foot, the minister — glad at heart that the occasion, on which he would observe his son seated by the side of the princess, had at last come — conducted him joyfully to the sacred place. The priests had already assembled there, and began their preliminary rites. The princess was seated in a corner of the hall with her lady friends to give her lord her company in the oblations to the sacred fire. The beauty, the learning, the magnanimous conduct in everything of her lord was so prominent in her mind that she was pondering over all the conversation of the previous night.

Just at the fifth ghajika it was announced that the bridegroom was entering the marriage-hall. Every eye was turned towards him. Only one person there knew that it was a different person, who was now approaching the hall. The same dress, the same ornaments and decorations, the same stature, the same colour; but one in that hall knew that now her life was hopeless. With more than the curiosity of the rest, she, too, turned her eyes in the direction of her approaching lord, but her eyes failed to catch the intelligent face that had expounded, with such nicety, the intricate Sanskrit verse of the previous night. Her confusion and dismay were immense. But weakness might bring shame on her whole family; — might, perhaps, even endanger the very life of her real lord! So she resumed her composure, and, going up to the minister's son, sat beside him, as she had done the previous day by the side of Atirupa. The rites proceeded, and she freely lent her help. The minister was highly
relate at the thorough success of his tricks, and that he had won a princess for a daughter-in-law and an empire for his son.

Meanwhile the princess swore in her heart to be virtuous, if the great god would give her back her real husband. She sat now with a sham husband merely to preserve her family dignity. Her heart was not in the affair, and she would rather murder the substituted husband with her own hands than prove false to the true one. The second day also drew to a close, and, in accordance with the custom, in the early part of the night, the minister's son and the princess were conducted to the bridal-chamber and the door was locked. But now that the princess was alone with her sham husband her anger knew no bounds. She was the first to speak:

"Stand there at the door, and don't stir one step and sully my room! Tell me the honest truth. Who are you? If you are a mean wretch, placed in this position by others, I shall pity and release you."

The minister's son replied: "I am your husband."

Before he had closed his mouth she had unsheathed a sword, and at the very sight of it an epileptic fit began. Seeing the poor wretch in such a helpless plight she put the sword back into its sheath, and raised an alarm. The door was immediately opened.

"There, take away your son-in-law. He has got epilepsy," said the princess, standing at the remotest corner of the room, to her mother.

Now no one knew the cause of this but the minister, who was still there, for the whole thing had happened so quickly that none of the party outside the hall had had time to go home. Cursing his fate, which had brought on the attack so quickly, the minister carried the bridegroom home.

"What is the matter, daughter?" said the queen.

"Mother, dear; if you wish me to live in this world, do not, please, talk upon this subject till I tell you everything," replied the daughter.

There was now confusion and dismay throughout the palace, but still no one knew the cause of the strange occurrence on the second day of the marriage.

Still, the ceremonials could not be neglected, and those of the third day were continued. The princess and the minister's son, again sat together in the hall, and, again entered the bed chamber: — the third time for the princess, the second time for the minister's son.

Said the princess to him just as the door was being shut: — "Fool that you are, that dare to approach again the bridal-chamber! I have allowed you admittance to-night, as I wanted to give you certain advice. Stand there in the place you stood last night, and hear what I have to say. You are not fit even to be the dust on my lord's feet. How did you dare, then, to assume this position? Tell me the whole truth, or you shall soon know the consequences of refusal!"

The minister's son, seeing that his life was in danger, and, giving up all hope of ever winning the princess for his wife, related, with fear and agitation, everything, except that about her real husband he could give the princess no more information than that he was a poor Brahman boy, picked up for the occasion by the minister, and that he had been safely conducted out of the Chandragiri dominions by the orders of his father.

This news gave the greatest consolation to the princess. She was glad to hear that her lord was still alive, and that there was no fear for his life for the present. So great a soul would, of course, prosper wherever he might go.

Then, turning to the minister's son, she said: — "Never, again, set your feet in my room. You may attend my father's court as the king's son-in-law, and receive the
customary presents, and do all that you like as regards the outer world. But if you ever dare to call me your wife, or approach my room, or write to me, or send messengers to me, I'll have you beaten to death!"

The minister's son received the order, and called to his father, who was waiting outside, for fear that something might happen that night also. The door was soon opened, and the minister's son left that chamber for ever.

Ever after that day, the princess kept to her own room, and only came out for her meals. That her real lord should return and claim her was her one desire. To her he was everything. Her parents observed the great change that had come over her. She gave up her usual ornaments and decorations, and clad herself in the meanest of her attire. She renounced flowers and scents, which had been her special taste. She had always slept on the softest of silken cushions, but now curled herself up on the bare ground when sleep overpowered her. Regular sleep she had none, and she always awoke with a start. She, who had always dwelt in summer-houses made cool by a thousand and one artifices, now she took her seat between five sacrificial fires (pachāgni), and did penance. To no one did she explain the mystery of her sorrow, and no one dared to ask her, for so great was the awe she was held in by all, even by her very parents.

The minister's son was so much ashamed of the treatment he had received from the princess, that he never opened his mouth about it to any one. He often frequented the palace as the king's son-in-law, and had due regard paid to him on that account, but even to his father he never said a word, notwithstanding repeated questions, threats and solicitations; and in this way days and months and years passed.

The object of the princess's penance was to regain her original lord, but no one except herself knew of this. Meanwhile the minister's son, as the royal son-in-law, received due honours and presents, and as he was a fair boy, and no one knew the secret of his disease, all expected that, sooner or later, the husband and wife would be reconciled. No one, however, dared to suggest a reconciliation and as to the minister's son, the very name of the princess sometimes brought on the fear of the unsheathed sword, and a visit of his disease. So he never dared to approach her, and, at the slightest hint that she was moving at a distance, he would glide away unobserved. He was content to be called the son-in-law of His Majesty, and his father, the minister, too, was glad, in a way, that some day or other the empire of Chandragir would devolve upon his son.

Thus, a full year and a couple of months passed, and the princess was still engaged in her severe penance. Her life was so pure, so chaste and so simple, that no one had the heart to stay her. But, one day, her old father said:-

"My dearest daughter, you are my only child; I had a great desire to see you, in my old age, married and happy with a husband. But ever since your wedding day you have become thoroughly changed. Is this ascetic's life the life which a princess should lead? Speak out, my dear, and let me know the misery that so affects you."

Replied the princess: "My most noble father; all that I do now is for the good of my husband. Don't ask me any more questions, till I tell you everything after my desires are accomplished. Till then leave me to myself. I may soon want some money, and please let me have it."

The determined air with which the princess spoke, her simple and innocent look, and the pleasure with which she evidently led her ascetic life for the time being, kept the king dumb, and he ordered his treasurer to give the princess whatever she required. She now began to order travellers' rest-houses to be erected at every tenth kōś from her city to Banaras, and put servants in each with instructions to entertain the pilgrims that might pass and repass to and from Banaras. Every convenience of the pilgrims was to be attended to.
Meanwhile, as soon as Atirupa had reached the borders of the Chandragiri dominions, he got down from the palanquin, thanked the bearers for not having murdered him on the way, took possession of the wealth the minister had left, and proceeded towards Banaras. Now that he was amply provided with funds, he found his journey very convenient, and reached that holy city in a couple of months. As he was sure of never living beyond his eighteenth year, he never thought again of his wife, the princess. What hope was there in him of ever regaining her? The minister's plans he knew well enough, and the care with which he watched for him he could well imagine! So Atirupa never looked back upon Chandragiri, nor did he ever think of returning back.

He spent a few months at Banaras in performing the holy rites, and then proceeded to Prayaga. Here our hero went to an old woman, and, giving her all the money he had in hand, requested her to regard him as her own son, and feed him. She was a good-natured dame, and treated Atirupa very kindly. In order not to be idle he let his knowledge of astrology be known, and thousands flocked to him to profit by his art. So, our hero thus led a good life, performing rites, distributing his knowledge, and engaged in devotion. The close of his eighteenth year was now fast approaching. The thought made him sad, but he always kept the secret to himself. Even to the kind old lady, who every day became more and more attached to him, he never said a word about it. As his end drew nearer he avoided public paths, and proceeded to the Ganges for his bath by a lonely footpath through an unfrequented jungle. He adopted this precaution so that people might not observe him at the time of his death. All this time, at Chandragiri, the princess was still at her penance, and her poor parents, at Sutpadi's capital, were anxiously expecting the return of their son.

At last the fatal day arrived, and while Atirupa, after his morning bath, was returning home by his lonely path to his adopted mother, his foot slipped while going up a step, made slippery by some rain that had fallen, and he fell down dead! His body lay unnoticed, for very few people passed by that lonely path.

Now, the moment of Atirupa's death was exactly the moment when the princess's austerity and penance fructified. The god Mahesha appeared before her, and requested to know the object of her austere devotions.

"O most holy god," said she, falling at his feet; "I want to gain back my husband."

"We have granted this boon to you, overcome by your sincere devotion; your lord will soon return back to you," said Mahesha, and disappeared.

From that moment the princess's face changed, and for the first time, since that fatal second day of her marriage, when she missed her husband's face, she felt happy.

"Mahesha has granted my boon; my noble husband will return to me soon now. Let it be days, weeks, months, or years! I shall wait patiently," thought she. But though this thought consoled her greatly, still she did not care to show to others that she was happy, so long as her husband's whereabouts remained unknown. Meanwhile, she issued strict orders to the several agents in her rest-houses between Banaras and Chandragiri, that every pilgrim, who passed or repassed that way, was to be carefully entertained and attended to.

Meanwhile, the old woman at Prayaga missed Atirupa, and did not know how to account for it.

"Our boy has never been irregular, even for a single day, since he came to live with me. Perhaps he has gone out somewhere to-day."

Thus thought she till noon came, and still Atirupa did not return. She then went here and there, but all her search was in vain. That whole day passed away. Night came on.

"Atirupa was always shy. Who will feed him to-night? Will he have enough to eat?" thought she.
On the second day the old woman’s anxiety increased, but what could she do? All her search proved useless.

Now, after thus conferring the boon upon the princess, Mahēśvara returned to his place in the heavens, and the sage Nārada came to visit him. On meeting the god, he asked him as to what the news was. Mahēśa told of the boon he had granted to the princess.

“Her husband is Atirūpa, who has died at Prayāga this morning. We fixed his life at eighteen years, and his term was over this morning. How will he return to the princess?” said the sage.

Then the great god saw the mistake he had committed, but, as he had power to alter things, he said:

“Our word to the princess shall never prove untrue. Her austerities, also, must never remain unrewarded. If Atirūpa is already dead, let him remain so for three days only. Let him regain his life on the fourth day, and let this mystery be unknown even to himself.”

Thus said Mahēśa, and cleared himself from a world of confusion!!

Just as the great god had said, Atirūpa came back to life on the fourth day after his death. He did not know what day it was, and rose up as one rising from a deep slumber. His clothes were all mired, and his body dirty, with the accumulated dirt of several days. He did not know what could have occurred to him. He only had a hazy recollection that the fatal day had come and passed away, and that he had fallen down in the struggles of death. Everything was an enigma. He rose up, went again to the river, bathed and dried his clothes, and, like a madman, returned slowly to his house without understanding what had happened. The good woman, as she welcomed him, said:

“Where have you been to, my good boy, for the last three days? We all missed you, and all my search after you was in vain!”

It now became perfectly clear to Atirūpa that he must have been asleep on the path for three days; or was it a three days’ death? The fatal day had anyhow come and passed away, and whether it was sleep or death that had come to him he did not care to puzzle his head about. He invented an excuse for the occasion, and lived under that good dame’s kind roof for a few days more, being now of one thing perfectly certain, that the fatal day had passed away, and that he was to live for many more years in the world.

The main object that now stood before him, was the misery which his poor old parents must be in. He had spent nearly two years from them. He had had good reason to fly from them, and now, he thought, he had equally good reason to return.

“Are they likely to be still living? Shall I ever have the happiness of meeting them again? If once I can rejoin them, never more will I quit my happy home. I will go and beg a thousand pardons from my father, who, I am sure, will readily grant them.”

With his mind thus made up, he spoke to the kind old lady about his intended departure. Though exceedingly sorry to lose him, she allowed him his wish to return to his home, and gave back to him all that he had given her, saying that she had been already rewarded by his good acts and kindness towards her. Our hero received his money back, as he would much need it on his journey, and requested the old lady to come to him, as soon as she heard from him. He would have taken her along with him, but he wanted to know first whether his parents were alive. Hiding the money in his rags, like a true pilgrim from Banaras, he now took the road, and, with the sacred water of the holy Ganges on his shoulders, went his way homewards.

Now every step that he took on his way homewards, conducted him unawares to his wife. At the very first rest-house an officer of the princess entertained him sumptuously, and when he was about to resume his journey, put a palm-leaf manuscript in his hand, and asked
him if he could read it and explain the meaning of what was written. Atirūpa received it, glanced over it, and at once his face changed colour. Checking himself he thus replied:

"I know the meaning of it; but I cannot tell you what I know. Permit me, please, to depart."

As soon as this was said, the master of the rest-house rose up and fell at the pilgrim's feet, and requested him to stay awhile, as his journey was not to be on foot any longer. Atirūpa was astonished.

"Am I dreaming, or is this reality?" thought he; "what is the meaning of all this? This is the verse that I recited to the princess of Chandragiri on my way here. Is this a trick to find me out? Am I likely to see her again?"

While he was thus musing, the words, "The palanquin is ready; will your holiness be pleased to go into it?" fell upon his ears. It was the master of the rest-house who had thus spoken to him.

"What is the meaning of this? Why should a poor pilgrim returning home to his country ride in a palanquin?" asked Atirūpa.

Then the master of the rest-house explained to our astonished hero the charity of the princess of Chandragiri, who had raised one thousand and one choutries on the way between Banaras and her town, with instructions to feed and entertain every pilgrim, to give to every pilgrim the manuscript he had just seen, to request him to explain the meaning, and to conduct to her that person, who could read it and explain its meaning. He further told the still astonished Atirūpa that several months had passed, that many had received and returned the manuscript unread, and that the only person, who had given him any hope, was the present pilgrim.

Everything was now plain to our hero: the verse was his own which he had repeated to his wife on the night he saw her: her name was connected with the charities. What more proof could he need? He was now perfectly sure that all these contrivances were his wife's plans to bring him back to her. He thanked God for his good fortune, and was sure that he was to be taken back to his wife's country. But what could have become of the minister's son? He did not like to enquire about this, lest it should lead him into danger.

Meanwhile, in accordance with instructions received, the messengers flew to the princess with the news that, at last, a pilgrim was coming in a palanquin, who was able to expound the writing on the palm-leaf. The princess's joy knew no bounds. Mahāsa's boon has been granted after all, and yet she was not quite sure till she actually saw her lord. She sent for her father, and he, ever ready to obey his virtuous daughter, came at once.

"Most loving father. I have attained the object of my penance, and we have to wait only for a couple of days more. There is a pilgrim coming here from Banaras the day after to-morrow, who must be entertained in our palace and perform his pūjā in our great hall, and after receiving blessings from his holy hands I shall be rejoined to my husband. Let all the great men of the city attend the pūjā to bless me on the occasion. Let my husband, too, be invited. But you must not give notice of this until we see the pilgrim actually settled in his pūjā in our palace. There will still be ample time. Meanwhile you should yourself go on in advance and welcome the pilgrim, and conduct him to our hall. He is no ordinary personage. I will explain everything to you after his arrival."

Thus spoke the daughter, and her father had no other course but to obey. She was his only daughter, and had brought him the happiest of news. So he hastened out, and proceeded to welcome the approaching pilgrim. The palanquin was placed on the ground as soon as the bearers saw the king, and notice was given to the rider inside that the lord of Chandragiri was approaching. The old king himself, too, when he was informed that the palan-
quin had been put down, got down from his vehicle and proceeded on foot to welcome the pilgrim. And for the first time in their lives the father-in-law and son-in-law saw each other face to face without the former knowing the relationship that existed between them. He was lost in admiration. The beauty, the noble bearing, and the holy appearance of the pilgrim were enough for any man to bow to. The monarch, also, on putting the ascetic life of his own daughter and the approaching pilgrim together, thought that there must be some spiritual relationship between them, or that the pilgrim was a real god in human form, and shewed him the greatest respect.

The pilgrim did not like to commit himself by saying anything till he was sure that it was his wife who was at the bottom of all these adventures. There was, therefore, more silence than talk after the meeting, and the little there was of talk was so neutral that it cleared none of the doubts of either party.

Chandragiri was reached at last, and the pilgrim with the holy Ganges water safely in his hand alighted at the royal mansion, and the vessel containing it was placed in the hall. As soon as the palanquin was announced the princess took up a convenient position in her balcony to observe her lord, and when her eyes roamed over him she breathed deep for joy.

"May Mahēśvara be praised! He has brought me back my nātha — my true lord!" thought she; "I shall never again lose him now."

From that very moment everything about her and in her began to change. She decorated herself with her choicest ornaments and put on the best of her apparel, and, while the pilgrim was engaged in his ablutions, came down herself from the upper story, and decorated the hall with her own fair hands for the performance of the pūjā.

Every one noticed the sudden change that came over the princess, and took it to be her joy at the approaching reunion with her husband, the minister's son.

The time for the worship of the holy water of the Ganges drew on, and almost all the great people of the city were assembled for it. The holy water of the Ganges was not a thing to be had daily, so they were fully sensible of the grandeur of this occasion.¹

The minister and his son, too, were in the assembly, and, as the son-in-law of the king, the son had taken a prominent seat. His father was seated near him overjoyed at heart that, after all, the princess was compelled by time to choose to be reconciled to his boy. The ceremonies over, every one stood up with outspread palms to receive the holy water, and our hero opened the vessel containing it and, holding it in his left hand, proceeded to distribute the contents with a small spoon (uddhārini) in his right hand.

"Shall I assist you, my dearest husband, in carrying that water? I am bound to do so on this occasion by the rules," cried out a female voice, and suddenly the princess stood by the left side of our hero with her hand on the holy vessel.

"What! what!" cried the king.

"I am the wife of this pilgrim! Let the minister be secured at once," was the reply.

The minister was soon so bound that he could not escape, and all the assembly stood in wonder, astounded and astonished. There was no time to be lost now, and the princess explained in detail the whole mystery to the listening crowd: how she had been married to Aśīrūpa; the Sanskrit verse; the substitution of the minister's son in his place; the disappearance of her true lord; the commencement of her misery; her penance and plans to discover the lost husband; and her success. She had carefully preserved the cups and the platter, in which she had served the food on the first night to her husband, and produced them now in proof. The minister

¹ This is a ceremony, in which worship is performed to the vessel containing the holy water of the Ganges, after which the Ganges water itself is distributed to the people assembled from the vessel containing it.
confessed his guilt, and his son attested the truth of the princess's statements as far as he knew it.

Thus everything became plain, and Atirūpa, by his good fortune, regained his life and his lost wife, the former by the latter, though he never knew it.

The minister was committed to the stake, and his son given leave to go to his house and never more to approach the palace. The marriage of Atirūpa with the princess was again celebrated with all due grandeur, and he succeeded to the throne of Chandragiri as Yuvarāja. He did not forget his parents in the time of his prosperity, nor the old lady at Prayāga. He proceeded in a royal progress to the south, met his parents, assured them that he was their son, explained to them his whole history from the day of his separation, and brought them to Chandragiri to live in his palace. The aged couple were delighted to have found their child after all, and lived in prosperity.

A word as to the prophecy of the boy-astrologer to the Sētupati. That king and his wife and children hid themselves in a wood adjacent to his capital. It was now two years ago since the son of Satyavāk had assured him that, without trying for it, he would, after a certain period, get back his lost kingdom, and that prophecy was now fulfilled.

Chandragiri was the empire of which the kingdom of the Sētupatis was a petty tributary State, and because the Sētupati had failed to send in his tribute regularly, his dominions had been invaded and he had had to fly for his life. The boy-astrologer was now himself the emperor, and he, out of kindness to his old king, gave him back his State. Thus was the prophecy duly fulfilled by the astrologer who had made it, and, as Emperor of Chandragiri, Atirūpa reigned over his vast empire for many a long year in peace and prosperity.

FOLKLORE IN SALSETTE.

BY GEO. FR. D'PENHA.

No. 10. — Bāūdādā and Bāyōbāi.

In a certain country there once lived a king, who had one son. The prince was sent to school, where he proved himself worthy of the schoolmaster, and when he had attained maturity the king, his father, thought it high time to get him married. The prince said to him: — "Māla bāikā karāl tē aśī karā gē bāpācchī dārī anī dīshī sārī rākāl aśī bāikā karā; nākān tē māla bāikā nākā?" If you wish to get me married, I shall want a wife that will keep up the dignity of my father and the honour of my mother; else I do not want a wife.

"Very well," the king replied; "we want for nothing, and I will send my messengers to all parts of the country and even to foreign lands, and get you just such a wife as you desire."

Accordingly, he at once despatched people to all parts of the country, and also to foreign courts, with the message: — "Kōncchī sōkri aśīl gē bāpācchī dārī anī dīshī sārī rākāl, aśī tē tiīnā āmātē nātē. If any one has a daughter that will keep up the dignity of the father and the honour of the mother, we wish to enter into an alliance with him."

The messengers went from village to village and from town to town, and penetrated into foreign countries, but with little success; for who was there that would guarantee to keep up the dignity of the father and the honour of the mother? At length the king of a distant country had an only daughter, and he too received this message, but also refused the proposal. The princess, however, asked her father what the letter contained, but the king refused to tell her. However, after much entreaty she was told what it was about, and exclaimed: — "Hā,

1 Lit. "If you wish to get me a wife, get me such an one as will take care of my father's beard and mother's sārī, such a wife I want, or I do not want a wife."
bēpē, āddā nādēn zābdē, mūn rākēn bēpēchē dārt anī āchē nārī; Yes, father, give them my answer, I will keep up the dignity of the father and the honour of the mother."

The king, thereupon, sent his own men with another message to the effect that he was willing to enter into the alliance, and that his daughter was willing to fulfil the conditions imposed by the prince. The messengers were also authorized to settle a day for the celebration of the marriage. The messengers reached the prince's dominions, and made all the arrangements necessary, and appointed a day for the auspicious occasion.

Preparations were now made on both sides on a grand scale. Nothing was spared to make the occasion a great event. In due time, on the appointed day, the marriage took place with all possible éclat. The bride was still very young and consequently had to remain at her parents' house till she should attain puberty.

A year or two after the marriage the prince thought of paying a visit to his wife, and expressed his desire to his father. The king, of course, had no objection, and gave his consent, giving him money for his expenses on the way. The prince, however, disguised himself as a poverty-stricken person, and went to his wife's country. When he had arrived there he cut a bundle of grass, and, carrying it on his head, passed by his father-in-law's house. His wife saw him with the grass and called out to him: — "Éh, mōkīdā, mōkīnā viktās kā? Hi! grasscutter, will you sell your grass?"

Our hero answered in the affirmative, upon which the princess struck a bargain and bought the bundle of grass. After this she said to him: — "Mōkīdā, mōkīdā, chākar hāis kāna bēkār hāis? Grasscutter, grasscutter, are you employed or without employment?"

The pretended grasscutter replied: — "Bēkār hāis; I am without employment."

The princess then said: — "Mōkīdā, ānchē gharā chākriā rētās? Grasscutter, will you take employment at our house?"

The prince said he was willing to take employment, and was engaged as a servant by his own wife, who, of course, was unaware of the real state of affairs. But the prince knew her, and thought it a fitting opportunity of testing, by observing her behaviour, whether she could fulfil the conditions imposed by him.

This state of things went on for a few years, when one day the parents of the princess called the supposed servant and said to him: — "Mōkīdā, āmīnā zātānā bēchē gāvān mūnā dōn mānī, āmīchē kākīchē sanāl kār; Grasscutter, we are going to a distant country for a month or two, during which time you must take care of our daughter!"

The servant having promised to take care of the princess, her parents, the king and queen, left for the distant country, and after they were gone the princess one day said to her servant: — "Mōkīdā, mōkīdā, tēsam nānā kā? Grasscutter, grasscutter, what is your name?"

The prince replied: — "Bālūdādā," and asked her in return what her name was, and she answered: — "Bayōbāi."

And then she said to him: — "Bālūdādā, mūn kānī kām sāngēn e kārīl nāhin? Bālūdādā, would you do anything for me if I were to tell you to?"

Bālūdādā replied: — "Hō, Bayōbāi, jēnē kām sāngēl tēm kārīl; Yes, Bayōbāi, I will do whatever work you may want me to do."

And then he said to her: — "Bayōbāi, mālā rādānūnī khāvālā dēlīl nāhin? Bayōbāi, you will cook and give me to eat, won't you?"

And Bayōbāi said: — "Hō, dōn; Yes, I will give."

And they lived together like a brother and sister; Bālūdādā doing whatever he was asked to do, and Bayōbāi doing the cooking for him.²

² From this point the story runs as that of ordinary persons, and not that of a prince and princess, for they are now called Bālūdādā and Bayōbāi respectively throughout, and the kings and queens are mentioned merely as parents.
About this time Bayōbāi attained to puberty, that is she was twelve years old, and was one day walking on the sea-beach, when a great merchant arrived with a ship full of mōštā pōūlitā, pearls and rubies. The merchant spied Bayōbāi walking on the sea-beach, and was so enamoured of her beauty that he determined at any cost to get hold of her. So he began to enquire in the neighbourhood if it were possible, but the neighbours said, that they could not tell, that her parents were not at home, and that she was left under the care of a servant. So he sent for Bālūdādā, and asked him, too, if he thought whether his mistress would allow his advances, and promised to give Bālūdādā five hundred rupees, and Bayōbāi whatever she asked for. Bālūdādā thought this the best opportunity possible of testing her, and went, therefore, running to Bayōbāi, said to her: — "Bayōbāi, ēk vārtā sāngtaīā tē āiklās? Bayōbāi will you listen to what I have to say?"

Bayōbāi said she would, but Bālūdādā again said to her: — "Vārtā sāngēn tē kārīl tē sāngtaīā; If you agree to what I say, I will tell you."

Bayōbāi, little suspecting what the nature of the talk was to be, agreed to do as he should say. Then Bālūdādā told her that a great merchant, who had arrived with a ship full of mōštā pōūlitā, pearls and rubies, had told him to ask her whether she would admit his advances and to tell her that if she would, he would give her whatever she asked for.

Bayōbāi, upon this, said: — "Kā ré, Bālūdādā, māhā ēdē bāpās ghoran nākhī, ani tēbō aṅī vārtā kārtēs? What, Bālūdādā, my parents are not at home, and you tell me such a thing as this!"

Bālūdādā then said that if she did not agree he would leave her service and go away. Upon this Bayōbāi said: — "Bārān, bārān, kabāl hāēn, sē tiālā sāng gē tīchē hātchan bāgal yājē uisān gē rāichān ēt vāstān tiālā ghoran jēēn anī bārā vāstāt kā lāt mārīn bārī kārīn, ani tīchānā mōštā pōūlitānāchān tārāt jēēn; Very well, very well, go and tell him that he must give me his word in writing that if I admit him at eight o'clock to-night, and turn him out again as soon as it strikes twelve, I may take his vessel of pearls and rubies."

Bālūdādā immediately went and informed the merchant, and got a document prepared then and there. Then Bayōbāi sent Bālūdādā to the bāsār to purchase a lot of vegetables, fish, ghā, and such like things, and he went and brought them home. Punctually at eight o'clock that evening the merchant arrived, and Bayōbāi offered him a seat; and preliminaries being over, she began to cook in order to entertain her guest. She gave Bālūdādā his meal as usual, and asked him to sleep in her house for the night; but he refused to do so, and leaving the house went and hid himself near a window, whence he could watch everything that passed. Now as Bayōbāi was cooking she wanted a cocoanut, in searching for which she spent nearly an hour and then another half hour in finding the kōlā to break the cocoanut with, and in this way kept on spinning out the time. It was past eleven o'clock by the time she had finished cooking, and then she laid out the supper for the merchant. At supper the merchant was told that he must eat of everything that she might bring, and not rise from the table. Now Bayōbāi had prepared so many dishes and so many kinds of sweets, which she brought on the table one by one, that before supper was over the clock struck twelve. Upon this Bayōbāi called out to Bālūdādā in a loud voice, thinking he was asleep in his own hut. Our hero, who was close by, ran off at the first call, and came back running from the direction of his hut, growling, or rather pretending to growl, for having been aroused from sleep: — "Kā ṣāhlān, kā ṣāhlān, kalā ṣāhlāvīdā? What is the matter? What is the matter? Why are you calling me?"

---

2 Twelve years is generally supposed to be the time when a girl attains her puberty, and not many years ago girls in Salsette were married at that age. The consummation of the marriage, however, did not take place for a few months, say six, and very often for the period of a whole year afterwards, though the wife lived in her husband's house.
Bayóbái then told Bálúdádá to kick the merchant out of the house and appropriate the ship full of pearls and rubies. The poor merchant was compelled to yield, for had he not given a written agreement? He had also, as he had promised, to give five hundred rupees to Bálúdádá.

A month or so after this Bayóbái’s parents returned from the distant country. Not a word, however, was told them of what had happened in their absence. Bálúdádá was now perfectly satisfied with Bayóbái, for he had tested her under the most trying circumstances, and he thought to himself: — “Bayóbái rákhir máªajé bëpá-Tríkí ddrí ani ásíchí sërì; Bayóbái will keep up the dignity of my father and the honour of my mother.”

He had been in his father-in-law’s employment for nearly five years, and he now told him that he wished to go home to his parents. So he asked to be paid off for the time he had served, as he had not drawn his pay. Bayóbái and her parents had taken such a liking to him that they were very reluctant to let him go, but as he was determined to do so they paid him off and gave him a lot of money over and above what was due to him. Bálúdádá had now plenty of money besides the five hundred rupees he had got from the merchant. He took leave of his friends and returned to his own house.

When he reached home his parents enquired after his wife, but he stoutly denied his having gone to her, and said he had gone to seek employment, and had returned with a large fortune. “How could he have got so much money as he had brought with him, but for the work he had done in all these years?”

A few months after this Bálúdádá asked his father to let him go and fetch his wife home, but his father said he would go and bring her himself. So the old man set out one day for his daughter-in-law’s (Bayóbái’s) house, where he was cordially received. After a few days’ stay there he told Bayóbái’s parents that, as she had now attained maturity, he wished to take her home. Her parents said they had no objection, and that they were very happy that she should have come to take her away. Bayóbái, therefore, after taking a tender farewell of her parents, set out with her father-in-law, taking with her all the rubies and pearls she had got from the merchant. When they reached home it was late at night and Bálúdádá had by that time gone to sleep, and accordingly Bayóbái did not see him. But for the next few days, Bálúdádá took to his bed and covered himself up from head to foot, so that Bayóbái had no chance of seeing him. One day, however, Bálúdádá knowing that Bayóbái would go to the well to fetch water, went out and climbed a bôr tree, and plucking a few ripe bôran, waited for her on her way to the well. He had not long waited, when Bayóbái came up to him, and happy at having seen her servant (for so at least she thought him) after such a long time, addressed him: — “Kà râ Bálúdádá, tin’ athildá kà kartés? O s kà tâd gâu? Barâ hâis kànn! Hallo, Bálúdádá, what are you doing here? Is this your native country? Are you well?”


To these questions Bayóbái replied: — “Hô râ Bálúdádá, barâ háin, nauriâchó ghard aîlànâ; sârin hân, pân nauriâchó tinh’ naînin bayíinn aîlàn; Yes, Bálúdádá, I am well enough, and I am come to my husband’s house. All are well, but I have not yet seen my husband’s face.”

Upon this Bálúdádá said: — “ThauriIN bôran sê ani nauiriâd dës, maiîjé tîchâm tinh’ kaléî; Take a few bôran and give them to your husband, and then you will have a chance of seeing

*Bôran* (singular, bôr) are fruits which ripen about the months of January, February and March. They are both sweet and sour. The tree is also known by the name of bôr.
his face." And Bayóbái answered: — "Ká, ré Bálûdáá dé, naurá té bólle nákín, chálé nákín, ani mánlóin té? But, Bálûdáá, my husband won’t speak or do anything, and perhaps he would beat me!"

Said Bálûdáá: — "Nákín, nákín máravudhá; No, he won’t beat you."

Bayóbái took the bórán and went home, and Bálûdáá, going home before her, went to sleep as before.

A few days more passed, and Bálûdáá again went, and climbing a mango tree plucked a few ripe mangoes and waited for the arrival of Bayóbái. She soon came and Bálûdáá asked her: — "Ká go, Bayóbái, bórán dítís kah naurilád? Well, Bayóbái, did you give the bórán to your husband?"

Bayóbái answered: — "Nákín, ré Bálûdáá măríl karí té míih biisain; No, Bálûdáá, I was afraid he might beat me."

Bálûdáá then gave her the mangoes, saying: — "Mín sánghaín aísain kar. Éh ambé jhè, ani rítcháin ká karíl: Éh kálarjé ani tiiché tôngðawar kápar chóh; ani té ámbé tiiché tôngðawar fák; májé tiicháin tông kalél ani té yúha bólél; Do as I tell you. Take these mangoes, and do you know what to do in the night? Take a pair of scissors and cut off the cloth off his face and throw him these mangoes. Thus you will see his face and he will be obliged to speak."

Bayóbái again asked: — "Măríl karí té? But suppose he beats me?"

Bálûdáá then said: — "Nákín máravúchá, sánghaín aísain kar. No, he won’t beat you, only do as I tell you."

And away went Bálûdáá and slept as before.

When she had drawn the water Bayóbái went home, and in the night she took a pair of scissors and, as advised by Bálûdáá, cut a piece off the sheet covering him and threw the mangoes on his face. This was too much for Bálûdáá, who could not stifle his laughter, and revealed himself to Bayóbái. Bayóbái was quite surprised, and asked Bálûdáá why he had played so many tricks. Bálûdáá answered: — "Túl dúd, hái gè varádáchá bórán mún bólél ná gè bápásáchi dárí ani áíschi sári ráxhí túshú mún varádén; tìa jàrín mún zín aurí g̀hôngàuí këllíh báyúd gè kaaréch rádàs tún bápásáchi dárí ani áíschi sári ráxhí kéllíh kà; Do you remember that, before the wedding, I said that I would marry only her, who would keep up the dignity of my father and the honour of my mother; and it was to find out whether you could really keep the dignity of my father and the honour of my mother, that I played so many tricks."

They then lived together happily to a green old age.

MISCELLANEA.

THE ANCIENT CAPITAL OF URASA, THE MODERN HAZARA.

The site of the old capital of Urasa has never been determined. Huen Tsang mentions it as lying either 300 or 500 li, that is, 50 or 80 miles, from Taxila. The serious discrepancy in the pilgrim’s itinerary renders his statement useless. The country of Urasa corresponded pretty nearly with that of the modern Hazara, if we include in that term the whole tract up to the Indus, now held by the Tanaolis, the Hassarzais, the Akaizais and others. Naturally the capital of the region would stand rather in the fertile neighbourhood of Haripur than elsewhere. Now with reference to the capital in the seventh century. Huen Tsang writes thus: — "The capital is 7 or 8 li in circuit, the air is soft and agreeable, there is very little ice or snow. To the south-west of the capital 4 or 5 li is a stupa about 200 feet or so in height, which was built by Aśoka-rāja. By its side is a sàngharama."

It so happens that near Haripur there are the remains of an ancient city of Buddhistic times, which exactly answers to this description. It stands on rising ground under a range of hills, two miles from Haripur, being on the right or west bank of the Dör, a stream which, flowing through the Haripur plain, falls into the Sirin.
close to the junction of that river with the Indus. It stands too, close to the "Road of the Great Kings" leading from Taxila to Kashmir. The containing walls of the city can be traced all round. Some of them still rise eighteen feet in height and they are beautifully built in the chequered style of the ancient stupas of Gandhara and Kophene. Within the city, which is in size answers probably exactly to the dimensions given by Huen Tsang, there was a citadel to the west looking down on the stream, and at least three stupas, two of which have been rifled probably by the Sikhs, together with a fortified peak towering over the ruins to the east. Within a mile of the city to the south-west, but on the opposite bank of the shallow river, are the remains of an old stupa, and in connection with it there are indications of buildings of considerable extent.

The Muhammedans have a little shrine (sidrat) close under the citadel hill, which they call Pir-Manaka, and the ancient name is preserved also in Manakrail, which is applied to the modern village close by. The coincidence of these names with Manikyala is suggestive. The climatic conditions are exactly fulfilled.

It is curious that the existence of this beautifully situated and strongly constructed place should have been apparently unknown to Sir Alexander Cunningham. I discovered the place quite by accident, having been directed to it by a Native, who told me that I should find there an old inscription.

The tope to the south-west is crowned by a modern Muhammedan tomb.

Manaka or Manika, as Cunningham informs us, was a prince living in the time of Kanishka and the probable founder of the great tope Manakylal. The Muhammedans have appropriated this prince and raised him to the dignity of a Pir. May I venture to suggest that Pir-Manaka is probably the city which was visited by Huen Tsang, and which he described as the capital of Urasa?

CHARLES SWynnerton, F.S.A.,

Potosi, Black Mountains;
Chaplain.

March, 1891.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

LUCk AND ILL-LUCK.

(a) In Telingana.

With reference to Indian Notes and Queries Vol. 1. note 218.—in the Northern Circars red is not objected to by the Musalmans during the Maharram, but is on the contrary much affected by them.

Masulipatam.

H. G. Prendergast.

(b) In Bihār.

It is advisable to put on clothes, proved to have been prosperous, on going to visit a āhām or on any important business. Hindus should mark their foreheads on such occasions, and a Musalmān should wear rings inscribed with texts, or silver armlets containing texts from the Qudra or other holy book beneath his sleeves. He must break in half the piece of wood, through which he passes the girdle that ties his trousers, and should not put on his trousers standing but sitting, at any rate while he draws the pedchas over his legs.

Sayyid Khairatāt Ahmad.

Gayd.

BOOK-NOTICE.

CHANTS POPULAIRES DES AFGHANIS, recueillis par JAMES DARMSSTETER. Paris: LEOUX: 1890.

I received this volume with pleasant expectations, I opened it with surprise, and I closed it with envy. Any work by M. Darmssteter was certain to be both original and scholarly, and readers of his Lettres sur l'Inde were justified in looking forward with interest to his promised collection of Afghān song and folklore. But the result has surpassed the expectations. We have here a portly volume of some 700 pages, containing not only a selection of Afghān songs with text, translation, vocabulary and commentary, but three admirable essays on the language, the literature, and the history of that nation. The work is the direct result of the liberality of the French Government, which deputed M. Darmssteter to India on a "mission d'études"; and this is what gives rise to the envy which I referred to in my opening sentence. Here we are beaten on our own ground. If there has been hitherto one domain of science which Anglo-Indians have made peculiarly their own, it has been the study of Indian dialects and Indian folk-lore. But even on this ground of study, the ever-increasing demands of official work have given little leisure for the complete and thorough exploitation of any particular tract, and few facilities are afforded by a Government, which, however sympathetic, finds itself unable to spare either the men or the money for research by specialists. What the Government of India cannot do, a foreign Government has done. It has enabled a scholar of the highest eminence to come to India and to thoroughly survey an area, of which but the outlines have been hitherto known. Let it not be
thought that I am forgetting the names of Trumpp, of Ravez, of Belbe, of Plowden or of Thorburn. These authors would themselves be amongst the first to admit the great addition to our knowledge which has been made by M. Darmesteter. Let us now take heed to the laurels we have hitherto won, and let the book under notice spur us to fresh efforts, and impel us to fresh conquests. Above all, let our rulers note that work, which should be peculiarly their own, has been elsewhere thought sufficiently important to induce a foreign nation to send a specialist to India to carry it out.

It is difficult to give a complete account of Prof. Darmesteter's book within the limits of asingle article. A mere sketch, and an extract or two, must suffice. Chapter I. of the Introduction (pp. iii—ciii) deals with the language of the Afghans, in its two dialects, the Pushtu of the north and the Pushtu of the south. Save for a few varieties of pronunciation, these dialects have few points of difference. The language has borrowed largely from Persian and from the Indian dialects, and also, through the Persian, from Arabic. In borrowing Persian words, it, as a general rule, retains the original sounds, except that of p, which it does not possess and replaces by ch. The characteristic Arabic letters (س, ج, &c.) it abandons, substituting the nearest indigenous ones. As regards Indian sounds, the aspirated letters drop their aspiration, and چ is represented by ج. Thus گنبد, pure, becomes گنبد; چَتَپ, printed, چَتَپ; and چَفِکَم, false, چَفِکَم. As a rule, cerebral letters only appear in Indian words, the exceptions being the appearance of an ی or ی in certain pure Afghani words, representing etymologically in the one case an earlier ی and in the other an earlier ید.

A minute discussion of the phonetics of the language leads the author to the following conclusions:—(1) Afghani is not an Indian dialect; (2) it is an Iranian dialect; (3) it is not a dialect of modern Persian or derived from Pehlavi; and, most probably, (4) it is derived from Zend or some very similar dialect. In short, the phonetics and the vocabulary of the Afghani language induce us to consider it as bearing the same relation to Zend that modern Persian does to the ancient language of Persia. We have, however, no proof of a corresponding Pehlavi. But such a Pehlavi is less necessary, for phonetic and morphological corruption is less advanced in Afghani than in Persian. Afghani bears that modern witness to the ancient

1 The North has ک and گ where the South has گ (گـ) and گ (گـ).
2 [Would it not be more correct to say that the

Zend, which has hitherto been sought for in vain, and the wild tribes of the Khaiber and the fanatical Musalmans of the Sulaiman range, have preserved the language of the old time Magi and of Zoroaster, better than the Persis of Bumay.

In its morphology, Afghani occupies an intermediate position between the synthetic Iranian languages and the extremely analytic Persian. In conjunction it is almost as analytic as the latter, but for nouns it retains the idea not only of grammatical gender, but also of declension. It has a direct and an oblique case. As in India, the latter appears to be derived from an ancient genitive. The numerals show remarkable agreement with Zend, as will appear from the following table:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghani</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Hindustani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ی</td>
<td>ی</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
<td>ہ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the verb, Afghani has, like the Pehlavi-Persian, substituted a passive construction in the past tenses. While, however, this substitution has become obscured in Persian, Afghani retains the evidence of it with perfect clearness. Just as Hindustani, so Afghani, says 'this has been done by me' (من نہ یہ کیا ہوا), and not 'I did this.'

The second chapter of the Introduction deals with the history and origin of the Afghans. M. Darmesteter traces their history from the first recorded mention of the nation by Abu'l-Fazl (1030 A. D.), as inhabiting the Sulaiman Range, down to the present time. Tradition makes them servants of Pharaoh, who emigratedither after his destruction, and they must, at any rate, have been converted to Islam at an early period, their country having been conquered by Abul Sa'ud, son of Abul Saffar, about the year 665 A.D. Since then, history relates little except internecine quarrels, varied by invasions of India. The latter are well-known to students of Indian history, and for the former the reader is referred to M. Darmesteter's interesting account: Bâbâ's (1526) conquest of Afghanistan is told in his own words. We learn how 'when the Afghans saw the impossibility of resisting, they presented them-

Musulmin conquest of Afghãnhistan was the result of a long struggle extending over the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th centuries A. D.?—R. C. T.]}
selves holding grass between their teeth, as much as to say, "I am your ox." A footnote refers us to Major Temple's Legends of the Punjab (II., 101, 165, I. 37), who quotes this as a conventional phrase, the cow being the most sacred of all things in the Hindú's eyes; to be treated as his cows is to be well treated by him. A much older authority on this point is the Delhi Siwâlik Pillar inscription of Visalâ Deva, dated 1164 A.D., where we read pratyarthâ-dasât-unârâ pratyah-sâdânâ triyâ. After the death of Bâbar the Afghâns regained their power temporarily in India to be finally expelled by Akbar in 1566. It was not till 1761 that Aâmâd Shâh, the Durrânî, beat the Grand Mughal a prisoner at Delhi, and destroyed the Marâthâ power at Pânipat. He thus left the way open to the European conquest of India, while giving rise at the same time to the Afghân Principalities of Farrukhâbâd and Bundelkhand. The Durrânî dynasty was succeeded (1818) by that of the Bârakzâis, who now occupies the throne of Kâbul.

The Afghân race is, at the present day, divided into three main branches, those of Afghânistân, under the dominion of the Amir: the independent tribes of Yâghistân (Sâvâ, Bunâr, Bâjaur, &cc.), being absolutely free of all foreign influence, have best preserved their national characteristics; and those of British India, in the six districts of the North-West frontier.

It is doubtful whether the classical writers have mentioned the Afghân nation by name. Arrian and Quintus Curtius mention Indian mountaineers whose country was traversed by Alexander on his way to the Hindú Kish from Arachosia (Qandahâr). Herodotus mentions the Rârves, Paktyes, who inhabited the country about Kâbul. Are these the Afghâns (Pakhthânes)? The details which he gives of their dress are not inconsistent with the theory, and, while they treat them as Indians, he says that their customs resemble those of the Bactrians, which would refer us to an Iranian type. There is, however, one serious difficulty. Of the two forms, Pashhtûn and Pakhtûn (or more anciently Pashtûn and Pakhtûn), the latter is a derivative one. The original was Pashtûn, which would lead us to expect in Greek Rârves, Paktyes, not Rârves, Paktyes. Pakhtûn is derived from pustû, a mountain, and means mountaineer, highlander, and the original form of the latter word was parašṭī or *parašhū. If, therefore, the Paktyes are our Afghâns, we must assume that Rârves is an imperfect transcription for Rârves, Paktyes, or rather Rârves, Parchâgnes, and that the kt of the Greeks, represents the exotic sound râh.

We do not meet the Paktyes after Herodotus, but Ptolemy, in his description of Arachosia, mentions the "mountains of the Paktyes" (hâr Rârvenor Rârvenor ophîn), and says that the Paktyes, Parchâgnes, are the most northern of the four tribes of Arachosia. These may be the same as the Rârves, Paktyes, whom we should expect to find in this very neighbourhood.

The third chapter of the Introduction (pp. clxxxiv. — cxxxvii.) describes the Afghan literature. This is of two kinds, written and oral. The former dates, according to tradition, from the Yâshârân conquest (1413-1424), but the first writer whom we know directly by his works was Akhûn Darvâzâ (1655), the author of more than fifty volumes, most of which are unpublished. His principal writings consist of theological abuse, directed against the mystic heresiarch Bâyâzîd Aânsârî; but one of them, the Makhzâni Afghânî, possesses real historical value.

The most ancient poet, whose works have been preserved, is Mîrza Aânsârî, grandson of the Bâyâzîd above mentioned. His poems, which are permeated with Persian Sufism, have been more than once published and translated. He was followed (1631-1691) by the warrior poet Khusâshâ Hânâ, who not only succeeded in throwing all his predecessors, with the exception of Mîrzâ, into the shade of oblivion, but also retains his popularity to the present day." Whenever M. Darmesteter asked a jam to recite a song to him, he commenced by asking, "Do you want one of Khusâshâ Khan Khanâ?" The ðèdān of this poet has been published by Dr. Bébè, but he was as prolific a writer as Akhûn Darvâzâ. Both Khusâshâl and Mîrzâ derived their inspiration from Persian, and their numerous followers have done the same, the ambition of each being to leave behind him a ðèdân. In the last few years Pêshâwar has become an active centre from which issue translations into Pushtû of the best known Persian and Indian works, and these, together with the works of the above mentioned poets and their successors, form the bulk of the written literature of the Afghâns.

All this is a foreign and learned literature, and, with the exception of the works of Khusâshâl, tells us very little about the Afghâns, their customs or their national genius. But the true literature of this nation, the only one which is understood and traversed by the Second Column of the Tal-Chôtêtılı Field Force, in the Spring of 1879; "J. R. G. S., Vol. L.—E. C. T."

8 Since M. Darmesteter's book was written, Mr. Riddolph has published selections from this Poet's works (Regan Paul and Co.)
appreciated by the people, and which in its turn
gives us a true picture of them, is that which is
oral and which takes the form of songs.

These songs are the work of illiterate poets.
The ��um, or poet-minstrel, plays in Afgahn life
a part analogous to that taken by the bard
amongst the Gauls. These poets form regular
schools. A beginner goes to a celebrated خلاص,
and becomes his یشگرید, or disciple. The
master, or یستاد, teaches him his own songs,
and those of other popular poets, and in-
trudes him at the festivals, public and private,
to which he is invited. When the pupil feels himself
strong enough to fly upon his own wings, he
leaves his master, composes under his own name,
and sets up for an یستاد in his turn. An یستاد
takes half the fees paid by his host for himself,
and divides the other half amongst his یشگرید.
A good یشوم dies a rich man. The famous یمر
would not open his lips under forty rupees, and
received a fee of Rs. 600 at the wedding of the
son of the Navab of Peshawar.

This یمر is almost the only celebrated یشوم of
Afgahn birth. They are nearly all Afganised
Indians, recruited principally from the یہم caste.
Caste rules not being so strict in Afgahnistan as
in India, other Indians also follow the same pro-
ffession, but they are always of low-caste, such as
یئلی, یحاتیگریدا, یملا or ییو. یئلی,
They are usually, though not always, Musalmans, but
are indifferent as to the subject of their songs. A
good Hindu thinks it no shame to earn an honest
livelihood by singing the triumphs of the Prophet.
This generalization of the caste-term یہم, should
be noted by historians of the Gypsies. The
یلیس, from whom our modern Romanies are
descended, were singers and musicians imported
into Persia from India by Bahrain Gaur

M. Darmesteter's collection of songs is divided
into five main divisions, historic songs, religious
ones, romances, love-songs, and songs illustrat-
ing Customs and Folklore. With the last are given
a number of proverbs and riddles.

The interest of the historical songs is that many
of them were written contemporaneously with the
facts. The collection commences with a modern
poem describing the Afgahn victory at Panipat in
1761, and is followed by others carrying the history
down to the time of the last Afgahn war. Nearly all
these songs are, it is needless to say, written from
the point of view of our enemies, and the light in
which they view our actions is not flattering to
our vanity. The best of them are too long
to quote here. Passing over the religious and
the romantic legends, both of which sections are
full of interest, we come to the Love-songs. In
Afgahnistan these are innumerable, and a یشوم
when told to sing, cannot comprehend his being
asked to sing anything else. A perusal of the spe-
cimens given by M. Darmesteter shows that the
imagery comes almost entirely from India. We
meet all the same graces and the same compar-
sions which we find in the poems of Sur Dasi or
Bidyapati. Here is a translation of a portion of the
well-known یاکھما, the most popular of all
Afgahn songs, written by the poet یمر.

1. I am sitting in woe, pierced with the daggers
of separation.
She came to-day, the یمین, and hath borne
away my heart: sweet, so sweet.
2. I am ever engaged in contest: red am I with
my blood: I am a beggar before thee.
My life is one anguish. My mistress is my
physician; I long for the medicine: sweet, so sweet.
3. Her bosom hath the apple, her lips the sugar,
her teeth the pearl; all that hath she, my well-
beloved; she hath wounded me in the heart,
and therefore am I plunged in tears; sweet, so sweet.
4. To thee is my service due; dream of me, O
my love, for ever and a day.
Morning and eve make I my bed at thy sanctu-
ary; I am the first of thy knights; sweet, so sweet."

Some of the specimens given of Afgahn proverbs
are excellent. Here are a few:

"She came to borrow fire, and is become the
mistress of the house.
Do not stick your finger into every hole.
If you offer only an onion, do it politely.
Gram pottage and no teeth; teeth, and no gram
pottage (gram requires good teeth.)
Who owns elephants, should have big doorways.
A black cow has white milk.
The cock may crow or not, but still the dawn
breaks."3

The work concludes with a Lexicographic
Index, which contains all the words in the songs
not to be found in Haverty’s dictionary, and
other useful indexes of proper names. A word
of praise must be given to the typography and
paper which are in every way worthy of the tradi-
tions of the Paris Imprimerie Nationale.

G. A. Grierson.

over all North India in much the same terms. See my Ed.
of Fallon’s Dict. of Hindostani Proverbs.—R. C. T.]
TWO PATTAVALIS OF THE SARASVATI GACHCHHA OF THE DIGAMBARA JAINS.

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

IN respect of the two MSS., which form the basis of the present paper, Mr. Cecil Bendall writes that they "were copies made for me by Pandit Chimanlal of Jaipur in Rajputana, when I visited that city in January 1885. Enquiring as I did at every opportunity throughout my Indian wanderings as to the doings of the Jain sect, I was much interested to find that Pandit Chimanlal was not only a Jain, but a member of the more retiring and less known branch of the faith." Dr. Klatt's publication of Svetambara pattaavals in this Journal (Vol. XI. p. 246) had rendered me keenly alive to the possible historical importance of these lists. For some time, however, I put these copies aside, under a suspicion that, as I had not seen the MSS. from which they were taken, they might be modern fabrications. On comparing them, however, with the list published in Prof. Peterson's Second Report, of which I must own I had never taken much account (probably owing to the fact that it is in verse and is printed in ordinary Nâgarî type without distinction for the proper names or any tabular statement to facilitate reference), I found that the tradition was the same. I accordingly commenced preparing my MSS. for publication, intending to print off MS. B. as it stood, noting the main variants, &c., of A and of the list (P) published by Prof. Peterson. I also made the alphabetical table of pontiffs which is printed in the following paper. My studies were, however, impeded by the circumstance that the first part of MS. A is chiefly in a modern language, of which I had no knowledge. This being so, I showed the MSS. to my friend Dr. Hoernle, who most opportunely happened to be visiting England at the time, and it is due to his knowledge of the ancient and modern Jain languages and institutions that the full exposition which here follows is due.

The two manuscripts are referred to, in the following remarks, by the letters A and B. MS. A comprises an introduction and the pattaavali proper. The introduction gives an account of the early pontiffs from Mahâvira down to Bhadrabahu II. and his four disciples, the first among whom was Mâghanandin, the founder of the Nandisangha. This account is in the form of Gâthâ verses, quoted from an earlier source, and accompanied by an exposition in a variety of the Rajputâni dialect. The introduction is followed by the pattaavali proper, i. e., by a nominal list of the successive pontiffs of the Nandi Sangha or the Sarasvati Gachchha. It commences with Bhadrabahu II., and ends with Bhuvana Kirti, the 108th pontiff, who ascended the chair in Saivvat 1840 (A.D. 1783), and was still reigning at the time the original manuscript was written. MS. A, unfortunately, is defective in two places. The pontificates, Nos. 65—78 and Nos. 92—104 (both inclusive), are missing. The first lacuna (Nos. 66—78) is, in the following table, filled up from MS. B; but the second lacuna (Nos. 92—104) could not be supplied from that source, as the two manuscripts begin to diverge with Nos. 88.

MS. B contains only the pattaavali proper, but it has the advantage of being complete. It also commences with Bhadrabahu II. in Saivvat 4 (B.C. 53), and brings the succession down to the 102nd Pontiff, Mahendrâ Kirti, who ascended the chair in Saivvat 1388 (A.D. 1881), and

1 The Digambaras are, I think, the only religious body in India that possess an extensive literature, and yet preserve the old-world Pandita's hostility to printing, once so general. [C. Bendall.]

2 The modern religious literature of Jainism is, of course, much more difficult, to the European student at least, than the ancient. For the Prakrit there are at least a fair number of glossaries, &c.; but for Mâravâli and the forms of Western Hindustani in use in Jain commentaries and original works, ordinary Hindustani dictionaries and grammars are of little avail; and their Gujarati literature (which, as will be seen from the forthcoming catalogue of Gujarati Books in the British Museum, is extensive) is often such as an ordinary educated Parsi, or even a Hindî, cannot understand. [C. Bendall.]

3 As MS. B only gives the dates of accession, I have filled in the particulars, relating to the length of the different periods of the lives, from another pattaavali in my possession which I hope to publish hereafter.

4 See, however, the first note at the end of the paper. Bhadrabahu may have to be placed 8 years earlier, or in 61 B.C.
who was living in Jaipur when Mr. Bendall visited that town in 1886. The entries Nos. 101 and 102, however, are in a different handwriting; and the original manuscript appears to have closed with No. 100, Naiṣa Kṛiti, who ascended in Saṅvat 1879 (A. D. 1822), and accordingly must have been written some time between Saṅvat 1879 and Saṅvat 1888 (A. D. 1826) when the 101st Pontiff, Dēvendra Kṛiti, succeeded to the chair. The original of MS. A, on the other hand, must have been written some time soon after Saṅvat 1840 (A. D. 1783).

The two manuscripts do not cover quite the same ground. They give the paṭāvalls of two different sections of the same main line. The two sections separated after the 87th pontiff of the common line. According to a remark in MS. A, the actual separation would seem to have taken place in Saṅvat 1572 (A. D. 1019), when one section appears to have removed to Nāgūr, while the other continued to reside in Chitdor, the seat of pontificate of the 87th common pontiff. The latter, according to MS. A, was Jina Chandra, the successor of Prabhāchandra; while, according to MS. B, it was the latter under whom the separation took place, and whose predecessor was Jina Chandra. Whatever the true case may have been, it seems, according to both manuscripts, that the two sections continued their allegiance to the 87th pontiff till the latter's death in Saṅvat 1831 (A. D. 1824), when each section elected its own separate head, and henceforth the two sections carried on their own separate paṭāvalls. Of these, MS. A probably gives the paṭāvall of the Nāgūr section, while MS. B seems to give that of the Chitdor section. This attribution, however, is, for the present, only inferential. It is certain that the two paṭāvalls of MSS. A and B diverge after the 87th pontiff, under whom the separation is said by MS. A to have taken place. I presume that the line of pontiffs given by MS. A migrated to Nāgūr, until they removed their residence to Ajmir, where they are found to be at the time of the 106th pontiff. The line, given in MS. B, would then be the section, which continued to reside in Chitdor, the seat of the 87th pontiff, until later on they removed to Jaipur, which is their present place of residence. The point is, perhaps, not one of any great importance, and may be cleared up hereafter.

The common line (ānava) of both sections is that of Kundakunda, the fifth pontiff of the Sarasvatī Gaṇghha. Hence that Gaṇghha is known also as the Kundakundānava. The reason of this appellation is not quite clear. Kundakunda is stated to have had four other names, Padmanand, Vakragriva, Gridhrapichchha and Bhūrachārya. In Professor Peterson's list his principal name is given as Padmanand. Perhaps there was some circumstance of sufficient importance connected with his eponym Kundakunda, which caused the latter to be perpetuated in an appellation of the Gaṇghha which he had adorned. The founder of this Gaṇghha was Mahanand, one of the four disciples of Guptigupta, each of whom founded a separate Gaṇghha. From him are derived two names of the Gaṇghha; viz., Nandi Sangha and Nandi Āmnaya. The word āmnaya, according to Hemachandra's Anēkārthā Saṅgrahā, is a synonym of kula (or kulakrama), and the appellation, accordingly, means “the generations” or “successions” of Nandi. A fourth name by which the Gaṇghha is known is Balatkara Gaṇa. The reason of this name is not known. I would venture to suggest, however, the following explanation. The second pontiff of the Gaṇghha was Guptigupta. He is stated to have had two other names, Arhadabain or “he who possesses the power of an Arhat,” and Viśakāchārya. I would suggest that the Gaṇghha may have derived its name of Balatkara or “the powerful” Gaṇa from its ancestor Arhadabain. The origin of the name would then be analogous to that of Kundakundānava. As a Gaṇghha, the line of pontiffs is distinguished by the term Sarasvatī; this name it seems to have received from the miracle of the pontiff Padmanand, who is said to have made a stone figure of Sarasvatī to speak (see below No. 83 of

---

\[1\] The MS. has the term abhāsā for ‘name’ (P. su-nāma), which I do not understand. Is it perhaps a clerical error for prabhāsā?

\[2\] Another synonym for the Jain term is saṅkēta, which occurs in the paṭāvall of the Upakāya Gaṇghha, published in Vol. XIX, p. 223.

\[3\] The words gane and gachchha, as Muni Atmārāmājī informs me, are synonymous.
the Tables. This miracle is also pointedly referred to at the end of the paṭṭāvali published by Professor Peterson.) It is, further, also called the Pārijāta Gachchha, apparently after the celestial tree of that name. But the reason of the name I do not know. Pārijāta is also the name of the coral tree (Erythrina Indica); and as Māghanandin, the founder of the Gachchha, is said to have kept his "retreats" (vāsa) at the foot of a Nandi tree, the thought suggests itself, whether pārijāta may not also be a synonym of that tree, so that the Gachchha would take its name from the tree of the retreat of its founder. The parallel character of all these terms as names of one Gachchha is clearly indicated towards the end of the introduction of paṭṭāvali A.

Though the Sarasvati Gachchha, as a distinct line of pontiffs, was really founded by Māghanandin, this pontiff, in all the paṭṭāvalis that I have seen, is always enumerated in the third place, and the Gachchha is made to begin with Bhadrabāhu I, who is the first pontiff of the line. Then follows Guptagupta, as the second pontiff, from whom, as I suppose, the line took its name of Balākāra Gaṇa. Then comes Māghanandin himself as the third pontiff, after whom the line is called the Nandi Saṅgha or the Nandi Amāya. Then comes the fourth pontiff Jinachandra; and he is followed by Kundakunda as the fifth pontiff, from whom the line derives its name of Kundakunda Anvaya.

Lastly, the Gachchha is declared to be a branch of the Mula Saṅgha, that is the Original Community, founded by Mahāvīra himself.

The principal value of the paṭṭāvalis, now published, is that they give complete series of dates. MS. B gives the dates of the succession of each pontiff. MS. A is even more comprehensive. It not only states the dates of succession; but adds, in the case of each pontiff, the number of his years before he took the vows (griha-varsha or grihastha-varsha), the number of years he lived as a simple monk (dikṣā-varsha), the number of years he held the pontificate (paṭṭa-varsha or paḍasta-varsha), and lastly the number of years of his whole life (sara-varsha or saradāy-varsha). Professor Peterson has published a paṭṭāvali of the Sarasvati Gachchha in his Report for 1823-1824,8 but it supplies no dates whatever. Moreover it carries the succession list only down to the 92nd pontiff, Narindra Kirti, while the paṭṭāvali now published brings it down to the 102nd. It appears to be a paṭṭāvali of what I have called the Chitār section of the Gachchha; for though it omits Nos. 88 and 89, it agrees with the paṭṭāvali of MS. B in Nos. 96-92. How the omission of Nos. 88 and 89 is to be accounted for, I do not know. As well as all other minor divergences from Professor Peterson's list (marked P) are noted in the following tables.

Professor Bhandarkar has also published a portion of a Digambara paṭṭāvali in his Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS. for 1883-1884, p. 124, 125 (published 1887). He states that he has taken his information from a paṭṭāvali, noted as No. 629 in the Report for 1875-1876.9 The portion, published by him, covers the same ground as the introduction of paṭṭāvali A now published; that is, it only goes as far as the actual commencement of the Sarasvati Gachchha. But, in some respects, his information differs from that now given, in others it is fuller. His paṭṭāvali must, therefore, be a different one from that of the present MS. A; if so, its full publication would be desirable.

A Digambara paṭṭāvali is also referred to by Professor Jacobi, in the Introduction to his edition of the Text of the Kalpa Sūtra, p. 30.10 He states that it was written in Jaipur, and that it carries the succession down to Saṅvat 1840; from this, and the other brief particulars mentioned by him, it would seem probable that it did not materially differ from the paṭṭāvali of MS. A. Professor Bühler, indeed, informs me that it is the identical No. 629, cited by Prof. Bhandarkar, which he had temporarily brought with him from India and lent to Professor Jacobi.

---

9 See Prof. Bühler’s Detailed Report of a tour in Search of Sanskrit MSS., Extra Number of Journal, Bombay Branch, Royal Asiatic Society, 1877, No. XXXIV. A. Vol. XII.
10 See Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, published by the German Oriental Society; Vol. VII.
As the Text of the Introduction in MS. A gives a large number of dates, in some ways conflicting with one another, it is now published in extenso with a translation. A note on the discrepancies of the dates is added at the conclusion of the paper. The pattāvālī proper, however, which is given in both MSS. A and B, is published, in abstract, in a tabular form, in which it will probably be found more convenient for study and reference. As a specimen of the full text, the first entry is here quoted:—

"1. Sambata 10 Chaitra śīlo 14 Māhā 1 Māhā 14 Māhā 11. Bhaṛat āmrīna."" (1) In Sambata 14, Chattra śūla 14, Bhadrapāla 14, for 24 years he lived as a householder, for 30 years as a (simple) monk, for 22 years 10 months and 27 days as pontiff. The days intervening (between his death and the accession of his successor) were 3. The total period of his life was 76 years and 11 months. By caste he was a Bṛāhmaṇa.

This will sufficiently explain the form of the entries of the tables. Regarding the abbreviations in the second column, S. stands for sūla; and V. for vadi; Ch. = Chattra; Pā = Pāgun (Pāgūna); Ā or A = Āsā or Āsa (Āsvaya or Āsvina); Pā. = Pāsa (Pāsadha); K. = Kāti (Kāltika); J. = Jēśtha; As. = Āsā; Bh. = Bhāūavā (Bhadrapada); M. = Māha (Māgha); S. = Shāvan; Mr. = Mārgasir; V. = Vaisākh. If the numbers of any entry show a discrepancy, they are shown in round brackets. In some cases (e.g., in No. 24) the discrepancy may be due to a mere error in summation; but I have thought it better to leave the numbers as given in the MS. If any number is wanting in the MS, it is indicated by a query (?). The bracketed remarks in the last column are additions of my own; P. refers to Professor Peterson’s List. All other remarks are translated from the manuscript.

As to the exact meaning of the term pirāha (see the quotation above), I am uncertain. I have taken it to mean the time which intervened between the death of one pontiff and the enthronisation of his successor; this time varies from a few days to upwards of one month. It occurs in the first 24 entries; from the 25th entry onwards the synonymous term antara is used.

Both Pattāvalīs are written in a rather rugged form of the Rājpūtāṇi dialect, with the exception of the Prākṛti Gāthās which are quoted in the introduction of MS. A, and the beginning and concluding portions of that introduction which are written in a wretched attempt at Sanskrit verse and prose.

The method of the introduction is to quote Prākṛti Gāthās from an authoritative work, and to accompany it with explanatory glosses in the vernacular dialect. These glosses are modern; the Prākṛti Gāthās appear to be old. How old they are, and from what work they may be quoted, I do not know. It would be important to determine this, and thus perhaps be able to restore the true text of the Gāthās. As they stand at present, their readings are often corrupt and in some places inconsistent with one another. I have made no attempt to render them correct or consistent; only a few obvious clerical errors have been corrected. From the manner of the vernacular commentary it is clear, that its writer found the Gāthās already in their present confused state, and knew not how to harmonise their statements.

TEXT.

Introduction of Pattāvalī A.

\[90.||\text{अर्थ पहावली लिखयेत}||\]

श्रीमतीनाथाचे और गृहस्थांचे लिखयेत ||

बहुव्यक्तिक वर्णां मुरा गृहस्थांचे लिखयेत \[90.||\]

श्रीमतीनाथां जीवनाचे मृत्यूत निश्चय ||

बहुव्यक्तिक वर्णां मृत्यूत निश्चय ||

कृपया वर्णां यथा मृत्यूत निश्चय ||

सर प्रकृति प्रवक्तां भूषणां स्वजनां ज्ञान ||

\[90.||\]

\[90.||\text{From another MS. patṭāvalī, which I also hope shortly to publish, I see that they are referred to a work called Vikrama Prabandha. Of this work, however, I know nothing further.}||\]
(1) अथ मंचापिकार प्रथम पद्यायों विपरे कुणात्मय चौथाकृत हुआ || १४ नाम छे ||
तैबा पाठ हुम त्वा धनिनारक संसार्तक अविनाय जी १, इति २५ शीर अविनास दुःसार ||
तैबा वर्ष ६२ ताही केवल रहो || गाथा ||
अल्लामाज्ञात्मकामें केलास्माय गोविंद गुप्तसिनो ||
वकाल वागम् १४ व गवव सुभवसिनं व संवासीे १ ॥
तह वकाल सरे युग संवासी सम्युसारमुणीद्वयोऽय ||
अड्डाकास स हच्रो लोकस्मायो ब्रह्मसिनो ॥ २ ॥
वकालते केलास्माय तिथिः गुणिः गोविंद सुभवस मन्त्रा ॥ ॥
बाहर बाहर शे जर लिखि उपेशीयम् १५ च भालिस्माय ॥ ३ ॥

(2) और पाठ मोतम स्वामी वर्ष १२ केवली रहो || तैबा पाठ मोतम चरामी ३८ केवली रहो। एवं वर्ष ६२ मे केवली रहा ||
तैबा पाठ ६ सुखसिनो लखिले || गाथा ||
मुख्यान्तिने पद्य जनम बधिरे वाते गववे ॥ ॥
प्रमाण वर्षा विद्वंदनर्कः १५ तुलसीवर्ष ॥ ४ ॥
मृत्यु बारी मती अविनाय बारी ||
इशानकास्मी संसार गोविंद भवाभुव मन्त्रा ॥ ॥
सब १६ सुखान्तिने पद्य जनम तिथिः निम्नतिनों व ||
अविनाय मोञ्चास्त्र [ तह ॥] वहार व संवास ॥ ॥

वर्ष १०० मे ए पीच अविनायकृति हया विन्दनवर्ष १२ निम्नतिन १६ वर्ष अविनायकृति वर्ष २२ गोविंदवर्ष (sic) वर्ष १९ नवबाराही ॥ ॥ ॥ ए पीच अविनाय बुधकेवली वर्ष २०० मे हुआ ॥

(3) तैबा पाठहरा ने गरार अवकृती चाँदी यो पद करो काँटी आवेरो अव सुक्ल न थामे ॥ ब्रह्मसिनो का पह एक बार बार कांटो लाख अवार जार पढ़े ॥ ॥
एक पर का बार बार अक्षय एवं हाय ॥ इशानसी मंडर जार लाख चाँदी हजार ॥ हे जात अव-बिना ५२९८५३२ ॥ ॥ शोक हुआ ॥
सी बार अवकृती ने दिलाना स्वामी बैसी हजार नो से अवासी न औष्ठिन अव सीसी लाखन एक सी सादा अवायक भुवन कुछ साथ लगे ३१६२८४२८४ ॥ ॥
सहाय शोक लखिले पद्य १ नभी स्वामी लगे ॥ तो तिलेक सी शालिस की एती लगे ॥

(4) तैबा पाठ महातीर्थ सुधव्य पर्य ६२ पाठ हुम वप्पुराही हवा हूम ॥ ॥ (गाथा ॥)
सह कांटिः सु वाते गववे ॥ उपयोग ॥ ॥
सह निरालि पालण्य ॥ गवव सुभवसिनो लखिले ॥ ॥
आयोध २६ विनायक पाहोल सत्यवल जनस्माय नागसेन मुनी ॥
स्वरूप २९ तिथि-विनायक सुभवसिन्युक्त-दर्शनमेय ॥ ॥
वह उपयोग ् ॥ ॥ सह इशानसी अवार लगार ॥
अवार २२ बीस सत्यवल जीवन के नेथ ॥ ॥

सीताराम वर्ष १२२ विनायकचार्य वर्ष १५ ॥ शीताराम वर्ष १२२ विनायकचार्य वर्ष १५ ॥ शीताराम वर्ष १२ जन्मसंवास ॥ ॥
सीताराम वर्ष २२ जन्मसंवास ॥ ॥ सीताराम वर्ष २२ जन्मसंवास ॥ ॥
सीताराम वर्ष २२ जन्मसंवास ॥ ॥ सीताराम वर्ष २२ जन्मसंवास ॥ ॥
सीताराम वर्ष २२ जन्मसंवास ॥ ॥ सीताराम वर्ष २२ जन्मसंवास ॥ ॥

(5) सी का पह के निकाले स्वामी तीन चाँदी हजार एक सी पेशी का ढारक अवार सीसी लाखन अवार अव ब्रह्मस्माय सी साथ लगे ॥ ॥
सी से एती एवग तीनो अवार अव अक्षय न थामे ॥

\[12 MS. वानि। 13 Skr. विन्दन। 14 MS. विन्दन। 15 MS. वर्षक। 16 MS. जुड़्। which agrees with neither metre nor sense. 17 न्त. in MS., but some such addition required by the metre. 18 MS. 52885288। 19 Read अवार, metri causa. 20 This line is not orthographically correct. 21 MS. वानिसाय; the metre is upagiti. 22 MS. अवारेएँ एव वानि। 23 MS. पदे।
[October, 1891.]
(12) तत्त्वं || नर्मदौकः परिज्ञातमहिः बलवकरगाम्ये चतुर्गारी मूलिनामाण्ड || नर्मदौ || चन्द्र || कौर || मूलपूणं || पुराणं नर्मदौकः सरस्वतीगाम्ये बलवकरगाम्ये तथा च श्रीमुगाये सरस्वती- गाहिः बलवकरगाम्ये चतुर्गारी मूलिनामाण्ड || नर्मदौ || चन्द्र || कौर || मूलपूणं || इत्यादि ||

(13) संव्रभं यास्यं वर्षं ११२ ॥ सुन्दरनास्यं वर्षं २४ ॥ स्वरूपच्यास्यं वर्षं २२ ॥ रस्त्वारं वर्षं २ ॥ नद्वारं जातं ॥ यथा ॥

सत्त्वम् चतुर्गारीं ॥ तिनं कारणं सम्भवीं हनवद जत्मी ॥
अङ्ग वर्तमानलिं साधस्य सर्वसिंहं मृगंपुषं हुस्तं ॥ २०४ ॥
परस्परं ॥ कार्ति जातं ॥ कुशलं समेतस्य सूचा ॥ २०५ ॥
चालीसं वर्तन जयप्रधं ॥ पात्तीसं सुमयं लिखी ॥ २१ ॥

सी यो आदिवाम् छुट्टिः पट्टी स्यानी ॥ चेरों जाकाल का योंसं स्यानी ॥ तवं रुतवटि ॥ उत्ति पुष्पं कित शृद्धतान संवं पुतका मे धायाय ॥

निव पैंनं निव पत्तानी की पिल ॥

TRANSLATION.

(1) Having bowed to the glorious Lord of the three worlds, and called to mind Bhāratī (i. e. Sarasvati), the true Guru, I declare the charming pațṭāvalli of the pontiffs of the Mūla Saṅgha.

(2) In the noble glorious Mūla Saṅgha, in the heart-ravishing succession of Nandin, in the pearl of a Balākāra Gaṇa, in the Sārasvatiya Gachchha ;

(3) In the line of Kundakunda there arose excellent glorious pontiffs. Even these are here set forth. Listen, oh ye men of worth!

§ 1. First in this paṭṭāvalli are to be mentioned the 14 Kulakaras who were in the beginning of the Yuga.

Next come the Establishers of the Faith and the Saviours of the world, of whom Adinātha is the first and Vīra the 24th and last.

Afterwards there were Kāvalins for 62 years (as related in the following three) Gāthās:—

(1) "After the Nirvāṇa of the last Jina, (there arose) Gōyama, the great Muni, a Kāvalin, and after the lapse of twelve years there arose the lord Sudhāmanna.

(2) "Then again after twelve years there arose the lord Jambū, a king of Munis; and he, the grand Kāvalin, abode for thirty-eight years.

(3) "There were sixty-two years of Kāvalins, and three Munis, Gōyama, Sudhāmanna and Jambū; two men for twelve years each, the third for forty years less two." (1—3.)

§ 2. After Vīra, Gōtama was a Kēvalin for 12 years [and after him Sudhārman for another 12 years] ; after this Jambū Swāmin was a Kēvalin for 36 years. Thus there were 62 years of Kāvalins.

After this we now write down the 5 Śrūṭa-Kēvalins (as related in the following three) Gāthās:—

(1) "Of Śrūṭa-Kēvalins there were five after the lapse of (those) sixty-two years; as the first, for fourteen years, Viṇhukumāra is to be reckoned.

(2) "Then Nandimitra for sixteen years; as the third, Aparājīya for twenty-two years; Gōvaddhaṇa for twenty years less one, Bhaddabāhu for thirty less one.

(3) "For one hundred years, there arose five men as Śrūṭa-Kēvalins, Viṇha and Nandimitra, also Aparājīya, Gōvaddhaṇa and Bhaddabāhu." (4—6.)

46 MS. ४५.१ 47 MS. चन्द्र ६ 48 MS. गोवद्धा निर्मलस्य c. m.; the metre is gītī. Cf. Hem. VI. 161.
49 MS. राष्ट्र. ५० MS. युज्जनं १२ MS. विज्ञेयश्रक्ति ४० MS. चरणिधरम् c. m.; the metre is gītī. ५२ Read मूलिनाम्बा. ५४ The bracketed passage appears to have dropped out of the original text. The portions within round brackets are added to bring out more clearly the meaning of the text.
In the space of 100 years there arose five Sruta-Kāvalins: *viz.* Vīśūpanandīnī, for 14, Nandimitra for 16, Aparājīta for 22, Govardhana for 19, and Bhadrabhin (I.) for 29 years. These five Ṭhārāyas were Sruta-Kāvalins within the space of 100 years.

§ 3. Up to this time the text of the eleven Āugas and the fourteen Purvas was known by memory, and books did not exist. The words of the Twelve Āugas amounted to one hundred and twelve krōṛ, eighty-three lākṣaṇa, fifty-eight thousand and five (i.e. 1,128,358,005).56

One sūkha of words consists of thirty-two akāaras. Accordingly there are fifty-one krōṛ, eighty lākṣaṇa, eighty-four thousand, six hundred and twenty-one sūkas (i.e. 510,884,821).57

In the writing of these twelve Āugas there was employed a total of thirty-five thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight krōṛ, thirty-three lākṣaṇa, one hundred and twenty-eight tānus of ink (i.e. 350,983,300,128).

In the writing of one thousand sūkas there is spent one paisa worth of ink; (hence) in the writing of all of them was spent as much as forty tālās.

§ 4. After this, i.e., 162 years after Mahāvīra, there arose 11 Munis who knew (only) ten Purvas; (as related in the following three Gāthās:—

(1) "One hundred and sixty-two years having passed, there arose eleven great Munis, for one hundred and eighty-three years, who knew (only) ten Āugas: *viz.*,

(2) "The Āchāryas Visākha, Pāthala, Khaṭṭiya, Jayasena, Nāgasena, Siddhattha, Dhitti, Vijaya, Buhilingsa, Deva and Dharmasena;

(3) "(For whom) years ten, nineteen, seventeen, twenty-one, eighteen, seventeen, eighteen, thirty, fourteen are to be counted respectively." (7—9.)

From the year 162 after Mahāvīra there lived the Āchārya Visākha for 10 years; from 172 after Vira, the Āchārya Pratibhīsa, for 19 years; from 191 after Vira, the Āchārya Kāhatviya, for 17 years; from 208 after Vira, the Āchārya Jayasena, for 21 years; from 229 after Vira, the Āchārya Nāgasena, for 18 years; from 247 after Vira, the Āchārya Siddhārtha, for 17 years; from 264 after Vira, the Āchārya Dhṛitiṣa, for 18 years; from 282 after Vira, the Āchārya Vijaya, for 13 years; from 295 after Vira, the Āchārya Buddhilinga, for 20 years; from 315 after Vira, the Āchārya Deva (I.), for 14 years; from 329 after Vira, the Āchārya Dharmasena. For the space of 183 years there existed men who knew (only) ten Purvas, i.e., for one hundred and eighty-three years.

§ 5. In the writing of these ten Purvas were used forty tālās of ink, (and) eleven thousand, one hundred and thirty-five krōṛ, and two lākṣaṇa, fifty-eight thousand, three hundred and ninety-three śros of leaves [i.e. 111,350,258,393].

Now these texts were in the memory of the 11 Āchāryas, and there were not yet any books.

§ 6. After these events these arose men who knew (only) eleven (or less) Āugas, for 220 years.58 Among these men, for 123 years, there were five ascensions of men who knew (only) eleven Āugas; (as related in the following two and one-half Gāthās:—

56 The fourteen Purvas being counted together as the twelfth Āuga.
57 The same number will be found given in Prof. Bhūdārkar's Report for 1887, p. 147—110.
58 This number, multiplied by 32, gives a total of 16,345,307,872 akāaras. Prof. Bhūdārkar, *ibid.*, does not state the number of sūkas, but gives the total of the akāaras as 16,345,307,888. This, divided by 32, gives the number of sūkas as 519,884,821 and 1. His pañjāvall, therefore, must have counted one-half sūka more than the present pañjāvall.
59 The text is here not clearly expressed. It reads as if the period of 220 years referred to the Eleven-Āgra-dhārinis only. But from what follows later on, it is clear, that that period is understood to be made up of the two periods of 123 years and 97 years of all the Āugas of diminishing knowledge.
(1) "Three hundred and forty-five years having passed after the nirvåna of the last Jina, five great Munis arose, men who knew eleven Āṅgas; viz.,

(2) "The Āchāryas Nakhattra, Jayapāla, Paṇḍava, Dhuvasēna, Kaśira, for years eighteen, twenty, thirty-nine, fourteen, thirty-two (respectively).

(3) "For the space of one hundred and twenty-three years there existed men who knew eleven Āṅgas." (10—12).

From the year 345 after Vīra there lived the Āchārya Nakhattra, for 18 years; from 363 after Vīra, the Āchārya Jayapāla, for 20 years; from 333 after Vīra, the Āchārya Paṇḍava, for 33 years; from 422 after Vīra, the Āchārya Dhuvasēna, for 14 years; from 436 after Vīra, the Āchārya Kaśira for 32 years.

§ 7. After (these) 123 years, within the space of 97 years, there arose men who knew (only) ten Āṅgas. From after 123 years there arose 4 successions; (as related in the following two and one-half) Gāthās:

(1) "For the space of ninety-seven years there were men who knew ten Āṅgas or nine or eight Āṅgas; viz.,

(2) "Subhadda and Jāsōbhadda, Bhaddabāhu and Lōhāchajja, the lord of Munis, who spoke the doctrine of the Jina.

(3) "Six, eighteen, twenty-three, fifty-two (respectively) were the years of these lordly Munis; two hundred and twenty were the years of all (these) men who knew ten or nine or eight Āṅgas." (12—14.)

Within the space of 97 years, there were 4 successions. From the year 468 after Vīra there was the Āchārya Subhadra, for 6 years; from 474 after Vīra, the Āchārya Yaśōbhadda, for 18 years; from 492 after Vīra, the Āchārya Bhadrabāhu-ji (II), for 23 years; from 515 after Vīra, Lōhāchajja-ji, for 50 years. Thus there were 97 years. The number of Āṅgas went on diminishing through the space of 220 years.

§ 8. In the writing of the eleven Āṅgas the expenditure of ink was one thousand, two hundred and eighty-one krūṣ, and six lakhā, forty-nine thousand, six hundred and sixty-four and one quarter jānka (i.e. 12, 810/649,664). In all these there were used forty ṛddas.

These texts were in the memory of the Āchāryas, and books did not yet exist.

§ 9. After this, for the space of 118 years, there lived men who knew (only) one Āṅga; (as related in the following two) Gāthās:

(1) "Five hundred and sixty-five years having passed after the nirvāṇa of the last Jina, there arose five men who should be understood to have known one Āṅga; viz.,

(2) "Ahivalli and Māgahaṇḍin, Dharasēna, Pupphayanta, Bhūdavali. Twenty-eight, twenty-one, nineteen, thirty, and twenty, were their years (respectively)." (15, 16.)

§ 10. There were 5 successions of men who knew (only) one Āṅga. From the year 565 after Vīra there was the Āchārya Ahivalli for 25 years; from 593 after Vīra, the Āchārya Māgahaṇḍin, for 21 years; from 614 after Vīra, the Āchārya Dharasēna, for 19 years; from 633 after Vīra, the Āchārya Pushpadantā, for 30 years; from 663 after Vīra, the Āchārya Bhūdavali, for 20 years; altogether 118 years. For the space of 118 years there were men who knew (only) one Āṅga; (the knowledge of it) went on declining, till there were only the

---

* The Gāthā has 93 years; the change to 59 is an alteration made by the commentator purposely, to harmonise the account of the gāthā. See the first note at the end of this paper.

* This would seem to be the same person who is afterwards called Arhadvali or Guptigupta.
Srutajñānins. Up to the year 683 after Mahāvīra (the knowledge of) the Aṅgas was conserved. Afterwards arose the Srutajñānins; (as related in the following) Gāthā:

(1) "For the space of one hundred and eighteen years there existed great Munis who knew one Aṅga. In the year six hundred and eighty-three after the Nirvāṇa of the Jina, the loss of the Aṅgas is said to have been complete." (17.)

Successions of men who knew (only) one Aṅga there were for the space of one hundred and eighteen years. In the writing of the eighteen thousand words of this one Anga there were used forty ṛkalās of ink, or 570'047,482, i.e., fifty-seven krūr, forty-seven thousand, four hundred and fifty-two tankas.

So much (of the sacred) text was in the memory of the Āchāryas, and books did not exist.

§ 11. Further, there shall now be related an account of the successions of the glorious Mūla Saṅgha, (beginning) from the year 683 after the glorious Mahāvīra. There had occurred the birth of Vikramādiya. In the year 2 after the Āchārya Subhadra's (accession to the pontificate) the birth of Vikrama took place; and in the year 4 of Vikrama's reign Bhdrabāhu-ji (II.) took his seat on the pontifical chair. Bhdrabāhu's disciple was Guptigupta. The latter had three names: 1, Guptigupta, 2, Arhadbalin, 3, Viśākhāchārya. He had four disciples: 1, Māghanandin who at the foot of a Nandi tree kept his rainy seasons, and who established the Nandi Saṅgha; 2, Viśabhā, who kept his rainy seasons under the tree called Jinasēna, and who established the Viśabhā Saṅgha; 3, Śīṅha, who kept his rainy seasons in the cave of a lion (śīlās), and who established the Śīṅha Saṅgha; 4, Dēva (II.) who kept his rainy seasons in the house of the courtesan Dēvadattā, and who established the Dēva Saṅgha.

§ 12. The detail is as follows:

In the Nandi Saṅgha, or the Pārijāta Gachcha, or the BalātkaRa GaRa, there are in use four surnames for the Munis, viz., Nandin, Chandra, Kṛṣṇa and Bhūṣaṇa, or (in other words) in the Nandi Saṅgha which is the Saravatī Gachcha or the BalātkaRa GaRa; or again (in other words) in the Nandi Ammīyā which is the Saravatī Gachcha or the BalātkaRa GaRa, of the glorious Mūla Saṅgha, there are in use four names for the Munis, viz., Nandin, Chandra, Kṛṣṇa and Bhūṣaṇa; and so forth.

§ 13. Here, first of all, there was Bhdrabāhu in the year 492 after ViRa. 24 after Subhadra, 22 after Vikrama's birth, 4 after Vikrama's accession; (as related in the following two) Gāthās:

(1). "It was the year four hundred and seventy when the birth of Vikrama took place. For eight years he played as a child, for sixteen he roamed over the country; (2), for fifteen years he performed sacrifices, being given over to false doctrine; for forty years he was devoted to the religion of the Jina and then obtained heaven." (18, 19).

The knowledge of these Munis went on diminishing. The cause of this was the badness of those times. Then the Muni Bhūṣavalī and the Muni Pushpadanta collected all the sacred lore in books.

Dated on the fifth day of the bright half of the month Jyeṣṭha.

---

62 The tree Cedrela Toona, according to Sir M. Williams' Sanskrit Dictionary. It is the well-known Indian mahogany tree, a very large and tall tree; see Wat's 'Economic Products of India', Part VII. p. 66. Nandī appears to be its South-Indian (Telugu) name; see ibid., part VI. p. 47, No. 155.
63 The MS. reading is not quite distinct; originally the number seems to have been 492, but afterwards altered to 493. The former is the correct number, as may be seen from the scheme in the first note at the end of this paper.
64 The name of this Muni is spelt variously and corruptly throughout, Bhūṣavalī, Bhitavallī, etc. Prof. Bhadadkar's MS. No. 602, appears also to read Bhūṣavalī.
Tables of the Kundakunda line, or the Sarasvati Gachchha, called the Nandit Āmnāya, or Balākāra Gaṇa, of the Māla Saṅgha. (From MSS. A and B.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Dates of accession</th>
<th>Householder</th>
<th>Monk</th>
<th>Priest.</th>
<th>Total.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhadrabāhu II</td>
<td>4 Ch. S. 14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21 10 27 3 76 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guptigupta</td>
<td>36 Ph. S. 14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9 6 25 5 65 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Māghanandin I</td>
<td>36 Ā. S. 14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4 4 26 4 68 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jinachandra I</td>
<td>49 Ph. S. 14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 9 6 3 65 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kundakunda</td>
<td>49 P. V. 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51 10 10 5 95 10 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Umāvāmin</td>
<td>101 K. S. 6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40 8 1 5 84 8 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lōhāchārya II</td>
<td>142 A. S. 14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10 10 20 6 69 10 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yasābjārītī</td>
<td>133 J. S. 10</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58 (8) (21) (5) 91 (9) 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yasōnandin</td>
<td>211 Ph. V. 11</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46 4 9 4 79 4 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dēvanandin I</td>
<td>253 As. S. 8</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40 10 28 4 76 11 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pāljayāpāda</td>
<td>308 J. S. 10</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44 11 22 7 71 6 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gupanandin I</td>
<td>333 J. S. 9</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11 3 1 4 38 8 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Vajranandin</td>
<td>394 Bh. S. 14</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32 3 5 1 4 37 8 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Kusāranandin</td>
<td>336 Ph. V. 4</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40 2 20 9 60 4 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lōkachandra I</td>
<td>427 J. V. 3</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26 3 16 10 60 3 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Prabhachandra I</td>
<td>453 Bh. S. 14</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25 5 15 11 58 5 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nēmichandra I</td>
<td>473 Ph. S. 10</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5 9 1 9 40 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bāhanandin</td>
<td>467 P. V. 5</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22 24 12 46 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Harinandin</td>
<td>451 M. S. 11</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16 7 15 14 40 7 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vasunandin</td>
<td>525 Ā. S. 10</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 2 22 9 46 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Viranandin</td>
<td>531 P. S. 11</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30 14 10 52 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Ratnakirti</td>
<td>561 M. S. 5</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23 4 7 11 43 4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Number</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Dates of Accession</td>
<td>Householder</td>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>Pontiff</td>
<td>Intermonastic Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Māśikyanandin</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>A.D. 523</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mārgachandra</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>P. V. 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Śāntikirtī I</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>A. V. 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mārkaṇḍa</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>S. S. 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mahākirtī</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>Mr. S. 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vīra-nanda</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>Vr. V. 9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Śrīdhārānanda</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>Ch. S. 9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Śrījaṇa</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>V. S. 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Nandākirtī</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>Bh. S. 10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Dānavāhāra</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Ch. V. 12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Anantākirtī</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>Ā. S. 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Dharmananda</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>S. S. 15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Vīra-nanda</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>J. S. 15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rāma-nanda</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>As. V. 12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Rūṣikirtī</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>V. S. 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Abhayānanda</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>Ā. S. 10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nārāyana</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>K. S. 7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Nāgachandra</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>Bh. V. 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nāyana-nanda</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>Bh. S. 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Harīchandra</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>As. V. 8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Mahāchandra I</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>S. S. 9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Māghachandra</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>M. S. 14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial Number</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>Dates of accession</td>
<td>Householder</td>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>Pontiff</td>
<td>Interim days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Lakshumchandra</td>
<td>1029</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Gupanandin II</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Guachandra</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Lókachandra II</td>
<td>1065</td>
<td>1009</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Śrutakrtti</td>
<td>1079</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Bhávachandra</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Mahlochandra II</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Mágachandra II</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Vrishabhahanand</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Śivanandin</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vasuchandra</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sanghanandin</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Bhávanandin</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Dévánandin II</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Vidyáchandra</td>
<td>1170</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Śórsachandra</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Mágahanandin II</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Jónsakrtti</td>
<td>1188</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Gangokrtti</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Siúhakrtti</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Hémakrtti</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sundarakrtti</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MS. B adds marginally Guakrti, which is also given by P. 14.)
(P. 15 inserts Vísvándin between Nos. 47 & 48.)

Down to here the seat of the Pontificate was in Ujínp. (P. 16 has Mágachandra.)
He pontificated in Wárá. (See remark under No. 44.)
In Wárá. (P. 16 has Brahmañand.)
In Wárá. (P. 16 has Viśahachandra.)
In Wárá. (MS. B calls him Siśhanand; P. 17, Harinand.)
In Wárá.
In Wárá. (P. 17, Sárakrti.)
In Wárá.
In Wárá. (P. 17, Sárakrti.)
In Wárá. (P. 18, Jónsakrti.)
In Wárá.
In Wárá.
In Wárá. (MS. B adds "from here 14 pontificates took place in Gwáller, down to Abha- vakrti, No. 77").
In Gwáller (Gwáliyar).
(P. 18, has Chármanand.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Dates of accession</th>
<th>Householder</th>
<th>Monk</th>
<th>Pontiff</th>
<th>Intercausal days</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Nënchandra II</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7 8 29</td>
<td>9 35 9 8</td>
<td>(P. 19 has Némiminandin.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Nabhikriti</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1 11 26</td>
<td>4 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Narëndrakriti I</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9 12 18</td>
<td>12 36 1</td>
<td>(P. 19, Narëndraditya-sah.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Śrichandra II</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6 3 24</td>
<td>7 38 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Padmakriti</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>1191</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4 11 25</td>
<td>6 37   1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>(Varadžhachandra)</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 11 28</td>
<td>3 26   1</td>
<td>(Perhaps wrong for Varadhamana, as given by P. 19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Akalaśkachandra</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 3 24</td>
<td>7 48 4 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Lalitakriti</td>
<td>1257</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 41   5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Kësavachandra</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6 16</td>
<td>6 45 6 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Chârukriti</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 3 2</td>
<td>7 47 3 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Abhayakriti</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 30 5</td>
<td>4 11 7</td>
<td>41 11 18</td>
<td>In Gwâler (Gwâliyar).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Vasantakriti</td>
<td>1264</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1 4 22</td>
<td>8 33 3</td>
<td>In Ajmèr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Prakshatakriti</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 3 19</td>
<td>4 28 3 23</td>
<td>In Ajmèr. (Perhaps wrong for Prakshatakriti, as in P. 22.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Śantiakriti II</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 9 7 8</td>
<td>43 9 15</td>
<td>In Ajmèr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Dharmachandra I</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22 5</td>
<td>8 65   13</td>
<td>In Ajmèr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Ramañkirti II</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14 4 10</td>
<td>6 58 4 16</td>
<td>In Ajmèr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Prabhachandra II</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>74 11 15</td>
<td>8 98 11 23</td>
<td>In Ajmèr. There was an Achârya of Prabhachandra in Gujarât. A certain Śrâvak called Prabhachandra for the purpose of performing a consecration; but he could not come. Then after giving the ācâryamatra to the Achârya, the Śrâvak conferred on him the title of Bhãjakrãka. Thus Padmanandin became a Bhãjakrãka. (MS, B adds the date Sam. 1375 + A. D. 1318.) He carved a stone figure of Sarasvatî and caused it to speak (see P. 41.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Padmanandin</td>
<td>1385</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18 99</td>
<td>23 28 23</td>
<td>In Dill (Delhi).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Subhaçandra</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50 3 11</td>
<td>96 15   3</td>
<td>In Dill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. — The Nágôr Line. From MS. A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Dates of accession</th>
<th>Householder</th>
<th>Monk</th>
<th>Pontiff</th>
<th>Intercolenary days</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Prabháchandra III</td>
<td>1507 J. V. 5</td>
<td>A. D. 1440</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64 8 17 10 91 8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Jinachandra II</td>
<td>1571 Ph. V. 2</td>
<td>A. D. 1514</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9 4 25 8 50 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Remarks: In 1572 the Gachchha split up into two; one section residing in Chitôr, the other in Nágôr.*

### B. — The Chitôr Line. From MS. B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Dates of accession</th>
<th>A. D.</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Dates of accession</th>
<th>A. D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Dharmachandra II</td>
<td>1568 S. V. 5</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>Mahendradri I</td>
<td>1792 P. S. 10</td>
<td>1735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Lalitakriti II</td>
<td>1569 Ch. S. 8</td>
<td>1545</td>
<td>Kheômendradri I</td>
<td>1815 A. S. 11</td>
<td>1758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Chandradri I</td>
<td>1562 V. P. 1</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>Sûrendradri I</td>
<td>V. V. 7</td>
<td>1765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Dêvendradri I</td>
<td>1602 Ph. Y. 7</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>Sûkhendradri I</td>
<td>1832 ?</td>
<td>1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Naréndradri I</td>
<td>1602 K. V. 8</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>Naióktriti</td>
<td>1879 A. V. 10</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Sûrendradri I</td>
<td>1733 S. V. 5</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>Dêvendradri III</td>
<td>1888 M. S. 10</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Jagatkriti</td>
<td>1733 V. Y. 5</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>Mahendradri II</td>
<td>1938 A. S. 10</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Dêvendradri II</td>
<td>1770 M. Y. 11</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ph. S. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Remarks: He was a householder for 4 years; (i.e., he was 4 years old when he took the vows).*

---

64. This date is obscure; the separation may have taken place in that year (1572), but separate heads were not appointed till 1581, when Jinachandra died.
INDEX TO THE PROPER NAMES.\textsuperscript{42}

[Ch. = Chittor section, N. = Nagor section. The numbers refer to the Tables; the paragraphs refer to the Introduction.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abhayya Chandra</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhayya Kirti</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhayendu, see 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahivali, § 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akalanka Chandra</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ananta Kirti</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aparajita, § 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arhadbalan, § 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balatkara Gana</td>
<td>§ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhadrabahu, (I) § 2, (II) § 7, 11; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhana Nandin</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhattarakha, see 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavva Chandra</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhavva Nandin</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutavali, § 9, 10, 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhuvana Bhushana</td>
<td>105 (Ch.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhuvana Kirti, (I) 59 (Ch.), (II) 108 (Ch.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahma Nandin</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhilinga, § 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhilinga, § 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandra Kirti, 90 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakru Kirti</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakru Nandin, see 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desa Bhushana</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deva (I) § 4, (II) § 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deva Nandin, (I) 10, (II) 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deva Sangha, § 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devendra Kirti, (I) 91 (N.), (II) 95 (N.), (III) 101 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharasena, § 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma Chandra, (I) 81, (II) 88 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma Nandin, see 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma Kirti, 90 (Ch.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharma Nandin, 34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharasena, § 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhritisena, § 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhrusvesna, § 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elacharya, see 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganga Kirti, 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gota, § 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourdana, § 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gridhrapichcha, see 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guna Chandra, 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guna Kirti, see 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guna Nandin, (I) 12, (II) 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guptigupta, § 11; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari Kirti, 42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hari Nandin, 19, see also 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hema Kirti, 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jagat Kirti, 94 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jambu, § 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayapalaka, § 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayasena, § 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jina Chandra, (I) 4, (II) 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jinasena, § 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juana Kirti, 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juana Nandin, see 62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamsa, § 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kushtya Sangha, see 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ksava Chandra, 75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshatriya, § 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kshemendra Kirti, 97 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumara Nandin</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kundakunda, 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshmil Chandra</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lalita Kirti, (I) 74, (II) 89 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohacharya, (I) § 7, (II) 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokha Chandra, (I) 15, (II) 48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokendra Kirti, 107 (Ch.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokendu, see 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghla Chandra, (I) 44, (II) 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magha Nandin, (I) 3, (II) 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maghavendu, see 44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mah Chandra, see 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahal Kirti, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendra Kirti, (I) 98 (N.), (II) 102 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mah Chandra, (I) 43, (II) 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manika Nandin, 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manikya Nandin, see 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megha Chandra, 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meghenda, see 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meru Kirti, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mula Sangha, § 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahhi Kirti, 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nag Chandra, 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagasena, § 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naipa Kirti, 100 (N.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakshatra, § 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandi Amnaya, § 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandi Kirti, 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandimitra, § 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nandi Sangha, § 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{42} The index was drawn up by Mr. Bendall. For the arrangement in the order of the Roman alphabet and for some additions I am responsible.
NOTES.

1. Chronological. There are several inconsistencies in the chronology, presented in the Gāthās. Gāthā 7 gives a total of 183 years; but the summation of the several items, given in Gāthā 9 as constituting the total, only yields a total of 181. Either the total or one of the items may be wrong. That the text of the Gāthās is here corrupt, is also shown by the fact that the lines do not properly scan and that the Prākrit names do not properly spell; thus the Prākrit names Dhītī and Buddhītāgga, as given by the MSs, do not represent the Sanskrit names Dhītī and Buddhītāgga which in all probability are correct.

Similarly Gāthā 12 gives a total of 97 years; but the summation of the items yields a total of 99. Here, too, the text of the Gāthās is corrupt; and one of the verses is a śloka, instead of an ṛg. In this case, the vernacular commentator attempted to remove the difficulty by simply altering one of the items and reading 50 instead of 52.

It is to be observed that these two errors neutralise one another; and this fact would seem to point to a manipulation of the text of the Gāthās with a view to harmonizing their statements. Thus the given items (in Gāthās 9, 11, 14) 10 + 19 + 17 + 21 + 18 + 17 + 13 + 20 + 14 + 14 + 18 + 20 + 39 + 14 + 32 + 6 + 18 + 23 + 52 (i.e., the real totals
181 + 123 + 99) = 403 years. The given totals (in Gāthās 7, 12) 183 + 123 + 97 also = 403. Similarly the given totals (in Gāthās 7, 14) 183 + 220 also = 403.

The following table exhibits the state of the matter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Kāvalins</th>
<th>up to A. V.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gōtama (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sudharman (12)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jambū (38)</td>
<td>(62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total... 62 or (62)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Sruta-Kāvalins</th>
<th>up to A. V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Viṣṇu (14)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Nandi (16)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aparājita (22)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gōvardhāna (19)</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bhadrabāhu I (29)</td>
<td>(162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total... 100 or (100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Ten-Pūrvins</th>
<th>up to A. V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Viśākhā (10)</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prāśātra (19)</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Kahatriya (17)</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jayāsena (21)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nāgasena (18)</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Siddhārtha (17)</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dhṛitisena (18)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vijaya (13)</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Buddhāliṅga (20)</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dēva I (14)</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dharasena (14)</td>
<td>343 or (345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total... 181 or (183)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Eleven-Aṅgins</th>
<th>up to A. V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Nakshatra (18)</td>
<td>361 or 363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jayapālaka (20)</td>
<td>381, 383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pāṇḍava (39)</td>
<td>420, 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Dhrusasena (14)</td>
<td>434, 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kaṃsa (32)</td>
<td>466, 468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total... 123 or (123)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Minor-Aṅgins</th>
<th>up to A. V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Subhadra (6)</td>
<td>472 or 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yasōbhadra (18)</td>
<td>490, 492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bhadrabāhu II (23)</td>
<td>513, 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lōhāchārya I (52)</td>
<td>(565), 567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total... 99 or (97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. One-Aṅgins</th>
<th>up to A. V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arhadbaliṇ (28)</td>
<td>593 or 595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Māghanandin (31)</td>
<td>614, 616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dharasena (19)</td>
<td>633, 635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pushpadanta (30)</td>
<td>663, 665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bhūtavañin (20)</td>
<td>683, 685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total... 118 or (118)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of 6 periods up to A. V. 683 or (683)

---

46 According to the Śvetāmbara tradition, Bhadrabāhu’s death took place in 170 A. V., i.e. 8 years later.
The bracketed numbers are those actually given in the Gāthās. It will be seen that the final date, i.e., 683 A. V., results equally from the summation of the several single successions as well as from the summation of the totals of the six periods. Yet the two series of numbers, as given in the Gāthās, do not agree with one another; and this in two respects. First, the given total of the IIIrd period (183) does not agree with the real total (181) of the several successions; so again the given total of the Vth period (97) does not agree with its real total (99); nor does the given total of the two periods IV and V (220) agree with their real total (222). Yet if the three periods (Nos. III, IV, and V), are totalled, the result (403) comes out correctly, because the errors in the totals of periods III and V (being 2 in each) neutralise one another. Secondly, all the actual dates, given in the Gāthās (viz., 63, 162, 268, 683 A. V.), agree with the numbers given for the several successions, except the date 345 A. V. which agrees with the given total (i.e., 183 of the IIIrd period), and which produces a wrong final date 685 A. V. This would seem to show that that date (i.e., 345 A. V.) as well as the given totals for the periods III and V are wrong. Another significant fact is to be observed. The verses, in their present state, do not give the date of the IVth period. It is the only date which is omitted; and the verse in which one would expect it, is the only verse which is not a gāthā but a śloka. The occurrence of a śloka in the midst of a series of Gāthās is an extraordinary thing; and one cannot help suspecting that the verse as it originally stood was a Gāthā containing the missing date; that the date was either accidentally or intentionally omitted; and that the remnant of the mutilated Gāthā was then turned into a śloka, the latter being of shorter dimensions than a Gāthā.

As to the cause of the confusion, I will give my own conjecture, for what it may be worth. I believe it arose from an attempt at reconciling two conflicting traditions. One of these traditions is contained in the Gāthās, which the paṭīvall quotes. This tradition gives four items of information: 1, the duration of each pontificate down to 983 A. V.; 2, the duration of each of the six periods, down to the same date; 3, the date of the termination of each period; 4, certain dates of Vikrama’s life, especially those of his birth and accession. Side by side with this older tradition there appears to have been another, much later one, for which the authority of no Gāthā is quoted and which is only given in the vernacular commentary. This later tradition enumerates a set of four synchronisms, referring to Bhadrabāhu’s accession, with whom the paṭīvall proper of the Sarasvati Gachchha commences. viz., 1, that the year of Bhadrabāhu’s accession is the 24th after Subhadra’s accession; 2, that it is the 22nd after Vikrama’s birth; 3, that it is also the 4th after Vikrama’s accession; and 4, that the year of Vikrama’s birth is the 2nd after Subhadra’s accession. The calculation starts with the year of Vikrama’s birth as a fixed point. He was born in 470 A. V.; this year is the 2nd after Subhadra’s accession; accordingly the latter took place in 468 (i.e., 463-49 A. V.). Bhadrabāhu’s accession took place 24 years after Subhadra’s accession; accordingly Bhadrabāhu succeeded to the pontificate in 492 (i.e., 492-93) A. V. The latter year accordingly is the 22nd after Vikrama’s birth (i.e., 470 + 22 = 492); it is also the year after Vikrama’s accession to the throne; accordingly Vikrama’s accession took place in 488 (i.e., 483-89) A. V. or in the 18th year of Vikrama’s life (i.e., 470 + 18 = 488). Having thus calculated 492 A. V. to be the year of Bhadrabāhu’s, and 468 A. V. to be the year of Subhadra’s accession, this result was found to collide with the older tradition of the Gāthās. For calculating backwards from the year 468 A. V., and subtracting 123 years (i.e., the duration of the IVth period), the year 345 A. V. was obtained as the terminal year of the IIIrd period. On the other hand, calculating forward, from the data supplied by the Gāthās, the year 343 A. V. resulted as the terminal year. To avoid this discrepancy, I suppose, the original text of the Gāthās was tampered with, and the duration of the third period changed from 181 to 183, and its terminal year changed from 343 A. V. to 345 A. V., forgetting, however, that thus the dates given by the Gāthās were rendered inconsistent.

It may be that this later tradition is peculiar to that Gachchha alone. Whether or not this is so, would be interesting to know. At present, however, I believe, no paṭīvall of any other Digambara Gachchha is known.
with one another. That change having once been made, and the lower terminal dates (565 A. V. of the Vth period, and 683 A. V. of the VIth period) being unalterable, it was further necessary to change the duration of the Vth period from 90 to 97, in order to harmonize the whole chronology. The question may be asked, why should the first change have been made in the duration and terminal date of the IIIrd period, instead of in the IVth period. For, Subhadra’s accession having been fixed in the year 463 A. V., it must at once have been found to be incompatible with the Gāthás, the calculation from which must have shown that 466 A. V. was the real date of his accession. The nearest remedy, it would seem, was to change, in the IVth period, the date 466 A. V. to 468 A. V. and the duration of 123 years to 125. Why this was not done, is not apparent, except on the supposition that the Gāthás which gave the date 466 A. V. was at that time already mutilated; and that the date of the IVth period being missing, recourse was had to altering the date of the next preceding (i. e., the IIIrd) period.

This is, however, not the only discrepancy between the later and the older traditions. It has been shown that the calculation from the later tradition places the accession of Vikrama in 483 A. V., that is, in the 18th year of Vikrama’s life. But the Gāthás 18 and 19 seem to show clearly that he ascended the throne in his 24th year, i. e., in 494 A. V.

Accepting the statements of the Gāthás to be correct, the real synchronisms would stand thus: — Vikrama was born in 470 A. V. and ascended the throne in 494 A. V. Subhadra succeeded to the pontificate in 466 A. V., and Bhadrabahu II. in 490 A. V. Accordingly the accession of the latter was 24 years later than that of Subhadra (herein both traditions agree); but it was 20 years after Vikrama’s birth (not 23, as the later tradition says); and it was four years before Vikrama’s accession (not 4 years after it, as the later tradition says); further, Vikrama’s birth was 4 years after Subhadra’s accession (not 2 years, as the later tradition says).

The most important point herein is, that Bhadrabahu II.‘s accession really took place 4 years before Vikrama, because this affects the whole of the dates of the paṭāvall proper. All those dates must be set back for exactly eight years.

Or, if those dates are correct, the date of either the birth or the accession of Vikrama must be placed eight years earlier.

In the former alternative, we have the year 494 A. V. for the accession of Vikrama, which would make the nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra to fall in (494 + 57 = 551) B. C. In the latter alternative, we should have the year 463 A. V. for the birth and (463 + 24 = 487) A. V. for the accession of Vikrama, and accordingly (486 + 57 = 543) B. C. for the nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra, that is, the very year given for Buddha’s nirvāṇa by the chronology of Ceylon. But as the year 470 A. V. is such a prominently fixed date in the Digambara tradition for the birth of Vikrama, it seems preferable to ante-date the accession of Vikrama by eight years and to place it in (494 — 8 = 486 A. V. This would place Mahāvīra’s nirvāṇa, again, in 543 B. C., but would put Vikrama’s accession in the 16th year of his life. The question is, whether Gāthás 18 and 19 admit his accession in that year. It appears to me possible to interpret the second line of Gāthā 18 to mean, that Vikrama was at child’s play up to his eighth and wandered about up to his sixteenth year. He then ascended the throne at 16, and followed the Brahmanic religion for 15 and the Jain religion for 40 years. The advantage of this view is that it fully agrees with the older tradition of the Gāthās, and only corrects two of the synchronisms of the later tradition. In any case, the coincidence of the years of Mahāvīra’s and Buddha’s nirvāṇa is a curious result.

2. On the history of Vikrama. Gāthās 18 and 19, which refer to the history of Vikrama, are in a somewhat corrupt state. The reading rasapasa makes no sense. I conjecture it to stand for pariparas (or pariparasa), “fifteen.” The meaning of the verses I take to be, that Vikrama was born in 470 A. V., that he lived 8 years at home and then wandered about for

---

Also in the Sūtāmbara tradition, where, however, it is the date of Vikrama’s accession.
16 years (I suppose in quest of adventures); that he lived 15 years as an adherent of the orthodox Brahmanic religion, and then 40 years as a follower of Jainism. If these periods are to be taken as successive ones, the verses would seem to indicate that Vikrama ascended the throne in his 24th year (i.e., 494 A. V.), and that he died at the age of 79 years (i.e., in 549 A. V.). Possibly some of the periods may be overlapping; but as, in that case, the verses would give no certain indication as to the years when Vikrama ascended and when he died, such an interpretation has not much probability. As to the possible meaning of the 16 years of wandering, see the preceding note.

Professor Jacobi's remarks on the subject, in the Introduction to his Kalpa-Sūtra, p. 30, I do not understand. The readings of his manuscript (No. 629, see above) may have differed from those of mine. But I am inclined to think that his statement, "the year of his (Pushpadanta's) death (683 A. V.) is also given for the birth of Vikrama," is merely the result of a misunderstanding of the vernacular commentary. The passage, in § 11, Sri-Mahāvīra samān varsha 683 pachhai; Vikramaditya ki janta huvva, must be interpunctuated after pachhai, and the date (683 A. V.) must be constructed with what has gone before, not with Vikrama's birth. The latter is clearly stated to have taken place in 470 A. V. Again, in the passage (in § 10): Sri Vīrāt varsha 633 Pushpadantānāgara varsha 30; Sri Vīrāt varsha 683 Bhūtavalyaṇḍha rāya varsha 20, the number 683 is clearly a miscalculation for 663, as Pushpadanta is said to have pontificated for 30 years and to have commenced his pontificate in 633 A. V. On the other hand, Bhūtavali's pontificate, which lasted 20 years, ended in 683 A. V. Accordingly Pushpadanta's death was in 663 A. V., and not in 683 A. V., the latter is the date of Bhūtavali's death.

3. On the title of Bhaṭṭāraka. With regard to the notice in the paṭāvall of MS.A, that the title of Bhaṭṭāraka was conferred on the pontiff Padmanandin (No. 84) by a Gujarāti Śrāvak, in Saṅvat 1375, I may add a statement made to Mr. Bendall by his Jaipur informant, that it was the wife of Muhammad Gōri who desired to see the chief of the Digambaras; and on his being clothed for the ceremony, the title of Bhaṭṭāraka was conferred on him. This tradition,—if it be a tradition,—does not quite agree with that of the paṭāvall; and I only give it here for what it may be worth.

THE BARABAR AND NAGARJUNI HILL CAVE INSCRIPTIONS OF ASOKA AND DASARATHA.

BY G. BÜHLER, PH.D., LL.D., C.I.E.

The transcripts of the subjoined six inscriptions from the Barābar and Nagarjuni Hill Caves have been made according to Mr. Fleet's impressions, from which the accompanying facsimiles have been prepared. These documents have been repeatedly transcribed and translated, and the impressions of the fine well preserved ones offer very few new readings. With respect to the third, which appears to be in a very bad state, it must be noted that in the defaced portions the impressions do not agree with the distinct readings of Sir A. Cunningham's facsimiles, Arch. Surv. India, Vol. I. Plate xx. and Corp. Inscr. Ind., Vol. I. Plate xvi.

Short as these inscriptions are, they yet possess a very great value for the history of the Indian religions and of Indian art. Five of them state explicitly that the caves, in which they are incised, were presented "to the venerable Ājīvakas" (ājīvika-bhādāntāh). Who these Ājīvakas were, has been first recognised by Professor Kern. In his account of the history of Indian Buddhism he identifies them with the Ājīvakas of Asoka's seventh Pillar-edict, with

---

90 Accordingly Vikrama's reign extended to (15+40 ==) 55 years, and his life to 79 years. According to the Śvētāmbara he reigned for 86 years.

91 That statement has also paralleled Prof. A. Weber's, see his Indische Studien, Vol. XVII, p. 219.

1 Der Buddhismus und seine Geschichte in Indien, Von Verfasser autorisierte Übersetzung von H. Jacobi, Leipzig, 1882-84, 2 Vols. The passages regarding the Ājīvakas will be found collected in the index, sub voce Ājīvika.
the Ājīvias of the Jaina scriptures, with the Ājīvakas of the Buddhist canon, and with the Ājīvikas or Ājīvins of Varāhamihira’s Jātakas, and he declares them to be an ancient ascetic order, worshipping Nārāyaṇa, or, in other words, a subdivision of the Vaishānavas. As Professor Kern’s work will not be accessible to the majority of Indian readers, I shall try to give a brief exposition of his arguments, regarding which he has kindly furnished me some fuller information. Assuming, as must be done, that the Ājīvikas of our inscriptions are the same as those named in Āśōka’s seventh Pillar-edict, he translates the words 1. 4-5: kēm-evा bāhanēsū Ājīvikēs-pi-mē kaṭē vinē viyāpatē kōhāntī-tī by “Likewise I have arranged that these (Dharmamahānāsīras) will be occupied also with the Brāhmaṇical Ājīvikas.” 4 With the information thus elicited from the Pillar-edict, he combines the statements of Utpala regarding the Ājīvikas, who are mentioned in Varāhamihira’s Brihat-Jātaka, XV. 1, together with the Vṛddhā-srāvakas, the Nirgranthas or Jainas, and other ascetics. Utpala says in his commentary: ājīvika-grahaṇaḥ cha Nārāyaṇ-ākāśaṇām, “and the use of (the term) Ājīvika refers to those who have taken refuge with Nārāyaṇa,” and in support of this explanation, brings forward two Prākṛt passages, introducing them with the words: tathā cha vai[read tathā cha vai]vai[read tathā cha vai]vai[read tathā cha vai][Kālakāchāriyaḥ], — “and thus (saye) also Kālakāchārya.” In the first of these passages the term ēdamāt, i.e. ēkadaṇḍaṁ, 5 “(an ascetic) carrying one staff” (instead of the usual triple staff) is used for ājīvika and in the second 6 a longer explanation is given, which Utpala renders by Kēśaṇa-mārga-dikṣhitāḥ Kēśaṇaḥbhaktāḥ Bhāgyavatā ity-arthaḥ. Accepting, as correct this explanation of the term, which agrees remarkably well with his translation of the passage from the seventh Pillar-edict, Professor Kern further identifies Āśōka’s and Varāhamihira’s Ājīvikas, with the Ājīvakas of the Buddhist canon and with the Ājīvias of the Jaina Agamas, who in the time of Śākyamuni Gautama and Varahamihara were a numerous and influential order of naked monks, acknowledging as their teachers Nanda Vadhchha (Nanda Vārya), Kisa Śaṅkīchha (Śrīka(?)) Śāṅkīchya) and above all Makkhali Gosāla (Māskcarin Gōśala) or Gōśala Māssakhaliputta. The accounts given by the Jainas and the Baudhās of the transcendental doctrines of the last named show him to have been a fatalist.

Though it is of course possible to interpret the sentence from the seventh Pillar-edict differently and to take the words kēm-evा bāhanēsū as an appendix to the preceding sentence, and though no proof is furnished that the Ājīvakas or Ājīvias of the Buddhist and Jaina scriptures were worshippers of Nārāyaṇa, it must be conceded that Professor Kern’s views are greatly preferable to those of other translators of Āśōka’s edicts who take ājīvika to mean ‘religious mendicant’ in general and to refer in the cave-inscription to the Buddhists. The latter renderings and interpretations are untenable. For wherever the word ājīvika or ājīvaka occurs, it always denotes a member of a particular order of ascetics, and it is in no case applied to Buddhist monks. Irrespective of the fact that

---

3 See Der Buddhismus, Vol. II. p. 55.
4 See Der Buddhismus, Vol. II. p. 386.
5 The same explanation is also given by Utpala on the parallel passage, Lōgu-Jātaka, IX. 12. (See Prof. A. Weber’s Indische Studien, Vol. II. p. 257 note) in explanation of the term ājīvin.
6 Prof. Kern reads this passage as follows: Jānaka-Hara-Sūpa-Kēśaṇa-Sāti-Bamhanda-sāgasat, dikkhaṇaṁ nāvai viśeṣād bhavo kalpa-ad. The passage refers, like Varahamihira’s, to the influence of the planetae on the production of various ascetics. Compare also Prof. Leumann’s version of the same passage in the Actes du Sixième Congrès int. des Or. III. 2, p. 554, and his remarks thereon.
7 Regarding the Ājīvakas of the Buddhists see the indices, Vol. II., p. 259 and Vol. V. p. 254, in Professor Oldenberg’s edition of the Vinaya-pitaka, Dr. Wensel’s index of names in the Journal of the Pali Text Society of 1885, p. 63 sub voc Makkalhiṣaṇiśa, and Dr. Hoernle’s first Appendix to his edition of the Uḍḍayana-saṅga. In addition to the passages collected in the works quoted, I may point out that, according to the commentator, a curious custom of the Ājīvakas is mentioned in the last line of verse 113 of the Tittira-Jātaka (Panaboll, Jātakas, Vol. II., p. 541). It appears that, on entering the order, the novices were burnt in the hand with a heated ball (of metal). It looks as if the Ājīvakas, like some modern Vaishā Pavas sects, had used the taptamudra.
8 Regarding the Ājīvias of the Jainas, see especially Dr. Hoernle’s translation of the Uḍḍayana-saṅga, note 253.
Professor Kern steers clear of these old errors, and that his interpretation of all the passages is self-consistent, his confidence in the statements of Utpala appears justifiable, because the latter are supported by so ancient a writer as Kālakāchārya. The Kālakāchārya, quoted by him, is in all probability the famous Jaina teacher, who is said to have changed the date of the Pajusan festival in the year 993 after Vīra, or A. D. 466. The identification is suggested by the fact that Utpala’s Kālakāchārya is the author of a work on astrology and that the Jainas ascribe to their latest Kālakāchārya an innovation which presupposes the study of astronomy. If thus the author, quoted by Utpala, belongs to the fifth century, his statements deserve to be treated with all due respect.

Under the circumstances stated, it appears to be certain that the monks, for whom Aśoka and his grandson Daśaratha provided cave-dwellings were not Buddhists, but members of some other sect, and it is probable that they were Vaishānavas. As Aśoka himself says in the twelfth Rock-edict that he honoured men of all creeds with gifts and various honours, it is no matter of surprise that he excavated caves for others than Buddhists. But the interesting point is that he did so as late as his thirteenth year, and possibly, if the Ājivikas were named also in the third inscription, even as late as his twentieth year. The first fact alone is sufficient to upset the usual theories regarding his conversion to Buddhism, but it agrees with the correct interpretation of the hints contained in the Sahasrām and Rūpāṇā edicts, which will be given on another occasion.

For the present I will only state that Aśoka became really a zealous Buddhist in the twenty-ninth year of his reign.

Of equal importance is the second lesson which these inscriptions teach. Their correct interpretation helps to upset a very generally received, but completely erroneous doctrine in Indian archaeology. For a long time it was almost an article of faith with Indian archeologists that the Buddhists invented and first developed the cave-architecture, and that the Brahmanical sects and the Jainas adopted this style at a very late period. Even the newest and standard work on this subject, Dr. Ferguson’s and Dr. Burgess’ Cave Temples of India, gives repeatedly expression to very similar views. It no doubt somewhat pushes back the remoter limit for the beginning of the excavation of caves by the Brahmanas. But the Buddhists are still represented as the inventors of the cave temples, and, according to the concluding remarks, p. 510, “the Jainas only awakened to the idea that they, too, might share in the spoils” at a late period, “when Buddhism was tottering to its fall, and the Brahmanas were stripping them (sic) of their supremacy and power.” Such utterances were only natural ten years ago, when the early activity, which the adherents of Vardhamana displayed in this direction, had not been recognised. At present the case is far different. Dr. Bhagvānlal has shown, independently from Professor Kern (Der Buddhismus, Vol. II, pp. 239-40), that a most important group of caves of the pre-Christian period, that at Udayagiri in Katak, belongs not to the Buddhists, but to the Jainas. If we now have to admit further, that at least five of the oldest caves are certainly not Buddhist, and probably Brahmanical, it becomes evident that the adherents of all sects have equally contributed to the development of the cave-architecture. They all used caves for housing their ascetics who wished to live in retirement, and as places of worship or at least for the protection of images of their gods. The full realisation of this principle will, I think, not merely have a theoretical value, but possess also a practical importance. It will probably induce the Indian archeologists to reconsider their views regarding some excavations which have been assigned to the Buddhists on very weak evidence or even,

10 Regarding the several Kālakāchāryas of the Jainas, see Prof. Jacobi, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. XXXIV, p. 239 ff. I may mention as a curiosity that in late South-Indian inscriptions the term Ājivikas denotes the Digambara Jainas, see Hultsch, South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I., p. 88, and passim.

11 Caves may be well included under the head of gifts.

12 The position of the cave in the immediate vicinity of the other two, where the name occurs, makes this very probable.
against evidence pointing in a different direction. The most important case of this kind is that of the Junagadhi caves. Bāvā Pyāra's Matḥ and the monastery in the Upar Kot have invariably been declared to be Buddhistic, though the inscription, found in the former, does not agree with this view. As I have pointed out when first editing it,\textsuperscript{13} the word kāvalīyānasampādāntānāḥ, “of those or to those who have obtained the knowledge of Kēvalins,” which seems to be applied either to the donees or to the prophets worshipped by them, is clearly not a Buddhist but a Jain term. The only possible conclusion is, therefore, that this large establishment was a Jain monastery. The authors of the Indian Cave Temples\textsuperscript{14} seem to have disregarded this important evidence, because they felt convinced that the caves belong to an early period, antecedent to the reign of Rudrasimha who must have been named in the inscription, and because they trusted to the symbols over the door of cave K, as well as to the “chaitya-window ornament.” Dr. Bhagvanlal’s remarks on the symbols and on his Jain slab from Mathura, attached to the Hathigumpha inscriptions, as well as Dr. Führer’s discoveries in the Kankall Tilla show that all the marks and ornaments, formerly believed to be exclusively Buddhistic, were used by the Jains. Even the wheel and the Stūpa are no longer safe guides for the archaeologist. With this state of things I believe that certainly Bāvā Pyāra’s Matḥ and probably also the caves in the Upar Kot will have to be struck off the list of Buddhist establishments. Another case, which looks to me suspicious, is that of the Dhāṅk caves, where Dr. Burgess has noticed an image of Purusānta.\textsuperscript{15}

I. BARABAR HILL CAVE INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI.

A.

1. Lājinā Piyadasiṁa duvādasa-[vaihī id...\textsuperscript{16}

2. [ya]nih [nigū]ha-kubhā di[nā à. [vi]kēhi\textsuperscript{17} [¥]

B.

1. Lājinā Piyadasiṁa duvā-

2. dasa-[vaihītiṇa] iyām

3. kubhā Khalati-kavatasi\textsuperscript{18}

4. dinā [jivī]kēhi\textsuperscript{19} [¥]

C.

1. Lājinā Piyadasiṁa [ku][n[a-[vi].-

2. sati-vaihī[bb]isi[t]ē

3. . . . utha ta . . . . . .

4. supi. ē kha . . . . . . i

5. . . . . . . [¥]\textsuperscript{20}

II. NAGARJUNI HILL CAVE INSCRIPTIONS OF DASHALATHA.

D.

1. Vahiyak[ā]\textsuperscript{21} kubhā Dashalathēna\textsuperscript{22} dēvānām piyēnā

2. ānaṃalīyaṁ abhīsitēṁ [Ajivikēhi]

3. bhādamālinkyā vāsana-nishithyē nishithē\textsuperscript{23}

4. ā-chaṅdama-sitiliyaṁ [¥]


\textsuperscript{13} See the discussion of this point at p. 196.

\textsuperscript{14} Arch. Rep. West. Ind. Vol. II. p. 150.

\textsuperscript{15} Restore Ajivikēhi. The second letter cannot have been dl as others have read it. But the remnants agree well with the suggestion that it was jē. And we have Ajivikēhi, as plain as possible in Dhararatha’s second inscription.

\textsuperscript{16} This is in Sanskrit khalātika, ‘bald, bare,’ and a khalātika parvata is mentioned in the Bhāhāya on Vertoṭika 4 to Pāṇini I, 2, 52 (Kielhorn, Vol. I. p. 229), see also the larger Petersburg Dictionary sub voce khalātika.

\textsuperscript{17} Restore Ajivikēhi. The first letter is not recognisable. The outlines of the blot, representing the second, agree with the supposition that it was jē.

\textsuperscript{18} I do not dare to propose any restoration of the badly defaced portion of this inscription.

\textsuperscript{19} Vahiyaṁ, not vapiyaṁ as the earlier transcripts have, is the plain reading of the impression. Vahiyaṁ corresponds to Sanskrit vahya, which is mentioned as a feminine name in the gana tīkā of Pāṇini. Here it is probably the feminine of an adjective which may be derived from vahya, ‘a palankeen’ or ‘sopha,’ and qualifies kubhā.

\textsuperscript{20} Those who believe the second sign of this word to be merely a variety of as, not the old sign for the lingual ṣha, will read Dāsālathēna, and in the sequel abhīsitēṁ and so forth.

\textsuperscript{21} This is a clerical mistake for nishithē, as the corresponding forms in B. and C. show.
ASOKA INSCRIPTIONS.

A.—Barabar Hill Cave Inscription of Piyadasi.

B.—Barabar Hill Cave Inscription of Piyadasi.

C.—Barabar Hill Cave Inscription of Piyadasi.
The second part of the Siddhânta is formed by the 12 uvâgas, upângas. This title is applied in the ângas to the Brahmanical upângas alone. In ânga 3, three of the existing uvângas are apparently mentioned, but under the title ânagabhâra and not under that of uvânga. In the uvângas themselves this appellation occurs at the beginning of the eighth alone, but there, according to all probability, it is a special designation of uv 8 — 12 alone, and had consequently [373] not yet acquired its present signification. The Nandi, too, does not accept it in its present meaning. It enumerates all the texts in question, which now bear this name, but enumerates them among the anângapavîthâ (for which term the Pâkhisatîtram &c. present ânagabhâra) and in an order different from the usual one at present in vogue.

The solitary passage, in which I have been able to discover this title used in the Siddhânta in its general signification, is in the Mahânisîtha, Book 3 (anâgâvânga .).

At the present day there are 12 texts bearing this name, corresponding to the number of the ângas. This arrangement is probably intentional and dates from a period (see p. 344), in which the twelfth ânga either really existed or at least was counted in with the others. There is an alleged inter-relation between the 12 ângas and the 12 uvângas, uvânga 1 being placed in connection with ânga 1, uvânga 2 with ânga 2, and so on. In the three-sâmyârî texts, uv 3 — 12 are called nîrâyâvalîyásukhakhamindhô uvângam (Âvi., Svi.), in the Vidyât. egamuvângam; each of the five vaggas of which respectively corresponds to ângas 8 to 12.

It is not improbable that [374] the existing arrangement of the 12 texts may have been the result of such considerations; and the similarity in extent of each of the different members of both series renders this assumption the more worthy of credence. 4 There are, however, so far as I can see,

---

4 The first letter has been added afterwards and stands above the 4. It has run together with the double i-strokes and is somewhat blurred.

1 cf. Abhayaâsa on uv 1, Malayagli on uv 2, 4, Sâktibandra on uv 6.
2 The order of succession adopted here, and which I follow from this point on, varies so far as the position of uv 5 — 7 is concerned from that of Bûbûr — see above p. 223 — where these appear as Nos. 6, 7, 8.
3 In the Vidyâtârapu we read: Some, however, regard both uv 7 and uv 5 as belonging to ânga 5, and according to their view, the uvângam belonging to ânga 7 — 11 is the âratakanthâ, formed by uv 8 — 12: amâ puça chānidapannattinâ sūpapannattai cha bhavatav-uângas bhavanâtî, tēmâ maça uvângasadaśâpa paucapânâ anâgâna uvângasi nîrâyâvaliyâyukhânindhô. This is manifestly an existing arrangement of those who no longer count the āratakanthâ as belonging to uvânga 7.
4 A solution of this riddle is, however, not far to seek, if we read 97 x 11 = x 7 = x 11 = x 97 = x 97 = x 11 = x 7 = x 19. By this means we have the beginning syllables of uvângas 1—3, 5—10 in their present order; and here again there is reference to 12 uvângas and to 12 ângas.

The last members in both series have the least, those in the middle the greatest, extent.
no instances of real inner connection between the aṅgas and the uvaṅgas having the same position in the series. I say this, despite the fact that the scholia are only too zealous in attempting to establish such an inter-relation.

Definite groups are recognizably here as in the case of the aṅgas. Though all the uvaṅgas with the exception of uv. 3 begin with the legendary introductory formula tēṇāṁ kalēṇāṁ... yet in the case of uv. 2, 4 the pañcehanamukkāra, which we have met with already in aṅga 5, is placed before this introduction. In uv. 4 a verse, designed to glorify this pañcehanamukkāra, follows upon it, and then come several other verses of an introductory character. In the case of uv. 5 there is a larger number of introductory verses or of verses descriptive of the contents of the whole, before the legendary beginning; in the case of uv. 7 these are placed after the legendary beginning. Both of these uv. (5 and 7) differ from the others in the following particular,—[376] they make use of the title pahuḍa for their sections, a title which we have met with in the case of the 14 pūrvas. In the introduction of uv. 7 and in uv. 4 there is a direct reference to the pūrvas. These two uv. are peculiar in being identical or at least in representing two recensions of one and the same text. Uv. 5, 7 and 6 are mentioned together in aṅga 3, and share an introduction that is completely identical, mutual references in the text to each other, and above all in the concluding part of their titles, the common factor pannatti, praṇāpati. A part of uvaṅga 3, the divasāgarapannatti, belongs to the same category with them, since it has on the one hand the same termination in its title, and on the other is mentioned in aṅga 3 with them. At the period of the Nandi and of that of aṅga 3 it appears to have enjoyed a separate existence. Finally the title of upāṅga 4, pannavaṇḍa, is to be brought into this connection, so that upāṅgas 3—7 may be regarded as a group which is bound together by external criteria. The word pannatti which is here the link between them, was found in the title of aṅga 5. The words pannatti (praṇāpati) and pannatti (praṇāpati) and the finite verb praṇāpaya have such a special use in the Bhagavatī and, as was discovered later, in the entire Jaina-Siddhānta, that (Bhag. I. 368) I called attention to the [376] Pannattivāda, or Praṇāpattivāda, who are mentioned by the northern and southern Buddhists among the 18 chief sects of Buddhism at the time of the second council of Aśoka. According to Wasmijzew, pp. 228, 244 (German transl. pp. 251, 268), this sect dates from the second century after Buddha’s nirvāṇa.

Upanāgas 8—12 form a second group closely connected with each other (see above). They form, as tradition itself asserts, in reality but five chapters of a single srutaskandha, and are counted as five special texts merely to complete the parallel with the twelve aṅgas. The title of uv. 8 is later on, e. g. in the Vidyāprāṇi, regarded also as the collective title of all five; and a special name, kappiyā, kalpika, is allotted to uv. 8. In the Nandi all the 6 titles are placed together.

According to the introduction of the avachāṇi to the Ḍghanirūkti (see above, p. 217) the dasāśūrins gained especial honour in performing the meritorious service of composing saṃgrahaṇī to the uvaṅgas (or of composing the uv. and the saṃgr. ?), and therefore had just claim to the salutation (namukkāra) in the first verse of that Nirūkti. Tradition calls Ajja Śāma the author of the fourth uvaṅga, the Pannavaṇḍa; see verse 4 of the introduction to that uvaṅga. There is, however, another, who in this passage characterizes himself as the real promulgator, and introduces himself with the word “I.”

[377] In the case of the first uvaṅga, secondary additions are, according to Leumann, clearly demonstrable. The second uvaṅga appears, however, to have suffered more, and the present text may, in fact, be a different one from the original. The reader is further referred to my remarks made on aṅga 8—10 and especially on aṅga 10.

In the remarks of the redactor scattered here and there in the aṅgas, there were many
references to the upāgas, their titles being directly mentioned or the names of particular divisions cited. In the upāgas vice versa there is no lack of references both to the aṅgas and to other upāgas. Apparently we must recognize in these remarks of the redactor a hand aiming at unity (see above, p. 228), — a hand which has dealt uniformly with the aṅgas and upāgas in that form of the text which both at present possess.

The varying statements in the MSS. in reference to the extent of each of the upāgas are as follows: up. 1 has 1320 granthas,9 — 2. 2079, — 3. 4750, — 4. 7785, — 5. (2001?),7 — 6. 4454, — 7. 1600,8 — 8 — 12. 1109.

XIII. The first upāgam, uvaśvāyam, aupaṭṭikam, of renewed births. The explanation of the name by aupaṭṭika is (see above, p. 323, Leumann, p. 2) an incorrect Sanskrit rendering, since the formation is from अूप + अूप and not from अूप + अूप. The work is divided into two parts, which are, however, not separated by any recognized dividing line. The first, which is greater in extent than the second [378], treats in great detail of the appearance and sermon of Mahāvīra in Champā under king Kāśyapa Bambhasārapatta,9 and of the pilgrimage of the king to Mahāvīra. The many varṇakas, which, on such occasions as this, are found in the legendary introductions to the aṅgas, uvaśvāyam, &c., occur in this instance in their full form. They are consequently cited elsewhere merely by their introductory words; and for anything beyond this, reference is generally made to our text. The law proclaimed by Mahāvīra is here (§ 57) designated partly as āgārabhammē and partly as āgāraśāmiṃī. See my remarks on page 244 ad aṅga I. The second part, which contains the essence of the work, is in extent scarcely more than a third of the whole, and looks, as Leumann says, like a more detailed treatment of Bhag. 1, 1, 77 (see Bhag. 1, 1, 77). It is divided into divisions of tolerably small compass, which all possess a form equally solemn. These small divisions are not equal in extent nor are they counted on to the end. At the end there are 22 kārikās, which describe the abode &c. of the Siddhas, viz. of those that have escaped migration of souls. We find the teaching of Indabhubi by Mahāvīra treated of, partly in a general way, partly in reference to 16 definite categories of men as regards their uvaśvāya among the nārāyas, &c., up to the heavenly worlds, and to the final perfection and residence of the blessed in the śīpabhārā puṇḍhāyi. Dr. Ernst Leumann has given a detailed account of its contents in the introduction to his edition of the text (“the aupaṭṭikasūtra,” Leipzig, 1883), accompanied by an excellent glossary.

Among the interesting facts contained in the middle part of the work, the following is of especial importance. In § 75 there is an enumeration of alien sects, [379] parivṛtvā, viz.: the Śaṅkha Jātī Kāviḷā,10 Bhūchhohā11 haṁśī,12 paramahamsā bahuṇḍa ga kalivṛtvā13 Kanhaśparivṛtvā.14 In immediate connection with this is an enumeration of the 8 representatives of each class15 from the Brāhma caste: tattha khalim aṣṭha māhaṇaparivṛtvā bhavaṇī: Kaṇḍa16 ya Karakaṇāḥ ya Ambaćya ya Pārśārasi Kaṇṭha Divyaṇāc ci€va Dēvaṅgūra ya Nārāḥ17 yi, and from the warrior caste: tattha khalim aṣṭha khaṭṭiyaparivṛtvā bhavaṇī, taṁ Śilaśa Māsihārē18

8 The statements vary here e. g. between 1167 (Kirolhn’s Report, 1889-91, p. 50) 1290, 1267, 1320 and 1500. Leumann counts 1299.
9 The statement is here omitted; cf. uv. 7. 10 Other statements are: 1854, 2000.
11 Kaṇṭilā devāta yesha, Śaṅkha śva niśavatā.
12 Bhūchhohā, kāliṇā Śraṇvīśeśa, tasya vā śisya Bhāravāḥ (!).
13 In reference to the following names see Wilson Sel. works 1, 231 (ed. Rost).
14 Kuraṇābhā, kūtāra in Wilson, also in the Arupikup. Ind. Stud. 2, 179.
15 Naṅkāppab: kūtāra iti kecit.
16 Kaṇṭilā (Kāṇṭilā-ā?) Kaṇṭil refers, it is true, to Kanya as Leumann affirms in his glossary) dayāb shōdaṇa parirājakāḥ lākṣāna vāyāyāḥ.
17 Kaṇṭha var. 1.
18 These Jains, possessed by the desire of changing everything, have not allowed even the name of the old Mārādī to remain unaltered. Some MSS. have even Nārābhā.
19 var. Masādī, Masāmī, Masāḥ, also hārē. The Māshāra name of a country in the Ait. Br. may perhaps be compared.
Naggal Bhaggañ Tiya (Tika?) Vidēhe rāyā Rāmē Balē 'ti ya. After this follows an enumeration of the works of Brāhmanical literaturae, which is identical in every particular with that in the fifth aṅga.19 See above p. 304.

The sage Anuṣṭaṇḍa,20 who is enumerated among the 8 mīhāṇaprīvīvāyas, must have played no unimportant rōle in the opinion of his Jain colleagues or enemies, either at the time of the composition of this upānga or at that of those who interpolated the statements in reference to him. There have been inserted two detailed legends concerning him, the first of which deals especially with his [380] scholars,21 the second with himself, with his second birth in the person of the boy Dādhpālima, and with his final perfection. Here occurs an enumeration of the (§ 107) 72 kalās, which are in fact essentially the same as those in aṅga 3, and (§ 105) of the foreign peoples from whom the female attendants of the boy (as in aṅga 6) came. These names are in general identical with those enumerated in aṅgas 5 and 6, and are also mentioned in a previous passage (§ 53) where the maid-servants of the queen are treated of. The list is as follows:—

bhuṟuḥim kuṭjīham Chīlāhīm vāmalaḥim vādhabhīhīm Babhārīhīm Paśīyāhī (basi2) Jōṇīyāhīm Palhāvyāhīm Iniśyāhīm Chāruṇīyāhīm (Vāru2 Thāru2) Lāsīyāhīm Laśyāhīm Damillīhīm Śiṃhālāhīm Ārālīhīm Pulūṁdīhīm Pakpāḷīhīm Bahalīhīm Marūmāhīm Sabarīhīm Pāralīhīn nāpādāhīm. For v. 1, see Leumann, p. 60.

The 13 dūśhāhīs22 unfortunately are merely mentioned here (§ 109) and not enumerated by name. We might readily conjecture that the 13 foreign peoples, just mentioned, were here referred to, though the expression dēś is not in harmony with such an assumption. For the expression dūśhāhīsvisāra, which we meet with here, we find a fuller form in aṅga 6 (cf. above, p. 313), aṭṭhārasaviṣāra. Dr. Leumann has had the kindness to inform me that the commentary has at least the appearance of referring this to the 13 modifications of one dūśhāhī and not to 13 special languages: aṣṭādasās vidhiśprākārāb [381] pravṛttiprakārāvās aṣṭādasābhira vā vidhiśhir bhēdāḥ prachāraḥ pravṛttir yasyāḥ śū, tathā tasyāḥ dūśhāhīhīm sabhēdana varṇavālụprāyāṁ viśāradaṁ paṁcīṭhā. By the annāttīthyah (§§ 26, 99) of the text, i.e. according to the scholia anyayūthikā (see p. 299), which are opposed to the niggantuḥ paryaya (§ 18) of the genuine doctrine of the Jaina, we are to understand the śākyādayaḥ. By the chēyās (§ 99) we must understand the arhacchaitāyitaṁ jānaptiṁ, and by the ājīviyās (§ 120) the a Jáhānīs of Gōṇḍa,23 the seven pavyānānāhīs (§ 122), i.e. representatives of the seven schisms, which, to use the expression of Abhayadēva, Jindāgamaṁ nihūntaṁ (i nīṃuṇa? ) apalapaṁ chā, are enumerated one by one in the text. They are as follows:— bahurāy, jīvapadēṣyā, ānvattiyā, śiṃchāchhēyā, dōkīrīyā, tērāsīyā (see p. 351), abaddhīyā (ārvatēyīyā var. 1). Abhayadēva characterizes them according to their order as Jamālampatānuśārināḥ, Tīṣyaguptacchāryamatavāprayāvidaṁ, Asūhāchāryaśāhāyamātānubhāpātinaṁ, Pushpa(skya)mātraṭānuśārināḥ,24 Gāṅgāchāryamatānubhāptinaṁ, Rōhagupta25 matānuśārināḥ, Gōṇḍhā māhīlanatāvalaṁbinaṁ; on this see p. 275 on aṅga 3, p. 355—6 on pūrvas 7—9, and below my remarks on Āvāṣy. Nījī, Uttarajjī, 3, 9.

19 sahaṅgari is here too explained by: sahaṅgari dādāth sahāṅgari vāṣā saināvāsārāviṣārāḥ by: Kāpāyanaśramānībhūtāḥ.
20 Also Anmada, Anuṣṭaṇḍa. This name must be derived from Āmara, short form of Āmabhāja. — L.
21 Whọ once wandered jest,ēhamālāmaṁ abhinaṁ along the Gāṇḍa from Kaṇḍapāḷīpura to Purimāṭānamārāgam. The name of the month is explained as follows: jēṣṭhā mūlaṁ and (!) mukhermāti paṟṟāmāyaḥ yatra svaṁ as jēṣṭhā-mūlaṁ māsā, jēṣṭhāṁ.
22 See below pp. 339, 400 for the 13 different methods of writing.
23 On this point cf. the interesting statements in Nēmicāndra’s pravahānāsarkvodhāsā, § 94 v. 739—41. Leumann tells me that these statements are found earlier, viz., in Sāṅka on aṅga 1, 2 and in Abhayadēva on aṅga 3, 2. They are as follows:— niggantuḥ-Saṅka-vaṁśa—gṛṇāya(gairakōhī)ājīva paṁcīṭhā sāmaṇḍaḥ tattvam ya niggantuḥ tē jē Jīvapadēṣayīvā mānīpō ṣaṅka-ya Śuṇyāsāya, jē jālīḍa tē u tāvaṇa gṛṇa jē ābhūtavativāthā tiṣṭhānija gṛṇāya k'ū || jē Gāṇḍacchāryaśaṁ gairakōhīhīm bhūaptiṁ tē u ājīva || sāmaṇḍēyaṁ bhūrapē paṁcīṭhā vē pattī paṁcīṭhāṁ ime || Here then all the five kinds of āramās are represented as possessing equal authority; gṛṇa is doubtless for “rudrīs” according to their ābhūtavativāthā, cf. Bhāg. 1, 35, 273, where, “metals and jewels,” is an error. — The first line of the above quotation (nigg) . . . . saṃpaṁ is drawn from Nīṭhā-bhāṣya XIII. 103a.— L.
24 Or Añvānitra; von Pushyanitra, see pp. 348, 356.
25 Or Chhabha.
SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION.

The system of transliteration followed in this Journal for Sanskrit and Kanareser (and, for the sake of uniformity, submitted for adoption, as far as possible, in the case of other languages), except in respect of modern Hindi personal names, in which absolute purism is undesirable, and in respect of a few Anglicised corruptions of names of places, sanctioned by long usage, is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanareser</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Kanareser</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>भ</td>
<td>भ</td>
<td>भ</td>
<td>भ</td>
<td>भ</td>
<td>भ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
<td>आ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
<td>अ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
<td>इ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
<td>ई</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
<td>उ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
<td>ऊ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
<td>ऋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
<td>ऌ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
<td>ए</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
<td>ऐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
<td>ओ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
<td>औ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>विअर्गा</td>
<td>विअर्गा</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>न</td>
<td>बह</td>
<td>बह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जिह्मुल्क्या, or old Visarga before ज</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>बह</td>
<td>बह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ज़</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ज</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>बह</td>
<td>बह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अपदहमुल्क्या, or old Visarga before र and ल</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>र</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>बह</td>
<td>बह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुसुद्रा</td>
<td>अनुसुद्रा</td>
<td>र</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>बह</td>
<td>बह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुदेशिका</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>का</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>बह</td>
<td>बह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अनुदेशिका</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>का</td>
<td>ब</td>
<td>बह</td>
<td>बह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
<td>ज्ञ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञा</td>
<td>ज्ञा</td>
<td>ज्ञा</td>
<td>ज्ञा</td>
<td>ज्ञा</td>
<td>ज्ञा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
<td>ज्ञह</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single hyphen is used to separate words in composition, as far as it is desirable to divide them. It will readily be seen where the single hyphen is only used in the ordinary way, at the end of a line, as divided in the original Text, to indicate that the word runs on into the next line; intermediate divisions, rendered unavoidable here and there by printing necessities, are made only where absolutely necessary for neatness in the arrangement of the Texts.

A double hyphen is used to separate words in a sentence, which in the original are written as one word, being joined together by the euphonic rules of sandhi. Where this double hyphen is used, it is to be understood that a final consonant, and the following initial vowel or consonant-and-vowel, are in the original expressed by one complex sign. Where it is not used, it is to be understood of the orthography of the original, that, according to the stage of the alphabet, the final consonant either has the modified broken form, which, in the eldest stages of the alphabet, was used to indicate a consonant with no vowel attached to it, or has the distinct sign of the virāma attached to it; and that the following initial vowel or consonant has its full initial form. In the transcription of ordinary texts, the double hyphen is probably unnecessary; except where there is the sandhi of final and initial vowels. But, in the transcription of epigraphical records, the use of this sign is unavoidable, for the purpose of indicating exactly the palaeographical standard of the original texts.

The avagraha, or sign which indicates the elision of an initial a, is but rarely to be met with in inscriptions. Where it does occur, it is most conveniently represented by its own Devanāgari sign.

So also practice has shown that it is more convenient to use the ordinary Devanāgari marks of punctuation than to substitute the English signs for them.

Ordinary brackets are used for corrections and doubtful points; and square brackets, for letters which are much damaged and nearly illegible in the original, or which, being wholly illegible, can be supplied with certainty. An asterisk attached to letters or marks of punctuation in square brackets, indicates that those letters or marks of punctuation were omitted altogether in the original. As a rule, it is more convenient to use the brackets than to have recourse to footnotes, as the points to which attention is to be drawn attract notice far more readily. But notes are given instead, when there would be so many brackets, close together, as to encumber the text and render it inconvenient to read. When any letters in the original are wholly illegible and cannot be supplied, they are represented, in metrical passages, by the sign for a long or a short syllable, as the case may be; and in prose passages, by points, at the rate, usually, of two for each akṣara or syllable.
[382] There is a commentary by Abhayadéva, a várśikãm or avachúri by Pârśvachandra. In reference to the difference of the constituent parts which were united to form this upá̊ngam, the reader is referred to Leumann, p. 29, who has made some pertinent remarks upon the subject.

XIV. The second upá̊ngam, ráyapaśaṇấhyāyam, which is always translated by rája-praśnyāyam. This is perhaps to be explained as a complete misunderstanding of the Prâkrit title by which this text is always cited in those passages from the hand of the redactor which refer to our text in the ágásas, etc. For pâśaṇấhyāyam cannot properly be praśnyāyam, since the latter word rather pre-supposes a Prâkrit form pâśhyāyam. Paśaṇấhyāyam seems, according to the conclusion at which I arrived ad Blag. 1, as, to refer to the name of king Prâṣenajit who is well-known in the legends of the Jains.25 There is, however, one important objection to this conclusion,—there is no mention of this king in our text, which mentions a king Paëśi but no Paśyâl. Inasmuch as the authenticity of the form of the name pâśaṇấhyāyam cannot be gainsaid,26 there remains but one possibility open: that the original title of the text has been preserved and either the name of Pa Españ has been substituted for that of Pâśyâl29 (see p. 324) in the text, or there has been substituted an entirely different text for the whole of the old one. [333] Though the latter conjecture savours of boldness, we are not without analogous examples as we have seen in the case of ágásas 8 — 10. Our first means of explanation appeals much more to our sympathy, especially as we have a perfect parallel in a later legend. We possess two recensions of the Samyâktvakaumudikâthã, in the first of which the scene is laid at the time of "Srêṣāka, son of Prâṣenajit," in whose place Uditâlôdya, son of Padmâbhava appears in the second. This is, however, brought about in such fashion that Srêṣāka is referred to in a two-fold introduction. The legend in question appears to be old and to antedate the two existing recensions of the Samyâktvakaumudikâthã.

The Sanskrit translation of the title Râyapaśaṇấhyâyam by râjapaśnyâyam is very far from being in harmony with the contents of the work. The burden of the very smallest portion of its extent is in our text the questions of a king. The questions play here no greater rôle than in any other of the legends similar to this in which a king requests instruction. The irreconcilability of this Sanskrit title with the contents of the work itself makes eo ipso for the conclusion that this title is nothing but a mere makeshift to conceal the original contents.

It is, therefore, of no little significance that a beautiful conjecture elaborated into an investigation by Dr. Leumann has shown that one of the Pâli texts of the Buddhistic Tipitaka, — viz. the Pâyâsi-suttam (Ughanikâya 1, 25) — is especially closely connected [384] with that part of our upâ̊ngam which treats of king Paëśi. It is apparent, then, that we must assume either a common foundation for both or the use of a special Buddhistic work as a ground-work. That the original text of the Râyapaśaṇấhyâyam might easily have suffered a transformation, is indicated by the irreconcilability of this title with the Sanskrit translation and with the contents. Thus the old name Prâṣenajit gave place to that of our text Pa Españ (Pâśyâ in Pâli).

It is noteworthy that at the conclusion of the work there is an exclamation of reverence addressed to the Jinas, to the suyadâ váyâ(vratâ) bhâgavâ, to the pannâti bhâgavâ, and to the bhagavat arahat Pâsa. Joined to this exclamation are some very corrupt words, which are perhaps to be restored as follows29 Passanâsya vâjî. It is at least certain that Pâsa, and not Mahâvîra, is glorified in this paragraph. Could this not be a residuum of the original text,

25 See e.g. ágás 8, p. 329.
26 In Nandil, Pâkhikas, and Avi, the name is râyapa(p)paśnyâyam; Svi. and V. have sâpalya; the passages in the texts showing the hand of the redactor always have the form sâpalya.
27 Leumann is of the opinion (Apup. p. 2) that the name Râyapaśnyâyam arose by "connection with Râja Prâṣenajit by a popular etymology." It seems to me, however, that Râyapaśnyâyam is the prâśaṇa and râjapraśnyâyam the posterius.
which had a right to the title rāya Pasēvāyiya and which perhaps treated of the relations of king Praśijñat and Pāsa? Pāsa, it should be noticed, appears as a teacher in up. 10, 11. The seer glorified in our present text is at least called Pasāvachchiya, i.e. scholar of Pāsa; and appears in a recital put in the mouth of Mahāvira as the teacher of king Paśi. In the other legends, in which [385] any such Pasāvachchiyaas occur, they are invariably characterized as converts to the teachings of Mahāvira. See above, p. 300. Malayagiri attempts to find in this reference to the Pasāvachchiyaas a special proof of the connection of upāśa 2 with aśa 2 which, he maintains, treats of the views of the foreign pāshandas.

We were for some time left in doubt whether the references in the aśas to the Rāyapasēvāyiyaam were in reality all contained in the Rāyapasēvāyiyaam (cf. Jacobi Kalpas. p. 107); but Leumann has shown that this doubt is without foundation. See above, p. 390. But, granted the actual occurrence of all these citations, this fact only makes for the conclusion, that, at the period of these remarks by the redactor, the substitution, which I assume, was already a fait accompli. Nor does this exclude the assumption that our text originally possessed a contents that was really in harmony with its title.

The subject of the largest portion (almost two-thirds) of the existing text, which after the panchanāmakkāra begins with the customary legendary introduction tēnaṁ kīkṣaṁ, is as follows: The god Sūriyābha, who has his throne in the Sōhamkārapā, makes a pilgrimage with a numerous retinue to Anallakappā, the city of king Śa (Śvetā), in order to offer his reverence to Mahāvira (who is abiding in that city), especially by means of music, dancing and singing. Furthermore, the information is treated of which, in long span-out details, is imparted in reference to Sūriyābha, his synonymous vimāna and all his splendour, by Mahāvira to Gōyama (Gādābhūti), who questions him on these points. [386] The discussion of the subject consists in reality of a mere heap of together of compounds; and the sentences often extend over several pages. It is idle to talk of this as style, since it exceeds even the widely extended license which is customary in these sacred texts. We recall Bāga’s Kādambari in this connection, though the latter possess a wealth of poetic thoughts and images which elevates it above this dreary and insipid hedge-podge. We have however, the right to propound the question whether there may not be a genetic connection between works like the Kādambari and this species of Jain literature, since at least the confused style of the Indian novel may have been influenced by Jain legends of this sort.

On page 205 of the edition (of the text of 298 pages printed in India), Mahāvira finally comes to the point and informs us how Sūriyābha reached this glory of his, and of his first birth as king Paśi (Prādēi) in Śetyāīya. The latter sent his charioteer Chitta [387] with presents to his vassal Jiyaśutta at Śivatthā in the land of Kapilī. At that place Chitta heard the sermon of the “Pasāvachchihī Kēśī nīmaṁ kumārang,” and was so much edified thereby that after his return home he induced his master Paśi to let him drive him to the sanctuary, where Kēśī happened to be preaching at that very time. Chitta brought about that conversation between Paśi and Kāsito which the translation of the name Rāyapasēvāyiyaam by Rājayasīnyam refers. This

30 32 nātīvālī, 4 váṭītta, 4 gīya, again 4 nātīvālī and 4 nātīvālī are given in great detail. The commentator, Malayagiri, however, offers scarcely any explanation on this point.

31 It is certain that Indian fables are greatly under the influence of the simple Jāta tales of the Buddhists. Likewise, the modern stories as Snāhasanudvīrīśīkā etc. are without doubt influenced by the kathācoles which were gradually cultivated more and more by the Jains. It is noteworthy, that in Caṇḍa as in the Pādāvatī, the style of which is much better than that of Āṇeṇa, the same persons are frequently born thrice. This three-fold birth is the special delight of the Jain legends. Our text, in this very place, offers an example of this fact. Of the verse quoted, Ind. Stud. 16, page 159 from the Amṛtyugd, in reference to the abhūrana.

32 This quarto edition contains the commentary of Malayagiri and a gloss in Bhāsā. The text gives the year Śaṅkata 1732 (1), the gloss 1732 (1). Pārākhyānas is mentioned in the latter as being the scene of the events narrated.

33 Reference to this point is found in upāśa 8.

34 See Uttarālj. Cap. 23. See the statements of Dharmaśa in his Kupokalasākākāditya (1, 7), in my treatise on this subject, page 22, Journal of the Berlin Acad. of Sciences, 1892, p. 812, in reference to modern descendants of this Kāśikumāra, who themselves claim this title until the end of the XVI century.
conversation, which begins with the question in reference to the relation of the jiva to the satvaa, reaches in the printed text from page 242 to page 279, and contains, therefore, about an eighth part of the whole. In reality, however, there is more than an eighth, since the beginning contains a good deal of commentary.

With the relation of the former birth of Suvavya as Paesi, Mahavira, connects his prophecy in reference to his future birth as Daudhapainna. This prophecy is in all essentials completely identical (though somewhat more detailed) with that form of the history of this person, which we met with in up. 1 and in up. 8 (cf. also Bhag. 11, 11).35 We have then discovered here a fact that is likely to cast a somewhat suspicious light upon the history of the text of up. 2. The enumeration of the 72 kalasa (p. 290) varies here but inconsiderably; and Malayagiri does not help us by giving any explanation of the names. The enumeration of the foreign peoples is in essential agreement with Bhag. 9, 32 (above p. 392), with the single exception [388]; that here, too, the Cha. usiyiy (Vau?, Pa?!) and the Jogiya have been included in the list. There are, however, some few variations in the names and in the order of their succession. See Leumann, Anp. p. 60. On page 52 champa?harasi is added among the red stuffs, and likewise in up. 3; cf. chinapa?ta in anga 10, p. 333.

The commentary of Malayagiri dates, according to Aufrecht, Catalogus, p. 396b, from the year (Vira?) 1772; according to Leumann this is merely the date of the taba based upon Malayagiri.


In up. 10 these ther? bhagavanst? are added by Mahavira himself — cf. ch?dastu? 4. The introduction then proceeds to give, in response to the question s? kim tanjivabhigame?, a species of division of the entire work. No smaller sections, except some,37 are marked off in the text. [389] The various views of those38 are here enumerated39 who characterize the jiva either as du?via (to 17? of the MS. — ms. or. fol. 1081 — consisting of 212 leaves) or as tiviya? — as tiviya? (to 34?), as cha?vitva? (to 184?); this is the chief part, almost ? of the whole40, as paw?HAVita? (to 186?), as ch?HAVita? (to 193?), sattavita? (to 193?), avis40 (to 195?), nava? (to 195?), and dasavita? (to 197?). Then the same pujvatt, follow in the same order, but according to another guiding principle. Within this system there are innumerable groups, species and sub-species of each of the jivas according to their properties and relations. The contents is remarkably dry and offers but little of genuine interest. Very frequent are the references to the fourth upa?ga, which is quite similar to it in contents and form. At present it is impossible to decide which text has the better claim to priority. Many single verses and sometimes whole series of githas, or kari?ka-verse are inserted.

The section which treats of the divas (and samudras). (i. e. 89b to 107a) appears at the date of anga 3 and of the Nandi41 to have had a separate existence under the name divasavigarama?nati which is mentioned twice in anga 3. See p. 263. This section unfortunately contains

---

28 s. Leumann, Anp. p. 73 fg.
29 This is preceded by a reverential exclamation nam?Uabhdhiy?nam, cha?vitvada tithyagama?nam, an unusual form, which appears to belong to the text itself and not to emanate from the copyists.
30 In the Ms. chiefly used by mn. the conclusion of an uddha is given three times.
31 And from cha?m.
32 In none groups (japarati, Wibhirapai), introduced in a way that is quite identical in each separate case.
33 We find treated here the division into svalaya to 52% tririksha?ni ? to 56%, maipasa to 74%, diva to 185 and then a few further remarks to 184.
41 In the Wibhirapai there is a maha?apa? on it cited among the parinayas.
almost nothing of real geographical value, [390] and nothing but fantastic conceptions concerning mythology. This holds good in reference to the astronomical (if we may use the expression) remarks concerning the different numbers (!) of the suns, moons and stars in each of the dvipas, which appear to harmonize completely with the statements of the fifth (or seventh) upāṇga. See Ind. Stud. 10, 239. The 24 nakṣatras consequently begin with Abhijit and not with Kṛṣṇiti. There are no legends whatsoever. Dr. Leumann sends me the following detailed statement of the contents of this upāṇga:

I. Introduction; — II. Two-fold division of creatures. 1 — 10. thāvarā; 1 — 5. pañjaphrakāryā ēgīnāyā; 6 — 7. ākṣākāryā ēg.; 8 — 10. vaṇ̄ṣaṅkāryā ēg.; 11 — 26. tasā; 11. tēukkāryā ēg., 12. vāukkāryā ēg., 13. baṁkāryā, 14. bhāṁkāryā, 15. chaṁkāryā, 16 — 26. paṁcchitākāryā, 16. nēkāryā, 17 — 29. sāmānekkāryā-tirikkaṁkāryā, 21 — 24. gabbhavakkaṁkāryā, 25. maṇ̄ussā, 26. dēvā; 27. tāsi and thāvarā (in general). — III. Three-fold division of creatures: 1 — 6. itthiymā, 7 — 12. pariśā, 13 — 18. nāpuṁsā, 19 — 24. the three together and among themselves. — IV. Four-fold division of creatures. A geographical text is inserted called the dvāsamadda. 1. pañhamō nēkārya-uddāsā, 2. bītiyaṁkārya-uddāsā, 3. taṁkārya-uddāsā, 4. tirikkaṁkārya-paṇḍ. udd., 5. tirikkh. udd. bī, 6. maṇ̄ussā, 7. 31 — 33. dēvā, 8 — 23. dvāsamaddā, 8 — 16. the Jambuddīva, the inmost part of the world, of circular form. 8. Description of the above, in general the same as that of Sūryābhavimāna in Rīj-pr. 9. the gate of the east, Vījaya dāra — 10. The residence rāyahū of the god Vījaya who rules there, 11. [391] The walk of reverence of Vījaya within his vimāna. — 12. The duration of the existence of Vījaya, 13. The gates of the three remaining regions of the world: Vējyāmaṁta dāra, Jayatāmaṁta dāra and Aparājita dāra, and the distance of the dāras from each other. — 14. Jambudīva as bounded by the Lavaṇa sea which surrounds it on all sides like a ring. — 15. Explanation of the name Jambuddīva. — 16. Number of the constellations moving over Jamb., 17. The Lavaṇa sea, the first ocean surrounding Jambuddīva like a ring; the description here corresponds to that of Jamb. and from this point on is in the same strain, 18. The Chanda-dīva and Sāra-dīva of the different parts of the earth and oceans, 19. Appendix to 17: Ebb and flow etc., 20. The second part of the globe, Dhāyaśana, that in circular form is contiguous to the Lavaṇa sea; then the second ocean Kālōda which, in the form of a ring, is adjacent to Dhāya; and finally the third part of the globe, Pukkharaṇa, contiguous to Kālōda, 21. The Samaya- or Maṇ̄ussa-Khetta, consisting of the above mentioned two first parts of the globe and the first two oceans together with the inner half of the ring of the second part of the globe, which is separated from the outer half by the circular mountain, Maṇ̄ussottara. 22. The following parts of the globe and oceans which are connected with one another as rings: Pukkharāda, Vāruṇavara dīva, Vāruṇāda, Khrōvara dīva, Khrōvāra dīva, Ghatava dīva, Ghatōda, Khādava dīva, Khōdōda. 23. The following world-ring, Nandīsaṛava dīva. 24. The following oceans and world-rings: Nandīsaṛava dīva, 25. The remaining oceans and world-rings up to Sayambhuramaṇa dīva and Sayambhuramaṇāpāda, 26. The names of all these parts of the globe and oceans, 27. The [392] waters and aquatic animals of the different oceans. 28. In reference to the dvāsamadda in general (nāmādhēja, udhdhārasaya, pariṇāma and uvaṇīya). 29. 30. A brief insertion, perhaps an appendix to the dvāsamadda. — 29. A brief insertion, perhaps an appendix to the dvāsamadda. — 29. A brief insertion, perhaps an appendix to the dvāsamadda. — 29. About pariṇāma. — 30. Concerning the ability of gods to catch an object that has been split a hair (p. paṅkhīta), to lengthen or to shorten one. — 31 — 33. dēvā continuation; (see 7). 31. jōṣa-uddāsā. 32. pañhamō Vēmāṇiya-udd. 33. bī bō Vēmāniya-udd. 34. Final collective statements (duration of existence, etc.) in reference to the four divisions of creatures. — V. — X. Five-fold to ten-fold division of creatures. — XI. Introduction to the following analogous divisions of all creatures. — XII. to XX. Two-fold to ten-fold division of all creatures.

43 This concluding title, says Leumann, is incorrectly placed after Chapter 34 instead of after 23 in the Berlin MSS, and in those of Prof. Monier Williams.
XVI. The fourth upāgaṁ, panṇavaṇā (ptraṇāpanā) bhagavāl, likewise treats of the different forms, conditions of life, etc., of the jīva. It is divided into 36 paṇas, (padas), of which several (15, 17, 23, 38) consist of from two to six uddeśakas. According to the fourth of the nine verses of the introduction, it is the work of Ayya Śāma (Ārya Śāma, also Śyāmārya), who at the same time is called the “twentieth-third dhūrapurisa” i.e. after Vīra (after Suharmanavāmin, according to Malayagiri). [393] This statement causes no little difficulty. According to Klatt, l. l. p. 247b and 251b (9, 23) and in the Journal of the German Oriental Society 33, 47a, the modern Jain lists of teachers place, with some few differences, Śyāmā in the fourth century after Vīra; but the “twenty-third” successor of Vīra is placed by one list immediately before Dēvārdhīgani, 980 after Vīra, and is regarded by the other as contemporary with the destruction of Valabhi (Valabhbhaiga), 846 after Vīra. The Gurvavali of the Tapāgaḥcha expressly enumerates Śyāmārya as a contemporary of the ninth patriarch; and in both of the old Thērāvalis of the Nandi (or Ávāṣyaka) and of Mērntuṅga he is enumerated as the 13th (not the 23rd) successor of Vīra. This apparent contradiction is done away with by the explanation of Bhāna Dāji, referred to p. 217n., according to which the eleven gaṇadharas of Vīra are regarded as being included in the designation of Śyāma as “23rd” successor. This method of including the gaṇadharas has however not been traced elsewhere.

The text begins with the panchnamukkāra, followed by the following glorification: caḥ paṁchanamukkāra savvpāpanaśāṇopamānaḥ maṁgālaṁ cha savvpāpanaśaṁ paḍhamam hoi maṁgālaṁ. This glorification is to be ascribed to the last dāṣāprāṇi, śīt Vajra (584 Vīra), according to modern tradition. See Knp. 811 (21) on this point and also the same passage in reference to the question whether in the last pāda we must read hoi or havā; about which there is fierce contention among the Jain theologians.

[394] Then follows in nine verses the real introduction, of which Jacobi (Journ. Germ. Orient. Soc. 34, 41) says “it is manifestly the production of Dēvārdhīgani, the redactor of the Siddhānta.” The first verse praises Mahāvīra; the second characterizes the panṇavaṇā savvabhāvāṇam as uvaduṇāyā by him (bhagavāya); the third and fourth pay reverence to that saint, Ajja Śāma, the “23rd dhūrapurisa,” whose wisdom, perfected by listening to the pūras, gave to his scholars this śruta-jewel after he had brought it up from the śruta-śāra: vāyaṅvavānāniśā tēśaṁtīmēna dhūrapurisēṇa | duddharāhaṇēṃ | mūpāṇa puṇva-suyasaśāmaddhādīh | 3 || suṣayaśārā rīpāna jēca suyarayaṇam uttamam dinmah śaṅgaṇasse, bhagavatot tassā namō Ajja Śāmassa || 4 ||

In verse 5 an “I” promises to describe (or proclaim) the work in the same way as the “bhagavānt” has described it; and the work is characterized as “dripping with dhāsaḥśayāḥ.” ajjhaṅkaṇam āṁś chittāṁ suyarayaṇam dhāśvān śāstraṇām | jaha vānasaṁ bhagavāya ēam avi taha vaṇṇaśām | 5 || It is, of course, clear that some one else than the previous speaker is to be understood by this “I;” and Jacobi’s [395] conjecture, mentioned above, must

43 Of. in the Schol. on the Nādī: jīvāṁśāṁ padārthāṁ saṁjñāpanām yatro sa prajñāpanā, sa’in’va vrāttārā mahāprajñāpanaḥ. Two texts of this name are referred to there, a simple pannā and a mahāpanna. The latter is ascribed as the sixth upāgaṁ by Kashināth Kunte (p. 257) p. 5 and p. 7, who calls it, however, “obsolete and extinct.” He does not mention the chandapannatī.

44 The Paṭḍava of Khaturagachha dates his birth 376 (or 396) after Vīra, in the same year the Gurvavali of Tapāgaḥcha assumes his death to have occurred. He was also called Kāśaka and was one of the three celebrated teachers of this name. See Jacobi, Journ. Germ. Orient. Soc. 34, 51ff.

45 Thus in the beginning of the Kalpasūtra, see Jacobi, p. 38, and Āraśya, 9, 123.

46 The preceding is omitted by Malayagiri, whose commentary begins here.

47 Jacobi translates “undergoing a severe test,” “I propose” holding that (in his head) which is difficult of retention; of the use of dhāsaḥ p. 304c (Bhag. 2, 245b).

48 buddhipadā var. I, constructed by Jacobi with vāyaṇavāra, as if we had ṣaraṇam.

49 dvārāsaṃaya śāryā śnīyanandam iva. The expression dvāraśaṃya occurs in the words “aggēṇya-puṇvanāsandaḥ” at the end of the Siddhāntaḥ. See above, page 355.

50 Malayagiri refers “bhagavāya” to Mahāvīra and not to Ayya Śāma as the one who in the text carries on the dialogue with Gōyaṇa. According to his conception then the work of Ayya Śāma begins with this verse; and this is probably correct.

Then comes the text xor' iṣoṣi which begins with the question sē kiṃ taṁ ajīvapanna-
vaṇa? It consists furthermore of the questions of Gōya (yama) and the answers probably of Mahāvīra, though it is uncertain whether Mahāvīra be meant or not, since there is absolutely no addition of a legendary colouring. These questions and answers are couched in the style and manner of the dialogues in the Bhagavati, and though there is here a connecting thread (which we do not find in the Bhagavati), every padam forming a connected whole, nevertheless, there is, as a rule, [390] no genetic succession of the padas, despite the fact that Malayagiri makes every effort at the beginning of every padam to restore the connection with what has gone before. Many gāhās are found in the middle of the text, and many of the padas begin with a short statement of contents clothed in gāthā form — dānagāthā (dāvāgāthā). There are no legends whatsoever. The "contents" is as dreary as that (cf. above p. 389) of the third uvaṇga, which is closely connected with it, is dogmatic, speculative or even fantastic, and contains but little of general interest. There is much, however, that is important in the first book in the section on Man, who is divided into two classes: milikka and ariya. First there is an enumeration of 53 Mēcha peoples, secondly an enumeration of 25½ (!) Aryan peoples with their chief cities, and lastly an enumeration of 18 manners of writing. All this possesses some chronological value which would be more apparent if the names had not been so corruptly handed down to us. Malayagiri offers us no assistance in the case of the first and third enumeration.

In the list of the Milikkas (Milakkhas) the names are frequently the same as those cited, p. 332 from aṅga 10, and are arranged in the same order of succession. Various differences of detail are, however, not wanting, and in fact the names here make a less favourable impression upon us and seem to be of less antiquity. They are: — Saga [397] Javanna Chilaya Savara Pappara (Babbara BC) Kāya (only ya BC) Muruṇḍo ḍṛda (gīha C) Buḍḍaga Nīṣagya Pākkāya āla Kūlaḷa Kōṅḍa (Goṅḍa C) Sīhara (Sīhala) Pārasa (Gāḍhā-

— sihara, 38. tattō saṃmuṇgha āla 39.

The Chīva have disappeared or their name is concealed under that of another people. The name of the Ārava has received another form — Aravṛt̄ — and its position has been changed.

Malayagiri has merely śaṅkāṭašiṇāvinaḥ Śaṅkā, Yavandēśiṇāvinaḥ Yavannā, śrāvīna sarvatra, sarvaram anumāṇādō [lokaṭa] vijayaśā. The names are found partly in the thematic form and partly in the Nom. Plur. — In Nēmichanda’s pravacanaśatoddhāra [274] v. 1894 — 7 we find 33 names, among which only 29 agree with those given here; and there are important variations. His enumeration decked out in a modern dress is as follows: — Saga Jávaṇa Sābara Vavara Kāya (Kīṛīa) Muruṇḍo ḍṛda (Muruṇḍa Uṛḍha) Goṅḍa Pākkasayā (Aravāga (Aukhāya C, Aukhāya C, Hruyāya Pāva Kośa Khāntiśa chēva | 94 | Ṭuvālaiya Laiasa (Lukhaśa) Bhokkasa Bhāṭilūdha (Bihāla Anūdāh) Pūlīkā Kœva Bhamaraṇayā) ( | Bhāṭilūdha) | Kīṛīya (Kopakha) Chīva, Chīva (Kopakha, Chīva (Kopakha) Āla Kōṅḍa (Dravāga) Kūlāgha (Kūlāgha) | 95 | Kīṛīya Āla (Kuṭamāh) Kūlāgha (Kūlāgha) | 95 | Kīṛīya Hānavuha Kharānuha Gayā-Tārya-Mūrjaśyāvanna (Mūrjaśyāvann) | Hā NAVUHAA Gayākanna anna vi anūṭīya bahava | 96 | It is of interest that the name Aravāga has been completely misunderstood.

B. omits.
The āriyas are divided into nine groups, the first of which is formed by the khattāriya, and is in gāthā form. It is as follows:

Rāyagiha Magaha, Champā Angā taha, Tamālitti Vaṅgā ya | Kaṁchaṇapuraṁ Kaliṅga, Bāṇāruṣi (|) chēva Kaśi ya ||
[393] Sīya Kosalā, Gayapuraṁ cha Kuru, Sūriyaṁ Kuśatthā (Cudda B, ṭṭa) ya | Kaṁpil- clampa Maṅghalā, Ahichhuttā Jaṅgalā chēva ||
Bāraval Sūratthā, Mihila Vidēhā ya, Vattha (chēhha B) Kōsambī | Naṁdipuraṁ Sāṁdibhī (ll B). Bhaṭṭapuraṁ āva Malaya ya ||
Vairāda (|) Vattha (chēhha B), Varanātthā (chēhha B), taha Mattiyāval Dasannā | Sottiyamai (Cvai C) ya Chellī, Vībhayaṁ (Vīya) | Simdhū-Sōvirā ||
Mahrāya Sūrasena, Pāvā Gambhi (| Bhaṅgī BC) ya Māsapuri Vaddhā (Vatī BC) | Sāvatthi ya Kuṇgalā, Köṭīvarisam (| Sīm cha B) Lātā (Cḍhā C) ya ||
Sēyañīya vi ya śaṅcārī Kani-addrāham cha āriyaṁ bhaṭiyam | pacheh (pachēhe C, ichē B, etth D = atra) uppati jināpaṁ chakhkhāṁ Rama-Kaṅghāpaṁ ||

These names represent a later stage than the 16 names in angā 5 (p. 304), but date back in all probability to a remote period. Pāṭaliputra is omitted here but found in angā 11 (p. 337, 338). [399] It appears to be an old reminiscence (or perhaps is a trace of the influence of the Rāmāyaṇa) that one half of Kēkaya is called Aryan. The other half is concealed under the name of the Kavvēya (C, where angā 10 has Kēkaya), cited among the Mālakkhas. Bāṇāruṣi is modern — cf. Bhag. 2, 222 — but is found in this form also in angā 5.

The second group of the āriyas, the jātā-āriya, deserves also to be noted here: sē kiṁ tām jātāriyaḥ? chāvvrāh paṇṇattā, tāṁ, Ambuṭṭhā ya Kaliṅga Vidēhā Vēdamisyāḥ (Cāyā BC) Hariyā Vaṅchanā (Chaṃcha C) chēva chu ēvyā ibbha jātītō, sē jātāriyaḥ. What is the meaning of the last three names?

The sixth group of the āriyas is formed by the bhaśāriya. We find here again the enumeration of the 18 manners of writing, which we met with (p. 280) in angā 4, 14, 16, 18, in which, however, the form in which they were cited is not so correct as here. The names in this very interesting passage are all follows (together with the variants from ABC), — sē kiṁ tām bhaśāriyaḥ? jē naṁ addha-Magahāḥ bhaśāḥ bhaśeṣṭi, jātthā ya naṁ baṁhī liv ("the sacred
THE GUPTA-VALABHI ERA.

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

The Introduction to my Gupta Inscriptions, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III., published in 1888 (see also ante, Vol. XV. pp. 189-194, Vol. XVI. pp. 141-154, and Vol. XVII. pp. 243-246, 331-339, 359-369), contains some matter that would have been stated more concisely, and some that would have been omitted altogether, if I had known then as much as I have learned since, about the conversion of Hindu dates into their European equivalents. I now take the opportunity of recasting my remarks on the classification of the dates and the exact importance of the era, with some subsidiary points. For a long time past, I have intended to do this; but I have only lately had leisure to carry out my intention.

The grammarian Paushkarasāḍi may be recalled in this connection.
I.—THE ORIGINAL GUPTA ERA IN CENTRAL INDIA.

1.—The Nature and Initial Day of the Years.

The dates that naturally require to be first considered, are those which, belonging to the Early Gupta period itself, also contain details that can be actually tested by calculation. Of these, we have five. One is the date in the Ėraṅ pillar inscription of Budhagupta. The other are the dates in the copper-plate grants of the Parivrajaka Mahārājas.

A.—The Ėraṅ inscription of the year 165.

A. Here the details (Gupta Inscriptions, Introduction, p. 80) are: — The year 165; Āśāṅga śukla 12; Thursday. From the Mandasor inscription written in Mālava-Saṅvat 529 expired, with Alberuni’s statements, we know that the English equivalent must lie in, or just before or after, A. D. 484. And by actual trials it is found that the exact day, for the tithi as an ended tithi, is Thursday, 21st June, A. D. 484; on which day the tithi ended, according to Professor Kero Lakshman Chhatre’s Tables, with Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit’s corrections for the ablapa, &c., at about 48 ghatis, 55 palas, = 19 hours, 14 minutes, after mean sunrise for Bombay, and 30 palas or 12 minutes later for Ujjain.

In A. D. 485, the tithi ended on Tuesday, 11th June; and thus in that year it cannot be connected with a Thursday in any way.

In A. D. 483, the tithi, ending, according to the same Tables, at about 56 gh. 45 p. (for Bombay), on Friday, 3rd June, began at about 58 gh. 45 p. on the Thursday; and thus it might be connected with the Thursday for the space of 1 gh. 15 p. = 30 minutes, just before the sunrise at the end of that day. This is, however, an altogether improbable time for the completion of the work which is recorded in the inscription; viz. the erection of the pillar. Moreover, even this result is not obtainable from Professor Jacob’s Tables; according to which the tithi, ending at about 23 hrs. 22 min., = 58 gh. 25 p. (for Ujjain), on the Friday, began at 26 minutes, = 1 gh. 5 p., on the same day, and cannot be connected with the Thursday at all. The possible result for A. D. 483, therefore, must undoubtedly be rejected on its own merits; to say nothing of the fact that it would not fit in uniformly with the results for the other dates.

The English equivalent, accordingly, is Thursday, 21st June, A. D. 484. This day corresponds to Āśāṅga śukla 12 of Saka-Saṅvat 407 current. And, putting aside for the present the question of current or expired Gupta years, Gupta-Saṅvat 165 may have commenced with any day from Āśāṅga śukla 13 of Saka-Saṅvat 406 current, up to Āśāṅga śukla 12 of S. S. 407 current.

This, however, leaves the initial day of the year altogether indefinite, within the range of twelve entire lunations. And the next step is to see what can be done to locate it within closer limits.

B. and C.—The Khôh and Majhgawâm grants of the years 163 and 191.

This can be done, to a very reasonable extent, by means of the dates in two of the grants of the Parivrajaka Mahārāja Hastin.1

B. Here the details (loc. cit. p. 110) are: — The year 163 in the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta kings; the Mahā-Āśraya janaṅktara; Chaitra śukla 2. The Mahā-Āśraya janaṅktara is one of the years of the twelve-year cycle of Jupiter. With the result for the Ėraṅ date as a guide, it is found that the janaṅktaras in this and the other similar dates can be determined, on uniform principles, by nothing but the system which is regulated by the heliacal risings of the planet. And by that system, the Mahā-Āśraya janaṅktara is question

1 In respect of the other two dates in the Parivrajaka grants, of the years 156 and 209, it is unnecessary on this occasion to say more than that the results for them answer exactly to the conditions established for the two which are now treated of. For the present purpose, we have to choose only the two dates which are the earliest and the latest with reference solely to the months of the Hindu luni-solar year.
began on the 5th April A. D. 481, and ended on the 11th May, A. D. 482. These days correspond to the *pūrṇimānta* Vaiśākha krishṇa 6 of Saka-SAṅvat 404 current, and Jyēṣṭha śukla 8 of S. S. 405 current. The intermediate Chaitra śukla 2 (ending on the 7th March, A. D. 482) was the Chaitra śukla 2 of Saka-SAṅvat 405 current. Accordingly, Chaitra śukla 2, Gupta-SAṅvat 163, is Chaitra śukla 2 of Saka-SAṅvat 405 current; and Gupta-SAṅvat 163 may have commenced on any day from Chaitra śukla 3 of Saka-SAṅvat 404 current, up to Chaitra śukla 2 of S. S. 405 current.

C. Here the details (loc. cit. p. 114) are:—The year 191 in the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta kings; the Mahā-Chaitra *saṅvatara*; Māgha krishṇa 3. Determined in the same way as in the preceding instance, the Mahā-Chaitra *saṅvatara* began on the 29th September, A. D. 510, and ended on the 28th October, A. D. 511. These days correspond to Āśvina śukla 11 of Saka-SAṅvat 433 current, and the *pūrṇimānta* Mārgāśirāha krishṇa 7 of S. S. 434 current. The intermediate *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3 (ending on the 3rd January, A. D. 511) was the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3 of Saka-SAṅvat 433 current. Accordingly, the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3, Gupta-SAṅvat 191, is the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3 of Saka-SAṅvat 433 current; Gupta-SAṅvat 191 may have commenced on any day from the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 4 of Saka-SAṅvat 432 current, up to the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3 of S. S. 433 current; and, for direct comparison with the result deduced under B., Gupta-SAṅvat 163 may have commenced on any day from the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 4 of Saka-SAṅvat 404 current, up to the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3 of S. S. 405 current.

Now, the period from Chaitra śukla 3 to the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3 of Saka-SAṅvat 404 current, which is admissible by the result under B., is excluded by the result under C., which fixes the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 4 of that year as the earliest possible initial day.

And, on the other hand, the period from Chaitra śukla 3 up to the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 3 of Saka-SAṅvat 405 current, which is admissible by the result under C., is excluded by the result under B., which fixes Chaitra śukla 2 of that year as the latest possible initial day.

Accordingly, it follows that, by the practice of the time when these two records were drawn up, Gupta-SAṅvat 163 began with some day from the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 4 of Saka-SAṅvat 404 current, up to Chaitra śukla 2 of S. S. 405 current; the possible range being seventy-three *tīthīs*, or roughly seventy-two days.

A reference back will show that these limits suit the result under A., just as well as the results for the two dates from which they are deduced. For, Gupta-SAṅvat 165 would commence on some day from the *pūrṇimānta* Māgha krishṇa 4 of Saka-SAṅvat 406 current, up to Chaitra śukla 2 of S. S. 407 current; which period is well within the wider limits which are admissible by A., if taken alone.

And it may be noted here, that the limited range for the initial day which has been thus established, excludes, for this period and locality, the possibility of a year commencing either with the month Kṛttikā or with the month Mārgāśirāha.

Now, with the exception of Chaitra śukla 1 for the luni-solar year, or the Māsha-SAṅkrānti for the solar year, in the interval established above there is no particular day which naturally suggests itself for the initial day of the year; unless the era originated in a coronation-date, the date of which, falling in that interval, had been preserved, and was still used as the initial day of each year. Of course, such a date may have been preserved; and such an initial day may have been used. But we have no evidence at present in support of such an assumption. And, the luni-solar year being probably more used than the solar year for the practical and popular purposes of everyday life, I think that we may accept it as almost certain that, whatever may have been the real historical initial point of the era, by the time when these records were written, the scheme of the Gupta year had become in all respects identical with the scheme of the luni-solar Saka year, with Chaitra śukla 1 as
the initial day of each year. At any rate, in the dates hitherto obtained there is nothing opposed to this view.

The initial day of Gupta-Saṅvat 163, therefore, is to be taken as Chaitra śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 465 current. And, if we go back on the analogy of this, the initial day of Gupta-Saṅvat 1, not yet determined either as current or as expired, would be Chaitra śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 243 current.

2. — The Arrangement of the Lunar Fortnights.

This point is determined by means of the date in another of the Parivrājaka grants, of the Mahārāja Saṁkhaśābha, in which the details (loc. cit. p. 117) are: — The year 269 in the enjoyment of sovereignty by the Gupta kings; the Mahā-Āśvayuja saṅvatsara; Chaitra śukla 13; and, at the end of the record, (the month) Chaitra, the (civil) day 28.²

This double record is explicable only on the understanding that, in the months of the Gupta year, the dark fortnights stood first, according to the pūrṇimānta arrangement, by which each month ends with the day on which the full-moon occurs. By this means only can the thirteenth tithi of the bright fortnight be the twenty-eighth tithi, and answer to the twenty-eighth civil day, in the entire month.

A double record of the same kind is, as a matter of fact, contained in the grant referred to above as C.; in which, in addition to the full date as given above, we have at the end the words "(the month) Māgha, the (civil) day 3." But this instance is not conclusive; as the tithi and the civil day, being under fifteen, might possibly be the tithi and day of the fortnight and not of the entire month.

To prove the point definitely, what is required is a tithi and day the number of which, exceeding fifteen, shows itself to be referred to the entire month, and not to the fortnight only. This we have in the grant of the year 269. And this record proves for certain that, for practical purposes, the pūrṇimānta arrangement of the lunar fortnights is the one that was used for the Gupta years during the period in which these records were written; and probably that this is the original system, from the commencement of the era.

II. — THE ERA AS USED IN NEPAL.

D. — The Khātmāṇḍu inscription of the year 386.

This date comes from Nēpal, and is contained in an inscription of Mānadeva, of the Lichchhavi family of Mānagrihī, on a pillar at the temple of the god Chāngu-Nārāyaṇa, about five miles to the north-east of Khātmāṇḍu.

D. The details (loc. cit. p. 95) are: — The year 386; Jyēṣṭha śukla 1; when the moon was in the Rōhiṇi nakṣatra; in the Abhijit mukhāra. By actual trial it is found that the exact day is the 28th April, A. D. 705; on which day the tithi ended at 57 ghāṣṭrī, 12 palas, after sunrise (for Khātmāṇḍu); the moon entered the Rōhiṇi nakṣatra at 11 gh. 3 p., and continued in it during the whole of the remainder of both the tithi and the day; and the Abhijit mukhāra, being the eighth among the thirty mukhāraśas into which the sixty ghāṣṭrīs of the day are divided, and beginning after the fourteenth ghāṣṭrī, occurred both while the moon was in Rōhiṇi and while the given tithi was current. The same conditions of the nakṣatra and the mukhāra, with the tithi, did not occur either in the preceding or in the following year.

² I read the day, first as 29 (Gupta Inscriptions, Texts and Translations, p. 116), and afterwards as 27 (id. Introduction, pp. 73 and note 3, and 117). — Accepting Prof. Jacob’s rule that the abbreviation dī, either with or without ś and 1 or 2, denotes the civil day on which usually there ends (or occasionally there begins) the tithi, the numeral of which stands in connection with it (note, Vol. XVII. p. 145), and finding that the thirteenth tithi ended, and the fourteenth began, a considerable time after sunset, — and, in fact, even after midnight, — viz. at about 46 gh. 55 p., = 15 hrs. 46 min., after mean sunrise (for Bombay), I think that the value of the second numerical symbol must be corrected once more, and, no matter what may be suggested at first sight by the value of similar symbols elsewhere, must be finally fixed at 8; i.e. "the (civil) day 28," (on which there ended the tithi 15 + 13 = 28.)
The English equivalent, therefore, is the 28th April, A.D. 705. This day corresponds to Jyēstha śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 628 current. And the result answers to the assumption that, on the analogy of what has been established under B. and C., Gupta-Saṅvat 386 began with Chaitra śukla 1 of Saka-Saṅvat 628 current.

It is to be noted, however, that we have as yet no other dates from Nēpāl, which can be used for purposes of detailed comparison with the present one. Consequently, if this date is taken by itself, and without any comparison with B. and C., there are the possibilities, (1) that Gupta-Saṅvat 385 may have commenced, in Nēpāl, with any day from Jyēstha śukla 2 of Saka-Saṅvat 627 current, up to Jyēstha śukla 1 of S. S. 628 current; and (2) that, therefore, the year used in Nēpāl with the Gupta era may have commenced either with the month Kārttika (or with the month Mārgaśirha) preceding the Chaitra śukla 1 with which, we are to understand, the year used in Central India commenced. This point is one that cannot be decided, until we obtain further dates from Nēpāl, with details that can be actually tested by calculation. And in the same way it is impossible to say for certain, at present, whether the pūrṇimānta or the amānta arrangement of the lunar fortnights was used with the era in Nēpāl. But in A.D. 879 the Gupta era (and with it the Harsha era) was superseded in Nēpāl by a new era, known as the Nēwār era, with Kārttika śukla 1 as the initial day of each year, and with the amānta arrangement of the fortnights (see Prof. Kiellhorn's paper on "The Epoch of the Nēwār Era," ante, Vol. XVII. p. 246 ff.). And by the statement in the Nēpāl Vaśiśṭha, that "in the time of Jayadeva, who established the Nēwār era, there came from the South, on Śrāvaṇa śukla 7, Saka-Saṅvat 811, a certain Nānyadēra, who conquered the whole of Nēpāl, and introduced the Kārūnaka "dynasty" (ante, Vol. XIII. p. 414, and loc. cit. p. 74), the years of this new era are connected so closely with the Vikrama era in its southern or Kārttikādi variety, and are contrasted so pointedly with those of the eras which preceded it, that I think it must be admitted that, in all probability, the years of the so-called Gupta era, as used in Nēpāl also, were Chaitrādi years, with the pūrṇimānta arrangement of the lunar fortnights.

III.—THE VALABHI ERA OF KATHIAWAD AND THE NEIGHBOURING PARTS.

In the time of Alberūni, the era with which we are dealing was known both as the Gupta era, and as the Valabhi era; the reason for this being plainly that, after the cessation of the Early Gupta power in Kāthiawād, and the neighbourhood, the use of the era of the kings of that dynasty was continued for about three hundred years by the Mahārājas and kings of the city of Valabhi. The reasons for which I now nominally separate this era from the original Gupta era, with which it is practically identical, will become fully apparent further on.

E.—The Kaira grant of the year 330.

The first date in the Valabhi era that can be tested, is contained in a copper-plate grant of Dharasena IV. of Valabhi, obtained at Kaira in Gujārāt.

E. The details (loc. cit. p. 93) are:—The year 330; the second Mārgaśirha (= Mārgaśirha); the titih śukla 2. Here, our only definite guide is the intercalary nature of the month Mārgaśirha, which is shewn by the record. If the year is applied in exactly uniform accordance with the results obtained under B. and C., this intercalary Mārgaśirha ought to fall in A.D. 649. In that year, however, there was no intercalary month at all. And Dr. Schram's calculations, as well as those made by Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit, show that the intercalary month fell in A.D. 648; when the intercalated fortnights would receive the name of Mārgaśirha, according to the rule for mean intercalation.

Accordingly, the (second) Mārgaśirha of Valabhi-Saṅvat 330, falling in A.D. 648, was the (second) Mārgaśirha of Saka-Saṅvat 571 current. And, if we go back on the analogy of this,
the month Mārgaśīrsha of Valabhi-Sañvat 1, not yet determined either as current or as expired, would be the Mārgaśīrsha of Saka-Sañvat 242 current, and would fall four months before the initial day of Gupta-Sañvat 1 as established under B. and C. above, and as applicable also to A. and D. An inference which might, at first sight, be drawn from this fact, is sufficiently obvious; viz. that we have here a current year, and in A. to D. expired years: with the construction that I put upon the fact, it will be considered farther on.

F.—The Mōrbi grant of the year 585 expired.

The date to be next considered is contained in the copper-plate grant of Jāṅka, from Mōrbi in Kāṭhiāwār.

F. Here the details (loc. cit. p. 97) are: — For the making of the grant, the year 585, expressly specified as expired; on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun; and for the writing of the charter, the year 585, not specified either as current or as expired; the month Phālgun; the bright fortnight; and the (civil) day 2.

A certain amount of vagueness attends this date, because it includes no details as to the month, &c., of the occurrence of the solar eclipse, and as to the week-day of the writing of the charter. Three eclipses were put before me by Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit, of which one occurred on the 10th June, A. D. 904, corresponding to the new-moon day of the āmānta Jyēṣṭha (or the pūrṇimānta Ashādha) of Saka-Sañvat 827 current; another occurred on the 10th November, A. D. 904, corresponding to the new-moon day of the āmānta Kārttika (or the pūrṇimānta Mārgaśīrsha) of the same Saka year; and the third occurred on the 7th May, A. D. 905, corresponding to the new-moon day of the āmānta Vaiśākha (or the pūrṇimānta Jyēṣṭha) of Saka-Sañvat 828 current. And, in order to bring this date into exact accordance with the conditions established for the dates that have been dealt with under A. to D. above, I selected the last of these three, as being the eclipse intended in the record.

Now, for the period somewhere within which the date of this grant must be placed, von Oppolzer's *Canon der Finsternisse*, pp. 202, 203, and Plate 101, gives us the following solar eclipses:

On the 27th June, A. D. 963, corresponding to the āmānta Ashādha new-moon of Saka-Sañvat 826 current; a total eclipse; the central line of the eclipse ended at sunset in Lat. 33° N., Long. 1° W.; and the eclipse was not visible anywhere in India.

On the 21st December, A. D. 903, corresponding to the āmānta Mārgaśīrsha new-moon of Saka-Sañvat 826 current; a partial eclipse; the central line of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° S.; and so the eclipse was probably not visible anywhere in India.

On the 18th May, A. D. 904, corresponding to the āmānta Vaiśākha new-moon of Saka-Sañvat 827 current; a partial eclipse; the central line of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° S.

On the 16th June, A. D. 904, corresponding to the āmānta Jyēṣṭha new-moon of Saka-Sañvat 827 current; a partial eclipse; the central line of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 30° S.

* In the passage which contains this date, there is a word which in the published lithograph reads *gōptē*. Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar has stated in 1889 (*Jour. B. Br. B. As.*, Soc. Vol. XVII, p. 37) that he found among his papers two impressions by Dr. Burgess which show that the reading of the original is *gōpëtē*; and that he asked Dr. Peterson to take charge of these impressions, as Secretary to the Bombay Asiatic Society, and deposit them in the Society's Museum, where they would be available for inspection. I have not been able to obtain them for inspection; either from Dr. Peterson, or from the Museum. But the point is of importance, only as regards the nomenclature of the era. Even if the era is here specifically called the Gupta era, still the date belongs to the Valabhi variety of the era.
On the 10th November, A.D. 904, corresponding to the amānta Kārttika new-moon of Saka-Saṅvat 827 current; a partial eclipse; the central line of the eclipse was nowhere north of Lat. 36° S. Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit, however, found (loc. cit. p. 100) that this eclipse was visible at Mōrbī, though only to a very limited extent; one quarter of the sun's disc was eclipsed there; and the middle of the eclipse was at 11:54 a.m. of the Mōrbī mean civil time.

On the 7th May, A.D. 905, corresponding to the amānta Vaiṣākha new-moon of Saka-Saṅvat 828 current; an annular eclipse; the central line of the eclipse was at noon in Lat. 17° S., Long. 51° E., and it ended at sunset in Lat. 11° S., and Long. 107° E.; and the eclipse must have been visible over almost the whole of Southern India. Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit found (loc. cit. p. 99) that this eclipse was very distinctly visible at Mōrbī; one ninth part of the sun's disc was eclipsed there; and the middle of the eclipse was at 12:9 midday of the Mōrbī mean civil time.

On the 30th October, A.D. 905, corresponding to the amānta Kārttika new-moon of Saka-Saṅvat 828 current; a total eclipse; the central line of the eclipse ended at sunset in Lat. 1° N., Long. 73° W.; and this eclipse was not visible anywhere in India.

On the 26th April, A.D. 906, corresponding to the amānta Vaiṣākha new-moon of Saka-Saṅvat 829 current; an annular total eclipse; the central line of the eclipse was at noon in Lat. 29° N., Long. 23° E., and it ended at sunset in Lat. 36° N., Long. 98° E.; and this eclipse must have been visible all over India.

On the 20th October, A.D. 906, corresponding to the amānta Āśvina new-moon of Saka-Saṅvat 829 current; a total eclipse; the central line of the eclipse ended at sunset in Lat. 40° S., Long. 57° E.; and this eclipse was not visible anywhere in India.

In selecting the eclipse of the 7th May, A.D. 905, I was guided, partly by the fact that it was distinctly visible at Mōrbī, even if it was not known beforehand from calculations; and partly by the fact that, on the supposition, based on the way in which I then applied the result for the date H. below, that the original nature of the Gupta year was preserved in Kāliaṇāya up to considerably later than this time, this eclipse fitted in exactly with the results that had been established and have now been re-stated and affirmed under dates A. to C. above, whereas the eclipse of the 10th November, A.D. 904, did not so fit in.

Further experience, however, has shown that, whatever may be the strict custom of later times, instances are beginning to accumulate, in which eclipses, of the sun at any rate, which we know to have been not visible in India, are quoted in genuine early records as occasions of ceremonies (compare page 2 above, and note 2).

So far, therefore, as visibility or invisibility is concerned, we might select any of the above eclipses; without inquiring whether it was actually visible at Mōrbī or not. And for this reason, and also, — taking the year at the end of the grant to be similarly the expired year 585, — in order to bring the making of the grant as close as possible to the date on which the charter was written, and further in order to place this date in precisely the same category with E. above, the eclipse which I now select is that of the 10th November, A.D. 904.

On this view, the month Kārttika of Valabhi-Saṅvat 585 expired or 586 current, was the Kārttika of Saka-Saṅvat 827 current. And the month Kārttika of Valabhi-Saṅvat 1 current
would be the Kār̥tika of Saka-Saṅvat 242 current; and it would thus fall five months before the initial day that has been established in the case of B. and C. above. This brings the present date into the same category with E.; and that is all that it is necessary to say at present.

G.—The Varāval inscription of Valabhi-Saṅvat 927.

The next date is contained in an inscription on the pedestal of an image built into a wall of the temple of the goddess Harṣahādevī at Varāval in Kāthiawār.

G. Here the details (loc. cit. p. 90) are:—The Valabhi year 927; the month Phāguna; the bright fortnight; the (civil) day 2; and (as I took it originally, and take it now) on Monday.

When I first dealt with this date, there was some doubt about the word that gives the name of the week-day. In the cloth rubbing placed at my disposal by the late Pandit Bhagwanlal Indrajit, the vowel au was discernible in the first syllable, and the consonant seemed to be bh. This would give bhaumē, "on Tuesday." Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrajit, however, stated, from personal inspection of the original, that the consonant was certainly s. This gave saumē, which is no real word. And Dr. Bhagwanlal Indrajit considered that what was really intended was bhaumē, "on Tuesday." While my own opinion, based on the fact that the top stroke which changes the ñ of that period into au was partially filled up in the rubbing, was that the intended reading was sômē, "on Monday."

All doubt as to the actual reading of the original has now been removed, by un-inked paper estampages, for which I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. Haridas Viharidas, Diwán of Junagadh. The estampages establish, beyond the possibility of argument, the fact that the consonant is distinctly s, and the vowel, au. The reading, therefore, is saumē. But, as stated above, this is no real word. And the question is, out of three possible corrections,—bhaumē, "on Tuesday;" sômē, "on Monday;" and saumē, "on Wednesday;"—which may be most wisely adopted? I decide, now as before, in favour of sômē, "on Monday."

If we adopt the correction bhaumē, "on Tuesday," then the equivalent English date must be Tuesday, 31st January, A.D. 1245, on which day there ended the tithi Phāguna-śukla 2 of Saka-Saṅvat 1167 current, at about 24 ghāti.4 There is, indeed, the possibility of connecting the given tithi with a Tuesday, three years later; for Phāguna-śukla 2 of Saka-Saṅvat 1170 current began at about 30 gh. 30 P. on Tuesday, 28th January, A.D. 1248. But the tithi thus began 14 minutes after mean sunset, and some three quarters of an hour after actual sunset; and I think that even for this reason this result must be rejected. Moreover, this result is incompatible with that obtained under E. above; for if Margaśīrṣa (and consequently also Phāguna) of Valabhi-Saṅvat 1, which, to give the best chance, we will take as the current year, fell in Saka-Saṅvat 242 current, then Phāguna of Va.-S. 927 current fell in S.-S. 1168 current, and, here taking the expired year in order to give the best chance, Phāguna of Va.-S. 927 expired fell in S.-S. 1168 expired or 1169 current, which is still one year short of the year arrived at above.

If we adopt the correction saumē, "on Wednesday," the tithi is coupled quite naturally with Wednesday, 29th January, A.D. 1248, on which day it ended at about 32 gh. 5 p.; commencing, as has been stated just above, at about 30 gh. 30 P. on the Tuesday. But here again, as shewn in the preceding paragraph, the result cannot be reconciled with that obtained under E.

And finally, if we adopt the correction sômē, "on Monday," the tithi is coupled quite naturally with Monday, 16th February, A.D. 1248, on which day it ended at about 30 gh. 5 p.

It is unsatisfactory, especially when so free a selection is available, that, in order to interpret this date intelligibly at all, a correction must be made in a point of leading importance.

4 This result was overlooked, when I first wrote on this subject. I owe it now to Prof. Kielhorn.
And, for reasons which will shortly become evident, I should be glad enough if I could see my way to adopting definitely Tuesday as the intended week-day, with the result of Tuesday, 31st January, A. D. 1245. But my opinion is, as before, that the writer really did intend səməd, “on Monday.” And it will be seen that this view places this date on, in all respects, absolutely the same footing with the other dates of this class.

I adopt, then, the correction səməd, “on Monday;” and, now as before, I take the equivalent English date to be Monday, 19th February, A. D. 1246. Then, Phalgunu śukla 2 of Valablī-Śaṁvat 927, falling in A. D. 1246, was Phalgunu śukla 2 of Śaka-Śaṁvat 1168 current. And Phalgunu śukla 2 of Valablī-Śaṁvat 1 would be Phalgunu śukla 2 of Śaka-Śaṁvat 242 current; and, as is the case under E. above, it would fall one month before the initial day that applies in the case of A., B., and C. above.

H. — The Verāwal inscription of Valablī-Śaṁvat 945.

The last available date that we have, is contained in a stone inscription, at the same temple of Harṣat-dvī, which refers itself to the reign of the Chaulukya king Arjunadēva.

H. Here the details (loc. cit. p. 84) are:—The year of the prophet Muḥammad, i.e. the Hijra year, 662; Vīkrama-Śaṁvat 1320; Valablī-Śaṁvat 945; Śimha-Śaṁvat 151; the month Asādha; the dark fortnight; the (civil) day 13, (and with it the thirteenth tithi); Sunday.

Irrespective of the results obtained from the other Guptā and Valablī dates, the exact period in which the equivalent of this date must be found, is fixed by the quotation of the Hijra year 662, which commenced on the 4th November, A. D. 1263, and ended on the 3rd October, A. D. 1264. The month Asādha corresponding ordinarily to June-July, it can here lie only in A. D. 1264; and the equivalent of the given date can be found only in that year. In that year, the month Asādha was intercalary; and, taking both the purimānta and the amanta scheme, it spread over five fortnights, from the 13th May (= the first purimānta Asādha kṛṣṇa 1) to the 24th July (= the second amanta Asādha kṛṣṇa 30). And there are two cases in which the tithi Asādha kṛṣṇa 13 can be connected with a Sunday; (1) the first purimānta Asādha kṛṣṇa 13 ended at about 13 gh. 5 p. (for Bombay) on Sunday, 25th May; and (2) the second purimānta and the first amanta Asādha kṛṣṇa 13, ending at about 30 gh. 10 p. on Monday, 23rd June, began at about 35 gh. 50 p. on Sunday, 22nd June.

The result of Sunday, 22nd June, however, is distinctly inadmissible. In the first place, the Sunday can here be coupled with the given tithi, only if the latter is used as a current tithi, with the week-day on which it began; and even from the Hindu point of view there would be a difficulty about this, as it began appreciably after actual sunset on that day. But further, the inscription, though written in Sanskrit, and though now standing in, I presume, a Hindu temple, is a purely Muhammadan record. “The purpose of the inscription,” as epitomised by Dr. Hultzsch (ante, Vol. XI, p. 242), “is to grant the income from a piece of land covered with houses, from an oil-mill, and from two shops, to a Masjid built by the donor, a Muhammadan shipowner from Hormuz, the small island after which the straits leading out of the Persian Gulf are called, and which was under the sway of the Amir Ruknul-dila. The grant “provides also for the expenses of particular religious festivals to be celebrated by the Shi'ite “sailors of Somanatha Pāshā. The eventual surplus is to be made over to the holy district “of Makkka and Madīna. The Muslim congregation of Somanatha Pāshā are appointed “trustees.” And under these circumstances it cannot well be questioned that any particular use of the Hindu tithi, as a current tithi, cannot be concerned in the matter at all. The tithi was plainly simply the ordinary ended tithi of the day, according to common everyday use.

Pandit Bhagwanlal Indraji obtained two other dates in the Valablī era; but the details are not available. Of one of them a hand-copy was shown by him to me; it consists of one line, beginning ṣanā ṣa; the remaining eleven or twelve letters are not very intelligible; but they certainly do not contain any further details of the date. Of the other he showed me a pencil-rubbing; it is a Sanskrit inscription, in Devāngarī characters, of the time of Vira-Kumārapāla, consisting of fifty-four lines, each of about fifty-eight letters; the date is in the last line, and all of it that is extant, consists of the syllables Valablī-śaṁvat 80 ṣaṇā. . . .
It follows therefore that, as previously announced, the correct English equivalent is Sunday, 26th May, A. D. 1264, for the first pūrṇimānta Āśādha kṛṣṇa 13 as the ended ēkādi of ordinary use. As far as the given Vikrama year is concerned, this day fell in Vikrama-Śaṅvat 1320 only as the expired southern year (see ante, Vol. XIX. p. 180, No. 129). And as regards the Saka era, it fell in Saka-Śaṅvat 1187 current. Thus, then, the pūrṇimānta Āśādha kṛṣṇa 13 of Valabhi-Śaṅvat 945, was the pūrṇimānta Āśādha kṛṣṇa 13 of Saka-Śaṅvat 1187 current. And the pūrṇimānta Āśādha kṛṣṇa 13 of Valabhi-Śaṅvat 1 would be the pūrṇimānta Āśādha kṛṣṇa 13 of Saka-Śaṅvat 243 current. This agrees exactly, either with the results established under B. and C., or with the result established under E. This date, however, because of the period and locality to which it belongs, is to be classified with E., and not with A., B., C., and D.

I have here only one other point to mention. From the circumstances of this date, I held it to be proved (Gupta Inscriptions, Intro. p. 90) that the original use of the pūrṇimānta arrangement of the lunar fortnights with the years of the Gupta era was preserved in Kāthiāwār — irregularly, it is true; but still occasionally, — up to at any rate A. D. 1264. In reality, however, this record furnishes no such absolute proof; for, Prof. Kiellhorn has been able to adduce eight other instances, ranging from A. D. 1136 to 1482 (ante, Vol. XIX. pp. 178-81, 354), in which, for certain, the pūrṇimānta arrangement of the fortnights is used with southern expired Vikrama years. On this point, therefore, I now withdraw the conclusion at which I arrived in my original treatment of the Gupta era. This, and the result for the Mōrbī date, are the only matters in which I have to modify my views. — in the first case, in respect of the arrangement of the fortnights in Kāthiāwār, and in the second case, in respect of the English equivalent: in other respects my original views are simply re-stated, in, I hope, a more correct and lucid form.

IV. — CURRENT AND EXPIRED YEARS; THE EXACT EPOCH OF THE ERA IN EACH VARIETY; AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE DATES.

So far we have simply taken the evident results for the dates, whether Gupta of Central India, Nēpālī, or Valabhi of Kāthiāwār, without any attempt to decide whether the unqualified years quoted in the original passages are to be applied as current or as expired. This point has now to be considered; since it depends on the exact commencement of the era, with the other points that are now in view.

The Mōrbī grant (F.1) is the only one in which the year is not left unqualified. In it we have distinctly "the year 585, expired." But, unfortunately, no information is given as to the month and week-day of the eclipse, or as to the week-day on which the charter was written; and there is a very wide choice available in the selection of the eclipse. Consequently, the quotation of the expired year here helps us in no way at all in respect of the other dates. All that can be done is to select for this date such a result as will place it on terms exactly analogous to the others; and this is done by the result chosen by me above.

Now, the result deduced under B. and C. is that the initial day of Gupta-Śaṅvat 1, still to be determined as current or as expired, was Chaitra śukla 1 of Saka-Śaṅvat 243 current.

And, on the other hand, we have found under E. that the month Mārgasthīra of Valabhi-Śaṅvat 1, still to be determined as current or as expired, must have fallen in Saka-Śaṅvat 242 current, four months before the initial day of Gupta-Śaṅvat 1.

If we assume that the Gupta year and the Valabhi year both had Chaitra śukla 1 as the initial day, the inference suggests itself, at first sight, that Valabhi-Śaṅvat 1 was equivalent as a current year to Saka-Śaṅvat 242 current; and that it is as an expired year that Gupta-Śaṅvat 1 was equivalent to Saka-Śaṅvat 243 current.
This assumption, however, would be rendered impossible if we were to accept, under G., the correction of bhuné, with the result of Tuesday, 31st January, A. D. 1245. For, this date corresponds to Phalguna śukla 2 of Saka-Saṅvat 1187 current. And so, Phalguna śukla 2 of Valabhi-Saṅvat 1 would be Phalguna śukla 2 of Saka-Saṅvat 241 current; in the Saka year before that obtained just above for Valabhi-Saṅvat 1 current.

To reconcile this discrepancy, we must of necessity then assume that Valabhi-Saṅvat 1 current began before Gupta-Saṅvat 1 current; and we must find a suitable initial day for it, other than the preceding Chaitra śukla 1, which goes back too far. Kārttika śukla 1 naturally suggests itself, and is found to answer. And then we might say: —

(1) The year in G. is a current year, answering to the equation Kārttika-dī Valabhi-Saṅvat 1 current = (Saka-Saṅvat 241 - 12 current = ) Kārttika-dī Vikrama-Saṅvat 376 current.

(2) The years in E. and H. are expired years, answering to precisely the same equation.

(3) The years in A., B., and C., are expired years, answering to the equation Chaitrādī Gupta-Saṅvat 1 current = Saka-Saṅvat 242 current.

(4) The year in D. is an expired year, which may answer to either of the above equations.

To this, however, there is the objection, that unqualified years may consequently be capriciously interpreted as current or as expired, on no uniform rule, but just as seems to suit best the requirements of individual cases. And we are in no way bound to adopt in G. the correction of bhuné, "on Tuesday: the stroke that distinguishes s from bh is far too regular, distinct, and perfect, to be the mere result of a slip of the engraver's tool; and though it may be said that the writer would not have formed the vowel au, unless he intended to write bhuné, still it may be neged, with equal force, that he would not have formed the consonant s, unless he intended to write sūnē.

My object is to deal with all the dates on uniform principles; taking either all the unqualified years as current, or else all of them as expired. The only assumption that is necessary, — if, indeed, it is an assumption, and not an obvious fact, — is that which has to be made above also; viz., that the Valabhi years were Kārttika-dī, each beginning with the Kārttika śukla 1 before the initial Chaitra śukla 1 of the Gupta year bearing the same number. To this objection need be taken; if we note that the Kārttika variety of the Vikrama era was the standard one in the part of the country from which the Valabhi dates come; and that, when the Vikrama era was introduced into Northern India where the Chaitra-dī Saka years were in use, the standard variety there was established by turning the Kārttika-dī years into Chaitra-dī years, each beginning with the Chaitra śukla 1 before the initial Kārttika śukla 1 of

—

* I disregard the assumption that in G. there is a mistake in the year (927 instead of 928). My object is to deal with the dates as they stand, without any alterations, except in the reading of sūnē in G.

* Here, and further on in what I submit are the real results, a year commencing with Mārgaśīraha would answer just as well for the Valabhi variety of the era; as should only have the to select, for the Mūrthi eclipse, that of the 30th October, A. D. 906. But the year commencing with Mārgaśīraha is apparently connected by Alberdul only with a variety of the Lokakśa reckoning; and therefore it does not commend itself for present purposes, as the well-known, and undoubtedly original, Kārttikēli Vikrama year does.

* In corroboration of this, we might possibly quote a point to which Prof. Kielhorn has drawn my attention; viz., that the real historical fact embodied in the tradition that Valabhi was destroyed 375 years after the commencement of the Vikrama era, is that 375 should be added to a Valabhi year to convert it into a (Kārttikēli) Vikrama year. I apparently fix the difference, below, at 375 years. But it comes in reality to just the same thing; because the end of what is technically called "Vikrama-Saṅvat 375 expired" is the end of Vikrama-Saṅvat 376 current. — It may be noted here that Alberdul gives, as will be seen, Valabhi-Saṅvat 712 = Vikrama Saṅvat 1088, with a difference of 376, and with the assertion, which I accept, that they are both expired years. Whereas, H. gives Valabhi-Saṅvat 945 (unqualified) = Vikrama-Saṅvat 1340 (unqualified, but known from the result to be expired, with a difference of 375. The discrepancy is easily reconciled if the Valabhi year in H. is taken, as I take it to be, as the current year; because then, substituting the expired year 944, we have the same difference, 375, that is given by Alberdul's statement.
the southern Vikrama year bearing the same number. And all that now remains, is, to determine whether the unqualified years quoted in the records are to be applied as current, or as expired.

Our first impulse is to try to discover what may have been the contemporaneous practice in neighbouring parts of the country. Nothing definite, however, can be established in this way. On the one hand, with the Kalachuri or Chchā era, which belongs to that part of India from which have come almost all the dates of the Early Gupta period that include details that can be tested by calculation, the preference appears to have been for the use of current years; thus, out of the fourteen dates examined by Prof. Kielhorn, in each of which the year is not distinctly qualified either as current or as expired (see his “Epoch of the Kalachuri or Chchā Era,” ante, Vol. XVII. p. 215 ff.), eleven have been found to be recorded in current years; two, in expired years; and one, in a year which is to be understood as expired if the first day of each year was Bhādrapada šukla 1, but as current if the first day of each year is taken as Āśvina śukla 1, which may be done without in any way affecting the results for the other dates. But, on the other hand, with the Neilā era, which supersedes the Gupta era (and the Harsha era) in Neilā, the preference appears to have been for the use of expired years; thus, out of twenty-one instances of unqualified years, in nineteen the years must be applied as expired, and in only two as current (see Prof. Kielhorn’s “Epoch of the Neilā Era,” ante, Vol. XVII. p. 246 ff.).

This process failing us, we turn next to the only other available source of information, the writings of Alberūnī. Here two things are to be noted; (1) the “gauge-year” selected by him, which (Sachau’s Translation, Vol. II. pp. 2, 7) is the year 400 of the era of Yezdajird, corresponding to Vikrama-Saṃvat 1088, Saka-Saṃvat 953, and Gupta-Saṃvat and Valabhi-Saṃvat 712; and (2) his statement (id. p. 3) that “in all chronological dates which we have mentioned already and shall still mention, we only reckon with complete years, for the Hindus are in the habit of disregarding fractions of a year.”

The era of Yezdajird dates from the accession of Yezdajird III, a Sassanian king of Persia, in A. D. 632 (see Prinsep’s Essays, Vol. II. Useful Tables, p. 302 and note). Consequently, the “gauge-year,” the year 400 of this era, was A. D. 1031-32; and according to Mr. Cowasjee Patell’s Chronology, pp. 139, 141, it began on the 9th March, A. D. 1031, and ended on the 7th March, A. D. 1032. Thus, we know that the year Saka-Saṃvat 953 quoted by Alberūnī is the expired year, which began on the 25th February, A. D. 1031, and ended on the 15th March, A. D. 1032. And the question is, whether, as would appear at first sight from his explicit statement (2), we really have to interpret also the Gupta and Valabhi year 712 as the expired year, and as coinciding with Saka-Saṃvat 953 expired.

It is to be noted that Alberūnī gives Vikrama-Saṃvat 1088 as one of the equivalents of the gauge-year; and that elsewhere he makes another statement in support of this, in telling us (id. p. 6) that “the epoch of the era of Saka or Sakakila falls 133 years later than that of Vikrama-dita.” These statements are both quite correct for the northern Chaitrādi-Vikrama-Saṃvat 1088 as an expired year; as which it extended, with Saka-Saṃvat 953 expired, from the 25th February, A. D. 1031, to the 15th March, A. D. 1032. But they are not correct for the Kṛttikādi variety of the Vikrama era, in which each year begins seven months later than the Chaitrādi year that bears the same number; so that the Kṛttikādi-Vikrama-Saṃvat 1088 expired coincided, not with Saka-Saṃvat 953 expired, but with part of that year and with part of the following, extending from the 19th October, A. D. 1031, to the 7th October, A. D. 1032. And, even if Alberūnī’s statement (id. p. 6), that “those who use the era of Vikrama-dita live in the southern and western parts of India,” is not sufficient to show that he knew the Kṛttikādi variety of the era, still the existence of it is established for his time and before it. Hence, in fact, Alberūnī has given an equation for converting Vikrama years into Saka years, which is applicable strictly to only one class of the Vikrama years; and his gauge-year is not specifically correct for the Kṛttikādi variety of the Vikrama era. In respect then,
of another era coming from just the same part of the country, it is at least possible that he
gives only a rough equation, when he tells us (ib. p. 7) that the epoch of the Valabhl era (and
of the Gupta era) falls 241 years later than the epoch of the Saka era; and that his gauge-year
may be similarly incorrect for the expired Valabhl year which he quotes in connection
with it. I myself entertain no doubt that this is the case.

Now, I think that this much, at any rate, is plain; that the Valabhl years were Kārttikādī,
each beginning before the Chaitrādī Gupta year bearing the same number. And the question
now is, how Alberūnī's statements may be best adapted to these two differing years. The
adjustment may be made in two ways. Valabhl-Saṅvat 712, taken according to Alberūnī's
statement as an expired year, may be treated as beginning either with the Kārttikā śukla 1
before the Chaitrā śukla 1 with which commenced Saka-Saṅvat 953 expired, or with the
Kārttikā śukla 1 after that same Chaitrā śukla 1. By the first means, Gupta-Saṅvat 712,
beginning with the Chaitrā śukla 1 after the initial Kārttikā śukla 1 of Valabhl-Saṅvat 712,
would coincide as an expired year with Saka-Saṅvat 953 expired; but then Valabhl-Saṅvat
712 expired, which, from Alberūnī's statements and the other considerations put forward by
myself, is evidently to coincide with the Kārttikādī-Valabhl-Saṅvat 1088 expired, would
fall one year too early, and would coincide with Kārttikādī-Vikrama-Saṅvat 1087 expired.
By the latter means, Valabhl-Saṅvat 712 expired would coincide with Kārttikādī-Vikrama-Saṅvat
1088 expired; but then it would be as a current year that Gupta-Saṅvat 712 coincided
with Saka-Saṅvat 953 expired.

In short, there is an incompleteness or an inaccuracy somewhere in Alberūnī's
statements. In my opinion, it is more likely to have occurred in connection with the original
Gupta era, than with the secondary Valabhl era which was in use even until after Alberūnī's time.
In remedying it, I follow what appears to be the true probability in the case; viz. that the
statement regarding the Valabhl year is wrong in precisely the same manner with the statement
regarding the Vikrama year as a Kārttikādī year; and I make exactly the same adjustment
that is unavoidable in the case of the Vikrama year given by him. And I consider, in brief,
that it is plainly deducible from Alberūnī's own statements that he made a mistake in giving
Gupta-Saṅvat 712 expired, instead of current, as the equivalent of Saka-Saṅvat 953
expired; that Valabhl-Saṅvat 712 expired was correctly indicated by him as the equivalent of
(the southern Kārttikādī)-Vikrama-Saṅvat 1088 expired; that consequently the month Kārttikā
of Valabhl-Saṅvat 713 current was the Kārttika of Vikrama-Saṅvat 1089 current, falling in
Saka-Saṅvat 954 current, in A. D. 1031; and that therefore the month Kārttikā of Valabhl-
Saṅvat 1 current was the Kārttika of Vikrama-Saṅvat 377 current, falling in Saka-Saṅvat 242
current, in A. D. 319.

If any definite proof is obtained hereafter, leading to any different conclusion, I shall be
glad enough to accept it, and to modify my views accordingly. Or if, such proof being
unattainable, there should come to be a general consensus of opinion, among those who are
entitled to speak with authority, that the unqualified years of all Hindu eras must be à priori
treated as expired years, I shall be glad enough to concur in so disposing of a point which is
not one of any particularly vital importance. Meanwhile, on the above grounds, I stamp
the unqualified years, determine the initial years and the epochs, and classify the dates, as
follows: —

I.—The Original Gupta Era in Central India.
A. B. and C. — The years are current years, answering to the equations, —

(1) for the first current year, Chaitrādī-Gupta-Saṅvat 1 current = Saka-Saṅvat 243
current, = the period from the 26th February, A. D. 320, to the 15th March, A. D. 331;
(2) for the epoch or year 0, Chaitrādī-Gupta-Saṅvat 0 = Saka-Saṅvat 242 current, =
the period from the 9th March, A. D. 319, to the 28th February, A. D. 320.
Thus:

A. — The date in the year 165 current, in the month Āśādha, the equivalent of which lies in June, A. D. 484, falls in Saka-Saṅvat 242 + 165 = 407 current, = the period from the 14th March, A. D. 484, to the 2nd March, A. D. 485.

B. — The date in the year 163 current, in the month Chaitra, and in the Mahā-Āsvayuja samvatara which was current from the 5th April, A. D. 481, to the 11th May, A. D. 482, falls in Saka-Saṅvat 242 + 163 = 465 current, = the period from the 6th March, A. D. 482, to the 22nd February, A. D. 483.

C. — The date in the year 191 current, in the month Māgha, and in the Mahā-Chaitra samvatara which was current from the 29th September, A. D. 510, to the 28th October, A. D. 511, falls in Saka-Saṅvat 242 + 191 = 433 current, = the period from the 25th February, A. D. 510, to the 15th March, A. D. 511.

II. — The Era as used in Népál.

D. — The year is a current year, answering most probably to precisely the equations given above.

Thus:

D. — The date in the year 386 current, in the month Jñēśthā, the equivalent of which lies in April, A. D. 705, falls in Saka-Saṅvat 242 + 386 = 628 current, = the period from the 1st March, A. D. 705, to the 20th March, A. D. 706.

III. — The Valabhi Era of Kāśiśāwaṭ and the Neighbouring Parts.

E., G. (with the correction of viṣṇe, and the result of Monday, 19th February, A. D. 1246), and H. — The years are current years, answering to the equations, —

(1) for the first current year, Kārttikādi-Valabhi-Saṅvat 1 current = southern Vikrama-Saṅvat 377 current, = the period from the 1st October, A. D. 319, to the 18th October, A. D. 320;

(2) for the epoch or year 0, Kārttikādi-Valabhi-Saṅvat 0 = southern Vikrama-Saṅvat 376 current, = the period from the 11th October, A. D. 318, to the 30th September, A. D. 319.

E. — The date in the year 330 current, in the second month Mārgaśīrṣa, the equivalent of which month is November-December, A. D. 648, falls in southern Vikrama-Saṅvat 376 + 330 = 706 current, = the period from the 24th September, A. D. 648, to the 12th October, A. D. 649.

F. — [Here, all that can be done is to select an eclipse in Valabhi-Saṅvat 585 expired or 586 current, which shall answer to the same equations. It must be found in southern Vikrama-Saṅvat 376 + 586 = 962 current, = the period from the 13th October, A. D. 904, to the 2nd October, A. D. 905. And the eclipse which I have now selected is that of the 10th November, A. D. 904, because it occurred before the date, in the same year, on which the charter was written, and is therefore to be preferred to the previously chosen eclipse of the 7th May, A. D. 905, which occurred later on in the same Valabhi and Vikrama year.]

G. — The date in the year 927 current, in the month Phāṅguna, the equivalent of which is in February, A. D. 1246, falls in southern Vikrama-Saṅvat 376 + 927 = 1303 current, = the period from the 23rd October, A. D. 1245, to the 12th October, A. D. 1246.

H. — The date in the year 945 current, in the month Āśādha, the equivalent of which lies in May, A. D. 1264, falls in southern Vikrama-Saṅvat 376 + 945 = 1321 current, = the period from the 5th October, A. D. 1263, to the 22nd October, A. D. 1264.

* See note 8 above.
A COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF GANADEVA OF KONDAVIDU,
DATED SAKA-SAMVAT 1377.

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

The original of this inscription was kindly sent to me for examination by Mr. W. H. Michael, M.C.S., Assistant Collector of the Kistna District. It consists of three copper-plates, the second sides of which are marked on the left margin with the Telugu numbers 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Both the ring with the seal, and the fourth plate together with any other plate that may have followed it, are lost. The alphabet is Telugu and the language Sanskrit, verse (lines 1 to 32) and prose (lines 32 to 56). The plates are not very easily read, as they are somewhat worn and as the text, though on the whole orthographically correct, appears to have been copied from a draught written in current-hand characters.

After two benedictory verses, which are addressed to Ganesa and to the Boar-incarnation of Vishnu, the inscription turns to the praise of king Kapila, surnamed Gajapati (verses 3 and 6) or Kumbhirta (verse 4), who belonged to the race of the Sun (verse 4). He was a worshipper of Jagannatha (Juggernaut), the famous shrine at Puri in Orissa (verse 6). His capital was Katasa (Cutack) on the Mahanadi river (verse 7). A descendant of his race was Chandradya, whose son was Gahidraputra (verse 8). The son of the latter was Gana, who assumed the surname Rautary (verses 9, 11, 12) or Rahutary (verse 10), i.e. the king of horsemen, on account of a victory over two Turushka princes (verse 9). These may have been two generals of the Bahmani king Allah-u-d-din Ahmad Shah II., who reigned from 1435 to 1457. Gana's capital was Könadvi (verse 12) in the Narasaraopeta Tahuk of the Kistna District. While residing there, he granted to a number of Bearpanas the village of Chawali (verse 13) in the Repalle Tahuk of the Kistna District. The date of the grant was the day of a lunar eclipse in the month of Bhadrapada of Saka 1377 (in numerical words), the cyclic year Yuvaras. The remainder of the preserved part of the inscription consists of a list of the donees. The name of the cyclic year shows that the Saka year is an expired year; and the eclipse should therefore have occurred in August-September, A.D. 1455. For that year, however, von Oppolzer's Cosm des Finsterniss shows only one lunar eclipse, on the 1st May; and though Sir A. Cunningham's Indian Eras shows another, on the 25th October, still that also does not answer to the record. The nearest lunar eclipse on the full-moon of Bhadrapada was that of the 3rd September, A.D. 1457, in Saka-Samvat 1379 expired, the Isvara samvatam.

In the above abstract I have followed the text of the inscription in representing Kapila-Gajapati as the ancestor of Gana. It is however very probable that Kapila is identical with Kapilasara-Gajapati who, according to a chronic of Königvidu, ruled from A.D. 1454 to 1461, and with Kapilendradya, who, according to Dr. Hunter's Orissa, ruled from A.D. 1452 to 1479. If this supposition is correct, it will be necessary either to translate the compound tad-vishad in verse 8 by 'the same race as he, viz. Kapila, or to refer the pronoun tad to the noun bhaseat, the Sun,' which occurs in verse 4. In support of this explanation, which at first sight appears somewhat arbitrary and artificial, it may be added, that the inscription names Katasa as the capital of Kapila (verse 7), while Gana resided at Könadvi (verse 12), and that it speaks of Kapila as a living person in the present tense. Especially in verse 3, the present tense cannot be explained as the historical present, as it is accompanied by the adverb adhara, now. I would accordingly consider Kapila, the Gajapati king of Orissa, as a contemporary of Gana of Könadvi, who appears to have been a tributary of his.

1 According to Brown's Telugu Dictionary, rathu or rasa means a horsemen. Edaraabhutaminda occurs among the bira of Viskapa II. of the third dynasty of Vijayanagara; ante, Vol. XII. p. 131, verse 40.
2 It may perhaps be further concluded from verse 9 that he bore the surname of Sreevaiyaka, and his father the surname of Mahbilabha.
3 Mr. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Vol. I. p. 78.
4 Mr. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Vol. II. p. 183.
5 Mr. Sewell's Lists of Antiquities, Vol. II. p. 183.
TEXT.

First Plate; First Side.

1. श्रीमान्यापितके नमः। अर्थु हस्तस्मये वरुण वहासि [हु]—
2. न पूर्ववंशं। नीति वक्षदुःगंगािशीव नामः—
3. नित्यः । [१०] न पराशराशिकी सु[हृ] हि घास श्रवण श्लोकः [१०]—
4. केतसलिपुषुपसंगम नृत्यव राजम् । [२०] वाटि प्रावतः—
5. न पवनि— कपस्वयंवच्य नाथो शिबिरयिन नारसिकः—
6. शाईय वष्णीवन्युगः। वश्मा। संस्थे विवक्षणात्तः—
7. पूर्वपुत्र सहाय्री राजा वेजवदितः कार्तिकी ग्रामपति। [११३]—
8. ज्ञातः थरः लोकनायकः कल्यंतमनये नास्तिसूद्धनो ह्यः वस्त्रिन्यु—
9. सुधारः वाङ्गे करिकरि अल्पः भारं भुविः। वशे ज्ञातः—

First Plate; Second Side.

10. श्रीमान्यापितके नमः। अर्थु हस्तस्मये वरुण वहासि—
11. नित्यः कवित्यानामः कविशीव [त] [१०]। वक्षदुःगंगािशीव नामः—
12. नि पराशराशिकी सु[हृ] हि घास श्रवण श्लोकः [१०]—
13. बृहि भविष्यविधि: विनयविधि:। भृहि भविष्य श्लोकः [१०]— ष्ट्रिव येव मयं प्रणामः। नमः नमः—
14. ग्रामश्रवण नारसिकः। ज्ञातः भुविः। वशे ज्ञातः—
15. नि पराशराशिकी सु[हृ] हि घास श्रवण श्लोकः [१०]—
16. नि पराशराशिकी सु[हृ] हि घास श्रवण श्लोकः [१०]—
17. नि पराशराशिकी सु[हृ] हि घास श्रवण श्लोकः [१०]—
18. नि पराशराशिकी सु[हृ] हि घास श्रवण श्लोकः [१०]—
19. नि पराशराशिकी सु[हृ] हि घास श्रवण श्लोकः [१०]—

Second Plate; First Side.

20. श्रीमान्यापितके नमः। अर्थु हस्तस्मये वरुण वहासि—
21. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
22. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
23. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
24. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
25. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
26. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
27. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
28. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
29. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
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30. श्रीमान्यापितके नमः। अर्थु हस्तस्मये वरुण वहासि—
31. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
32. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
33. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
34. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
35. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
36. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
37. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
38. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—
39. कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। कविशीव इति। [१०]—

7 Read पूर्व. 8 Read ज्ञान. 9 Read सिद्धान्त. 10 Read शास्त्र. 11 Read सैयं ज्ञान. 12 Read नित्यान. 13 Read विशे. 14 Read वियोग. 15 The sound is engraved at the beginning of the next line.
16 Read र्योस्तर्य, न. १०, ते. विः
Adoration to the blessed Gaṇadhāpati!

Verse 1. Let the being (Gāpēla), which has the face of an elephant, whose body is stouc, and the pery of bees on whose temples resembles a garland of sapphires — produce prosperity!

2. Let that primeval boar (Vishnu), borne on whose tusks the lovely earth resembles a bee clinging to the high (!) tip of the petal of a kātabi (flower) — protect me!

3. Bali gave the earth to Hari (Vishnu) disguised as a young Brāhmaṇa, Sibi (his) meat, and Karṣa (his) skin. There may have formerly been other munificent donors like Dādhāchi. Now the great hero, king Kapilēndra-Gajapati, surpasses (all of them).

4. Resplendent is that conqueror of foes, king Kapilēkara-Gajapati (i.e. Gajapati), whose powerful race was descended from the Sun, the lord of the world and husband of the group of lotuses, whose bright fame glitters on earth like the cluster of rays of the rising moon, and the sun of whose valour, having passed beyond the mountain which surrounds the earth, shines in the west.

5. Through the streams of the rutting-juice of his elephants, the earth is made muddy; the oceans are transformed into (dry) holes through the dust of his war-horses.

6. Let him be ever victorious, the brave and illustrious Kapilēvara-Gajapati, who has worshipped the lord of the three worlds, the crest-jewel of the black mountain (!), the blessed god Jagannātha, who is full of splendour, who resembles the burning forest spoken of in the Sruti (!), and who abides on the deep (!) shore of the ocean!

7. His capital, the city called Kāṭaka, on the bank of the Mahānadi, resembles Amaravatī (the city) of Sakra (Indra).

17 Read महद्व. 18 Read पुस्तकास. 19 This expression seems to refer to the eastern mountain, as avadhigiri in verse 11.
20 This seems to refer to the fire at the end of the lobha. The face of the idol Jagannātha is of gold; see ante, Vol. I. p. 36. Another possible reading is dāru-akriti, "consisting of wood."
8. Just as the full-moon from the ocean, the glorious Chandradéva was produced in his race. From him sprang the famous Guhidéevapātra, as Guhá from Mahéśa (Śiva).

9. From this favourite of the earth (mahéśabha) came the victorious king Gánamahtipatī, who, (because) he vanquished his two Turushka princes, was therefore called Rautarāyā, who perfumed the circle of the horizon with his fame, who taught (others) the initiation into the exclusive (practice) of liberality, who was fortune of temples and Brahmās, and another Śrivallabha (Vishṇu).

10. Vishṇu (as Narasimha) was a man only as far as his legs (or, only a quarter of a man), and Siva (as Ardhanarishvara) only half a man. But resplendent is Gana-Rahuttarāyā, who is a whole man (or hero).

11. As another (Vishṇu) lord of Lakṣmī, I consider that king Ayapa-Rautarāyā, whose feet are resplendent with the lustre of the jewels on the tops of the glittering diadems of kings, whose bright fame surpasses the splendour of the foam of the waves of the stream of the immortals (the Gaṅga), and the sun of whose valor ascends both the mountain which forms the boundary (of the earth) and the western mountain (Śiṅgā).

12. The city of Kūndavātī, the capital of this Rautarāyā, the Śravas of which are full of merchandise, and which is continually crowded with mighty elephants, chariots, horses and pedestrians, resembles the city of Balabhib (Indra), which is inhabited by gods.

13. In the Śaka (year) reckoned by the mountains (7), the horses (7), the fires (3), and the moon (1) (i.e. 1377), in the auspicious year (called) Yuvān, in (the month of) Bhādrapada, on the day of an eclipse of the moon, at the city of Kūndavātī — the illustrious and victorious king Ganaḍēva gave to Brahmāsas the village named Chāvali, together with the water, with the eight powers (śatārthya), and with the eight enjoyments (bhāgya).

Here the gōtras, names and śākhās of the Brahmāsas are written in the order of the shares (bhāga) in prose (bhāsha): —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śākhā</th>
<th>Gōtra</th>
<th>Father's name.</th>
<th>Donee's name.</th>
<th>Number of shares.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Srivatasa.</td>
<td>Mādhava-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>Vālabhāchārya.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja.</td>
<td>Yālīyā.</td>
<td>Vālabbhājī.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Ayālaladhānī.</td>
<td>Ramāyōjā.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Harita.</td>
<td>Vīśvēyāra-Yajvan.</td>
<td>Śīngā-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Gārya.</td>
<td>Gaagānājī.</td>
<td>Kommanōjī.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja.</td>
<td>Ayālaladhānī.</td>
<td>Śoṇā-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Kurađīnīya.</td>
<td>Peddōjī.</td>
<td>Śīngāyōjā.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Harita.</td>
<td>Peddi-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>Vīṇā-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Āṭrēya.</td>
<td>Appale-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>Nāgāyōjī.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja.</td>
<td>Ayālaladhānī.</td>
<td>Sarvā-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Anantuṭjha.</td>
<td>Mādhava-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Nandōjī.</td>
<td>Yandōjī.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>do.</td>
<td>Kumāra-Svāmin.</td>
<td>Kumāyōjī.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Srivatasa.</td>
<td>Mādhava-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>Auchiṣa-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Kāyapa.</td>
<td>Peddōjī.</td>
<td>Māllāyōjī.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Āṭrēya.</td>
<td>Ananta-Bhaṭṭi.</td>
<td>Mādhava-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do.</td>
<td>Bhāradvāja.</td>
<td>Kumāra-Svāmin.</td>
<td>Appale-Bhaṭṭa.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[22] According to Brown's Telugu Dictionary, śīja, śīja or śīha means 'a priest, tutor, master.' Compare the Kannarese ogāna or ājana, which according to Sanderson's Canarese Dictionary, is a tadbhava of the Sanskrit upāja. The intermediate Pāli form upajha proves, however, that the word must be derived from the Sanskrit upāja.
MISCELLANEA.

THE DATE OF THE GRECO-BUDDHIST PEDESTAL FROM HASHTNAGAR.

Mr. V. A. Smith has published, ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 257, a facsimile of a so-called Arian, recte Kharoshtri inscription on the pedestal of a Greco-Buddhist sculpture, found by Mr. King at Hashtnagar, and in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society, Vol. LVIII. Pt. I. Plate x., an excellent photo-etching of the sculpture together with the inscription. In the articles accompanying the two reproductions of the document, he has given Sir A. Cunningham's reading: = San 274 ēmbarasīsā masa sa me pañcāhāmī 5.

Though the great archaeologist, to whom we owe the correct determination of many Kharoshtri signs, has undoubtedly succeeded in reading the figures, and thereby in settling the most important point, every student of Pāḍkrit will agree with me that his rendering of the words is open to improvement, because several of them are linguistically impossible. On comparing the facsimile and the photo-etching, I find that the line has to be read as follows:

San II O xx xx xx x iv Pāṭavaḍāsa másasa di[va]sahum par[h]a[cha]nī 5 [II*].

This is in Sanskrit:

स नूठी प्रति ग्रांथ साधन दिवसों प्या न 5 [II*]

and in English:

"The year 274, on the fifth, 5, day of the month of Prawšṭhapada (i.e., Bhādrapada or August-September)."

With respect to the characters of the inscription, I have to add that the right limb of the syllable põ has run together with the left portion of the figure 4, the lower part of which latter touches the foot of the vertical stroke of p. In the photo-etching the upper part of the vertical stroke of p is not visible, though it is unmistakable in the facsimile of the impression. The vowel-stroke of the syllable põ is attached rather low down to the vertical, and is nearly horizontal instead of slanting. In the Asoka Edicts such a stroke would denote not ō, but u. Here it must be ō, because in the later Kharoshtri inscriptions u is expressed by a loop at the foot of the consonantal sign.

The second sign of the first word ūtra consists of a vertical line, with one very short and one somewhat longer horizontal, attached to its left. Some scholars have read it tha or tha. 2 In the Asoka Edicts its most elaborate form is ꞏ. I have given my reasons for accepting Sir A. Cunningham's explanation in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. XLIII. p. 184 f. The va of divasāsāmi has been almost effaced, and the cha of pañcāhāmī has been injured. All the anusvāras stand below the line and are visible in the photo-etching alone. The last is injured and indistinct.

With respect to the difficult question to which era the year has to be referred, I can only say that Mr. Smith's alternative proposal to take San 274 as a Śaka year, and as equivalent to 352 A. D., seems to me improbable. For, the letters of the inscriptions look very like those of Kanishka's and Huvishka's Kharoshtrī inscriptions. Moreover, it is doubtful whether the Kharoshtrī writing was still used in the fourth century, A. D.

G. Bühler.

PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP.

No. 25.

The Revue Critique for 1889.

In the number for May 19th, M. Barth contributes a critique on M. J. Grosset's contribution to the study of Hindī music, already noticed in these pages. M. Barth is of opinion that Hindī music must continue to remain unintelligible to European scholars until it is taken in hand by a master of both the Hindī and European systems of the art. In default of this, M. Grosset has done his best with the very inadequate materials at his command.

The same author deals, in the number for May 27th, with Dr. Fick's edition of a Jaina version 2 of the legend of Sagara. The Jains have taken this saga and turned it into a stupid story for the edification of the faithful. The Pāḍkrit text is taken from the Kathānakas inserted by Devendrā Gani into his commentary on the Uttarādhyaṇa-Sūtra, on which Prof. Jacobi has already drawn for his well-known Pāḍkrit grammar and reading-book. To this is added a translation, notes and glossary.

In the number for the 18th and 26th August M. V. Henry reviews Prof. Johannes Schmidt's

and the form would likewise be correct Pāḍkrit for prawšṭhapadosa.

1 The representation of the Kharoshtrī figures in Roman figures has been taken over from Mr. A. V. Smith.

2 The reading pāṭavaḍāsa is linguistically possible.
work on the formation of the plural of Indo-Germanic neuters, in which it is contended that the Indo-European neuter plural, so far as we can judge from the scanty remains available, is not a single but a multiple category, and that its principal peculiarities must be referred, not to a true plural, but to a singular collective noun of the feminine gender. Thus *yugā, the yokes' (Vedic yugā, Gr. ὕγα, Lat. jugā, &c.), was primitively a substantive feminine, declined *yuga, *yugā, *yugān, and the inflexion *yugā, *yugān, is only due to false analogy. M. Henry combats this conclusion at some length. The points are too technical to be reproduced here.

The following number contains another review, by the same writer, on Dr. Otto Hoffmann's treatise on the Flexion and Stem-formation of the Present in the Original Indo-Germanic Language. The work is designed to be sufficiently clear to be intelligible to a beginner in the newer paths of linguistic study, and at the same time sufficiently complete to be useful to the specialist who wishes to find quickly any detail which may have escaped his memory. The author has well succeeded, though the excessive brevity rendered necessary by the scale of the work is sometimes misleading.

In the number for October 7th, we have a criticism of Van den Gheyn's European Origin of the Aryans, by M. S. Reinach. The author is one of those who combat the theory referred to in the title of his work. The book is a very complete résumé of all the arguments for and against this theory. The argument based on language, viz., that Lithuanian is more nearly related to the original language than Sanskrit, is far from conclusive, even if the foundation were solid in all points, (which it is not). The Canadians speak a more archaic dialect of French than the Parisians, and the Jews of Salonica speak that dialect of Spanish which is nearest to the language of Cervantes. Similarly are disposed of the Palaeontologic-linguistic arguments, founded on the alleged flora and fauna of the Primitive Aryans; the anthropological argument, founded on the equation, Aryan = a Fair-complexioned Dolichocephalic; the archaeological argument, dealing with the Swiss lacustrine cities; and the geographical one, founded on the theory that the Aryans would not have had sufficient pasture in Central Asia. In conclusion, the reviewer, agreeing with M. Van den Gheyn, adheres to the Asiatic theory, and maintains that it is still better to say nothing about the cradle of the Aryans, and to talk only of the centre of dispersion of Indo-European languages. As Prof. Max Müller remarks, when an ethnographer speaks of an Aryan race, or of Aryan blood, he is committing an error as great as if he spoke of a dolichocephalic dictionary, or a brachycephalic grammar.

Passing over a review* by M. S. Lévi of Prof. Darmesteter's Letters on India, which are directed more to the general reader than to the Indian student, and a short but favourable notice by Mr. G. Drouin† on Mr. V. Smith's Obituary of the Early Greeks, (in which the reviewer regrets that the author has not added a Plate giving facsimiles of the coin legends, with a comparative alphabet), we come to the last article which will interest readers of the Antiquary—a review by M. V. Henry of Dr. Otto Franke's treatise on Indian Genders. The work contains texts of the Liûgānâkṣānas of Sāktaśyana, Harshaśvarina and Varnruchi, together with extracts from the commentaries of Yakshaśvarman and Sāktaśyana, and an appendix on Hindī proper names. Each stanza in the text, which is not perfectly clear, has been translated, the portions of the commentaries are well selected, and a copious index enables the reader to find each word wherever it occurs. The introduction occupies half the volume, and in it Dr. Franke describes, amongst other matters, certain Liûgānâkṣānas hitherto unknown, and the chronology of the various Liûgānâkṣānas, Sāktaśyana and Varnruchi. The appendix deals with the principle of the formation of Indo-European proper names, with special reference to those of Greek and Sanskrit-India.

Allémant des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.

The Proceedings for 1889 possess few features of interest to Indian scholars. At the meeting of the 4th October, Dr. Leitner described the language, religion and customs of the Huns. This wild tribe nominally professes Islamism, but is in reality very far from it. Their religion is connected with that of the famous Hashishin or Assassins, and recognizes a prince, now resident in Bombay, as an incarnation of the deity. Their language is composed of words, each of which expresses an entire group of ideas, and

---

* Die Flexionsbildungen der Indo-Celte-Romischen Neutra. Weimar, Herman Bölaus, 1889.

† Das Prasens der Indo-Celte-Romischen Sprachre in seiner Flexion und Stammbildung. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1889.

‡ L'origine Européene des Aryas. Paris, Bureau des Années de Philosophie chrétienne, 1889.

* Number for October 21st.

* November 11th.

which cannot be translated by single words into European languages.\footnote{10}

At the meeting of 30th October, a communication was read from Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, the Parsi High Priest at Bombay, regarding the receptacles for human bones, brought from Persia by M. Djalalofy, and deposited in the Museum of the Louvre. While the modern Parsis deposit their dead in Towers of Silence, where the flesh is devoured by birds, and the bones are accumulated, the ancient Persians appear to have had the custom of depositing the bones in isolated receptacles. The sixth chapter of the \textit{Vedānta} describes separately two different methods of disposing of the dead. One consisted in laying the corpse on the summit of a mountain, exposed to the rays of the sun; and the other in collecting the bones after the flesh has been devoured. The \textit{Dādīmān-tānti}, a Pahlavi work, describes the ossuaries, called \textit{amodās}, in which these remains were kept. The preservation of the bones had for its object to render possible the future resurrection of the dead, who, according to the \Pārśa\ doctrine, \textit{rise from their bones}.\footnote{11}

G. A. \textsc{Griffith}.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

CUSTOMARY OFFERINGS TO PRIESTS IN BENGAL.

At Rāniganj and elsewhere I found miniature brass plates and cups, etc., made and sold in large quantities for the purpose of being used in the customary offerings to \textit{pūrṇātīs}. These, of course, contained a corresponding diminutive quantity of food. Is this a breaking-down of the custom of \textit{dan} or is it an old established custom by which the poor man could ostensibly gain as much merit by \textit{dan} as the rich man?

R. C. \textsc{Temple}.

BOOK-NOTICE.

\textsc{The Vedānta-Sūtras, with the Commentary by Sankara\varshya, translated by \textsc{George Thibaut}.} Part I. (Sacred Books of the East; Vol. XXXIV.). Oxford, 1890. Pp. xxviii, 432.

This stately volume contains the first half of the standard work of the Advaita school. Those who have tried to study any of the philosophical systems of the Hindus from the original text-books, can form an estimate of the difficulties which Dr. Thibaut had to overcome in the task of rendering the actual words of one of the deepest philosophers of ancient India into plain and elegant English, and of thus enabling the general reader to acquaint himself with the metaphysics of Sāṅkara as easily as with those of Spinoza. Sāṅkara's great work breathes the spirit of a noble and independent thinker. The bold and consequent manner in which he tries to solve the highest problems, ensures him a prominent place among the philosophers of all nations and ages. The perusal of his work will modify the views of the editor of a European hand-book which states in full earnest that Kāliḍā's \textit{Sakuntala} is one of the chief sources of our knowledge of Hindī philosophy.\footnote{1} In the masterly introduction which Dr. Thibaut has prefixed to his translation, he contrasts Sāṅkara's commentary on Bādarāyana's \textit{sūtras} with that of Rāmānuja, the head of the Visistādvaita school; and arrives at the important conclusion that a number of Rāmānuja's explanations seem to be in better accordance with the real tenets of Bādarāyana, while Sāṅkara's explanations are often forced and artificial. "If, now, I am shortly to sum up the results of the preceding enquiry as to the teaching of the \Sūtras, I must give it as my opinion that they do not set forth the distinction of a higher and lower knowledge of Brahman; that they do not acknowledge the distinction of Brahman and Īśvara in Sāṅkara's sense; that they do not hold the doctrine of the unreality of the world; and that they do not, with Sāṅkara, proclaim the absolute identity of the individual and the highest Self" (p. 6).

In connection with the present short notice of Dr. Thibaut's new volume, it may not be out of place to draw attention to his translation of an elementary treatise on the \Pārśa-Mundūkā system, the \textit{Arthasaṅgraha} by \textsc{Langākāshi-Bhāskarā}, which appeared in 1882 as No. 4 of the Benares Sanskrit Series. This difficult little book treats of the general maxims, according to which the \textit{kālpastra} rules for sacrifices are built up on the \textit{Sukhyās} and \textit{Bṛhadāraṇyakas}. Thus the \textit{Pārśa-Mundūkā} is a half-sister of the \textit{Uttara-Mundūkā} or \textit{Vedāntā}, which is based on the \textit{Āranyaka} portions of the \textit{Veda}, and the chief representative of which is Sāṅkara's \textit{Bhāṣṭya}.

\footnote{1} [All this is according to \textsc{Dr. Leitner}, be it understood. — \textsc{R. C. T.}]
\footnote{11} [The customs of the North American Indians may be noted in this connection. — \textsc{R. C. T.}]
EXAMINATION OF QUESTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE VIKRAMA ERA.

BY PROFESSOR F. KIELHORN, C. I. E.; GÖTTINGEN.

(Concluded from page 142.)

I TRUST that my lists of dates will show, in a fairly accurate manner, the practice of dating followed in connection with the Vikrama era from the earliest to the most modern times, and that the materials brought together will be regarded as sufficiently full and trustworthy, to warrant their being used in an attempt to answer some of the questions which have been indicated in an earlier part of those notes.

In the following I shall first endeavour to show what conclusions are suggested by the dates, regarding the questions of current and expired years, of northern and southern years, and of the pūrṇimānta and amānta schemes of the lunar months. I shall then indicate in what part of India we find the Vikrama era first employed, and where and by which dynasties it was used during the millennium succeeding the earliest known date. I shall examine and try to account for the names under which the era has been known at various times. And I shall conclude these notes with some matters of detail which either concern the Vikrama era only or have reference to the practice of dating generally.

Current and Expired Years; Northern and Southern Years; Pūrṇimānta and Amānta Schemes.

As any conclusions under these heads should, in the first instance, be drawn only from regular dates, I would here summarize the results of my calculations of the 150 dates, the details of which have been given ante, Vol. XIX. pp. 224-40 and 166-187, as follows:

Total number of dates examined: 150.

A.—Dates in bright fortnights.
Number of dates: 80 (from V. 898 to V. 1874).

1.—Dates in the months Kārttika to Phālgunā.
Number of dates: 26 (from V. 1016 to V. 1729).

Results:
(a).—Dates in current years: 2 (V. 1304 and V. 1397); i.e. 7.7%.
(b).—Dates in expired years: 24 (V. 1016 to V. 1729); i.e. 92.3%.

2.—Dates in the months Chaitra to Āsvina.
Number of dates: 54 (from V. 898 to V. 1874).

Results:
(a).—Dates in northern current years: 3 (V. 1311, 1380, and 1587); i.e. 10.2%.
(b).—Dates in north. exp. (or south. curr.) years: 27 (V. 919 to V. 1874); i.e. 50%.
(c).—Dates in southern expired years: 23 (V. 898 to V. 1746); i.e. 42.6%.
(d).—Uncertain, but probably in south. exp. year: 1 (V. 1200); i.e. 1.8%.

B.—Dates in dark fortnights.
Number of dates: 70 (from V. 960 to V. 1877).

1.—Dates in the months Kārttika to Phālgunā.
Number of dates: 27 (from V. 1043 to V. 1575).

Results:
(a).—Dates in current years: 2 (V. 1209 and V. 1393); i.e. 7.4%.

[pūrṇimānta: 2; amānta: 0.]
(b).—Dates in expired years: 20 (V. 1043 to V. 1875); i.e. 74.1\%.
[pūrṇimānta: 14; amānta: 6.]

(c).—Pūrṇimānta dates of current years or amānta dates of expired years: 5 (V. 1229 to V. 1535); i.e. 18.5\%.

2.—Dates in the months Chaitra to Āsvina.
Number of dates: 43 (from V. 960 to V. 1877).

Results:

(a).—Dates in northern current years: 2 (V. 1202 and V. 1236); i.e. 4.7\%.
[pūrṇimānta: 2; amānta: 0.]

(b).—Dates in north, exp. (or south, curr.) years: 15 (V. 960 to V. 1877); i.e. 34.9\%.
[pūrṇimānta: 12; amānta: 3.]}

(c).—Dates in southern expired years: 18 (V. 994 to V. 1533); i.e. 41.9\%.
[pūrṇimānta: 8; amānta: 10.]

Uncertain: 8; i.e. 18.6\%; viz.—

(d).—North, curr. amānta, or south, exp. pūrṇimānta: 2 (V. 1225 and V. 1390);
(c).—North, curr. amānta, or north, exp. or south, exp. pūrṇimānta: 1 (V. 1315);
(f).—North, exp. pūrṇimānta, or south, exp. amānta: 5 (V. 1332 to V. 1570).

Current and Expired Years.

The result obtained under A. 1, by which the years of only two dates out of 26 are current years, shows at once that it has been at all times the rule to quote the Vikrama years as expired years; and that current years were quoted only exceptionally. And this conclusion is supported by the combined results under A. 1 and 2, and B. 1 and 2, which show that only nine dates out of the total number of 150 must necessarily be regarded as dates in current years. Now this result, though it would not permit us to speak with confidence about any one individual date, may certainly be used, for statistical purposes, to pronounce an opinion on the nature of a whole set of dates, the years of which our calculations would permit us to regard as either current or expired.

Thus, the five dates under B. 1, c, which in accordance with our calculations might be regarded as either pūrṇimānta dates of current years, or amānta dates of expired years, may with little chance of error all be put down as amānta dates of expired years. And similarly the two dates under B. 2, d, be safely regarded as pūrṇimānta dates of southern expired years, and the date under B. 2, e, as a pūrṇimānta date of either a northern or southern expired year. Occasionally our proceeding in this manner may indeed be shown to be correct by independent arguments. This is the case e.g. with the date of the year V. 1225 in an inscription of the Mahāṇāyaka Pratāpadhavañaladēva, which by the result of the calculation falls under B. 2, d, (No. 143); for this date cannot be separated from another date of the same year V. 1225 in an inscription of the same chief (No. 126), which we know for certain to be a pūrṇimānta date of a southern expired year.

As regards the 27 dates under A. 2, b, and the 15 dates under B. 2, b, the years of which theoretically might be regarded as either northern expired or southern current years, it may safely be assumed that nearly all are dates in northern expired years, and they will all be classed as such below. But it cannot be denied that one or two of their number may really be dates in southern current years; and I mention this here at once to show that, in treating these dates as I do, I am not showing any undue favour to the southern year. The year of the single date under A. 2, d, may be taken to be the southern expired year, because the eclipse mentioned in the date was visible in India in that year only. As to the five dates under B. 2, f,
it is impossible to say from general considerations, whether their years should be regarded as northern or southern expired years.

Since current years are quoted only exceptionally, it may be questioned whether we should, in every case, at once accept as correct the result of the calculation of a date, where such calculation would lead us to regard the year of the date as a current year. As to the dates treated of under A. 1, a and 2, a, and B. 1, a, no choice is left to us. But the case may well seem to be different with the dates No. 108 and No. 109, under B. 2, a. By the strict results of our calculations these dates would indeed be pūrūnānta dates of northern current years. But in regard to both, good reasons, — partly connected with the Sūnya era on which we expect Mr. Fleet to enlighten us, and partly based on a consideration of the exact ending-time of the tithi, — might probably be adduced for rejecting the seemingly correct results and taking the two dates as amānta dates of northern expired years.

Northern and Southern Years.

In accordance with preceding remarks, and disregarding as exceptional the dates in current years, we may count as dates in northern (expired) years the dates under A. 2, b (with the exception of No. 47 which professes to belong to an Āśāṅgādi year), and those under B. 2, b; i.e., altogether 41 dates; and as dates in southern (expired) years the dates under A. 2, c, and B. 2, d, the date under A. 2, d, and the two dates under B. 2, d; i.e., altogether 44 dates.

For reasons given above, and because the two dates No. 113 and No. 117 under B. 2, b, might equally well be considered as dates in southern years, this classification perhaps hardly does full justice to the southern year; but taking it to be approximately correct, I find that the numbers of dates of either kind were:

up to V. 1200: 6 in northern years; 9 in southern years;

V. 1300: 17
V. 1400: 22
V. 1500: 26
V. 1600: 30
V. 1877: 41

Accordingly, the total number of dates in southern years for all times slightly exceeds the total number of dates in northern years. In the earliest centuries of which we possess dates which admit of verification, the dates in southern years are decidedly more numerous than those in northern years; but in later times the northern year has been gaining considerably on the southern year. In fact, it may be said that, while even down to V. 1400 the proportion of northern to southern years remained about 2:3, this proportion has just been inverted afterwards. The general conclusion to which these figures would seem to point, is, that the reckoning by southern (Kārttikādi) years was from the beginning intimately connected with the Vikrama era, just as the reckoning by northern (Chaitrādi) years has always been characteristic of the Saka era; and it may fairly be assumed that the change, which has gradually taken place towards a more general employment of the northern year in connection with the Vikrama era, is owing to the influence of the Saka era.

1 The year of one of the five dates (No. 149) is shown to be a southern expired year by the Jupiter year which is quoted along with it.

2 A week after the proof of this paper was returned by me to Mr. Fleet, I was informed by Dr. Klatt, that the reading of my date No. 1, as taken from Professor Peterson’s Report, must be wrong, because, according to the Āśāṅgādi, Udayavasā was Śrī from V. 1797 to V. 1826; and that the correct reading therefore would probably be abhūtā-kā-thā-inda = 1804, and not 1804. And calculating for V. 1804, expired, I find that the corresponding European date, as required, is Monday, the 4th January, A. D. 1745, when the full-moon tithi ended 15 h. after mean sunrise. Accordingly, of the 20 dates treated of under A. 1, the year of only a single date was really a current year.

It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that the following remarks on northern and southern years are necessarily confined to dates in the months Chaitra to Āśvina.
Here again, if from this point of view we look at the results of our calculations of some of the early dates, it may perhaps seem doubtful whether our calculation has yielded in every case the only possible or the true equivalent of the original date. The year 896 of our earliest regular date (No. 37) undoubtedly is a southern year. The year 919 of the second date (No. 30) is a northern expired year, but here it may be noted that this year is also described as the Saka year 784, a fact which will appear the more remarkable, when I say that down to V. 1439 this is the only instance in which the corresponding Saka year is mentioned by the side of the Vikrama year in any date of my lists, and which might well be taken to account somehow or other for the employment of the northern year. The third date, of the year 960 (No. 110) would by the strict results of my calculations be a pūrṇimānta date of a northern expired year; but when we consider that in the southern expired year, with the amānta scheme, the tīkhi of the date commenced exactly at sunrise of the weekday mentioned by the date and ended only 51 min. after mean sunrise of the next day, we may well ask whether such a result, for the southern expired year, should not be regarded as satisfying the requirements of the case equally well. The 4th, 5th and 6th dates, of the years 962, 994 and 1011 (Nos. 58, 123 and 59), are all dates in southern years. The 7th date, again of the year 1011 (No. 111), is by the results of my calculations a pūrṇimānta date of a northern expired year; but here too the tīkhi of the date, with the amānta scheme, ended in the southern expired year only 26 min. after sunrise of the day following the weekday of the date, so that what has been said above of the third date, would here also be applicable. The 8th and 9th dates, of the years 1042 and 1084 (Nos. 31 and 112), are dates in northern expired years; and the 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th dates, of the years 1100, 1139, 1154 and 1192 (Nos. 134, 60, 61 and 125), all belong again to southern expired years. I need not continue this enumeration further; enough has been said to show that the number of early dates in northern years is perhaps even smaller than appears at first sight. Besides, it must not be forgotten that, so far as the present question is concerned, the northern expired year is really equivalent to the southern current year, and that there is no stringent reason why, in one or other of the above dates which are here taken as dates in northern expired years, the writer should not be considered to have quoted, exceptionally, a current southern year.

The terms 'southern' and 'northern' years, which are usually employed to denote years commencing with the months Kārttika and Chaitra, would naturally lead one to suppose that the Kārttikādi reckoning had always been prevalent in the south and the Chaitrādi reckoning in the north of India. To show how entirely wrong such a supposition would be, and to prove that, whatever may be the practice of quite modern times, down to about the 14th century of the Vikrama era both kinds of years have been used over exactly the same tracts of country, I put before the reader all regular dates, the nature of whose years we are able to determine, from rocks and stones, most of which undoubtedly have always remained at the places where the dates were first engraved on them. What I would conclude from these lists, is, that the use of the so-called southern year was indeed discontinued in northern India about the end of the 14th century, but that before that time the southern year was used in the north much more frequently than the northern year. In my opinion it would be well to discard the terms 'southern' and 'northern' years altogether, and to call the years, what they really are, Kārttikādi and Chaitrādi years.

**Dates on rocks and stones,**

- **in southern (Kārttikādi) years:**
  - V. 898 (No. 57) Dholpur, Northern Bājpūrtānā.
  - V. 994 (No. 133) Sīyājār, N. W. Provinces.
  - V. 1011 (No. 59) Khaṇjūtāhā, Bundelkhand.
  - V. 1100 (No. 134) Byānā, Northern Bājpūrtānā.
  - V. 1154 (No. 61) Dēgadh, Gwālior.
  - V. 1192 (No. 128) Kālanjār, Bundelkhand.

- **in northern (Chaitrādi) years:**
  - V. 910 (No. 30) Dēgadh, Gwālior; [Saka 724].
  - V. 960 (No. 110) Tērāhī, Gwālior; [perhaps southern].
  - V. 1011 (No. 111) Ambār, North Bājpūrtānā; [perhaps southern].
  - V. 1194 (No. 113) Kālanjār, Bundelkhand.
The Pūrṇimānta and Amānta Schemes.

Proceeding as before, and omitting as doubtful whether they should be considered as pūrṇimānta or amānta the dates under B. 2, a and f, and the dates No. 110 and No. 111 under B. 2, b, I find that of 61 dates 37 may be regarded as pūrṇimānta and 24 as amānta dates; and that the numbers of either kind of dates were:

up to V. 1200: 5 pūrṇimānta; 2 amānta;
  V. 1300: 14
  V. 1400: 21
  V. 1500: 24
  V. 1600: 28
  V. 1877: 37

Accordingly, the percentage of pūrṇimānta dates up to V. 1200 was about 71, between V. 1200 and 1400 about 55, between V. 1400 and 1600 about 50, and between V. 1600 and 1877 about 82. This may be taken to show that in early times the pūrṇimānta scheme of the lunar months was more commonly followed in connection with the Vikrama era than the amānta scheme, that afterwards the amānta scheme has been gaining considerably on the pūrṇimānta scheme, and that a change in favour of a more general employment of the pūrṇimānta scheme has again taken place in quite modern times.

Of the 61 dates to which these remarks refer, 20 can be shown to be dates in southern (Kārttikādī) and 13 in northern (Chaitrādī) expired years. Of the former, 10 are amānta, and 3 undoubtedly and two others most probably pūrṇimānta dates; of the latter, 10 are pūrṇimānta, and 3 amānta dates. These figures show that, while the southern (Kārttikādī) year has been joined with the pūrṇimānta as often as with the amānta scheme, the northern (Chaitrādī) year is more commonly joined with the pūrṇimānta scheme only; and they prove with certainty that neither scheme of the lunar months is necessarily and exclusively connected with either the southern (Kārttikādī) or the northern (Chaitrādī) year.

Locality and Names of the Era.

In order to ascertain where the era has been principally used and what names have been applied to it, it will probably be considered sufficient to examine the first 200 dates in the chronological list which I have given above, pp. 125 to 142, down to about A. D. 1300. The more recent dates are naturally of less importance and many of them are from MSS. and literary works regarding the locality of which I possess no exact information. Such is the case, too, with a few of the earlier dates, chiefly dates taken from MSS. which therefore will also be omitted in the following.
In my chronological list I have put queries against four of the earliest dates (Nos. 1, 2, 8, and 9), to show that doubts may possibly be entertained regarding their reading or exact interpretation. As these dates in no way affect my conclusions, I shall here take them to have been correctly given and explained by others. But I shall omit the date No. 6, of the Dhiniki copper-plate inscription of Jāïkādeva, which apparently is a forged document.

Where and by which Dynasties was the Era used up to about A. D. 1800?

The date No. 1 (V. 428) is from Bījayagadā, in north-eastern Rājputānā; No. 2 (V. 490) from Gaṅgādhār, in south-eastern Rājputānā; Nos. 3 and 4 (V. 529 and 589) are from Maudāsr, on the borders of south-eastern Rājputānā; No. 5 (V. 746) is from Jhālāhapāta, in south-eastern Rājputānā; No. 7 (V. 795) from Kaṇaswa, in south-eastern Rājputānā; No. 8 (V. 811) from Chitār, in southern Rājputānā; No. 9 (V. 879) from Kōtā, in south-eastern Rājputānā; and No. 10 (V. 898) from Dhōlpur, in north-eastern Rājputānā.

The earliest known dates, from V. 428 to 695, are therefore all from eastern Rājputānā, chiefly from that part of eastern Rājputānā which borders on, or is included in, Mālavā.—From the same part of India, and from Rājputānā generally, we also have the following later dates: No. 17 (V. 962) from Bhīllāmāla (Bhīllamāl); No. 31 (V. 1011) from Ambār; No. 33 (V. 1016) from Rājārājak; No. 50 (V. 1100) from Byāna; No. 52 (V. 1136) from Archānā; No. 120 (V. 1231) from Vīsālpur; No. 133 (V. 1244) from Tāhanga; Nos. 184 and 189 (V. 1324 and 1336) from Chitār; No. 194 (V. 1342) from Mount Abū; and No. 196 (V. 1344) from Udaypur.

The last of the above early dates, No. 10, is from an inscription of the Chāhumāna Chaṇḍamahāśēna; and later dates of Chāhumāna princes are: No. 98 (V. 1210) of Vīghrabājādevā; No. 104 (V. 1213) of Alḥājaḍēva; No. 105 (V. 1220) of Vīsālādevā; No. 109 (V. 1224) of Pithvīrāja; No. 114 (V. 1226) of Śomēsvara; and Nos. 115, 128, and 134 (V. 1226, 1239, and 1244) of Pithvīrāja.

From Rājputānā the list takes us in an eastern direction, first to the neighbouring State of Gwalior, and afterwards through Bundelkhand and Bēwā as far as Gāyā in Bihār.

No. 11 (V. 919), from an inscription of Bhōjaḍēva of Kanauj, is from Dēogadh in the Gwalior State; Nos. 12 and 13 (V. 932 and 933), are from inscriptions of the same king in the Fort of Gwalior; No. 14 (V. 936) is from Gyrāispur, and No. 15 (V. 969) from Tērahi, both in the Gwalior State; and No. 16, 18-21, 25-27, 29, and 34 (V. 960, 964, 965, 967, 969, 991, 994, 1005, 1008, and 1025), of the reigns of Mahendrapālādevā and Dēvapālādevā of Kanauj, are from Śyāḍōgī in Bundelkhand.

No. 30 (V. 1011), from an inscription of the Chandella Dhanag, is the first of a long series of dates of the Chândōllas of Bundelkhand, to which also belong: No. 32 (V. 1011) of Yāśēvarman and Dhaṅga; Nos. 41 and 43 (V. 1055 and 1059) of Dhaṅgadēva; No. 51 (V. 1107) of Dēvavarmadēva; No. 60 (V. 1151) of Kirtivarmanadēva; No. 67 (V. 1173) of Jayavarmanadēva; Nos. 75, 77, 78, 80, 94, 99, and 101 (V. 1185, 1187, 1188, 1190, 1203, 1211, and 1215) of Madana- varmadēva; Nos. 103, 129, 137, and 142 (V. 1234, 1240, 1252, and 1253) of Paramardēva; Nos. 150, 168, and 170 (V. 1269, 1297, and 1298) of Trālōkvyavarmadēva; Nos. 180, 185, and 191 (V. 1317, 1325, and 1337) of Viravarman; and No. 197 (V. 1345) of Bhōjavarman.

Other dates from Gwalior and Bundelkhand are: No. 42 (V. 1058) from Khanjūrāh; No. 49 (V. 1093) from Udayagiri; Nos. 55 and 59 (V. 1145 and 1152) from 'Dubkul'; Nos. 58 and 65 (V. 1150 and 1161) from Gwalior; Nos. 83, 85, and 193 (V. 1192, 1194, and 1340) from Kalānjar; No. 91 (V. 1227) from Chandpur; No. 107 (V. 1222) from Udaypur in Gwalior; Nos.

*See ante, Vol. XIX. p. 371. I would now also say that in V. 794 the Vikrama era was not used yet in the locality to which the inscription belongs.
116 and 131 (V. 1227 and 1243) from Ajayagadh; No. 130 (V. 1240) from Mahôba; and No. 181 (V. 1318) from Jhânsí.

From the tracts of country east of Bundelkhand as far as Gayâ, and those north of Bundelkhand and Râwah up to the Jumna and the Ganges, and north of these rivers as far as Jaunpur, we have the following dates: No. 102 (V. 1216) from Alha-ghât; No. 139 (V. 1253) from Râwah; No. 110 (V. 1225) from Phulwariya (?); No. 112 (V. 1225) from the Târkhândi rock; Nos. 28, 123, and 186 (V. 1005, 1232 and 1325) from Gayâ; No. 22 (V. 974) from the Aṣnî inscription of Mahâlápâlêdévâ of Kanauj; No. 48 (V. 1033), from 'Kurrah'; No. 88 (V. 1199) from Gaûjâ; No. 45 (V. 1083) from Sârnâth; and No. 199 (V. 1533) from Jaunpur.

To the south-east of Râjputânâ, and adjoining it, is Mâlava. Of the Paramâra princes of this country and their successors we have the following dates: Nos. 35, 36, and 40 (V. 1031, 1036, and 1050) of Vâkpatîrâja-Muñjî; No. 44 (V. 1078) of Bhûjadévâ; No. 53 (V. 1137) of Udayâdîya; Nos. 64 and 65 (V. 1161 and 1164) of Naravarmandévâ; Nos. 82 and 84 (V. 1191 and 1192) of Yâsavarmandévâ; No. 89 (V. 1200) of Lakshmîvarmandévâ; No. 126 (V. 1235 and 1236) of Harîchandradévâ; No. 140 (V. 1256) of Udayavarmandévâ; Nos. 149, 151, and 152 (V. 1257, 1270, and 1272) of Arjunavarmandévâ; Nos. 153, 158, and 163, (V. 1275, 1286, and 1289) of Dênapalâdévâ; and No. 176 (V. 1312) of Jayasiîmâdévâ. To Mâlava also belongs No. 81 (V. 1190) from Inghôdâ.

Adjoining Râjputânâ, on the south, and west of Mâlava, was the kingdom of Anhîvâd (including Kâthiâvâd), the Chauluka and Vaghâla rulers of which furnish us with the following long list of dates: No. 38 (V. 1043) of Mâlara; No. 47 (V. 1086) of Bhumîdévâ I; Nos. 56 and 57 (V. 1145 and 1148) of Karradévâ; Nos. 71 and 86 (V. 1179 and 1196) of Jayasîmâh dévâ; Nos. 90, 96, 103 and 106 (V. 1205, 1208, 1218, and 1220) of Kumârâpalâdévâ; Nos. 118, 119, and 121 (V. 1229, 1231, and 1232) of Ajayapalâdévâ; Nos. 136, 141, 144-148, 156, 159, 161, 165, and 166 (V. 1251, 1256, 1261, 1263, 1264, 1266, 1268, 1287, 1288, 1295, and 1296) of Bhûmadévâ II; No. 155 (V. 1280) of Jayantasiîmâh; No. 171 (V. 1299) of Tribhuvanapalâdévâ; Nos. 172, 175, and 179 (V. 1303, 1311, and 1317) of Vishaładévâ; No. 182 (V. 1320) of Arjunâdévâ; and Nos. 190, 195, and 198 (V. 1333, 1343, and 1350) of Sûradévâ.—From Kâthiâvâd we have, besides, the dates Nos. 100, 160, and 162 (V. 1215, 1288, and 1289) from Gîrnâr; and No. 177 (V. 1315) from Siyâl Bêt.

A few early dates of some of the rulers of Kanauj, north-east of Râjputânâ, have been already given above. Of the later Bâtbor princes of Kanauj we have the following dates: No. 61 (V. 1154) of Chandradévâ and Madanapaladévâ; Nos. 62 and 66 (V. 1161 and 1166) of Madanapâla and Gòvindachandradévâ; Nos. 68, 70, 72-74, 76 and 79 (V. 1174, 1177, 1181, 1182, 1185, 1187, and 1188) of Gòvindachandradévâ and Râjyapaladévâ; Nos. 93 and 95 (V. 1207 and 1208) of Gòvindachandra's queen Gâsaladévî; Nos. 111 and 113 (V. 1225) of Vijayachandradévâ; and Nos. 122, 124, 125, 127, and 132 (V. 1232, 1233, 1234, 1236, and 1243) of Jayachchandradévâ.—To some of the later chiefs of Kanauj apparently belong Nos. 138 and 154 (V. 1253 and 1276). And from places north-east of Râjputânâ we have, besides, the dates No. 39 (V. 1049) from Dêwâl; No. 92 (V. 1207) from Mahâbân; and No. 192 (V. 1337) from Rôhtak.

With the exception of two or three dates from inscriptions and about a dozen dates from MSS. about the locality of which I am not certain, the above are all the dates in my chronological list down to the year V. 1359 or about A.D. 1300; and the result of this examination may be stated thus:—

Our earliest known dates, to about V. 900, are all from eastern Râjputânâ, especially from that part of eastern Râjputânâ which borders on, or is included in, Mâlava. From there, if we may judge by the dates collected, the era spread first towards the north-east and east, to Kanauj and to Gwâlior and Bundelkhand, and afterwards towards the south-east and south, to Mâlava.
proper and Aphilvád (including Káthiávád). And, speaking generally, down to about A.D. 1300 the use of the era was confined to that comparatively small portion of India which would be included by straight lines drawn from the mouth of the Narbadá to Gayá, from Gayá to Delhi, and from Delhi to the Rann of Cutch, and by the line of coast from the Rann of Cutch back to the mouth of the Narbadá. Within these limits and down to the time mentioned the era was officially employed especially by the Chaulukya and Vágbháta princes of Aphilvád, the Paramáras of Málava, the Chandélás of Buudelkhand, the earlier and later dynasties of Kanaúj, and the chiefs of Rájputáná.

Names of the Era.

By far the greater number of dates contain nothing to show what era was followed by the writer. It is true that from early times the word ‘year,’ in dates of this era, has been mostly expressed either by the full word sañcāvatara or by the abbreviated terms sañcātra or sañcā, and that in consequence the term sañcāvatara has been supposed to denote exclusively a year of this particular era, and that the era itself has been described as the ‘Sañcātra-era.’ But in reality sañcāvatara and sañcā may be used of the years of any era, and only in quite modern times are these terms by the Hindus themselves employed to distinguish Vikrama from Saka years.5

Irrespective of this modern usage, the years of only 63 dates of my chronological list are qualified by certain words or phrases which were intended to specify the era used; and it is in consequence of the employment of such words or phrases that the era is spoken of as either the Málava or the Vikrama era. The number of dates which have given rise to the former designation is only five; 58 dates of my list are expressly referred to the Vikrama era.

The Málava Era.

The five dates (Nos. 3, 4, 7, 14, and 115), the years of which are qualified by phrases containing the word Málava, occur all in inscriptions which are in verse, and are from places close to, or included in, Málava. The expressions actually used by the poets are three: in the Mandasáro inscriptions of V. 493-529 and V. 589, Málavánáha gaṇapakhyá and Málava-gaṇa aṭhiti-váahá, years ‘according to the reckoning of the Málavás’; in the Kajkasa inscription of V. 795 and the Meúálgadh inscription of V. 1226, Málavánáha sañcāvatara- and Málavás-gaṇa-váahá, ‘years of the Málava lords’ or ‘years elapsed of the Málava (lord or) lords’; and in the Gárispur inscription of V. 936, Málava-kútáchechhadanábha, ‘years (elapsed from the commencement of the Málava time (or era)).’ As regards these phrases, the poet who recorded the late date of V. 1226 probably took the expression which he employed from some earlier poem; and altogether the phrases need not necessarily be considered to contain an indication regarding the origin of the era; but they show that from about the 5th to the 9th century this era was by poets believed to be especially used by the princes and people of Málava, while another era or other eras were known to be current in other parts of India. At the same time, considering that our earliest dates are actually from south-eastern Rájputáná and the parts of Málava adjoining it, the employment of the word Málava in connection with the era may be taken to point out fairly accurately the locality in which the era was first employed. What special circumstances may have given rise to its establishment, I am unable to determine at present.

The Vikrama Era.

When we examine the dates of my list to about V. 1400, the first thing to strike us is that while among the first fifty dates (down to V. 1100) we find only three which the writers expressly refer to the Vikrama era, there are seven such dates among the dates 51-100 (from V. 1100 to V. 1215), fourteen among the dates 101-150 (from V. 1215 to V. 1269), and seventeen among the dates 151-207 (from V. 1269 to V. 1384). For these figures would seem to indicate that the

5 See Professor Bháyáhar’s Report for 1883-84, pp. 158-160.
connection of Vikrama with the era grew up gradually, or was an innovation which took centuries to become generally adopted. And here it may be stated at once that the earliest date (of the year V. 898) which contains the word vikrama at all, describes the era somewhat vaguely as 'the time called vikrama,' and that only about 150 years later, in a poem composed in V. 1060, we hear for the first time of a prince or king Vikrama, in connection with the era.

The next point to arrest our attention is that, with one slight exception which would rather prove the rule, down to V. 1400 the only princes who used expressions containing the word vikrama in the dates of their documents, were the Chaulukya and Vaghela rulers of Anhilvâd, and that the phraseology employed in the inscriptions of these princes clearly shows a gradual advance from the simple 'year' to the year (of the era) established by the illustrious Vikramâditya. The earliest Chaulukya copper-plate (date No. 38), a grant of the king Mûlarâja, is dated sahit, 'in the year,' 1068. In the copper-plates of Mûlarâja's successors, and in other inscriptions and MSS., the dates of which are referred to the reign of one or other of them, we find in the place of the simple sahit the following phrases:—

vikrama-sahit, in a copper-plate of Bhimâdêva I. of the year 1086, and in a copper-plate of Karandâva of the year 1148 (dates No. 47 and 57);

Srî-nripa-Vikrama-sahit, in a stone inscription of Jayasihhadêva of the year 1196 (No. 86);

Srînâsad-Vikrama-sahit, in a stone inscription of the reign of Kumârâpaladêva of the year 1202 (No. 90);

Nîpa-Vikrama-kâlād-arvâk, in a copper-plate of the reign of Ajayapaladêva of the year 1231 (No. 119);

Srî-Vikrama-nripatēh sahit and srî-Vikrama-narēndra-sahit, in MSS. of the reign of Bhimâdêva II. of the years 1251 and 1261 (Nos. 136 and 144);

Srînâsad-Vikramâditya-stpâdita-sahitvatsara- in copper-plates of Bhimâdêva II. of the years 1256, 1263, 1283, 1291, 1295, 1296, and in a copper-plate of Tribhuvanapaladêva of the year 1299 (Nos. 141, 145, 156, 159, 161, 165, 166, and 171);

Srînâsad-Vikrama-nripa-kâlittita-sahitvatsara- and srî-Vikrama-sahit, in a copper-plate of Bhimâdêva II. of the year 1266 (No. 148);

Srînâsad-Vikrama-kâlittita-sahitvatsarē, in a copper-plate of the Vaghêla Visaladêva of the year 1317 (No. 179);

Srî-nripa-Vikrama-sahit, in stone inscriptions of the reigns of Arjunadêva and Sârângadêva of the years 1320 and 1343 (Nos. 182 and 195).

Besides, srî-Vikrama-sahit also occurs in two inscriptions of the years 1288 and 1288 or 89 (Nos. 160 and 162) at Gîrînr in Kâthiavâd which belonged to Anhilvâd; and we find srî-Vikrama-kâlitita-sahitvatsara- exceptionally in three copper-plates, of the years 1191, 1235, and 1256 (Nos. 82, 126, and 140), of the later Paramâras of Mâlava who, in employing a phrase of this kind, may well be supposed to have imitated their neighbours, the kings of Anhilvâd, who more than once had conquered portions of Mâlava.

Now, what I would lay particular stress on in regard to the above expressions, is the gradual change which may be observed in the phraseology of the dates from the time of Mûlarâja to that of Bhirradêva II. In the copper-plate of Mûlarâja the year of the date is simply called sahit, 'the year.' In the grants of Bhirradêva I. and Karandâva the year becomes 'the vikrama-year.' This expression, under Jayasihhadêva, Kumârâpaladêva and Ajayapaladêva, is changed to 'the year of the illustrious Vikrama,' or 'the year of the illustrious prince Vikrama,' or 'the year reckoned from the time of the prince Vikrama.' And finally, under Bhirpadêva II., about A.D. 1200, we have 'the year (of the era) established by the illustrious Vikramâditya.' In fact, that phrase which, supposing the era to have been established by or
invented in memory of a king Vikrama-ditya, we should have expected to find in the very earliest dates, we actually meet with only in some of the latest dates.

In addition to the dates enumerated we have, down to V. 1400, altogether seventeen dates which are expressly referred to the Vikrama era; and these seventeen dates again have this in common, that (exactly like the dates which are referred to the Mālava era), all occur in inscriptions or literary works which are in verse. And in fourteen out of these seventeen dates the date itself is in verse and forms part of the poem, while in three instances it is in prose and has been added at the end of a poem. The exact terms in which the poets refer to the era in these dates, are as follows:

No. 10 (V. 898), from a Chāhumāna inscription at Dholpur: *gatasya kālasya vikrama-śākyasya, 898 years of the time called vikrama*, gone by.

No. 40 (V. 1050), from Amitagati’s *Subhāshita-ratna-saṅdōha: samārūghā pūta-trīdāvastu vikrama-nriṇe, ‘after king Vikrama had ascended to the pure dwelling of the immortals’.*

No. 54 (V. 1139), from a *praśasti* by Guruchandra-gaṇi: *Vikrama-kālāmmi ‘in the time from Vikrama’*;

No. 58 (V. 1149), from an inscription at Gwalior: *gatēsu-abdēhu Vikramatī, ‘years gone by from Vikrama’*;

No. 114 (V. 1226), from a Chāhumāna inscription at Biholt: *kēlō Vikramabhāsvata, ‘in the time of Vikrama-ditya’*;

No. 121 (V. 1232), from the *Naraspati-jayacharyā: Vikramāra-gatē kēlē, ‘in the time gone by from Vikramāra’*;

No. 130 (V. 1240), from an inscription at Mahōta: *Sāhasāḥkasya vatsurē ‘in the year of Sāhasāḥka (i.e. Vikrama-ditya)*;

Nos. 137 (V. 1252) and 180 (V. 1317), from Chandella inscriptions at Bādīvar and Ajaygaōr: *Vikrama-vatsurē, ‘in the Vikrama year’*;

No. 143 (V. 1260), from a *praśasti* by Malayaprabhaṣūrī: *ēri-Vikramatī gatēsu, years gone by since the illustrious Vikrama*;

Nos. 201 and 202 (V. 1305), from Jinaprabha’s *Bhayaharaustava-nrīti and Ajitaśantaśivavvṛiti: saENVatēvikrama-bhāpatī, ‘in the year of the king Vikrama’*;

Nos. 206 and 207 (V. 1384), from Delhi Museum inscriptions: *abdē Vikramārkaṇḍaḥ and Vikram-ibbē, ‘in the year from Vikramāra’, or ‘of Vikrama’.*

The above are all from verses; the following are from dates in prose, added at the end of poems:

No. 63 (V. 1161), from an inscription at Gwalior: *ēri-Vikramārka-nrīpa-kāl-śīta-saENVatērā*;

No. 105 (V. 1229), from the Delhi Siwālik pillar inscription: *saENVatēēri-Vikramādityē; and No. 192 (V. 1337), from the *Pālam Bōli* inscription: *saENVatēsmīnēVikramādityē.*

Now, considering that eleven of these seventeen dates are from inscriptions in Rājputāna and districts north of Rājputāna, and in Gwalior and Bundelkhānd, the result of our examination may be stated thus:

The earliest known instance of the word vikrama occurring in a date we find in an inscription in verse, by which the year 898 is referred to ‘the time called vikrama’; a prince or a king Vikrama is for the first time spoken of in connection with the era in a poem composed in V. 1050; and over the largest part of the territories in which the era was used...

---

8 In verse 276 of Dhanapāla’s *Pūrṇānico* the year 1029 also is referred to the vikrama-kāla. This date I had overlooked when compiling my chronological list.
it was, down to V. 1400, styled the Vikrama era by poets only. In official documents the description of the era as Vikrama era is practically confined to the kingdom of Áphila, and the inscriptions of the rulers of that kingdom show how the original expression sahahāt, "the year," (in V. 1086) first became the vikrama-saṃvatsara, and was afterwards further amplified until about A. D. 1200, it had become the year of the era established by the illustrious Viśramāditya. In the language of both poetry and prose, what we may call the technical expressions 'Vikrama era' and 'year of the king Vikrama' were preceded by the simpler or vaguer terms 'vikrama-time' and 'vikrama-year;' and my chronological list shows that, the later the dates, the more frequently were their years expressly referred to the Vikrama era.

This state of the case, in my opinion, certainly tends to show that the era was neither established by, nor designedly invented in memory of, a king Viśramāditya. Had it been founded by a king Viśramāditya in 58 B. C., or had there existed any tradition to that effect, it would indeed be more than strange that no allusion should ever have been made to this for more than a thousand years afterwards. And had it been invented in memory of some great king, the name of that king would surely have been prominently mentioned in the earliest dates, and would not have been brought to our notice gradually and, as it were, hesitatingly, when the era had already been in use for at least five hundred years. Besides, it must be borne in mind (though on this I would lay little stress) that, independently of the fact that this era commences in 58 B. C., nothing has yet been brought forward to prove the existence of a king Viśramāditya in the century preceding the birth of Christ. And as regards the late Mr. Ferguson's theory, according to which the Brāhmans, during the tenth or eleventh century A. D., in memory of a king Viśramāditya, invented this era which they made to commence in A. D. 544, but for convenience of reckoning antedated 600 years, that theory, highly artificial as it was in itself, can no longer be upheld, because we now possess at least two (contemporaneous) dates which are anterior to A. D. 544.

The reason why the era in later times was joined with the name of a king Vikrama, has therefore still to be sought; and, as suggested by the dates, the question in the first instance would appear to be, how and in which sense the word vikrama originally came to be connected with the years of the era.

We have seen above that the greater number of early dates which admit of verification belong to southern (Kārttikādī) years, and have arrived at the conclusion that this reckoning by Kārttikādī years was a distinguishing feature of the Vikrama era. While the Saka year began with the month Chaitra (March-April), the Vikrama year originally commenced with the month Kārttika (October-November), the former began in spring, the Vikrama year began in autumn.

Now autumn (kānda) in India was the season when kings went out to war; autumn was pre-eminently the Vikrama-kāla. This the poets knew as well as the authors of the Nīti- and Dharma-pātras, and are never tired of impressing on us. In the Rāmāyana Rāma says to Sūrya:—

This is the month of Śrī, first!
Of those that see the rain-clouds burst.

1 See Professor Max Müller's India, what can it teach us?, p. 284:—"The whole theory would collapse if one single coin or stone could be produced dated (contemporaneously) A. D. 543."
2 See Mr. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, Introduction, p. 51, note 2:—"It can hardly be doubted that the original scheme of the Vikrama years is the one commencing with the first day of the bright fortnight of Kārttika."
3 I cannot quote in the remark of Mr. Fleet that the counting of the era by autumns is worth noting "as being one of the points which identify the Māvāra era with the Vikrama era;" for the word kānda also occurs in dates of other eras, and its employment is due to the fact that the writers of the dates were poets.
4 Professor Goldner draws my attention to the fact that already in the Rigveda Indra destroys the strongholds of the demons in autumn. Compare Rigveda, i, 131, 4; 174, 2; ii, 12, 11; vi, 20, 10. — According to Varāhamihira's Brāhmaṇa-sūtras, xlv, 1 and 2, the instruction of horses, elephants, and troops (preparatory to going out to war), is to take place on the eighth, twelfth, or fifteenth of the bright half of Kārttika or Śrāvana.
5 See the Kāchchhadādās, xxvi, 14-17, and xxx, 66-61. I quote above from Mr. Griffith's Translation.
Four months, thou knowest well, extends
The season when the rain descends.
No time for deeds of war is this:
Seek thou thy fair metropolis,
And I with Lakshmaṇ, O my friend,
The time upon this hill will spend.

When Kārttiṭī's month shall clear the skies,
Then tempt the mighty enterprise.

And later on he thus laments over the inactivity of his ally:

Lord Indra thousand-eyed has sent
The sweet rain from the firmament,
Sees the rich promise of the grain,
And turns him to his rest again.
The clouds with voices loud and deep,
Veiling each tree upon the steep,
Upon the thirsty earth have shed
Their precious burden, and are fled.

Now in kings' hearts ambition glows:
They rush to battle with their foes;
But in Sūrīṇa's sloth I see
No care for deeds of chivalry.¹¹

In the Rāghuvaṃśa Rāghu undertakes his dīvījaya in autumn. Autumn, decorated with lotus-flowers, approaches him like a second Rājalakṣamī, and invites him to set out before Rāghu himself is resolved; in autumn the bulls even seek to equal him in viśrama.¹² Similarly Bhāravi speaks of autumn at the marching out of Arjuna.¹³ In the Rāvaṇaśākhi and in the Bhaṭṭīkīṣya Rāma sets out in autumn to slay Rāvaṇa and regain Sītā.¹⁴ In the Gauḍāvahā Yaśōvarma starts at the end of the rainy season, in autumn, to subject the whole earth to his sway.¹⁵ In the Harshacharita, Bāha speaks of the grey beard of an aged warrior as the beginning of autumn (jara-dṛamkha), white with flowering grasses, ejected again from the mouth after it had been drunk at war-time (viśrama-kīṭī).¹⁶ In the third act of the Mūḍrārakṣasana the poet devotes several stanzas to the description of autumn, solely to intimate to the audience

¹¹ The original text, in the Bombay edition, is:

Anyānya-buddha-vairāṇā jīvahūṣṭāṁ nṛpaṁ ṃ tāṅkā nāyaṁ sugūśaṁ cha tathāvādham

¹² See Rāghuvaṃśa, iv, 14, 22, and 24.

¹³ See Kīrtīkīṣyana, iv.

¹⁴ See Rāvaṇaśākhi, ed. by S. Goldschmidt, i, 14 and 16:—

"With difficulty passed for Dāśaratha the rainy season,—the evening twilight for the sun of his energy, the strong fetter for the elephant of his anger, the cage of the lion of victory.

Then there came,—for the monkey chief the path of glory, the prime support of the life of Rāghava, for Sītā the stoppage of her tears, for the Ten-headed the day of death,—there came the autumn."

And compare also i, 34, where the commentary has the note: jara-samayē bhāḍṭīsāṁ gṛhā ādityaṁ udāyasya bhavaṁ,

See also Bhaṭṭīkīṣya, vii, 14; and compare particularly ii, 1, with the remarks of the commentators.

¹⁵ See Gauḍāvahā, verse 122.

¹⁶ The passage of the Harshacharita, referred to in the above, occurs in the 6th uccaḥvīte (on p. 156 of the Calcutta edition), and has been already cited by Mr. S. P. Paṇḍīt in the Introduction of his edition of the Gauḍāvahā, p. 102, but explained altogether differently, probably because Mr. Paṇḍīt's text was corrupt and yields no sense at all. My own reading of the text is: samaṁ śuc ca viśramā-kīṭā-pādāṁ akāś-पिकी-कालो नूकना-पिकातम जहाँ-क्रिया-धरणे. In my opinion Bāha would never have used the expression viśramā-kīṭā in the way he does, if it had been already in his time a technical term denoting an era.
that, as Chāṇakya puts it, the time is one for warlike exertion, not for festivities. In the prologue of a play which treats of war, it is the season of autumn that must be sung about.

From autumn, the true vikrama-kāla, it is but a short step to the year being called vikrama-kāla, and in my opinion the Hindus did take this step, and the vikrama-kāla of the dates originally is nothing else than the poets' war-time, from autumn transferred to the year. Since poets were accustomed to speak of sarad as vikrama-kāla, it was but natural that this expression should have become connected also with sarad in the sense of 'year,' especially as sarad has always been with poets a most common word for year; and to describe the year as vikrama-kāla must have seemed the more appropriate as suggesting that which was the characteristic feature of the year which people were using, namely, the fact that that year commenced in autumn, the season of war. Thus the usage of the poets would first have led to the employment, in connection with the years of the era, of the terms vikrama-kāla and vikrama-saṅkhaṭa era or vikrama-saṅkhaṭa, the very terms which we meet with in the earliest dates that contain the word vikrama.

Afterwards, when the origin and the true meaning of the terms vikrama-kāla and vikrama-year had been forgotten, people would seek to interpret those terms after the manner of their time, and, Vikrams being a well-known name of famous kings, they would naturally connect the era with a king of that name who would be supposed, either, like their own kings, to have counted the years from his accession, or to have otherwise given occasion for the establishment of the era. The manner in which the change actually took place, is clearly indicated by the dates which we have examined. The vikrama-time and the vikrama-year became 'the time of the illustrious Vikrama' and 'the year of the illustrious Vikrama.'

The name thus created for the era could not of course at once have been used everywhere, but would only have been adopted gradually; and accordingly, when we see it occur rarely in the earlier and more and more frequently in the later dates, this is exactly what, in conformity with my views, might have been expected. And curiously enough we find that even down to V. 1400, in general only poets described the era by the new name, just as the usage of poets had first suggested its invention, and just as it is the poets who, at an earlier stage, had described the same era as the Mālava era,—a name whose direct connection with the later name appears to be only this, that both are essentially poetical names of the era with which we are dealing.

Others have intimated that the Vikrama era was invented by the Brāhmans to get rid of the Saka era, supposed to have been obnoxious as being the era of the Buddhists. I have not been able to discover anything which would support such a theory. What an examination of the dates teaches, would rather appear to be this, that the (Kārttikeya) Vikrama year was peculiarly the year of the warriors or Rājputras, while the Brāhmans who were responsible for the making of the calendars would naturally have been reckoning by Chaithrdi (Saka) years, as we must do now when calculating or verifying a Hindu date. And it is at any rate a fact that the Vikrama era has been adopted, more than by others, by the non-Brāhmanical Jainas, just as the official description of it as Vikrama era, in early times, is especially peculiar to the kingdom of Anhilvād, the stronghold of the Jaina religion.

Some matters of detail regarding the calculated dates.

Irregular dates:—Returning now to the list of calculated dates, I would first obviate a misunderstanding as to the year. It is now well known, that the Hindus in recording their dates have never been very accurate, and anybody holding such views would probably, in support of them,
point to my lists in which, out of 290 dates, no less than 45 (Nos. 151-195) have been put down as irregular. But a more careful examination will show that the case is not as bad as it appears, at first sight. For of what I have called irregular dates, two (Nos. 158 and 159) are really regular; and seven others (Nos. 151-157) are shown to be regular, when calculated by the proper Śuddhānta which the writer of the date must be supposed to have followed; and in the case of eight other dates (Nos. 160-167) the irregularity is simply owing to the facts that the dates either are partly illegible or that they were misread by those who first deciphered them. Thus the number of irregular dates would already be reduced from 45 to 28. And out of these again eight (Nos. 168-175) are termed irregular solely because the tithi apparently is joined in them, not with the day on which it ended, but with the day on which it commenced. Now we know that a tithi often must be joined with the day on which it commences, and in the case of some of these so-called irregular dates we can already now point out the exact rule by which it has actually been so treated. The whole subject of what may be called current tithis is indeed so intricate and offers to the Hindus themselves so great difficulties that it cannot be treated here incidentally and for the Vikrama dates alone; but what I have seen of it would certainly for the present make me suspend my judgment in cases where the civil day would seem to have been joined with the tithi commencing on it, and I would therefore not venture to say that any of the dates 168-175 are really incorrect.

Accordingly there remain altogether 20 dates (Nos. 176-195) which there seem to be good reasons for considering as wholly or partly faulty. Out of this number no less than fifteen dates occur in copper-plate inscriptions, two (Nos. 177 and 189) are dates of stone inscriptions, two (Nos. 182 and 195) are in verses recording the times when certain literary works were composed, and one (No. 186) is a date of a MS. Here the comparatively large number of apparently incorrect dates met with in copper-plate grants—15 out of 45 dates of copper-plate inscriptions which my list contains—must strike us as very remarkable and, considering the general correctness of other dates, one cannot help suspecting that some at least of the documents which contain those incorrect dates must be forgeries.

Years of other eras, quoted along with the Vikrama years:—In addition to the Vikrama year, ten of the calculated dates (Nos. 20, 22, 23, 25, 30, 43, 45, 48, 119, and 200) also quote the corresponding Śaka year, one (in No. 20) incorrectly. I have already mentioned that the earliest and only ancient date of this description occurs in the Dōgadh stone inscription of Bhājādeva of Kanauj of V. 919 (No. 30), and that after that time the Śaka year is not quoted again along with the Vikrama year till V. 1439 (No. 43). One of the ten dates (No. 119 of V. 1717) quotes, besides the Śaka year, also the corresponding Saptarshi year, here described as the Śattra year; and the same Saptarshi year is quoted also with the Vikrama year only, in the date No. 94. Two dates, of V. 1202 and 1266 (No. 108 and No. 9) quote the Śimha year and the well-known Varāval date of V. 1320 (No. 129) quotes not only the Śimha, but also the Muhammadan (Hijra) and Valabhi years. Besides, the date No. 261 of the chronological list, of V. 1652, quotes the Allāt (or Ilāhī) year to which the day of the date belages. — As regards the Vikrama year itself, it may be mentioned here that the four dates Nos. 23, 47, 101, and 167 of the list of calculated dates are expressly referred to the Āśādhādhi Vikrama year, of which I have treated separately ante, Vol. XVIII. p. 251.20

Jupiter years quoted along with the Vikrama years: — Jupiter years are quoted in only sixteen dates of my list, and it is a remarkable fact and one which well accords with the original practical character of the Vikrama era, that none of these dates is earlier than V. 1232 (No. 163). With the exception of one quite modern date from the Kanarese country (No. 260 of V. 1841), the systems followed are the so-called northern systems. In three dates, of V.

19 On the dates Nos. 158 and 159 see my remarks on 'repeated tithis,' below.
20 The Āśādhādhi Vikrama year 1754 is quoted in the date of a MS., described by Professor A. A. Macdonell in the preface of his edition of Kātyāyana's Śrauṣṭracarita, p. xiii.
1464, 1531, and 1555 (Nos. 149, 22, and 48) the Jovian year was actually current on the day of the date, but had not begun at the commencement of the solar year (mean-sun system). In six dates, of V. 1275, 1356, 1445, 1458, 1707, and 1755 (Nos. 11, 166, 44, 20, 25, and 55) the Jovian year was no longer current on the day of the date, but was current at the commencement of the solar year (northern luni-solar system). And in six other dates, of V. 1232, 1353, 1500, 1650, 1886, and 1877 (Nos. 163, 42, 73, 51, 53, and 175) the Jovian year was current both on the day of the date and also at the commencement of the solar year (either mean-sun system or northern luni-solar system). — Regarding the wording of the dates attention may be drawn to the phrase Bhāva svāyatsārād pārthād in the date No. 166, by which the year Bhāva is distinctly described as, what it really was, an expired year. And in general it may be observed that in no less than five out of the above sixteen dates (Nos. 20, 22, 25, 48, and 200) the Saka year is quoted along with the Vikrama year.

Interpolary months: — Turning now from the years to the months, we find that interpolary months are distinctly quoted as such in ten dates. With a single exception, all these dates are dates of MSS. In five of them, of V. 1534, 1630, 1724, southern V. 1746 and northern V. 1747 (Nos. 75, 50, 78, 79, and 158), the name of the month is qualified by the word prathama-; in three, of V. 1218, 1298, and 1489 (Nos. 34, 137, and 157), by the word dēṣṭya- or the abbreviated term de'; and in only one quite modern date (No. 175 of northern V. 1877) by adhikā-, which in this instance has reference to the first of the two bright fortnights of the interpolary month. The exception mentioned is the date of a stone inscription of V. 1100 (No. 134) in which the month is poetically described as indhyā-Bhindrapada, the false Bhindrapada, an expression which my calculation of the date shows to denote the first of the two avānta months Bhindrapada. — It may be added that one of the ten dates (No. 157 of V. 1489) furnishes an instance for the well-known fact that calculations by several Siddhāntas do not always yield the same interpolary month.

Under the date No. 79 I have shown that the writer has called the same month, which in one place he describes as prathama-Vaisiṅkha, in another place simply Vaisiṅkha, though referring both times to the same lunar fortnight. And my list contains several other dates the months of which were interpolary, though this is not indicated by the wording of the dates. Thus Chaitra was interpolary in the date No. 36 of V. 1232, and Vaiśākhā in No. 62 of V. 1290, and the bright half of the first date was the second bright half (of the proper Chaitra), and the bright half of the second date the first bright half (of the interpolary Vaiśākha). Similarly Jyēṣṭha was interpolary in the date No. 121 of V. 1877, and Ashāḍha in No. 129 of V. 1830, and the dark halves of both months were the first dark halves (of the pāṁśānta proper Jyēṣṭha and Ashāḍha). Of the two dates No. 110 of V. 960 and No. 145 of V. 1315 it is impossible to speak with confidence; and the date No. 166 of V. 1386 is altogether so peculiarly worded that the absence of any reference to the fact that the month of it was interpolary possesses little significance.

Laukika months: — In seven dates of copper-plate inscriptions of the Chaullukyas of Ahilīvād, the earliest of which is of the year V. 1256 and the latest of V. 1317, the word laukika- and the abbreviated terms lauki and lau are prefixed to the names of the months. Thus, in the dates Nos. 9, 13, 39, and 109, of V. 1266, 1263, 1263, and 1256, where the date is first given in words and afterwards repeated in figures, we find lauki Mārga- and lauki Mūrga-, lauki Kārttika- and lauki Kārttika-, lau Sravaṇa- and Sravaṇa-, Bhindrapada- and lau Bhindrapada-. Besides we have in No. 138 of V. 1317 lauki-Jyēṣṭha-, in No. 164 of V. 1264 lau Śāhada-, and in No. 194 of V. 1299 lau Pāṇḍava. Here the circumstance that the simple Sravaṇa is in the same date employed in the place of lau Sravaṇa and lau Bhindrapada in the place of the simple Bhindrapada, as well as the manner in which the dates work out, would almost suffice to prove that the lauki months are nothing else than the ordinary lunar months. But the matter is placed beyond all doubt by certain passages in Jaina literary
works which tell us that the Jainas had two kinds of names for the months, the *laukika* or ordinary names, *Śrāvaṇa, Bhādrapada*, etc., and the *līkottara* names *abhinandita* (or *abhinanda*), *pratisthītā* (or *praparisthīta*), *vijaya, pṛtivardhana, śrēya, śiva, śīra*, *himavat, vaṣantamāsa, kusumasaṁbhava, nīdāga, and vanaṁvīra* (or *vanavīrāhīna*). *Laukika-Śrāvaṇa* would thus mean 'the month which is ordinarily called *Śrāvaṇa* (but whose *līkottara* name is *abhinandita*),' and this Jaina usage has been followed in the above dates; and it is plain now why the word *laukika*, which some scholars have erroneously taken as qualifying the year, occurs in this manner just in inscriptions from Āhālavāḍ. — In the place of *laukika* and in the same sense the word *sāddharaṇa* appears to be used in the date *No. 186* of *V. 1512*, which is from a M.S. of which I do not know where it was written.

**Nakṣatras, Kāraṇas, and Yōgas:** — If we now turn to the days of the dates, it must strike us that, compared with dates of the Saka era, the Vikrama dates, especially in more early times, rarely furnish any *data* besides the *tithi* and weekday. Thus, down to *V. 1250*, out of seventy dates of our list of calculated dates only one (No. 57 of *V. 898*) gives the *nakṣatra* and *yōga*, and four (Nos. 190, 30, 58, and 31, of *V. 794, 919, 962*, and *1042*), two of which are from literary works and the earliest of which is from a forged copper-plate, give the *nakṣatra*. And altogether, of the 200 calculated dates, three (Nos. 11, 22, and 23) give the *nakṣatra*, *kāraṇa*, and *yōga*, five (Nos. 8, 57, 71, 122, and 136) the *nakṣatra* and *yōga*; 20 the *nakṣatra* only, and one (No. 39) gives the *yōga* (Vyanipata) only. Of these 29 dates ten are from stone inscriptions, ten from literary works, six are dates of M.S., and three of copper-plates. All the other dates, as furnished are correct, except those given in the dates Nos. 190 and 195.

**Lunar and solar eclipses:** — Five dates from copper-plate inscriptions mention lunar eclipses, and five, also from copper-plates, solar eclipses. The *lunar eclipse* all work out satisfactorily. Two of them (in Nos. 5 and 40, of *V. 1055* and *1272*) were total eclipses, visible in India, and two (in Nos. 4 and 161, of *V. 1036* and *1220*) partial eclipses, also visible in India. Of the eclipse mentioned in No. 80 of *V. 1200* it is impossible to speak quite positively, because it so happens that there were lunar eclipses on each of the three possible European equivalents of the Hindu date; but as only one of these eclipses was visible in India, it is highly probable that this is the eclipse referred to by the inscription. — Of the five *solar eclipses* only two work out satisfactorily. One of these (in No. 83 of *V. 1043*) was a total eclipse, which was not visible in India, and the other (in No. 114 of *V. 1270*) a total eclipse, visible in India. The three other solar eclipses are mentioned in the dates Nos. 190, 192, and 194; of *V. 794, 1166*, and *1299*, which do not work out properly. — What deserves to be drawn special attention to here, is, that one of the solar eclipses, as already remarked, was not visible in India.

**Samaṅkṛantis:** — The date No. 133 of *V. 994* quotes an unspecified *samāṅkṛanti* (really the *Vṛṣa-saṅkṛanti*) which took place during the *tithi* of the date, 3 h. 30 m. after mean sunset; and another unspecified *samāṅkṛanti* is quoted, wrongly, as it appears, in the date No. 193 of *V. 1187*. — Two dates, No. 74 of *V. 1516* and No. 119 of *V. 1717*, mention the *Māsē-saṅkṛanti*, which in both cases took place during the *tithi* of the date, in the one date 3 h. 1 m. before mean sunrise, and in the other 1 h. 1 m. after mean sunset. — A *Dakṣiṇāyana-saṅkṛanti* which also took place during the *tithi* of the date, 4 h. 32 m. after mean sunset, is quoted in connection with the date No. 112 of *V. 1084*. — Besides, the *Uttarāyana-saṅkṛanti* is mentioned in five dates. In two of them, No. 12 of *V. 1290* and No. 174 of *V. 1234*, the *samāṅkṛanti* took place during the *tithi* of the date, in day-time, but the dates differ from each other in this that in the second date the *tithi* is joined with the week-day on which it commenced. In the date No. 169 of *V. 178* (assuming the reading of it to be correct) the *saṅkṛanti* took place 3 h. 29 m. before the commencement of the day on which the *tithi* commenced 3 h. 24 m. after mean sunrise; and in *No. 176* of *V. 1161* it took place 7 h. 58 m. after mean sunrise, between...
three to four hours after the end of the *tithi* of the date. Finally, in No. 191 of V. 1154 the Uttarāyaṇa-saṃkrānti is wrongly quoted, because it cannot possibly take place on the third of the bright half of the month Māgha, the day given by the date.—The general result is, that in six out of eight cases in which a *saṃkrānti* may be supposed to have been correctly quoted, it took place during the actual *tithi* of the date; and taking this to be the rule, I have little doubt that the same was the case in the date No. 169, and that the reading of that date should be altered in the way already suggested by me under the date.22

**Other holy or festive times:** — Occasions, other than eclipses and *saṃkrāntis*, on which donations were made, are mentioned in connection with the dates in the following terms:—*manvādau*, in connection with Chaitra-sūdi 15, in the date No. 172 of V. 1185; *akṣhayatritiya-parvaṇi* and *akṣhayatritiya-yugādi-parvaṇi*, with Vaiśākha-sūdi 3, in No. 63 of V. 1222 and No. 173 of V. 1229; *mahā-Vaiśākhyādi-parvaṇi*, with Vaiśākha-sūdi 15, in No. 71 of V. 1256; *mahāchaturdaśi-parvaṇi*, with Śravaṇa-sūdi 14, in No. 35 of V. 1238; *Kārttikādy-apana-parvaṇi*, with Kārttika-sūdi 11, in No. 180 of V. 1231; *āmāvāsy-parvaṇi* in No. 109 of V. 1256; *vyāhārya-parvaṇi* (denoting here the *vyāha* Vyālapita) in No. 39 of V. 1263; *abhishekā-parvaṇi* in No. 10 of V. 1263; and *dīnāya-māṅgha sāvatsarikā* in No. 178 of V. 1107. Among these dates special attention may be drawn to Nos. 63, 172, and 173, which quote the *manvādī*, *yugādi*, and *akṣhayā-tritiya* festivals.

**Repeated tithis:** — An instance of a repeated *tithi* is distinctly furnished by the date No. 158 of V. 1747 in which the day is described as *dvitiya-chaturthi-dīna*; and I would here draw particular attention to that date because my previous remarks on it are not quite correct. When they were written, I had been misled to believe that a day on which no *tithi* ends receives the number of the *tithi* which ends on the preceding day, and I accordingly stated that in the date under discussion we should by Professor Jacobi's Tables have two days numbered 3, and only one fourth day. But as in reality, and most naturally, a day on which no *tithi* ends receives the number of the *tithi* which is current during the whole of that day and ends on the following day, the result obtained from Professor Jacobi's Tables quite accords with the wording of the date No. 158, and Wednesday; 19th March, A.D. 1690, was by those Tables really a *dvitiya-chaturthi-dīna*. A proper understanding of the rule regarding *adhika tithis* also shows the date No. 159 of V. 1404 to be quite correct by the Tables. For since in that case the 14th *tithi* of the bright half commenced 1 h. 4 m. before mean sunrise of Thursday, 18 October, and ended 0 h. 45 m. after mean sunrise of Friday, 19 October, A.D. 1347, both the Thursday and the Friday must have been numbered 14 in the calendar, and the Thursday, which more fully might be described as *prathama-chaturthi-dīna*, is properly denoted in the date by sūdi 14.

**Suggestions for Calculating Dates.**

The above are about all the remarks of more general interest that are suggested to me by the lists of dates, and I would therefore for the present23 conclude these notes with a few practical hints which may save trouble to others.

So far as my own experience goes, a *tithi* of the bright fortnight never ends on the same weekday more than once in three consecutive years, and accordingly, when, by calculating a *tithi* of the bright fortnight for one of the (two or three) possible years, the proper weekday has been found, such a result may generally be considered as satisfactory, and no further calculation need be made for the remaining possible year or years. In the case of a date of the bright fortnight of the months Kārttikā to Phālguna (e.g., No. 3), the calculation should first be made for the expired Vikrama year, because mostly this will at once furnish the desired result. In dates of the bright fortnight of the months Chaitra to Āśvins (e.g., No. 30 or 57), the calcu-

---

22 Attention may be drawn here to the occurrence of the term *shakaśālikā*, denoting one of the solar months, in No. 166 of V. 1386.

23 Some interesting dates collected since the publication of my lists will be published hereafter.
tion should first be made for either the northern or the southern expired year, and the northern current year should be tried only when neither of the two other years has yielded a satisfactory equivalent of the original date.

A titthi of the dark fortnight never ends on the same weekday more than once in three consecutive years for the same scheme of a lunar month, i.e., either the amanta scheme, or the puramanta scheme. But not infrequently such a titthi in the amanta month of one year may end on the same weekday on which it ended in the puramanta month of the same name of the preceding year. Accordingly, in verifying a date of the dark fortnight of the months Kartika to Phalguna, one should begin by calculating for the puramanta month of the expired year. If thereby the desired weekday is found (as, e.g., in No. 83), the result may be regarded as final, and no further calculations are necessary. On the other hand, if the puramanta month yields no satisfactory result, the amanta month of the expired year should be tried (as, e.g., in No. 97); and here it should be remembered that, even when the proper weekday has thus been obtained, the result is not necessarily the only one possible, because the puramanta month of the current year may perhaps yield the same weekday (as, e.g., in No. 103). The verification of dates in dark fortnights of the months Chaitra to Ashina is more troublesome still, and it seems impossible to suggest any particular line of procedure beyond saying that the necessary calculations should here too always first be made for the expired (northern or southern) years. But in addition to what has been already stated concerning the weekdays of the puramanta month of one year and the amanta month of the same name of the following year, it may finally be mentioned here that sometimes the amanta month of the northern current year, too, yields the same weekday for the end of a titthi as the puramanta month of the same name of the southern expired year (as, e.g., in No. 143).

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

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

No. 196.—COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF NARENDRA MEGABAJA-VIJAYABHITA II.

I edit this inscription from the original plates, which belonged to Sir Walter Elliot, and are now, I understand, in the British Museum. I had them for examination in 1878. I have no information as to where they were obtained. The inscription has recently been edited by Dr. Hultzsch, in his South-Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I. p. 31 ff., No. 36; his version of the text, however, being given in Devanagari, I have now to give my own reading in Roman characters.

The pistes, of which the first and last are inscribed on one side only, are five in number, each measuring about 9' by 3'. The edges of them were raised into rims; and the writing is mostly in a state of fairly good preservation: the surfaces of the plates are a good deal corroded, and in a few places they are quite eaten through by rust; but even then only a very few letters are entirely obliterated. — The ring on which the plates are strung is about 3" thick and 4½" in diameter; it has not been cut; but one end of it is loose in the socket, and advantage was evidently taken of this to detach the plates, in order to make the impressions which are in the Elliot collection; they were afterwards secured by a thickening of the ring at the same end. The seal on the ring is circular, about 2½" in diameter. In relief on a countersunk surface, it has, across the centre, the legend śr-Śrī-Trībuvasundarā; in the upper part, the sun and moon; and in the lower part, a floral device. — The characters belong to the southern class of alphabets; and are of the regular type of the period and part of the country to which the record belongs. The average size of the letters is about ½". Many of them are filled in with a hard incrustation of rust; but in the others there are discernible, as usual, marks of the working of the engraver's tool. They do not show through on the reverse sides of the plates. — The language is Sanskrit; and, except in the quotation of four of the customary benedictive and imprecatory verses and in the use of a verse to give the name of the Dātaka, the whole record is in prose. — In respect of orthography, the only points that call for notice are
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(1) the use of kri and kri for kri, in sanskriti and sanskriti, lines 21, 23; (2) the use of the Dravidian 
\[ \text{f} \] in the dynastic name, line 5, and in karadja, line 7, na\[a\], line 8, l\[\text{f}t\]a, line 9, dhav\[a\], line 10, 
and gan\[\text{d}a\]\[\text{k}\]a, line 11; and (3) the doubling of \[i\] after r in dar\[\text{s}\], line 15.

The inscription is one of the Eastern Chalukya king Narendramrigaraja-
Vijayaditya II. It is non-sectarian; the object of it being only to record the grant, to twenty-four Brāhmaṇa, 
of the village of Kograpura in a vishaya the principal part of the 
name of which is illegible. The grant was made on the occasion of an eclipse of the moon; 
but the date is not specified by any further details. It may be noted how the grantees are 
grouped together, not by their birth-places or their gōtras, but by their sūtras.

With the exception of Vijayavāda, the birth-place or residence of the writer, which must 
be the modern Bāwāda in the Kistna District, I cannot identify, with any certainty, any of 
the places that are mentioned in this record.

The Dūtaka of the grant was the prince Nṛpā-Rudra, who is described as a brother 
(bhrātri) of Vijayaditya II, but as a descendant of the Hālaysa race. He appears, therefore, 
to have been a half-brother, born from a different mother belonging by birth to the lineages 
of the Kalachuris of Tripura.

TEXT.\(^1\)

First Plate.

1 Svasti Śrīmatāṁ sakalabhuvana-saṁstātyamāna-Māṇavya-saṅgōtraṁāṁ Hāriti-purāṇāṁ
2 Kaśyaptāva-prasāda-labdhā-rājyaṁāṁ mātri-gaya-paripulitānāṁ Svāmi-Mahāśeṇa-pāṇi
3 ā-nudhyātināṁ bhagavān-Nārāyaṇa-prasāda-saṁsādita-vara-varahālāṁchhan-ekṣabhaṁ-
4 svāhā-vaśkṛt-arāti-maṇḍalānāṁ[a]\(n\)āt\(a\)vāṁdhi-āvaḥbhṛtā-samaṇa-pavitrikṛṣita-vapa
5 svāhā Chajukyaṁānāṁ kulam-alaṁkaraṁśŚrī[\(\text{r}\)]
6 ya-āri(Sub) yaṁ nīravady-ōdāra-ṛṇa-ṛṇa-śaṁkṛītāsya Śrī-Viśajyaṁāya-mahārājaṁāya
7 paurāṇaḥ śpurita-karavāla-dhāra-vaśkṛt-arāti-bhūmaṇḍalasya śva-charita-nyak[k\(\text{s}\)\]rīta

Second Plate; First Side.

8 Nṛpā-Naḷa-Nahush-Ānabbāda-Yayatē[a] Vaiśṇavī-śva-chakra-mandakasya Vaiśnava-
9 vārdhāna-mahā- rājaṁya priya-tanayāḥ pratā[p\(\text{r}\)\]nīrāg-avanta-saṁasta-saṁanta-maṁl-lājitā-sasānaḥ
10 kahatā-ṛṇaṁ-saṁkta-traya-pātihūtāḥ anēka-saṁgrāma-vaiy-āśādita-vikrama-dhavaṁya Yā-
11 maṁ-danda-chaṇḍa-dōḍandā-maṇḍal-āgra-nakha-khaṇḍita-ṛ)i\(p\)n- kari-gaṇḍaḥ\(a\)ḥ[\(\text{r}\)]
12 Narendramṛga-
13 rāja\(a\) arāti-shadvyagga-nigraha-kaṇaḥ samadhigata-rāja(ā) vidyā-chatushtayaḥ chatur-
14 upāya-patra-
15 yōga-chaturāḥ dūṣaṁ(ṣaḥ\(a\)) nigraha-śaṁtā-anugraha-kaṇaḥ Madhumathana iva vā-
16 vikrama-g sąkṛta-bhūchas[r\(a\)]yaḥ
17 Yudhishthira iva Bhuṁ-Ājñu(ṛ)juna-parākrama-sahāy[\(\text{r}\)]
18 Daśaratha-suta iva Sītā-
19 nanda-kaṇaḥ Manu-rei-

Second Plate; Second Side.

20 va san-mārga-darśi padmākha(ka)sya iva arī(ṛ)-timura-nikara-viḍvāmasan-āditya[a]n
21 paraṁ-bhruṁya[\(\text{h}^\text{r}\)] paraṁ-mahā-
22 śvarāḥ samastabhad(ṛ)bhunāśraya-ārī-Viśajyaṁāya-mahārājaḥ-hirtha-paraṁśvara-lhaṭṭ-
23 raṁaḥ 6 . . . .

\(^1\) From the original plates.
\(^2\) Read "karisōrol.
\(^3\) I take this word, which I had misread, from Dr. Hultsch's text.
\(^4\) Read "rajaḥ."
Third Plate; First Side.

22. trāya Maviṇḍārmaṇé Podēṅgu-vāstav[a*]ya A(ha)rita-gōtrāya Hiraṇyā(nya)kēśi-sūtryā Yā-
23. jīnasārmane Podēṅgu-v[a*]astavāya Saṅkrī(ṛi)ti-gōtrāya Hiraṇyā(nya)kēśi-sūtrā-
24. ny Krovāsirī-v[a*]astavāya A(ha)rita-gōtrāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Kanda(? kusṭa)ṣ-
25. rmaṇe Urpuṭra-v[a*]astavāya Bhāradvāja-gōtrāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya
26. Vishnusārmane Vāṃgiparṇa-v[a*]astavāya Kauṇḍinya-gōtrāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrā-
27. ya Guṇajāvāsārmane Vāṃgiparṇa-v[a*]astavāya Śaṭṭiḥyā(ṛi)ṣṭā-gōtrāya A(ā)pa-
28. stamba-sūtrāya[a*] Bhadrasārmane Vāṃgiparṇa-v[a*]astavāya Kauṇḍinya-gōtrāya A(ā)pa-

Third Plate; Second Side.

29. stamba-sūtrāya Vishnusārmane Vāṃgiparṇa-v[a*]astavāya Kauṇḍinya(nya)-gōtrāya A(ā)-
30. pastamba-sūtrāya Nārāyaṇasārmane Chāṇkur-v[a*]astavāya Bhāradvāja-gōtrā-
31. ya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Drōpāśarmane Chāṇkur-v[a*]astavāya Bhāradvā-
32. ja-gōtrāya Āpastamba-sūtrāya Nārāyaṇasārmane Krovāsirī-v[a*]astavāya
33. ya Harita-gōtrāya Āpastamba-sūtrāya Mādhavaśarmane Krovāsirī-v[a*]ast-

Fourth Plate; First Side.

34. vyāya Parasara-gōtrāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Vennasaṃśarmane Krovāsirī-v[a*]ast-
35. trāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Arudisasārmane Urpuṭra-v[a*]astavāya Bhāradvāja-
36. gōtrāya
37. A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Nandisārmane Kāraṇchodu-v[a*]astavāya Bhāradvāja-gōtrāya A(ā)p-
38. stamba-sūtrāya Vishnusārmane Kāraṇchodu-v[a*]astavāya Bhāradvāja-gōtrāya A(ā)pastamba-
39. sūtrāya Yaṛa(ja)ṣa-

---

Dr. Hultsch has read nada in the second syllable of this word; but the end stroke of the subscript consonant is continued upward so pointedly, that it can only be p. He has also taken the name of the village as Abhipondaṇḍārura.

Dr. Hultsch has read the first syllable of this word as na; but, in my opinion, wrongly.

In the second syllable of this word, the a, as distinguished from ā, is marked clearly in lines 21, 22, and 23, though not here.

In lines 32, 33, and 34, this word appears with the short a in the second syllable. It is difficult to say which may be the correct form. The writer might be more likely to write va for ed (and has in various instances used œ instead of ṍ), than va for va; but there are several cases in which he has written a by mistake for a.

This letter, etc., was omitted here, and was inserted between the pa and the st of the same word in the next line.

Here, and in lines 33 and 51, this word occurs properly, with the long a in the first syllable.

13 See note 9 above.
14 Read parāśura.
15 See note 9 above.
16 Here, and in lines 37 and 39, Dr. Hultsch has read the third syllable of this word as ha; but, in my opinion, wrongly.
Fourth Plate; Second Side.

39 rmm añode Chāntu[r]u[v]*-va[ś]*stavyāya Bhāravāya-gōṭrāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Bādāśērammaṇdo Kṛjñah.
40 v[ā]*stavyāya Kauṇḍīnaya-gōṭrāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Veṣṇuṣārammaṇā Ṛayūru-
41 ya Agniśāya-gōṭrāya A(ā)pastamba-sūtrāya Ṛompayārammaṇā vēḍa-vēḍāṃga-
ratēbhyaḥ
42 sa[ś]-karmā[niratēbhyaḥ][h]* chattru-viṇāśāti-brāhmaṃgēbhyaḥ17 chandru(ndra)-grahaṇa-
43 nimitāt udaka-pū-
44 ṛvva[m]* Kṛṛrapṛṛ-aṃa-grāmas-savvā[ṛvva]-kara-parīhāram kriṭvā dattaḥ, [h]* A-
45 v[ā]*-savdhi-vihēda19 [h]* pūrva[vata][h]*. A-
46 ṛgupṛṛr karṣhātah Vāna[ma]pṛṛr paścimitaḥ Vānḍrāpedaya uttarataḥ
Gani(? na)yāra-
47 bu(?mbu) [h]* ēṭeṣhām-apy-av[ā]ttta [h]* Asy-ēpari na kēna[ḥ]-bāḍhā kar-
nāyā karūti yas-sa pa-

Fifth Plate.

46 śccha-mahāpitaka-[saṁ]yuktō bhavati [h]* Vyasēn-āpy-ṅktāṁ [h]* Bahubhir30=vvasa-
dhā datta bahubhiḥ.ch-ānu-
47 pālītā yaśya yaśya yaśā bhūmīs-tasya tasya tadd phalāṁ [h]* Sva-dā(ḍa)ttāṁ
para-dattāṁ vā [yō] harēta
48 vasundharām shashtī-variṣha31-sahasra[ṛ]-vishṭāyāṁ jāyatē krīmi[ḥ] [h]* Kalpa-
[ṛ]-[ṛ]-[ṛ]-sahasra[ṛ]
49 svarggē [ṭaśṭha]-ti bhūmi-da[h]* a(ā)kṣheptā ch-ānumanta cha tāṇy-ἐva narakē
vasēt [h]* Rāmēś-āpy-n-
50 kṛṁ[ḥ] [h]* Sarvavim22=Śevaṁ bhāvināḥ pārthivendrān bhūyō-bhūyō yāchatē Rāma-
bbhadrāh sāmānyō-yaṁ dharma-sā-
51 tur-ṛjīpa[ṁ] kālē-kālē pāla[ṁ] bhavadbhiḥ [h]* Narēndrā[r]agājasayα33 bhrāt[ā]*
Haihaga-vāṃsā-jaḥ ājñapti-
52 r pavaya dharma[ṃ]sa ya[n][rjip(v)pa-Rudr]-[h]* ṛjip-ōttama[h]* [h]* Vijayavād-
vāstavyāya24 Aksbaralalit-āchāryyēga likhitam [h]*

ABSTRACT OF CONTENTS.

The son’s son of the Mahārāja Vijayaśitya (I.) (line 6), who adorned the family of the
Chaulukyas (l. 5), who are of the Mānavya gōtra (l. 1), and who are Hāritiputra:s:

The dear son of the Mahārāja Vishnuvardhana (IV.) (l. 8), who by his achievements put
thoue Nṛga, Nala, Nāhuśa, Ambarisha, and Yayāti:

Narēndrā[r]agājasayα (Vijayaśitya II.) (l. 11), (a very lion of a king) who has left open the
temples of the elephants of his foes with the claw that is the scimitar in his arm which is as
firm as the rod of Yama, — he, the most devout worshipper of the god Mahēśvara (l. 15), the
asylum of the universe (l. 16), the illustrous Vijayaśitya (II.), the Mahārājaḥhirāja, the
Pramāśvara, the Bhaṭāraka, thus issues a command to all the cultivators, headed by the Rāja-
traṃāṣa, dwelling in the . . . . . vāḍi vishyāya (l. 17):—

"Be it known to you! On the occasion of an eclipse of the moon (l. 42), the village
named Kṛṛrapṛṛ (l. 43) has been given by Us, with exemption from all taxes, to twenty-four
Brāhmaṇs; viz., Vēṇyāsarammaṇ (l. 19), a resident (by birth) of Ṛopanḍur, belonging to the

---

17 Read chatur-viṇāśāti-brāhmaṃgēbhyaḥ.
18 Dr. Hultsch has given the reading viś[ṭḥa].
19 Dr. Hultsch has here read cha[tu]viṇāśātyai datta'[h*].
20 Metre, Śūkṣa (Anuṣṭubh); and in the next two verses.
21 Read vēṣeka.
22 Metre, Śūkṣa. 
23 Metre, Śūkṣa (Anuṣṭubh).
24 Read viṣṇatāyaṇa.
Kauśika gōtra and the Hiranyakēśin sūtra; Chaṭīśarman (l. 20), a resident of Valōcheri, belonging to the Kauśika gōtra and the Hiranyakēśin sūtra; Vidaśarman (l. 21), a resident of Poḍēngu, belonging to the Gautama gōtra and the Hiranyakēśin sūtra; Mavēḍisārman (l. 22), a resident of Poḍēngu, belonging to the Saṁkrti gōtra and the Hiranyakēśin sūtra; Yajñasārman (l. 22-23), a resident of Poḍēngu, belonging to the Harita gōtra and the Hiranyakēśin sūtra; . . . sarman (l. 23), a resident of Poḍēngu, belonging to the Saṁkrti gōtra and the Hiranyakēśin sūtra; Kandaśarman (?)(l. 24), a resident of Krovāsiri, belonging to the Harita gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Vīṇhuśasārman (l. 26), a resident of Uṛpuṭūru, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Gujjadēvasārman (l. 27), a resident of Vangiparrū, belonging to the Kauṇḍinya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Bhadrāsārman (l. 28), a resident of Vangiparrū, belonging to the Śaṇḍilya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Vīṇhuśasārman (l. 29), a resident of Vangiparrū, belonging to the Kauṇḍinya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Nārāyaṇasārman (l. 30), a resident of Vangiparrū, belonging to the Kauṇḍinya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Drūṇasārman (l. 31), a resident of Chānturu, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Nārāyaṇasārman (l. 32), a resident of Chānturu, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Mādhavaśasārman (l. 33), a resident of Krovāsiri, belonging to the Harita gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Vennamasārman (l. 34), a resident of Krovāsiri, belonging to the Parāśara gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Arudisārman (l. 35), a resident of Krovāsiri, belonging to the Vatsa gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Nandisārman (l. 36), a resident of Uṛpuṭūru, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Vīṇhuśasārman (l. 37), a resident of Kāraṇāchedu, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Bhadrāsārman (l. 38), a resident of Kāraṇāchedu, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Yajñasārman (l. 38-39), a resident of Kāraṇāchedu, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Bāḍadīsārman (l. 39), a resident of Chānturu, belonging to the Bāhravāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; Vēṇṇasārman (l. 40), a resident of Krājam, belonging to the Kauṇḍinya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra; and Rēmpāyasārman (l. 41), a resident of Hāyūru, belonging to the Agniśāya gōtra and the Apastamba sūtra.

Lines 43 to 45 give the boundaries of the village; viz., on the east, Atūguparrū; on the south, Vānapar, or Vāmapar; on the west, Vānḍārapadān; and on the north, Ganiyārābu (?).

Lines 45 to 51 contain a sentence prohibiting obstruction to the enjoyment of the grant followed by four of the customary benedictory and imprecatory verses.

Line 51 f. tells us that the Dūtaka (denoted by the word dūnakṛt) was a prince named Nripa-Rudra, born in the Haihaya lineage, a brother (bhrāṭṛ) of Narēndramgangarāja. And the record ends with the statement that the charter was written by Aksharalalitächārya, a resident of Vījavavāda.

GEOGRAPHY OF INDIA, WITH EXTRACT FROM A PAPER BY THE LATE PROF. H. H. WILSON.

By J. Burgess, LL.D., C.I.E.

In this Journal (Vol. XIV., pp. 319 ff.) I last called attention to the information that might be derived from Sanskrit literature on the ancient and medieval geography of India, suggesting that some effort might be made to collect and arrange it. In 1882 I had indexed the Brihat-Saṁhitā and made other geographical notes, some of which were engrossed in the footnotes which I contributed to the late J. J. H. Beal's Buddhist Records of the Western World, but I have not found time since to do much more. Lately, however, in writing on an allied subject, my attention was directed to Colonel Wilford's last paper in the Asiatic Researches (Vol. XIV., pp. 373-470), intended as the first of a series on the geography of India, which, Prof. H. H. Wilson said, "would have established the learned author's reputation on a firmer basis, than any of his preceding erudite, but often fallacious, investigations." In the introduction to this paper he gives
an account of the works he had consulted, which were apparently valuable, but not very widely circulated. Some of these are: — the Kṣṭhāra-samāsas, — one purely mythological, another (written by order of Rāja Bijjala of Paṭaṇa, who died A.D. 1648) is entirely geographical and “a most valuable work;” the Muṇja-pratidēśa-vyavasthā, by Rāja Muṇja, and its redaction the Bhoja-pratidēśa-vyavasthā, — both large works; a work written by order of Bukkarāya of Vijaynagar Vik-Sam. 1341, which Wilford supposes is the same as the Bhuvana-sūgara; a commentary on the geography of the Mahābhārata, written in Bengal by order of a Rāja Paulastya, in the time of Husain Shāh (A.D. 1493-1515); the Vikrama-sūgara, considered a valuable work; and the Bhuvana-kēśa, — said to be a section of the Bhavishya-Purāṇa, but revised and greatly augmented, — probably subsequent to 1550.

In the Search for Sanskrit MSS., it might be well to make enquiry for these and similar treatises and tracts. Among them may be found much that would be of great importance for the elucidation of the mediæval, as well as the earlier, geography of India.

In 1824 Professor H. H. Wilson found some fragments of a geographical work, which formed the subject of a paper he contributed to the Oriental Magazine for that year (Vol. II., pp. 186 ff). As this paper has not been republished in his collected works, and the Oriental Magazine is now practically inaccessible to most, I venture to submit his version of the fragments, with so much of his preface remarks and footnotes as is of interest: —

“The work,” he says, “from which they are taken, is professedly a section of the Bhavishyat Purāṇa: it is not, however, found in the entire copies of that Purāṇa, and is, no doubt, a distinct composition. Much of the work is either of some antiquity, or is made up of ancient materials; but there is a very large proportion that is clearly quite modern, mention being made of several Muhammadan cities. The style of the description, in conformity to the prophetic character of the Purāṇa, of which it pretends to be a section, is also prophetic, and announces what countries and towns will exist in the Kali age. We shall take the liberty however, to substitute the present or the past, for the future tense.

“Divisions of Pundra-Dēsa, from the Bramanda Section of the Bhavishyat Purāṇa.

“That part of Bhārada or India known by the name of Pundra,1 consists of seven principal divisions, Gaur, Varendra, Nīvritti, near the country of Sambha, the forest tract called Nārikhanda, Vartabhumī, Vardhamāna, and Vindhya-Parswa or the country along the foot of the Vindhya mountains. These we shall severally describe.

“Gaur, in which Gaura is situated, lies to the north of Vardhamāna, and south of the Padma.2 The Ghanges here assumes a southerly direction. The country is populous, abounds with villages, and contains several considerable towns, the principal of which are the following: —

“Gaura, situated on the borders, Rāmakoli, Maulapāṭṭan on the Bhagirathi or Hugli river. In the vicinity of Kiriteswari is Moraśuddhā, founded by a Yavana; Kanthakākha on the banks of the river. The cities of Gaura have been often destroyed.

“The inhabitants of Gaura are, in general, worshippers of Vishṇu, and assiduous in repeating his name. They are, however, immoral, licentious, and dishonest, and no man may call

---

1 “From the following description it appears, that Pundra is the collective name of a country, following a curiously circuitous direction. It is bounded on the north-east chiefly by the Barhamputra, north of Dacca, and the eastern portion of the Himālaya. It then follows a course south-west across the Ghanges, passes to the south of Bihār; and again comes to the Ghanges about Mirzapur, being bounded on the west by Rewa and Bundelkhand, Gondwana, Chutia Nāgpur, Orissa, and Lower Bengal, therefore, are the limits of its southern course. Pundra, consequently comprises the following districts: in Bengal, Rājshāhī, Murshidabād, Dināpur, Rangpur, part of Nadiya, Bārbhūm, Barwān, part of Midnapur, and the Jungle Mahāla. In Bihār, part of Bāṃgrī, Pachīt, and Palāman; and in Allahabad [N.W. Provinces], part of Chunār.” —[Allowance must be made for the less accurate method of localisation that prevailed at the time when the paper, from which these extracts are given, was written. — Euro.]  

2 The Pāddā or main stream of the Ghanges after giving off the Hugli.
his house or his wife's own. The learned amongst them have allowed their legal and ceremonial observances to fall into disuse. The natives are generally feeble and short-lived.

"Varendra" is a tract abounding in water, and very fertile, lying east of the Padmavati. The chief cities are, Pudilā near the Nārada river; Nātāri, famous for dancers, mines, and jugglers, the capital of a large district in the centre of Varendra, called Nātāri; Chapalā, on the banks of the Varāla river; Kākamāri, a city full of the writer-caste; and Syamātaka on the Chalana Bil. The people of Varendra are the ready servants of the Mlechchhas, or foreign barbarians. They are worshippers of Siva, eat meat and drink wine. They are weak and contemptible. The country abounds with beggars, and the Brāhmans follow heterodox and unrighteous doctrines.

"Nivritti" lies on the north of Varendra, and on the west of Banga, near the country of Virātha. It abounds in pasture grounds, and dogs, goats, buffaloes, and kine. Another name for it is Matayaka, derived from its plentiful supply of fish; but this name is specially applied to the parts which lie along the skirts of the track occupied by Pulindas (foresters and mountaineers). The chief towns are Varddhana-kutā, governed by a Yavana; Kachhapa on the banks of the Gura river; and Srīrañga, or Vihārika, where the women are remarkable for flat noses.

"The inhabitants of Nivritti are of short stature, very dirty and ignorant. Under the dominion of the Yavanas all distinction of caste was confounded, and the people are sunk in meanness and immorality.

"Nārakhanda" is a district abounding in thickets. It lies west of the Bhāgirathi; north of the Dwārakēswarī river. It extends along the Panchakutā hills on its west, and approaches Kikata10 on the north. The forests are very extensive, chiefly of sukha, arjuna, and sali trees, with a plentiful addition of brushwood. The district is celebrated for the shrine of Vaidyanāth.11 The deity is worshipped by people from all quarters, and is the source of every good in the present age. In the division of Virabhāmi, the no less eminent form of the same divinity, named Bakreswara,12 is present in the world. Three-fourths of the district are jungle, the remaining fourth is cultivated. The soil of a small part of it is very fertile; but far the greater portion is saline and unproductive. There is no want of water, and numerous small streams run through the forest; the principal of these is the Ajaya.13 In many places there are iron mines. The people are in general small, black, and of immoral propensities and ignorant of religious duties, a few only are attached to the name of Vishnu. They are dexterous bowmen and industrious cultivators.

"In that part of the district called Viradesa is the city of Nagara;14 also Sipulya, and other towns. On the western borders are the villages Mayanpur, Chāsagrama, and Suvernadi. On the southern confines towards the Odra country, is Kindavishna. Suvarnamukhya is in the forest, and Panchala in the stony and gravelly tract. In the eastern parts are Mandaravani and Kāsgani, and on the west of the jungle near Vaidyanath are Patra Kolā and Bharawani.

---

8 Varendra or Barendra appears to include Rājashāhi and part of Maimansingh.
9 Now Natar.
10 "This seems to include Dinalpur, Rampur, and Kuch Bihar; but we are not aware what country is intended by Virātha."
11 "These seem intended for the Mech tribe, a race once occupying the tracts in Rangpur on the south of the Brahmaputra."
12 The Tista or Tri-ratna, the river of three streams.
13 "This comprises the north portion of Bishanpur, part of Birbhum, and part of Bhāgilpur and Mangār."
14 "Corrupted into Dalkisore; Wilford says it is named from Darikeswara Mahādeva."
15 Synonymous with Magadhā.
16 At Devagāth.
17 Probably the same place as 'Bukkeswar' in Hamilton's Gazetteer, called 'Bhum Bakeswar' Imp. Gaz. Vol. I. p. 449. — J. B.
18 "The Aji, called also Ajavati and Ajinātī according to Wilford."
19 Nagara, the capital of Birbhum till the 19th century.
"Varthabhumī" is the next division of Pundra. The central portion is a forest: along the skirt of it is Dhaivalabhumī. In one direction it is contiguous to Tungalabhumī, and another to the Sekhara mountain; and it comprises Varabhumī, Sāmanta-bhumī, and Mān-bhumī. This country is overspread with impenetrable forests of sal and other trees. On the borders of Varabhumī runs the Darikā river. In the same district are numerous mountains, containing mines of copper, iron, and tin. The men are mostly Rāja, robbers by profession, irreligious, and savage. They eat snakes, and all sorts of flesh; drink spirituous liquors, and live chiefly by plunder, or the chase. As to the women, they are, in garb, manners, and appearance, more like Rakshasīs than human beings. The only objects of veneration in these countries are rude village divinities. The principal towns are Pushapataṭan, Kusumapaṭan, Chatranagar, Raghunāthpur, Dhavalapura, Sivullapala, and Barahānagar. The chief villages are Chakraveshaṭanī, Kichandra, Suvernatapanna, Nandala, Kesara, Rāyapur, two Sarangas, Virabandhana, Suvarnarikki, Patri, Kadali, Trapushabad, near the Sitavati, and Yakamothaka.

"Vardhamānā" is the next division of Pundradeśa. The country is highly populous, and the people are pious and cultivated, obedient to the laws, and diligent in their religious duties. The chief object of worship is the śādigrām, which is to be found in every respectable house. Amongst the principal cities are Hāataka, near a forest; Vīlwapataṭan, west of the Bhāgirathī, near the Sarasvati river; and Sāmanta-pataṭan on the borders.

"Vindhyapārswa" is the last division of Pundradeśa. It lies north of Rānastambha, south of the Ganges, west of Kikata, and east of Tīrtharakā. It comprehends a population of a very miscellaneous character. The greater number are addicted to the worship of Devī, eat flesh, and drink spirituous liquors. In the early part of the Kali age, this country was the residence of a Kāhatriya prince, who assumed the garb, the attributes, and name of Vāsudeva, and passed himself off for the real Kṛṣṇa. The divine lord of Dwāraka, however, vindicated his rights, and a war ensued, in which the impostor was slain.

The principal towns and villages are Sudarśana, near the mountains; inhabited chiefly by hunters and fowlers and people of low caste. Pushapagrama within the hills near the Son. Darāraksha, near the hills on the Gālikā river. Guraigrām, on the side of the hills near the Son. Mudgalapur, amongst the hills near the Chandraprabhā river. Shāhpur, Mārjarapura, Sivapur, and Majapapur, on the banks of the Ganges. Barada on the Son; and Manigrām on the Parnā river. In the south-west quarter, about three yojanas from the Bhāgirathī, is Marāha-Nagar, which is the residence of the governor of the province, amidst forests and mountains. Kāntita-pataṭan is situated upon the Ujjalā river, near the Ganges, and Surapataṭan on the Chandraprabhā.

"Besides these, Yavanas have many cities and villages in these parts, as Janahābad, Nemas-Ganj, Sher-ganj, Sikandarpur, &c., &c."

---

**MISCELLANEA.**

**THE DATE OF ONE OF THE KANHERI INSCRIPTIONS OF AMOGHAVARSHA I.**

At the time when I edited the Kanheri inscription of the Rāmakrātā Ṭamāgaharsha I, which is published ante, Vol. XIII. p. 134, I was not able to calculate Indian dates for myself; and I now find that the European equivalent for the date of the inscription referred to, which I have given, ib. note 9, is altogether wrong.

The inscription is dated, in words, and again partly in figures, in the Saka year 775, and the Prajāpati sanvatsara, on the second lunar day

13 "Probably part of Mānaspur, Pachit, and perhaps part of Rāmgarh. The Sekhara mountain is probably Purāvanti hill near Madhuvanu."

14 "Barīkhār: but how far the limits of the district coincide with those here intended, cannot be conjectured; for our text is but a small part of the original, several pages of the MS. being here defective."

15 "Side of the Vindhyā, a tract about Chunār and Mirzapur: for Rāma-stambha is Chandel and Bhagelkhand; and Tīrtha-rāja is a synonym of Prayāg."

16 "This may be meant for Mirzapur."
of the dark half of Áśvina, on Budha-dina or Wednesday. By the Southern System of the cycle the Prajāpati saṁvatsara coincided with Saka 773 expired; and by the Northern System it commenced, according to the Sātra-Siddhānta rule without bṛjā, in Saka 772 expired, on the 26th November, A. D. 850, and ended in Saka 773 expired, on the 22nd November, A. D. 851. And accordingly, either the year 775 has been put wrongly in the date for 773, or the saṁvatsara Prajāpati has been quoted incorrectly. Calculation shows that we have to decide in favour of the former alternative. For, the second of the dark half of Áśvina, pūrṇimānta or amanta, did not fall on a Wednesday in either Saka 775 current or Saka 775 expired; but by the amanta scheme it did fall on a Wednesday, the 16th September A. D. 851, in Saka 773 expired. And Wednesday, the 16th September A. D. 851, is therefore the proper equivalent of the date, and this day fell in the Prajāpati saṁvatsara by both the Southern and the Northern Systems of the Cycle.¹

Dates in which the year of the Cycle is quoted correctly, and the Saka year incorrectly, are not uncommon.

Thus, the Aśjanēri stone inscription of Senva-dēva, ante, Vol. XII. p. 128, is dated in the Saka year 1083, and the Dundubhi saṁvatsara, on the 16th lunar day of the bright half of Jyēśṭha, on Soma or Monday, under the nakshatra Anurata and the yūga Siddha. By the Southern System of the Cycle the Dundubhi saṁvatsara coincided with Saka 1064 expired, not with Saka 1063; and calculation shows that the year of the date was really Saka 1064 expired. For, the date corresponds, for Saka 1064 expired, to Monday, the 11th May A. D. 1142, when the 15th tithi of the bright half ended 13 h. 52 m., and when the nakshatra was Anurādhā up to 13 h. 47 m., and the yūga Siddha commenced 2 h. 38 m., after mean sunrise.

Again, to quote only one other example, the Pāṇā stone inscription of the Yādava Singhana and his feudatories Sādavā and Hūmādīdevā, which I have re-edited in Epigraphia Indica, is dated in the Saka year 1128 and the Prabhava saṁvatsara, on the full-moon tithi of Śrīvāna, at the time of a lunar eclipse. By the Southern System of the Cycle the Prabhava saṁvatsara coincided with Saka 1129 expired, not with Saka 1128; and besides, if the year of the date were really Saka 1128 expired, the corresponding date would fall in A. D. 1206, and in that year there was no lunar eclipse at all. On the other hand, taking the year of the date to be Saka 1129 expired, which was the Prabhava saṁvatsara, the corresponding date will be the 9th August A. D. 1207, when there was a lunar eclipse which would have been just visible in Khāndēsā.

F. KIELHORN.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

A PECULIAR CUSTOM OF SUCCESSION.

From a debate in the House of Lords on the Manipur matter (see the Times of the 23rd June, 1891), it appears that "the succession to the Gaddi, or as we should say to the throne, is based upon a peculiar system. Where there is a series of brothers, they succeed one after another, and so the succession goes on until the last of the brothers is exhausted, and then it is his son, and not the son of the elder brother, who succeeds."

The Manipur State is one of recent origin. But a peculiar custom such as this, — if it really exists, — must probably have some basis in antiquity. And there are not wanting instances within the limits of India proper, which suggest that it may have been an occasional rule there in early times.

Thus: — Among the Rulers of Valabhī (see ante, Vol. XV. p. 273), the Sënpati Dharasēna I. was succeeded by his younger brother, the Mahārdāja Drāmasēna; the latter, by his younger brother, the Mahārdāja Dhruvasēna I.; and the latter, again, by his younger brother, the Mahārdāja Dharapāṭṭa: and the succession was then continued by Dharapāṭṭa's son Guhasēna, and his descendants.

Again, in the Chalukya family we may note specially, in the Eastern Branch, the succession after Jayasinhī I. and Jayasinhī II. (see page 283 above); and in the Western Branch, the succession after Satyāśraya II., and again after Vikramāditya V. (see Mr. Flett's Dynasties of the Kannara Districts, p. 18-19).

Instances could, of course, be brought forward to show that such a rule, if it existed, was at any rate not invariably observed. But the cases quoted above are at least peculiar coincidences. And they, and many other points in early Indian history, suggest that there may have been

¹ On that day, the second tithi of the dark half ended 10 h. 39 m. after mean sunrise.

² Compare a similar date, of Saka 788 expired, discussed by Mr. Flett, ante, Vol. XVII. p. 142, No. 19.
been an early practice, more or less binding, of the kind which appears to exist now in Manipur.

The matter seems worth looking into further; especially with a view to ascertaining whether the Dharmasāstras prescribe any such rule of inheritance and succession for the warrior and regal castes.1

SOCIAL CUSTOMS; MARRIAGE.

In Telingana.

(1) The custom of sending a sword to represent an unavoidably absent bridegroom at a wedding, is not uncommon among Rājus and Valamas. It is considered allowable among other Hindus also. See Indian Notes and Queries, Vol. I. note 669.

(2) With reference to Indian Notes and Queries, Vol. I. note 678, Khonds, Sauras, Gadabas, Jātāpas, Pānos, Dūns (Gajjām and Vizagapatam Hills), Paidis, Rellis, Yerukalas, Dūmaras, Pānkalavāndu, Mandulaṅdu, Gariṅgālāndu, Manadāṅdu, Jālakaduṅgālāndu, Baitakummaras (wandering smiths), Yanadis, Oddi Upparas (Oddars), Upparas, Chachchudus (Mehtars), Mālas, and Madigas, permit the remarriage of deserted or divorced women and widows. If a superseded woman means in this connection a woman who has declared herself divorced before a pāiṣkāyād because her husband married again without her consent, such a woman is permitted by any of these castes to re-marry. A man of any of these castes may marry a woman outcast on his account from a caste higher than his own.


THWÉ-THAUK.

Thwé-thauk in Burmese means ‘one who has drunk blood,’ i.e., one who has drunk the blood of either an animal or a human being, infused in water or spirit, as a mark of exchange of friendship or fraternity. If the blood is that of a human being, it is generally obtained from a puncture in the arm; and if that of an animal, it is obtained by killing a fowl, as among the Chinese2 and Karens, a buffalo, as among the Kachins,3 or a dog, as among the Chins. It is believed that this drinking of blood effects, as it were, the amalgamation of the natures, both material and moral, of the parties contracting friendship, and that this would cause a feeling of reciprocity in each other’s breast.

This custom obtains among the Chinese and Indo-Chinese nations. Among Chinamen, the ceremony is performed in a temple, and the gods are called upon to witness the compact. The tie existing between two ‘blood-drunk’ brothers is even stronger than that between brothers born of the same parents. In the case of the latter, the motive power is natural fraternal affection, which may sometimes be made subservient to private interests, but in the case of the former, the tie is surrounded by a halo of honour and religious sanction, which every Chinaman is taught to respect.

Among the Karens, Kachins, Chins, and other wild tribes of Burma, the custom is still in force and is as punctiliously observed as ever. But among the Burmans, it has died out through the influence of Buddhism, the humanitarian doctrines of which discomfitance of the shedding of blood and the placing of reliance in the supernatural powers, whose presence is invoked in the ceremony. Still the Burmese language possesses certain words, which attest to the fact that, in his pre-Buddhist days, the Burman was not loath to contract friendship or fraternity by ‘blood-drinking.’ A petty officer in the Burman army was called a Thwé-thauk, and when King Mindon invited all the scions of royalty to live at the capital, he placed them under thwé-thauks, who were to keep watch and ward over them. In Upper Burma, an upper menial servant is called has always been a common practice with all Chinese secret societies. — Rangoon Gazette of 2nd October, 1891.

1 A small quantity of the blood of the slaughtered animal has been caught, and is now mixed in a large vessel with an abundant supply of raw native spirits. The whole is stirred up with the points of swords and spurs, which are dipped into the liquor; and each chief, as he comes up in the supposed presence of the attendant deities and takes his draught from the sacred bowl, swears his oath of fidelity in muttered prayers, which imply the most fearful results as a certain consequence of infidelity. The dipping of the spears and swords in the liquor, in which the oath is drunk, is said to be typical of the violent death which would, of a certainty, be incurred by a departure from the engagements contained in the oath. — Fytle’s Burma: Past and Present, Vol. II. p. 111.
a thad-thawk, and according to Judson's Burmese Dictionary, a band of fifty men is also called a thad-thawk.

No doubt the origin of the custom may be traced to a society, whose government and domestic relations were loosely organized, and which naturally, in all matters affecting life and property, gave preference to might rather than to right. In such a society, the sacred ties of affection, due to consanguinity, required to be strengthened and supplemented by an external ceremony, based on superstition, for the purpose of defending or advancing the interests of the commonwealth. In primitive man the amount of self-control is not sufficient to keep the rising passions in check, and hence a banding together or an agglomeration of human units is required to resist aggression or to invade the rights of others. Nowhere is the motto 'Union is strength' more rigidly followed than in a state of society, where moral force is powerless against physical force.

Taw Sein Ko.

**BOOK-NOTICE.**

**The Minor Law Books,** translated by JULIUS JOLLY.


Though in the series advertised to the public as "Sacred Books of the East" the sacred books of India have hitherto been conspicuous by their absence, the knowledge of Hindu law has been advanced to a large extent by the translations of Smriti-texts that were contributed by the two leading authorities, Professors Bühler and Jolly. The new volume which the latter scholar has brought out, contains annotated translations of two very important law-books. Both are professedly based on Manu, but anterior to his commentator Mēdhātithi. Professor Jolly assigns Narada to the fifth or sixth, and Brihaspati to the sixth or seventh centuries A. D. Narada's is the only Smriti, completely preserved in MSS., in which law, properly so-called, is treated by itself, without any reference to rules of penance, diet, and other religious subjects. Of special value to Hindu reformers is the following text of Narada (p. 184 f. of Professor Jolly's translation):

"When her husband is lost (i. e. gone no one knows whither) or dead, when he has become a religious ascetic, when he is impotent, and when he has been expelled from caste: these are the five cases of legal necessity, in which a woman may be justified in taking another husband."

Unlike Narada's, the Smriti of Brihaspati appears to have treated of the whole sacred law, but is not preserved in MSS. Professor Jolly has collected from quotations in later law-books, and arranged under their proper headings, all those fragments of Brihaspati which refer to law in its proper sense, — a laborious and difficult task, which few could have performed so well. If the footnotes did not draw attention to the sources

1 The reading mātrīpror ātanasi cha pumāya (Dr. Burnell's S. I. Palæography, p. 97). "for the merit of my parents and of myself," is in better accordance with the wording of the grants themselves.

2 It seems preferable to explain saṃdhivigrāha- from which the single passages are taken, the reader might feel inclined to consider the text as a complete treatise on Hindu law. The chapter on documents (VIII.) contains the subjoined interesting note on royal edicts, which is quoted from Brihaspati in the Vṛatamitrādāya (p. 365 f. of Professor Jolly's translation):

"12. Having given a tract of land or the like, the king should cause a formal grant (āṣāna) to be executed on a copper-plate or a piece of cloth, stating the place (of issue), the ancestors of the king, and other particulars.

13. And the names of the king's mother and father, and of the king himself, and (containing the statement that) this grant has been made by me to-day to N. N., the son of N. N., who belongs to the Vedic school N. N.,

14. As being endurable while the moon and sun last, and as descending by right of inheritance to the son, grandson, and more remote descendants, and as a gift which must never be cut down or taken away, and is entirely exempt from diminution (by the allotment of shares to the king's attendants, and so forth),

15. Conveying paradise on the giver and preserver, and hell on the taker, for a period of sixty thousand years, as the (respective) recompense for giving and taking (the land).

16. (Thus the king should declare in the grant), the secretaries for peace and war "signing the grant with the remark: 'I know this (jātdam mayā)."

17. (The grant) should be provided with (the king's) own seal (mudrā), and with a precise statement of the year, month and so forth, of the value (of the donation), and of the magistrate. Such a document issued by the king is called a royal edict (āṣāna)."

Ukhakāba as an inaccurate expression caused by the metre, instead of saṃdhivigrāha-ukhačākhyāṇam.

The term adhyakṣa appears to correspond to the dātaka or dīpati of the grants.
MISCELLANEA.

PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP.

No. 26.


(A) PROCEEDINGS.


(B) ARTICLES.

I.—Central Asia and the Further East.

1. The expedition of Karelin to the South-Eastern Coast of the Caspian in 1836, by D. Kobeko. Karelin, for some time an officer in the Artillery, afterwards in the service of Khán Jaagør, and finally in the (Russian) Home Office, died in 1872. He made three journeys to different points of the Caspian coasts and one to the Altai. He left accounts of his travels, some of which are unpublished; and a set of drawings, relating to his expedition in 1836, is now in the library of the Scientific Committee of the Treasury Office. The scientific results of his travels are interesting and important, and his diaries may even now be consulted with profit. As to political results, there were none; since all the different measures he proposed with a view to consolidate Russian influence on the Caspian were rejected by the Foreign Office.

2. On two stones with Chinese inscriptions, by E. Koch (with one plate and two lithographs). In the summer 1839, M. N. Jadrintzef brought home with him two inscribed stones found in the ruins now called Khara Balgasun on the upper part of the Orkhon River. According to M. Koch they bear inscriptions belonging to the time of the Uigur rulers of Mongolia, between 761 A.D. and 840 A.D. Unfortunately the stones are in such a damaged state as to defy a complete decipherment. One of them bears, besides the Chinese inscription, some lines in Uigur characters, and these lines are now the oldest known Turki document.

3. Titles and names of the Uigur Khans, by M. Radlof. In this article the author supplies us, from the Chinese history of the Tan Dynasty, with the names and titles of 12 Uigur Khans, which he completely restores from the corrupt Chinese transliteration. These Turk words, bearing a close resemblance to the language of the Kudatku-Bilik (composed some 300 years later), corroborate most happily the stone documents just mentioned. In an additional note M. Radlof gives a transcript and translation of what is left of the Uigur inscriptions. His conclusions are:—(1) The Uigurs spoke a Turki dialect closely allied to the language preserved in the Kudatku-Bilik. (2) Indications from Chinese writers, informing us of an Uigur alphabet in the VIIIth Century, A.D., are quite trustworthy. This alphabet of the Northern Uigurs is identical with the alphabet of the Uigurs of Eastern Turkistan, propagated by the Nestorians and adopted in the XIIth Century by the Mongols. The existence of Uigur stone documents of the VIIIth Century in Northern Mongolia is deemed to be so important a fact, that the Imperial Academy of Sciences has decided upon sending an expedition with a view of exploring the ruins, which are supposed to belong to the once famous Karakorum. The expedition started from St. Petersburg in April 1891.1

1 This expedition has been most successful. A large quantity of inscriptions has been found. M. Radlof is going to publish shortly a detailed account of the work done by the expedition.—15th Dec. 1891; S. d’O.
4. On some Witty Etymologies of the Sarts, by N. Ostrokov. The article gives some instances of alterations by the common folk in the names and titles of Russian officials in Turkestan. The name of the late Governor-General, Tchernezhoff, the Sarts pronounced as Shhr-nab (the Lion's Representative); the title "Procureur" (Attorney General) they pronounce "Birkurar" and explain it as the title of a person "who at once sees and decides," (Bir-Kurar). General (Janadar) they explain as جاندار, Jandár Ali, &c.²

5. A stone document of the Conquest of Korea by the Manjúrs, by A. Pozdnéjev. This is a text and translation of an inscription in Manjú and Mongol relating to the conquest of Korea by the Manjúrs. The text was published in the September Number (1889) of the Journal of the China Branch, R. A. S., with a note promising an edition of the Chinese text and asking persons acquainted with Manjú to give explanations on this part of the text. In answer to this Prof. Pozdnéjev undertook a translation, and found out, that besides the Manjú, there is also a Mongol text, in some points differing from the Manjú. The inscription is interesting from two points of view: (1) as furnishing us with some new facts on the relations between Korea and China, and (2) as offering us the hitherto oldest known specimen of Manjú writing, the inscription being only seven years posterior to the introduction of the Manjú alphabet, which took place definitively in 1032. To the last point we may now add that Prof. Pozdnéjev has since found in the Paris National Library a very interesting MS. relating the adaptation of the Mongol Alphabet to the Manjú Language. A detailed account of this MS. will shortly be published.

6. Contribution to the bibliography of the Kalmuck folktales. N. Veselovský. In a short note the author points to a translation of the popular poem of Jangar, by M. Bobrovnikof in the Imp. Russ. Geographical Society's Messenger for 1854, omitted by Prof. Pozdnéjev in his last article,⁴ and to the Kalmuck (Qalmák) tales collected by Lohr in Russian and published at Moscow in 1878.

II.—Persia.

1. Some notes on the Pārśi Schools in Persia. A. Orlov. — This is a translation, with some explanations, of a Persian article, not seen by the editor, of which the title is "Some Notes on the Pārśi Schools in Persia." The article gives some facts about the schools, the teachers, and the system of education in Persia.

2. Persian versions of the old Russian tale called "Shenjaka's Judgment," by V. Shukovský. This is a tale, which once had a wide circulation both in the East and West. It relates the story of a man, who, by a series of accidents, gets accused of many crimes and is liberated by a wise judge, who, in some versions, pronounces his judgment from a sense of justice, and in others in expectation of a bribe. The oldest known version is in the Jdtakas.⁵ M. Shukovský gives two Persian versions, one in verse, from a chap-book (text and translation), and the other in prose (translation only, as the text was published in a Persian lithographed Reading-book in St. Petersburg in 1839).

3. Indo-Persian humour, by V. Shukovský. In this article are quoted some satirical verses from an Indo-Persian Tarkiva called دروز روز. The verses relating the wonderful feats of a sham hero, are ascribed to a certain 'Ja'fûr, the jester.' This little poem is a delightful pendant to the Persian folk-song treating of the same subject, published by M. Shukovský in Vol. I. of the Zapiški.

III.—India.

1. Popular dramatic entertainments at the Holt festival in Amhord. I. P. Minajef. — This account of twelve dramatic entertainments was found in the papers of the late Prof. Minajef, who wrote them down most probably from the mouth of some old man at the festival. There are some interesting notes, of an article, signed by four Persians, in an Ispháhán newspaper, called Farhang. According to the article, there were then in Yezd 6,737 Pārás, showing some increase as compared with the 6,483 in 1872 (according to Houtum-Schindler). There were 7 schools with 402 pupils, and in one of these schools the Arešta and Pahlaví were taught. "It would be very interesting to know how this teaching is going on," remarks M. Orlov, and he quotes an article of M. Shukovský (Journal of the Public Instruction Office for 1885), to show that, so early as in the reign of Muhammad Shah, a beginning had been made of teaching these languages, which was, however, unfortunately unsuccessful. So far as one can judge from the scanty information we have as to the position of the Pārás in Persia, the teaching is improving, chiefly through the help of their Indian brethren.

⁴ It is interesting to note that the same process goes on in Burma, among the jok-loving population there, as regards British officials. Mr. Lightning is a title of some use to those two quick-tempered officials, As to folk-etymologies of European names and words in India, they are simply innumerable.—Es.]
⁵ Prof. Pozdnéjev is printing an account of the wars between the Manjú and Korea.
⁶ See ante, Vol. XX. p. 87a.
⁷ Gomarnchánjaftá, translated by the Rev. R. Morris in the Folklore Journal, and analysed and partly translated by Mr. C. Tawney in the Journal of Philology. A list of the different versions of this tale has been published by the present writer.
of one Hari Lāl, a bānīdī in Almārā (Kūmān), who communicated to him some fine folktales, which are to be found in Minayev's Indian Tales collected in Kamdeo in 1875, published in St. Petersburg, in 1877. The somewhat plain language of these pieces of real folklore was probably the cause why the late Professor did not put them in the account of his journey to India (St. Petersburg.—1875; 2 Vols.) Nearly all the pieces are of a satirical character, some of them being directed against false devotees, some against the European rulers of the country, some against Missionaries, some against unfaithful wives.

IV.—Semitic.

1. On a fragment of a Hebrew papyrus \(^6\) from the collection of W. S. Golenishev, by A. Harkavy. This short fragment bears on ritual. It is chiefly remarkable for its age, as it belongs to a date between the VIIIth and Xth Centuries.

2. Contributions to the biography and works of Sayyid-al-Fayūmī from the MSS. in the Imperial Public Library by A. Harkavy. Sayyid-al-Fayūmī (892-942 A. D.) the first Hebrew grammarian, belongs to the time of the revival of Hebrew science, in the IXth and Xth Centuries, A.D., in Egypt. Some of his works are known and published, but many important facts relating to his literary career can be gathered from this Hebrew-Arabic MSS. in the Imperial Public Library at St. Petersburg. Dr. Harkavy gives extracts from the following works of Al-Fayūmī: (1) From the “Book of Poetry” (a manual), and (2) from the “Book of the Exiled” (a controversial work). To this last are appended some extracts from works directed against the Sayyid.

3. On an inedited MS. of the Arabian Nights, by Baron D. Gunzburg. The MS. under notice belongs to the private library of Baron Gunzburg, and of all the MSS. of the Arabian Nights that have been as yet examined, it is the most closely allied to the MS. of Michel Sabbagh (Paris National Library, Nos. 2522 and 2523), and consequently to the Baghdad MS. This MS. is complete, unusually correct, and written in a very elegant style. It seems to be one of the best of the MSS. of the Arabian Nights. A remarkable feature of it is the high esteem in which women are held throughout the whole text, against the usual oriental way of treating women.

The article gives a comparative table of the tales, and a detailed comparison of the tale of Aladdin's Lamp in Zotenberg's text. This story is somewhat short in Baron Gunzburg's MS., but it is given in a more elegant and refined style than in the printed version. We may add that it is most desirable that Dr. Zotenberg, who is preparing a work on the Arabian Nights, should get access to this fine MS.

V.—Armenian and Georgian.

1. A summer journey to Armenia. Notes and extracts from Armenian MSS., by N. J. Marr. This is the result of a journey to Armenia in the summer of 1890. M. Marr went to Armenia chiefly to collect materials for his work (shortly to be published) on the Armenian fables ascribed to Vardan. He found, however, time enough to peruse also other MSS. of the rich Etchmiadzin Library, and to make a catalogue of the Armenian MSS. in the monastery on Lake Sevan (Gokcha), Besides some emendations to the text of Moses of Khoren, the article gives:—(1) a note on Asath, the translator of the Armenian “Barlam and Josaph,” who is named in two MSS. of the Sevan Monastery, and one MS. of Etchmiadzin, written in 1441; (2) a passage from the “Answers and Questions of Vardan” bearing on the legend of king Artavazd: (3) a passage of Vardan the Great (XIIIth Century) on a translation of the Bible into Syriac by the king Abgar, which tells us that at that time there was no Armenian alphabet; (4) Marr points out the importance of collecting all possible data bearing on the history of the Armenian alphabet and on works in Armenian prior to the invention of the Mesropian alphabet; (5) on the Osiphirik, a sort of collection of pious legends and apocrypha; (6) a note on the Armenian text of the Georgian Chronicle: the original of all hitherto known copies is the MS. No. 1732 of the Etchmiadzin Library; (7) The Book of Adam and Eve; copious extracts of the Armenian text of which apocrypha are given with a Russian translation, and the text seems to go back to the Greek version; (8) Joseph and Asseneth; some notes on this interesting apocrypha, edited by Prof. Carrière; M. Marr gives from the Etchmiadzin MSS. two texts (with translation) bearing on the same history; (9) “The Prayer of Asseneth” and the “Testament of Joseph,” which last he identifies with the “Prayer of Joseph” in the list of apocrypha of Mekhitar (XIIIth Century).

The article is to be continued, and will deal with some more apocrypha and other Armenian texts.

2. Sophron, son of Isaac, or Isaac, son of Sophron? by N. J. Marr. The existing MSS. of

---

\(^6\) A facsimile is given on pl. 14.
the Georgian "Barlaam" are insufficient to decide the question whether the author of this version was called Sophron, son of Isaac, or Isaac, son of Sophron.

3. The Etymology of the Armenian Sepouh and the Georgian Sepé, by N. J. Marr. These titles, according to M. Marr, go back through a series of transformations to the Avestic Vtáépúthera. The argumentation is very able, but not definitively persuading.

VI.—Egypt.

1. Archæological results of a journey to Egypt in the winter of 1888-89 (with five plates), by W. S. Golenisheff. The author during a stay of more than half-a-year in Egypt succeeded in making some important and interesting acquisitions, some of which were exhibited at a meeting of the Oriental Section of the (Russian) Archeological Society, where the au-thor gave explanations, which, in a somewhat revised and enlarged shape, are embodied in the present article. As most of these objects have already been described in special reviews, we have only to say a few words on some of the most interesting: a collection of páyri, some of which are in Pahávast, Hebrew and Greek; portraits from Tel-al-Amarna; some inscriptions; a seal with a Phœnician inscription "in honor of Jeremia"; some interesting pieces of Koptic embroidery. The article gives also some interesting notes on the Bulág Museum, on the acquisition of antiquities in Egypt, and short diary notes of a journey from Edfu to the Red Sea (chiefly topographical).

VII.—Archeology and Numismatics.

1. The Elisabethpol Find, by Baron W. Tiesenhausen. The Imperial Archeological Commission has last year from Tiflis a silver buckle and 296 Persian coins, chiefly of the XVIIth to XIXth Centuries, A. D. (1122-1220 A. H.), found in the province of Elisabethpol. A description of this buckle is given in the article.

2. New Find in Bulgar (in the Province of Kasán) by N. Likhatchef. In September, 1889, a peasant in the village of Unpénak, Bulgar, dug up in his courtyard some brass calドrons, two of which had on them Arabic inscriptions (benedic-tions to the possessor). M. Likhatchef's opinion is that these objects must probably belong to the end of the XIVth Century.

3. On two fals found near the village Balymer in the Government of Kasán, by N. Likhatchef. In the autumn of 1889, near Balymer, were dug up a skeleton and near it two copper coins: one with the name of An-Nasir-li-din-Allah, and the second with the name of Mangu Kaán. More such finds would be most desirable, as they would help to give a certain date to all such sepultures in Bulgar.

VIII.—Miscellaneous.

1. Translations from Persian, Turkish and Arabic; Imitations of Oriental Poets, by M. G. Delightful poems, faithful renderings of oriental ideas and feelings; translations from Sâdî, Hâfiz, Firdósí, &c.

2. Kerôpe Petrovitch Pathakov (with portrait), by N. Vassilofsky. A short biography of the well-known Armenian scholar. Prof. Pathakov, who was born in 1833, was the son of an Armenian priest. He began his studies in the College of Stavropol, passed later into the Lazaref Institution in Moscow, remained some time in the University of Dorpat, and finished his studies in the chief Teaching Institution of St. Petersburg. He was later for some time a teacher in a Female College in Tiflis, and afterwards, till his death in 1889, he was a professor at the University of St. Petersburg. His first scientific work (as a student he wrote many poems, which are still very popular in Armenia) was the Catalogue de la Littérature Arménienne. He also edited and translated many of the Armenian historians, wrote on Armenian geography, on the inscriptions of Van, etc. A list of his works is appended to the article.

3. Musalat edn books printed in Russia during the year 1889, by W. D. Smirnov.—This is a list with a bibliographical description; the number of copies printed of each book is also given.

IX.—Reviews.

1. The Kirghiz and Karakirgiz of the Syrdar-yinské District. Vol. I., Common Law (Russian), by N. T. Grodekoff.—This book shows clearly that the administration is carefully studying the country it has to deal with. A clearer distinction between 'ádat and shari'di is most desirable, as the shari'di is only a powerful means of oppression in the hands of the upper classes directed against the masses. General Grodekoff's book will be of great use to the Orientalist and to the administrator.

2. Ethnographical Notes on Tibetan Medicine, (Russian), by W. Ptizyn.—This is a list of 101 maladies, 429 names of drugs, and a description of surgical instruments. All the names are given in Tibetan with Russian translations. The whole is compiled from communications from Lamas from the Transbaikal District.

3. History of the Town of Kuasimof (Russian), by N. Shishkin.—This is a short history of the
town, founded chiefly on the large work of Weljaminofo-Zermonf, entitled The Tears and Tear-viches of Kassiof.

4. Persian, Arabic and Turkish MSS. in the Tashkent Library (Russian), by E. Kahl.—A description of 87 MSS. The chief interest lies in the historical part of the Persian MSS., where some good and old copies of interesting works are to be found.


6. Catalogue of Oriental Coins in the British Museum, Vol. IX., by Stanley Lane-Poole. An excellent catalogue of a splendid collection; in this volume we find more than 290 imitated coins. On pp. 312-313 the reviewer proposes to read بیشین instead of بیشین, as the بیشین is clearly to be seen on two dinars in the Museum of Baron Stieglitz. Other different readings are proposed.

7. Modern Persian Comedies, etc., edited by Dr. A. Wahrman. No. I. Monsieur Jourdan, with German translation, notes and glossary. These comedies, which first appeared in a Russian shape (Tiflis, 1853), were translated into Turkish (ib. 1890) and lastly into Persian (1874). They are very bad representatives of modern Persian, and in many passages are only adaptations of the Turkish, and even of the Russian, original. From this point of view they can be hardly welcome, and are not to be put in the hands of beginners. The reviewer gives some corrections to text, translation and glossary.

8. Glossary of Iberian and Latin words used by the Mosarabes, etc. (Spanish) by D. F. J. Simonet. The first part of the book is an ardent panegyric of the Mosarabes (Mosarabs), who, according to the author, have created the so-called Arabic civilisation in Spain. The somewhat too passionate argument does not always sufficiently reason out many other facts, which indeed do not quite corroborate the fundamental idea of the author. The second part is the Glossary, which is quite on a par with the first part. It is not everybody that will agree with D. Simonet's conclusions, but to all Arabic scholars, interested in the history of Spain, it will give much useful information.

9. The Tale of a certain Old Man (Russian), by Ch. Loparef.—This is a diary of a voyage to the Holy Land in the XVIIth Century, by a Russian. M. Loparef has edited the text with copious notes. Two postscripts on the MS. are interesting, as giving some facts of the intercourse between Russia and Turkey at that time. Appended to the Review is a notice by Baron Rosen on the word Чeлеби, which occurs in one of the postscripts. From different explanations he adopts that of Ahmed Vafik-Pasha in his Lehjehi-Othmanische. Чeлеб goes back to Persian Chelip, which goes back to the Syriac Talibd (the Cross). Cf. Arab. صليب. The learned Pashá is wrong only in referring its origin to the time of Christian influence in the reign of Changis Khan. We know now that this influence is to be dated much earlier, from the time of the first Nestorian missionaries. In this way we have, as the oldest meaning of the word, "Man of the Cross," Christian. As the first who adopted the Christian faith were persons of high and even of royal descent, it was afterwards applied to them, and still later, as a designation of all educated people. The oldest here known mention of this interesting word is from 1313. More facts will enable us to decide the question definitively.

10. A Historical Grammar of the Modern Armenian language of Tiflis (Russian), by A. Thomas. This is a perfectly worthless, unscientific compilation, written without any knowledge of the most elementary principles of philology. The painful impression produced by M. Thomas's book is greatly relieved by a series of most interesting philological notes by the reviewer (M. Marr).


12. Journal of the Society of Investigation of the Amur Country, Vol. I. (Russian). This recently founded Society has started a periodical. The contents of its first number are interesting. We may point out an article of the President, M. Basse, "On Archaeological remains in the valleys of Lefi, Daubikhe and Oulakhe." The report of the Society tells us that it has an Archaeological Museum with 285 objects.


7 It is adopted from the same source by M. Barbier de Meynard in his Dictionary.
merciant, Mirzâ Bukhârî to Kharkof, Moscow and St. Petersburg; (6) The Turkistan Gazette; (7) Conclusion.

14. A Chinese-Russian Dictionary, by the Rev. Father Palladius and P. S. Popof. A very rich dictionary containing 11,668 hieroglyphs. The best parts are those relating to Buddhism, Taoism and the Confucian philosophy. The pronunciation is that of Peking. It is to be regretted that the accents are omitted.

15. Minor works of A. von Gutschmid, Vols. I and II. (German). A most important publication both for the Orientalist and for the historical student. The first volume gives articles on Egyptology and Greek Chronography; the second volume relates entirely to the Semites and to early church history. Two more volumes will be published on the history of the non-Semitic nations of Asia and on Roman-Greek medieval history.

16. Handbook of Arabic as spoken in Egypt (German) by Dr. E. Völlers. A most excellent hand-book for Arabists, who wish to get acquainted with modern Arabic. To persons who are not trained in literary Arabic, the book will be probably somewhat difficult.

17. Transactions of the Egyptian Institute, 2nd Series, No. 10 (French). Among articles bearing on Oriental subjects, that of Yakub-Artyam-Pasha may be noted, which deals with Koptic methods of fractional configurations, now quite antiquated, though in circulation for a long time.

18. Arabic Authors by J. J. Arbuthnot. The reviewer pronounces this book to be "a failure."


Sergius d'Oleenburg.

NOTES AND QUERIES.

NOTES ON SOUTH-INDIAN FESTIVALS.

I.—Pongal.

The Pongal is one of the chief Hindu festivals in Southern India and generally takes place about 12th January. It is celebrated with much delight and amusement by all classes of the Hindos, as being held on the day on which the sun leaves the sign of Capricorn and proceeds towards the Equator.

All houses are neatly whitewashed and repainted. Relations are invited from a distance, and alms are given to the poor. New rice, mixed with milk, green gram, sugar and other edibles are boiled in a new vessel in an open yard in the centre of the house and offered to the sun-god. Every one in the house partakes of this food with great eagerness, for, if the rice has boiled well it is a good Pongal, promising future happiness. Relatives, friends and acquaintances all salute the master and inquire whether "it has boiled?" On the third day is the cattle feast, when all the cattle are bathed and adorned and their horns painted in various colours. Rice and milk are boiled and given to the cattle.

11. —Yakusmaprappu, or New Year's Day.

This falls about the 12th of April, and is a very important festival. Early in the morning every one takes a bath in cold water, in a river if possible or at home. During the day there are great public rejoicings. Relatives are invited and the holy water mixed with marigold (nim) flowers, while molasses and young tamarind are presented by the family priest and freely passed round. This is done to secure good health during the coming year. Towards evening the family priest produces the new Almanac and reads out the more striking passages, explaining them at the same time, while the whole family sits round him eagerly gathering their fortune during that year.

III.—Dipavali.

A social festival held about the 23rd of October in commemoration of the auspicious day when the Asuras, Bâlêchakravarti and Narâkasura were slain by Vishnu. As this event is said to have taken place in the evening, the people express their joy at the event by illuminating their houses with lights arranged in artistic lines and letting off fireworks and crackers. The Hindus of all classes get up as early in the morning as two o'clock, anoint their bodies with gingly oil and bathe in hot water, put on new clothes and ornaments, and gaily decorate their children. Sweetmeats of all kinds are prepared, of which everybody in the house partakes after the bath.

K. Srikanthiyar.

MEDICAL LORÉ IN MADRAS.

If fever comes on a person on a Saturday, the fever will last till the next Saturday. Medicines are generally not administered on a Saturday, as it is an inauspicious day. They would only be given on the next day.

K. Srikanthiyar.
INDEX.

Achyanaràya of Vijayanagara; his coins 306
Addakali-Gachchha, of the Jains 271
addition, the Burmese system of, explained 55 ff.
adhyaksha, = dàtaka or dàfapti 424 n.
Ádityadatta, Sàdhvajagrihakà, an officer of Balavarnâdéva 123
Afgân language, the components of the, 338;
is an Iranian tongue probably derived from Zend, 338; — literature, a note on, 339, 340; — love-songs, 340; — proverbs 340
Afgân Race, discussion on the origin of the 338, 339
Ájìtvakas, the 361
Ajmere, Sanskrit plays by Sàndhâdeva and Vigrâharâdja; partly preserved in inscriptions at 201
Ajñâpta, used to denote the Dáttaka of a grant 106, 413
Akalârâ inscription, noticed 84
Akhnân Darvēzâ, the Afgân writer 339
Ákulanâmanâna, a village in the Gudrâvara-vishaya 270
Alandâtrâs, a village in the Srâuliya bhûga 96
Alexander of Epirus was a contemporary of Asàkâ 242
Alikasadara, = Alexander 241
alphabet; the North-Indian; the powers of certain characters in it 117, 118
Amma I, Visnuvardhana VI (Eastern Chalukya) 12, 13, 95 n, 266, 283
Amma II, Vijayaditya VI (Eastern Chalukya) 12, 13, 270, 283
Ammângâdevâ, wife of Râjârâjâ I 273
dâmbâya is a synonym of kula or kukakrama, and means 'generations, successions' 342
Amôghavarâha I (Râktrakâta), 101, 103;
distinct evidence of a break in his reign, 113, 114; — the English equivalent of the date of his Kâperi inscription of Śaṅga-Sanhvat 775 (for 773) 421
Anderson, his murder at Multân 315, 216
Andhra or Andhra country 93
Andhras mentioned in the Asàkâ inscriptions 239, 240, 247
dàgû, the meanings of, in certain dates. 237 to 239
Àgâsînas; names of the Eleven Àgâsînas, according to the padâvatî of the Sarasvatî-Gachchha, 343, 349; — of the Minor Àgâsînas, 349; — and of the One Àgâsînas 349, 350
Àghîlâkâra pradâasti of Vikrama-Sanhvat 1651;
English equivalent of the dates 141 and n.
animals, grateful, in folktales, 30 ff.; — the object of propitiating slain, among savages. 195
Arjanî inscription of Śûnapâdevâ, of Śaka-Sanhvat 1063 (for 1064); examination of the date 422
âvikâ, as a termination of proper names, in Guṇâgânakâ, 102; — and in Kâliyârâykâ 103 and n.
Ántâkâna, = Antignus 241
Antignus Gonataes of Macedonia was a contemporary of Aśoka 242
Antiochus II. of Syria was a contemporary of Aśoka 242
âvusântâvas, a religious institution of Aśoka's time 253
Aparâjita, Aparâjya, the third Sûrya-Chakrâ 347, 348, 358
Arabian Nights, an Indian origin for the, noted, 185; — either MS. of the 427
Arabic-Persian word wâgârâ used in the Tirunelli grant 291 and n.
Araû, Prof. von Roth on the 394, 395
are, the sines of, in the Pañcasiddhântakâ 233
Arhabalân, a name of Guptâgupta 342, 350
Arician grove, the 45
Arician, priesthood, rule of the, 45; — priests, their story explained 46
arithmetic, as preached by Burmese astrologers, 53; — the correspondence between the Burmese and Hindu astronomical system of, 53; — the use of Indian (Pâlî) terms by the Burmese in their, 53; — the correspondence between the Burmese and Tibetan systems of, 53; — origin of the Tibetan system of, 53; — Burmese and Tibetans not taught to multiply by rote beyond nine times nine, 54; — Burmese, is a mental system, 54; — Burmese process of calculation in writing, 54; — illiterate Burmese system of notation, 54; — Burmese system of, the result of working with a natural (= spoken) notation, 68; — antiquity of the Burmese system of, 54; — Burmese standard works on, 54; — Burmese system of, limitation of the, 57; — not adapted to fractions, 57; — Burmese system of, an explanation of the origin of, 67, 68; — Hindu astronomical system of; method of addition, 58 n.; — method of subtraction 59 n.; — method of multiplication, 60 n.; — Hindus taught to multiply by rote up to high figures, 63; — method of division, 63 n.; — note on Koptic 430
Arjuna Singh, his rebellion at Gujârâwâla 216
INDEX.

American, Apocrypha, notes on, 427: — date of the alphabet 427
Arthānā inscription of Chāmuṇḍārāja, of Vikrama-Sarīvat 1136: English equivalent of the date 129 and n.
Ārūtāṅkā dārāyka, a subdivision of the Guḍrāśā
viṣhayā 98
Āryādēvi, apparently the name of the wife of Dāñabāra 272
Āryan, European origin of; criticism of Van den Betsy's work on the 395
Āśoka, the great Buddhist king: mentioned by the name or title of Piyadasi (= Priyadārśina), 168, 170, 231, 232, 263, 364: — and by the epithet of Dīvinārayī, 165, 231: — he had also the name of Dharmaśākya, 233, 282: — probably Priyadārśina was his original name, and he took the name Āśoka or Dharmaśākya at his conversion to Buddhism, 263: — his rock edicts at Sahasrāsā, Rānpāth, Bārāt, and Bhabra, and the inscriptions in the Barābar caves; M. Senart's texts and translations, rendered into English by Mr. Grierson, 154, 165, 168: — Dr. Bühler's rendering of the Barābar cave inscriptions (and of the Nāgarjunī cave inscriptions of Āśoka's grandson, Daśāratha), 361: — discussion as to the author and language of the inscriptions, 229: — I, the author, 229: — the Piyadasi of the inscriptions is the Āśoka of the literary records, 232: — his coronation is to be placed four years and five months after his accession, 233: — the chronological order of the inscriptions, 236: — the period of them is fixed by the mention of certain contemporaneous Greek kings, 238: — his accession is to be placed about B.C. 273, and his coronation in B.C. 270, or 269, 242, 243: — members of his family, 246: — his royal residence was at Pālaiputra, 247: — the extent of his dominions, 247: — the synchronous Greek kings, and Indian and other tribes, mentioned in his inscriptions, 238: — his empire embraced the whole of Northern India, extended to the central plateau of the Dehlan, and was bordered by provinces over which he exercised suzerainty, 249: — his relations with foreign countries, 259: — the opening phrase of his edicts is a trace of the influence exercised by the Persian conquest and administration in north-western India, 255: — the classes of his functionaries, and their duties, 249: — the anusāśāyka, a religious institution, 253: — literary traditions about Āśoka, 256: — the successive
A. Bāntāsamudra, the noted 85 n.
dārāyka, a subdivision of a viṣhayā 98
Aṭāvārājula, an officer of Vishnuvar-dhara 18, 96
Aṭhrava-Voḥa (see Kauṣikīsātra), 90: — the numbering of the pariiśikās of the 148
Aṭhacarprā, an ancient town or village 418
Aṣekē, notes on the grammar of the 148
Aṭa-Rāturāja, another name of Gānaśēva 393
Ayrton, his murder at Multān 215, 216
Bacchus, see Dionysus 51
Bāghā, perhaps mentioned as Vav-vōnā 392 and n.
Bahāwalpur, Nawāb of, his share in the capture of Multān 216
Bairātās Prasāirītā, the; improvements in the reading, 114: — remarks on the date of one of them 154
Bairāt rock edict of Āśoka, edited 154
Bālasākā-Cana, another name of the Sarasvati-Gachchha 342
Balvar, the Wisdom of, a note on the Georgian romance of 86
Balavarmadēva, Mahādmānta, 123: — his grant, edited 123
Balder, the myth of, discussed, 192, 200: — Balder's Bale-fires discussed 199
Ballāladēva-Vēlābhāta 271
Banners and crests, differences between the devices on 279 n.
Barbar Hill mentioned by the ancient name of Khulati or Khulatika, 169, 170, 364 and n.: — the cave inscriptions of Āśoka, edited; M. Senart's renderings, 168: — Dr. Bühler's 361
INDEX.

Bijja, a king slain by Chalukyabhimara-Vishnur- 
vardhana VII........................................ 270
Bildachaduna, a notice of the.......................... 294
Biṣparasa, Prākrit name of Vishnurvardhana I........ 16
blister, girl born of a, in folktales........................... 142
blood, origin of the tabu of, 49; — of tabued 
persons very dangerous, 49; — consequent 
customs, 49; — contains the 'soul,' 49; — 
red juice in plants, especially in the vine, 49; 
— consequent customs, 49; — the savage 
thread of menstrual, 197; — an origin for 
the objection to shedding or spilling, 49; — 
drinking, a form of initiation, 423; — 
a form of oath, 423; — as a pledge of 
frienship, 423; — is still a custom among 
Karens, Kachins, Chins and Burmese wild 
tribes, 423; — survives amongst the 
Burmese only in their language........................... 425
'drain-drunken brother.'.................................. 425
Bōdhpī, a Burmese book on astrological move- 
ments.......................................................... 54
Bōdjiya, another name of Ballaladeva-Vīrā- 
ṇātha.......................................................... 271
Bodhiḥaryadevārya of Sāntidēva, the, noticed. 83, 84
Bōdhi-Gayā inscription of Vikrama-Saṁvata 
1005 (?); English equivalent of the date... 127
Bojana, an officer of Narāṇḍrāṇīgarāja- 
Vijayāditya II............................................... 101
Bōllīga, Burmese rules of astrology.................... 54
'Bombay East Indian,' defined.............................. 183n.
'Bombay Portuguese,' defined................................ 183n.
Bombay Presidency, an inscription from the, 
edited......................................................... 65
bones, of dead ancestors, object of preserving 
among North American Indians, 120; — of 
slain animals, object of preserving, among 
savages...................................................... 135
Book of Adam and Eve, note on the Armenian 
Apocrypha called the.................................... 427
bride's feet, the, bringing ill-luck to her hus-
band's house.................................................... 82
Brihadgriha, the residence of Balavarmanadēva, 
123; — Hemachandra gives it as a syno-
nym of Kārthaka.................................................. 124
Brihaj-Jātaka, mention of the, in folktales........... 31
Brihaspati, the law-book; notice of Dr. Jolly's 
translation..................................................... 424
British Museum: a grant of Narāṇḍrāṇī- 
garāja-Vijayāditya II, edited, 414; — the 
inscription of Sārānagadēva; English equi-
ivalent of the date............................................. 137 and n.
Buddhilinga, the ninth Daśa-Pānīs.....................348, 358
Buddhist caves recently discovered, at 
Nāḍsūr and Nenavall................................. 121
Buddhist inscriptions........................................ 134, 135, 136, 361
Buhilinga, = Buddhilinga................................. 348
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>INDEX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Bukkārāya of Vijayavāra; his coins | 392 |
| bull, the, represents Dionysus, 195; — Osiris... | 194 |
| burial, communal customs of, in North America, 119; — ancient communal, among the Pārsīs... | 386 |
| Burma, the French in, in the 18th Century, a notice of | 91 |
| burning-glass, the use of, in ancient India | 295 |
| 'burying the Carnival'; origin of the custom | 51 |
| armati person in folktales | 144 ff., 185 ff. |
| aries, the origin of playing... | 293, 294 |
| aster, an origin for many ceremonies and customs connected with... | 48, 49 |
| Caspian, Kassia's journey on the, notes on... | 425 |
| Caucasus, notice of works on the... | 88 |
| Central Provinces, an inscription from the, edited | 310 |
| Chalukyanas | 392 |
| Chalomes, see Seunju | 92 |
| Chālatakaṇḍa, an ancient place | 289 and n. |
| Chālaruddha, a king to whom Dharmanāpaini gave the rule over Kanaṇu; he is perhaps Bhājaśīva | 188 |
| Chāhukya chiefains under the Rāṣṭrakūṭas | 69 |
| Chāhukya-Arjuna, a brāhuṇa of Nerāṇḍrāṇugraha-Vijayaditya II | 100 |
| Chāhukya-Bhitāna I (Eastern Chalukya) 12, 13, 103, 293 |
| Chāhukya-Bhitāna II, Vishnuvardhana VII (East. Chal... | 12, 13, 95 n., 269, 283 |
| Chāhukya-Chandra, a brāhuṇa of Saktivarman 273 |
| Chāhukya-Chōla, a king | 268 |
| Chalukyas, Eastern, 1 to 15, 93 to 104, 191, 268 to 285, 414; — their chronological list, 12, 13; — their complete genealogy, in four parts, 274; — their genealogical table, 283; — a branch line of descent in later forms, 287, 286, 283; — variants of the form of the family-name, 95 n.; — their insignia, 275; — their original capital was Veŋgī, 93, 267, 269; — and they were called distinctively "the lords of Veŋgī", 93, 101, 102, 103, 269, 271; — they perhaps lost Veŋgī to the Chōlas for twenty-seven years, 272; — the capital was afterwards transferred to Rājamañḍrapura, 94, 296; — their intermarriages with the Chōlas, 273, 277; — and the Hāyihas, 101; — they latterly became Chōlas at heart, 277; — a settlement in Western India, or an intermarriage with the Eastern Chalukyas, 277; — they conquered the Kalinga country, 104; — and re-subjugated it, 278; — their wars with the Chōlas, 270, 272, 276, 277; — the Gangas, 101, 102; — the Rāṣṭrakūtas |
| of Mālkēd, 101, 102, 103, 114, 266, 270; — and the Western Chalukyas | 281, 282 |
| Chāhukyas, Western; wars with the Chōlas and the Eastern Chalukyas... | 280, 281, 282 |
| Chāmunārjuna, Paramāṇa; see Arthūra... | 189 |
| Chandaladevi, wife of Bhūma | 298 |
| Chandaladevi, wife of Mallapadēva | 288, 293 |
| Chandradēva of Orissa | 300, 293 |
| Chandrugopā, = Chandragopīna... | 85 |
| Chandrika inscription of Kalachuri-Sainvak | 724, noticed | 85 |
| Changē Khān, notes on the chronology of... | 87 |
| Chaturasonic, the spread of the game | 293 |
| Chāntūru, an ancient village | 413 |
| Chāvali, a village in the Kistna District... | 390, 393 |
| Chavane, the Taittirīya... | 17 |
| Chellār; see Kullōntas-Chōḍadēva II | 194 |
| Chellārā apradhaka | 284, 285 |
| Chērā-Phulāya alphabet | 286 and Plate... |
| Chērūṇpurā, a town in the (? Pāki visayya, 17, 96; — probably it is the modern Chērūṇpurā... | 157 |
| Chhatār Singh Aṭărīwāla, his alliance with the Amir, Dāst Muḥammad | 215, 216 |
| Chōlas, conquered by Gullūb Singh... | 213 |
| child-birth, superstitions connected with... | 47 |
| origin of May-day and the May-pole, 47; — vows to procure, 80; — cult of a Roman goddess to procure, 46; — the function of Dīna Nemorensis... | 47 |
| children, custom of 'passing,' discussed | 190 |
| Chilones, see Selungs | 92 |
| Chinghiz, see Changē | 87 |
| Chīpurupāla, a village in the Vījaya-vatapatam District; probably mentioned by the ancient name of Chērūṇpurā... | 15 |
| Chittor line, the, of the Sanasvat Gacchhaka... | 365 |
| Chitrāgadh inscription of Sanarāsinha; English equivalent of the date... | 137 and 139 |
| Chōḍadēva, = Kullōntas-Chōḍadēva II... | 285 |
| Chōla maṇḍapa, the... | 268 |
| Chōlas mentioned in the Aśokā inscriptions... | 89 |
| — they perhaps held the Veŋgī country for twenty-seven years, 272; — their intermarriages with the Eastern Chalukyas, 273, 277; — and their wars with them... | 270, 272, 276, 277 |
| church, the use of, in Indian Christian folklore... | 32, 80 ff., 144 ff. |
| Cinderella, a version of, in Saltsette... | 142 ff. |
| Citra pradāsa; see Sāraṅgadēva... | 137 |
| Cis-Satīnj States, annexation of the... | 212, 213 |
| clothes, 'prosperous,' in Bihār... | 375 |
| Coast Moors, see Moors of Ceylon... | 129 |
| coins, notes of, Parthian, 86; — Saffar, 87... | 85 |
| Samānī, 87; — Sasanian, 86, 87; — used as... | 85 |
INDEX.

charms, and altered for the purpose, in Madras, 219; — coins of the kings of Vijayanagara, 301; — of An-Nasr-li-Din-Allah, 428; — of Mungu Kaaan .......... 423
colour-sense as exhibited in the Aeseda .......... 148
communion with the divinity, an origin of the belief in .................. 195
consorants, the 'stop' sound of, in Nicobarese 298
corn, an examination of various customs connected with the cultivation of .......... 52
Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. III., the a Gupta Inscriptions; improvements in the readings .................. 188
eoughs, medicine and charms for, in Madras 192
cow, as a sacred Hindu metaphor ................. 339
crests; the bear-crest of the Eastern Chalukyaas, 96, 275; — differences between the devices on crests and those on banners 279 n.
crying the neck, an origin of the custom ...... 52
current and expired years; a case in which a year of the sixty-year cycle of Jupiter is distinctly quoted as the expired year, 411;
years of era; unqualified years of the Vikrama era are only exceptionally to be applied as current, 398; — the unqualified years of the Saptarshi era and the Lokakshma reckoning are to be applied as current 151 to 163
Currie, Sir Frederick, his share in the sale of Kashmir .......................... 213, 214

Daddana, a king conquered by Viahnuvar-
dhana I. .................................. 95
Dakshinagaram, an ancient name of the di-
strict round Gayâ .......................... 313
Dakshinarka, a form of the Sun, as a god, at Gayâ ............................. 312, 313
Dâla, grandfather of Kulachanda .................. 313
Dalhousie, Lord, his interview with Gulab Singh ................................ 238
Dalip Singh of Lâhôr placed on the throne by Suchet Singh and Hira Singh, 71; — reviews his troops on Gulab Singh's visit to Lâhôr, 75; — visits the Governor-General at the Qâysr camp, 213; — his deposition .... 217
Aâla, a custom of, in Bengal .......................... 306
Dânanripa, a variant of the name of Dânâr-
nava .................................. 272
Dânârnava (Eastern Chalukya). ...12, 18, 272, 283
dvandavaka, a corruption of dvandavaka 394 and n.
dangerous things, their origin in the doctrine of tabu .................................. 49
Dârdâ, conquered by Gulab Singh ................. 219
Dârila, a commentator on the Râsaâkutsâva .... 91
Das-Prâvina, names of the eleven, according to the pâtâsâl of the Sarasvati-Gaichhia 348, 338

Daśaratha, grandson of Aśoka; he had the epithet of Dâvânâjîya, 364, 365; — his Nâgârjuna hill cave inscriptions, edited 361
dates (see also eras); [here, and under all connected entries, the details of such Vikrama dates as were fully indexed in Vol. XIX., are not repeated] dates in which the Saka year is quoted incorrectly, 191, 422;
— a date which does not give satisfactory results in respect of an eclipse, 390; —
dates recorded in —
decimal figures ... 83, 84, 85, 126 to 141, 151, 152, 153, 212, 311, 314, 421
decimal figures combined with numerical symbols .................................. 323
numerical symbols .................................. 17, 128
numerical words ................................. 35, 154, 191, 314, 393
words ....126 to 141, 154, 311, 312, 314, 421
daughter, adventures of the only, in folktales, 332 ff.

days, civil, of the fortnight, or month, denot-
ed by sindi and siti, and budi or vadi and cati, and mentioned in recorded dates: —
bright fortnight: —
first .................................. 137
second .................................. 134
fifth .................................. 85, 137, 212, 311
seventh .................................. 83, 84, 123
tenth .................................. 152
fifteenth .................................. 129, 130
dark fortnight: —
third .................................. 83, 132, 138, 152
twelfth .................................. 84, 130, 141
thirteenth .................................. 151, 314

days, lunar, i.e., tithi, of the fortnight or
month, denoted by the number or name of the tithi, and mentioned in recorded dates: —
bright fortnight: —
first .................................. 111
fifth .................................. 312
ninth .................................. 141
fifteenth .................................. 122
dark fortnight: —
first .................................. 15
second .................................. 421
third .................................. 132, 133
seventh .................................. 157
eighth .................................. 3
eleventh .................................. 153, 289
twelfth .................................. 151
thirteenth .................................. 133, 151, 152
fortnight not specified: —
full-moon .................................. 130
days of the week; names of them, as used in
recorded dates: —
Aditya (Sunday) .................................. 212
INDEX.

Árki (Saturday) ........................................ 288
Buddha (Wednesday) ................................... 151, 152, 421
Chandra (Monday) ...................................... 153
Guru (Thursday) ......................................... 83, 132, 137, 138, 141
Kavya (Friday) ........................................... 151
Mangala (Tuesday) ...................................... 151
Ravi (Sunday) ............................................ 130, 137, 152
Sani (Saturday) .......................................... 138, 151, 152, 287

Sérica (Monday) .......................................... 35, 84, 129, 136, 137,
141, 153, 422
Saka (Friday) ................................................ 83, 84, (7), 129, 130
Sakara (Friday) ............................................. 35, 74
death: to the savage = absence of the 'soul,' 48; — may be permanent or temporary, being dependent on the absence of the 'soul,' 48; — temporary, in folktales, 329; — a mode of reviving after, in folktales, 82, 83; — slaying, and the revival of the slain death, 51; — carrying out, origin of the custom, 51

decimal figures combined with numerical symbols .......................................... 123

Delhi Museum inscription of Vikrama-Sambat 1384; English equivalent of the date 138 n.

Demeter, see Proserpine ............................... 51
demons, an origin of the belief in ...................... 48
deus ex machina in folktales ........................... 31
Deva, the tenth Daša-Pārvīn ................................ 348, 358
Devaṇānāpiye, 'dear unto the Devas,' an epithet of Āśoka, 165, 231; — and of his grandson, Daśaratha ................................. 364, 365
Devaṇapāla-deva of Dhāra; his Harasanā inscription, edited, 310; — inscriptions of his, at Udaypur, noticed .......... 83
Dēvarāya of Vijayanagara; his coins, 302
to 305

Dhalaga, or Valaga, a king slain by Chālukya-
 bhima-Vibhuvardhana VII ................................ 270

Dhāra, Jayasimhadēva of, 84; — Devapāla-
dēva .......................................................... 310, 311
dharmā-mahāmātra, title of a class of Āśoka's officials ................................. 250, 252
Dharmapāla acquired the rule over Mahādya by defeating Indrārāja ........................................ 188
Dharmasena, the eleventh Daša-Pārvīn ............... 348, 358
Dharmāśoka, another name of Āśoka .................. 233, 268
Dheli, = Dehi ............................................... 313
Dhrisīṣaṇa, the seventh Daša-Pārvīn .................. 348, 358
Diana Neminensia, explained, 45; — the object of her cult, 46; — a spirit of the wood ........................................ 47
Digguśaṇa, a village in the Pāguṇaravā 
viśāya .......................................................... 270
Dimila viśāya, an ancient territorial division, the name of which is preserved in that of Dimile .................................................. 15, 16, 17, 96

Dionysus as the god of vegetation, 51;
— represented by an animal, 193;
— Dionysus, as the god of the animal kingdom, slain periodically .................. 51
Dīpalvalī Festival, note on the ....................... 420
disguise as a man by heroine of folktales, 185;
— of prince hero as a poor man ........................ 336
division, the Burmese system of, explained, 50 ff.
Diwan Jawāhir Singh aids Suchot Singh ............ 71
dog, the image of a, as a charm for coughs in Madras .............................................. 192
donkey, riding on a, a punishment in India .......... 117
Dūst Mūhammad Khān, Amir of Afghanistan;
his defeat by the British, 215, 216; — helps the Sikhs against the English ........ 217
drinking, an origin of the custom of exclusive .... 48, 48
dīrghatāma, 'dimly seen' ................................ 101

Drōh-Ārjuna, a biruda of Chālukya-Bhima I ..... 138
Drujjura, a village in the Pennstevadvi 
viśāya .......................................................... 207

Easter; bonfires, reason for the custom, 198;
— Eve, customs connected with ...................... 198
eating, an origin of the custom of exclusive .... 48, 49
eclipses, lunar, mentioned in recorded dates, 17, 389, 417, 422; — a lunar eclipse quoted for a day on which there was not one, 390;
— solar eclipses quoted, which were not visible in India, 2, 9, 372, 415; — solar eclipses which do not work out satisfactorily .......... 412

Edwardes, Major (Sir Herbert) takes Multān 215, 216

Effigies, burning of, as a religious or periodical custom, survival of human sacrifices ................. 198

Egeria, a notice of the nymph ......................... 46
Ekādāsi, the catching of, a tale of noodles in Madras .................................................. 221 ff.

Elavargu, a village in the Velananda viśāya .... 271
Elliott, Sir Henry, at the darbar held at Lāhūr 
depositing Dulp Singh .................................. 217

English, corruptions of, in Bāhūr, 89; — in 
Burma, 89; — in the Pañjab, 69; — in 
Telugu .......................................................... 89

eras; comparative statement of years of the Saptarathi era and Lōkakāla reckoning with 
expired years of the Kāliyuga, Vīkrama, and 
Saka eras, and of the Kalpa, 150 and n.; 
— eras used in recorded dates: 
Kalachi .................................................. 84, 85
Kaliyuga ..................................................... 154
Lōkakāla .................................................... 151 to 154
Saka .......................................................... 35, 151, 152, 191, 393, 421, 422
Saptarathi .................................................. 151 to 154
INDEX.

Gandhāras mentioned in the Aśoka inscriptions ........................................ 239, 240, 247
Ganiyārabu (?), an ancient town or village ........................................ 418
Gaugā, wife of Vishnudevahana ................................................................. 268
Gaugā and Yamunā, among the insignia of the Eastern Chalukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūtīs ......................................................... 275
Gangaiṇḍa Chālapuram was the capital of Kulottuttugha-Chālādevā I .................. 290
Gāŋgakūṇḍa, = Gangaiṇḍa-Chālapuram ..................................................... 280
Gangāpāla, another name of Gangaiṇḍa-Chālapuram .................................. 280
Gangas, wars of the, with the Eastern Chalukyas ....................................... 101, 102
Gauḍa, a division of Punḍrādēsa ................................................................. 419
Gauhar Raḥmān of Gilgit, his doings ......................................................... 235
(Gautama or) Gōtama, the first Kaviḷaṅk. .................................................. 347, 358
Gāyā in Bihār; the surrounding district mentioned by the name of Dakshināgāra, 313; — the inscription of Vanarakṣīdeva of Vikrama-Saṅvat 1325; English equivalent of the date, 137 and n.; — the inscription of Vikrama-Saṅvat 1429; English equivalent of the date, 138 and n.; — an inscription of the reign of Sultan Firūz Shāh, edited ........................................... 312
Gōvinda in Bihār; a peculiar attraction of .............................................. 286
Geographical notes; the divisions of Punḍrādēsa, 418; — Ajmān, 202 n.; — Gayā District, 313; — Godāvari District, 93, 284, 285; — Hōsaṅgāhā District, 311; — Kistna District, 101, 302, 415; — Malabar, 286; — Sāṭarā District, 96; — Shāhābād District, 124; — Trichinopoly District, 280; — Vizagapatam District .......................................................... 15, 16
Gōshis, an origin of the belief in ............................................................... 48
Gulab Singh ................................................... 218
Gē Naikād Banijāra, notice of the Bihār poem ........................................ 298
'Goanese,' defined .................................................. 183 n.
Gōtama, the, represents Dionysus ....................................................... 193
Gōtā, a shower of, indicates birth of a son, in folktales ................................ 145 ff.
Golden Bough, the, explained; — is the mistletoe, 197 f.; — an original for the name, 200; — the, represented the 'soul' of the Rex Nemorensis, 49; — life-index of the king of the wood, 47; — enquiry into the reason for plucking the, before murdering priestly predecessor .................................................... 46
Fox in folk-tales ........................................................... 29 ff.
Frazer, Mr. J. G., his method of studying comparative religion ................... 45, 46
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gachchhas of the Jains; the Saravat, 341; — it is also called Parijāta ................ 343
Gajapati king of Oriasa, a ................................................................. 390
Gāmakāmbā, foster sister of Chālukya-Bhīma I ........................................... 108
Gānāṭa of Konduvīḍu; his grant, of Saka-Saṅvat 1377, edited ....................... 390
Ganarathabahāsāha, another name of Muja-mārya ................................ 284
Ganāṭa-Mahendra, a birada of Chālukya-Bhīma-Vishnuvardhana VII ............. 269, 283
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
Gabriel, the angel, in Indian folktales .................................................. 108 ff.
INDEX.

Gouñâru, a village in the Kandeugâdi
vishaya ........................................ 267 and n.
Gosalladé; see "Hathiya-dah" .................. 131
Gôtama, the first Kâvala .......................... 347, 353
gôtra, 'a family or clan'; the Mânavya gôtra
included the Chalukyas, 99, 106, 417; —
names of gôtras mentioned in records:
   Agnivaśya .................................... 418
   Brahma ....................................... 393
   Aupamanya .................................. 133
   Bhâravâja .................................... 393, 418
   Gârâya ....................................... 393
   Gautama ..................................... 17, 123, 418
   Harata ....................................... 393, 418
   Kâshaya ..................................... 106, 393
   Kauñâjina ................................... 393, 418
   Kauñika ..................................... 418
   Parâsara ..................................... 418
   Sanâkri ....................................... 418
   Sândjila ...................................... 123
   Srîvatsa ..................................... 393
   Vâsiśthava ................................... 123
   Vatsa ......................................... 418
Gôvindha, = Gôvârdhana, the fourth
Śrûta-Kâvala .................................... 347, 348, 353
Gôvinda III. (Kâsha-râkâta) ...................... 101
Gôvinda V. (Bhâravâja) .......................... 270
Gôvindachandrádeva of Kanaûj; see Rûn .... 130
Gôyama, the first Kâvala .......................... 347
Gôyama, grammar, note on Franke's treatise on Indian
genders, 393; — the formation of the plural
of Indo-Germanic neuter, 393; — the
flexion and stem-formation of the present
in the original Indo-Germanic language ... 395
grave, kneeling on the, as a mode of re-vivi-
fying the dead, in folktales ...................... 82, 83
Grythnasâtra of Hiranyakâsî; irregularities
in its language .................................... 296
Gundâvadi vishaya, an ancient territorial
division ............................................ 97 n., 275, 294
Gudrahârâ vishaya, an ancient territorial
division, 97, 98; — it is apparently identical
with Gudrâvâ and Gudrâvâra, 97 n.; —
and perhaps also with Gudrâvâdi .......... 97
Gudrâvâra vishaya, an ancient territorial
division, 97 n., 103, 270, 271; — also Gudrâ-
âvâra ............................................. 97 n., 271
Guhidëvâtpâtra of Orissa .......................... 390, 393
Gulâb Singh of Jummu adopts Kânhiyâ Singh,
71; — his troubles as to Bibh Chandâ's
claims, 74, 75; — attempt to poison him,
75; — conquers Kishâvar, 76; — his conduct
during the Sikh war, 77, 78; — the 'sale'
of Kâshmir to him, 213, 214; — ousted
from power temporarily by Lâl Singh, 213,
214; — terms of his Treaty with the
British Government, 214, 215; — re-
linquishes Hazâra for Manûwar and
Ghari, 215; — offers to help the English
to put down Chhatar Singh Atârâvâl, 214, 217; — aids in the subjugation of the
Pañjab, 217; — interviews Lord Dalhousie,
218; — interview with Sir Charles Napier,
218; — takes Dârdû and Chilâ, 219; —
is attacked with diabetes, 219; — sends
help to Hazâra, 220; — helps the British
in the Mutiny, 220; — his death ...... 220, 221
Gunâga, a variant of the first part of the
name of Guñaka-Vijayaâditya III .................. 102
Gunâgâñka, a variant of the first part of the
name of Guñaka-Vijayaâditya III .................. 102
Guñaka-Vijayaâditya III. (Eastern Chalukya)
19, 18, 102, 289
Gunakenalla, a variant of the first part of the
name of Guñaka-Vijayaâditya III .................. 102
Gunjâgolam, or Gunjâgolam, a village in the
Vengahânu vishaya ................................ 271
Guntâgolam; see Gunjâgolam .................... 271
Gupta Inscriptions, the; improvements in the
readings ........................................... 188 to 190
Gupta-Valabhi era, the, 376 to 380; — I, the
original Gupta era in Central India; 1, the
nature and initial day of the years, 377; —
A., the Brān inscription of the year 185, 
377; — B. and C., the Khôh and Majhuwâân
grants of the years 183 and 191, 377; — 2,
the arrangement of the lunar fortnights, 
379; — II, the era as used in Nêpâl; D.,
the Khâmpû inscription of the year 386,
379; — III, the Valabhi era of Kâthâ-
wâd and the neighbouring parts; E, the
Kaira grant of the year 390, 380; — F, the
Mêbî grant of the year 585 expired, 381;
— G, the Verâvâl inscription of Valabhi-
Sanâvat 927, 383; — H, the Verâwâl
inscription of Valabhi-Sanâvat 945, 384;
— IV, current and expired years; the
exact epoch of the era in each variety; and
the classification of the dates, 385; — Gupta-
Sanâvat 1 current began with the Chaitra of
Saka-Sanâvat 243 current, in A. D. 320, 
388; and Valabhi-Sanâvat 1 current began
with the KârttiKA of Vikrama-Sanâvat 377
current, in A. D. 319, 389
Guptigupta, also named Arhadhalîn and
Vişâkhâchârya, a disciple of Bhadrâbâhu
II. .................................................. 342, 350, 351
Haidar's Bahâduri pagoda coin ................. 307
INDEX.

Haihayas, = Kalachuris of Tripura; an intermarriage with the Eastern Chalukyas, 107, 415, 418

hair, origin of the sanctity of the, 49; — consequent customs, 49; — methods of promoting the growth of the, in Madras ... 192

Haksam, observances when visiting a, in Bihar 337

hand, the bloody, in Persia ... 148

Hausi inscription of Prithviraj; examination of the date ... 132 and n.

Harakeli-ud-daka, a play by Vigrahacarya, partly preserved in an inscription at Ajmer, 203; — English equivalent of the date of the composition of it ... 132 and n.

Harigana (Kalachuri of Ratnapur) ... 94

Harikara of Vijayanagara; his coins ... 302

Haripur in the Hazara country ... 336

Harirajadaha, an inscription of, at Udaiypur, noticed ... 84

Harischandra-deva (Paramara); examination of the date of a grant of his, of Vikrama-Saunvat 1285 ... 133

Haritaputra, an epithet of the Eastern Chalukyas, 96, 106, 417; — variants of the word ... 96n

Harsau, a village in the Hoshangabad District; mentioned by the ancient name of Harshapura, 310, 311; — the inscription of Devapaladaha, edited ... 310

Harshapura, ancient name of Harsau ... 311

Harshavardhana, of Kanauj; his Lingadahsesara is later than that of Vararuci ... 119

harvest, sacrifices at the ... 193

harvest-dog, = Harvest-May ... 193

Harvest-May, its origin and meaning ... 47

Hashanagar Greco-Buddhist pedestal; revised reading of the date by Dr. Bühler ... 394

"Rathiya-dah" inscription of the time of Gsalladahi, of Vikrama-Saunvat 1207; English equivalent of the date ... 131 and n.

Hazara country, the, answers pretty nearly to the ancient Urasa ... 336

head, the, contains the 'soul,' hence its sanctity ... 49

Hemaraj, father of Kalachanda ... 313

heroes, monumental slabs of; an inscription on, edited ... 69

Hida, name of a people mentioned in the Asoka inscriptions ... 239, 240

Hira Singh raises Dalep Singh to the throne, 71; — his claims to various territories, 72; — his death ... 73

Htōpādāsès, the, who is the author of it? ... 295

Hdt Festival, Prof. Minayer's folktales collected during the, notes on ... 426, 427

Hoshangabad District, an inscription from, the, edited ... 310

human sacrifice; various reasons for the custom, 50, 51; — shown in the fire festivals ... 197, 198

Hunzara, Dr. Leitner on the ... 385, 386

Ibn Khordadbeh, a new edition of, noted ... 86

Ikkeri pagoda coin ... 207

'incarnation' = permanent or temporary endowment with divinity ... 46

Indra, Adhiraja, possibly = Indra, Mahārāja, of the Gaṅga family of Kalingaraga ... 97

Indra-Bhāṭāraka (Eastern Chalukya) 12, 13, 97, 106, 288

Indrāśa, a king of Mahādāya, defeated by Dharapadha ... 188

Indrājā, = Indra-Bhāṭāraka ... 97

Indrājā (Rāṣṭrakūta); the date of his death ... 35

initiation by drinking blood ... 428 n.

inscriptions on copper, edited: —

Balavarsadahā, Mahāśivamata ... 123

Bhūkara-Ravivarman ... 288

Gāndēva (of Koṭaṇḍiu); Śaka-Saunvat 1377 ... 390

Maṅgi-Tyavāra (Eastern Chalukya) ... 104

Vijayāditya II. (Eastern Chalukya) ... 414

Vishnuvarthana 1. (Eastern Chalukya); of his eighteenth year ... 15

inscriptions on stone, edited: —

Asoka; his rock edicts at Sahasaram, Rānpāth, and Bairat, 154; — and at Bhabra, 165; — his cave inscriptions at the Barabar Hill; M. Senart's renderings, 168; — Dr. Bühler's renderings ... 361

Dāsaratha (grandson of Asoka); his cave inscriptions at the Nāgarjun Hill ... 361

Devapaladaha (of Dharā); his Harsaud inscription of Vikrama-Saunvat 1275, edited 310

Firdūs Shāh Sultan; Vikrama-Saunvat 1429, 312

Kāṭār inscription recording the self-immolation by fire of a Saiva ascetic ... 69

Vigrahacarya-jadaha (of Śrīkāntha); parts of a Sanskrit play by him, dated Vikrama-Saunvat 1210, and of another of his time ... 201

inscriptions, notes of; Achemenian, 293; — on an Aramaic vase, 85; — Sabaean, 296; — in Siberia, 88; — Chinese, 425; — the oldest known Mangu, 436; — Mongol in the Koryo, 426; — the oldest known Turkic, 426; — the oldest known Uigur, 425; — Russian expedition in 1891 to Karakorum in search of Uigur ... 425

intercalary months; how indicated in Vikrama dates ... 411

invocations of Bhāratī, 310; — Brahman, 310; — Gaṅga, 310, 313, 392; — Śiva, 310; — the Sun, 313; — and Vishnu ... 310, 392
iron, origin of many customs connected with 49
išpeh-bed preserves the word patsi in modern Persian 45
Iśvara, as Deus ex machīna in folktales 31 ff.

Jagannātha, the famous shrine at Puri in Orissa 390, 392
Jagati metre in the Mahābhārata 296
Jah-i-Qâdirî, a Musalman sect in Tâshkand 88
Jāínka ; see Môrât ... 381
Jains, Webers Sacred Literature of the; translated by Dr. Smyth; continuation 18, 170, 365
Jâjalladāvâ (Kalâchurî of Ratnapûr) 85
Jambû, the third Kâsilin 347, 358
Jânâthanâgarî, a city in the Vengi country 284
jâtakas, noted ... 87, 118
Jâtvârman, another name of Kulaśâkhara- 288
dâvā
jâvâk, a late instance of the ceremony, at 219
Manâwar in the Kaśmir Territory
Jâwâhir Singh kills Peshârâ Singh, 76; — his dispute with Mûl Singh, 219; — his attempts to get possession of Jâsrâta ... 220
Jaya-sëna, the fourth Dasa-Pûrva 348, 388
Jaya-sinhu I. (Eastern Chalukya) 12, 13, 97, 106, 283
Jaya-sinhu II. (East. Chal.) ... 12, 13, 99, 283
Jaya-sinhu-dâva (Chalukyana); date of a MS. of his time 130
Jaya-sinhu-dâva of Dhârâ; an inscription of his, at Râhatgâth, noticed, 83, 84; — English equivalent of the date ... 136
Jaya-sinhu-dâva, another king; an inscription of his, at Udaypur, noticed 84
Jaya-sinhu-dâva (Kalâchurî of Ratnapûr) 84
John of Damascus was not the author of Barlaam and Josas ... 65
Joseph, the Legend of; a Turkish version, noted 117
Joseph and Asseneth, notes on the Armenian Apocrypha, known as 427
Jotiâ Shâh Brajâlî, the perfect astrologer of Kaśmir ... 219
journey, an origin of purificatory ceremonies before and after a 48
Jupiter, the planet; mentioned as standing in Makara, 287; — use of years of his sixty-year cycle according to the mean-sign and northern luni-solar systems, 410, 411; — quotation of an expired year of this cycle, by the mean-sign system, 411; — cases in which the given years may belong either to the mean-sign system, or to the southern luni-solar system ... 422 and n.
Jupiter, the planet; his sixty-year cycle according to the southern luni-solar system; names of the years as used in recorded dates:

Kalâchurî of Ratnapûr ... 84, 85
Kalâchurî of Tripura; see Hai-hi-yasa ... 101, 415
Kalâcârama, a follower of Vishvûvardhana I ... 95, 104
Kulasankalita, Warren's; examination of some errors in it ... 35 to 45
Kali-Vishvûvardhana V. (Eastern Chalukya) ... 12, 13, 102 and n., 283
Kalîngâ mentioned in the Asoka inscriptions, 247; — the three Kalîngas conquered by the Eastern Chalukyas, 104; — Kalînga re-subjugated by the same ... 278
Kalîgatū-Paraṇy, the, of Jayâkoṇḍa; historical matters in it ... 278
Kalîyartiyangâ, apparently a variant of Kalîyartiyaanka ... 104
Kalîyartiyaanka, a biruda of Kollabiyangi- Vijayâditya IV ... 103 and n.
Kalîchunâgarî, an ancient village 272
Kalîvakaṇḍa, a village in the Dimila vishaya 15, 17, 96
Kâma, father-in-law of Amma-Vijayâditya VI ... 271
Kambiojas mentioned in the Asoka inscriptions ... 239, 240, 247
Kanakapatî (Vaihu), the lunar day of. 283 and n.
Kâschî, 102; — the court of Kölûttunga- Chôdâdâva I. was held here ... 280, 281
Kanâîruvâdi vishaya, an ancient territorial division [probably = Kanâîruvâdi ... 267
Kanâîruvâdi vishaya, an ancient territorial division ... 267
Kanâîruvâdi vishaya [probably = Kanâîruvâ- di] ... 270
Kâb Singh Mân, his share in the capture of Mûltân ... 216
Kâgheri inscription of Amôghavarasha I., of Sakâ-Samvat 775 (for 773); English equivalent of the date ... 421
Kanîshra-Narasaryâ of Mâisrûr; his coins ... 309
Kapila, a Gajapati king of Orissa, of the Solar Race ... 390, 392
Kâraûnâshâ, an ancient village ... 292
Kâkârûn, note on a Russian expedition to, in search of Uïgur inscriptions ... 425
Kâraṇa, an astrological term; for half a tithi; names of the karaṇas as used in recorded dates:

Bâlava 212
INDEX.

Dhātridaiyata (= Bālava) .......... 312
Taśarala ................. 133
Kāraśchedu, an ancient town or village .................. 418
Kaśyapāldāta, a brūdha of Chālukyabhūma-Vishnupravanada VII ........ 269
Karelin's journeys on the Caspian, notes on ................ 424
Karnarashtra vishaya, an ancient territorial division .......... 98, 99, 106
Karnadēva (Chaulukya); see Sūnac ............... 129
Kārūsha, apparently the ancient name of the Shāhābāb District .... 134
Kasiṇu, the ‘sale’ of, to Gulbā Singh ... 213, 214
Kāṭa, Duryādhīndha, an officer of Kulōtung-Acūkādēva II. .... 285
Kata was the capital of Kapila ............. 389, 392
Katakhādhiśa, the name or title of an officer of Amma-Vijayāditya VI .... 267 n., 272
Katakarāja, the name or title of an officer of Amma-Vishnuvarāna VI, 267 and n.; and of Amma-Vijayāditya VI ... 271
Katakēśa, the name or title of an officer of Bājārājā I. .......... 275
Kausīkādētra of the Atharva-Veda, edited by Bloomfield, noticed ........ 90
kauṣīkikura-prasada, the excellent favour of the goddess Kauśikī (Durgā) .......... 99 and n.
Kavyaṭa composed his commentary on the Dvēkṣakāra in the time of king Bhimasūrya, in Kalīyugā-Saṁvat 4078 expired ...... 154
Kēḷaṭa, an official of Balavarmādeva ........ 123
Kēḷalapatya, a king or prince mentioned in the Asoka inscriptions ..... 240, 249
Kēvalānas, names of the three, according to the pātadēval of the Sarasvatī-Gachchha ...... 347, 358
Khalati, or Khaṭhrāla, the ancient name of the Barabar Hill ........ 166, 170, 364 and n., khadīka, a grain-measure .......... 106 and n.
Khaṭhrāla, = Khaṭhrāla .......... 348
Khōlīlaf, the accounts of the Khohāl Khān Khahjak, the Afghan poet ........ 333
king = priest among savages, 46 ff.; — origin of the custom of sacrificing the son of the king-kahē = kicēob .......... 120
king-priest = man-god among savages, 46 ff.; — endowed permanently with divinity, 46; — his power to compel nature to conform to his will, 46; — endowed temporarily with divinity, 46; — origin of the custom of fixing the term of his reign, 50; — origin of temporary substitute for the, 50; — ‘kings’ of departments of nature, explained .... 47
Kistṇa District, an inscription from the, edited .......... 390
Koḍhatāli, a village in the Kandaravāṇi vishaya .......... 270
k-haungen, the Burmese multiplication table ...... 54
Kokkili (East. Chal.) .......... 12, 13, 96 n., 99, 283
Kolani-Kāṭamanāyaka, another name of Kāṭa .......... 283
Koldo-Hin, a Chinese secret society .......... 423 n.
Koleśa, a village in the Guddavāḍi vishaya .......... 284, 285
Kollabiganda, a variant of the first part of the name of Kollabiganda-Vijayāditya IV .......... 103
Kollabiganda-Vijayāditya IV. (East. Chal.) .... 12, 13, 103, 283
Komaṭi caste of Mādras, folktales concerning the .... 79 ff.
Kundakunda; see Kundakunda .......... 342, 351
Kunḍavāḍu, in the Kistṇa District; it was the capital of Gāṇapēva .......... 390, 393
Kūparu, an ancient town or village; 101, 417
Kūrametti, a village in the Guddavāḍi vishaya .......... 275
Kōśār, a village in the Belgaum District; an inscription, edited .......... 69
Krājan, an ancient town or village .......... 413
Krāṭa, an ancient town or village .......... 106
Krishna II, (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) defeated by Gunaka-Vijayāditya III .......... 102, 163
Krishnāraja of Masur, the pagoda coin of .......... 307
Krishnāraja of Vijaynagar; his coins, 305, 306
Krovasi, or Krovasi, an ancient town or village .......... 416 n., 413
Kahāṭrāla, the third Daśa-Pārvīl .......... 348, 358
Kubja-Vishnu, and Kubja-Vishnuvarāna, = Vīshnuvarāna I. .......... 90, 271
Kuḍa inscription of Prabhavēla II of Ratnapur, noticed .......... 84
Kulacacanda, governor of Guya under Sultan Firāz Shāh .......... 313
Kulasēkharadēva; see Tirupāsāvam .......... 288, 288
Kūlōttunga-Kāṭaḍēva I. (Eastern Chalukya) ...... 12, 13, 95 n., 276, 283
Kūlōttunga-Kāṭaḍēva II. (East. Chal.), 12, 13, 283, 285; — examination of the date of his Chellūr grant .......... 121
kumāṭrāda, a leader of those of weak intellect; utterly wanting in intelligence .......... 114
Kumbhrāja, another name of Kapila .......... 390
Kundakunda, a pontiff in the Sarasvatī-Gachchha .......... 342, 351
Kundakundānayya, another name of the Sarasvatī-Gachchha .......... 342
Kūndavāmaḥādevī, wife of Vimalāditya .......... 273
Kunṭāditya, another name of Bhājanaditya .......... 194, 267
Kunuramatē, a town of Vīshnuvarāna I. ...... 96
l and s, interchange of, in North-Indian Languages .......... 87 f.
Lāchālādēvi, queen (Kalachurī of Ratnapur) .......... 84
Lake, Lord, a folksong about .......... 192
Lakṣīnāvāda, wife of Vijayāditya .......... 268, 292
INDEX.

Lalita-Vigrahavādeja, a play by Sūmadēva, partly preserved in an inscription at Ajumere. 202
Lal Singh, his share in the destruction of Paṇḍit Jalla, 73; — joins in campaign against the English, 76; — his conduct at Mādki, 77; — temporarily ousts Gulab Singh from power, 213, 214
laukika, an abbreviation used in certain dates; also laukik, laukika, and laukika without the sign of abbreviation; it denotes the ordinary names of the months, as distinguished from the lōkottara names, 411, 412
Lawrence, Sir Henry, his share in the sale of Kaśmir, 213, 214; — his share in the deposition of Dalip Singh, 217; — his visit to Kaśmir, 218
license, periods of religious; an origin of the custom, 196
life, its meaning to a savage, 48
life-index, the, its connection with the external soil, 199
Limbarāya, a goddess, 311
Liṅgāsudāsanas, the relative age of some, 119
Lityerises, an enquiry into the myth of, 52
Lōkakāla reckoning, the, an adaptation of the Saptarasih era, by omitting the centuries; the unqualified years are to be taken as current years, 150, 151 to 154; — an instance of the quotation of an expired year, 154
Lōkamahādevī, wife of Chālukyabhāma-Vigrahavādeja-Viṣṇuvardhana VII, 239, 239
Lōvakīkī, a Chēla king slain by Chālukyabhāma-Viṣṇuvardhana VII, 270
luck, bad, the bride's feet bringing, 32
Lōlhiāna, the burning of, by the Śikh, 77
Lucknow Museum grant of Bailavarmadēva, edited, 129
Lunar Race, the, included the Chāluksya, 288, 274, 279, 295

'Madhucara-ghar' inscription of Naravarman, of Viṣṇu-Gadhisvānta-Sāivat 1164; English equivalent of the date, 129, 130 n.
Madhurāntakādevī, wife of Kūlasthāna-Chōjādevī I, 376, 380, 283
Madras Museum, an inscription in the, edited, 104
Madras Presidency, inscriptions from the, edited, 15, 104, 285, 390, 414
Magas of Cyrene was a contemporary of Aśoka, 242
Māghanandī, a pontiff in the Sarasvatī-Gacchha, 342, 350, 351
magic, sympathetic, explained, 46
Mahābhrāta, Triśūkha and Jagatī metre in the, 296
Mahādēva, son of Vīṣṇu-Vardhana of the Solar Race, 268
Mahākāla, a general of Chāluksya-Bhīma I, 103, 267
Mahāmātra, title of a class of Aśoka's officials, 249, 252
Mahārāja, the first title used by the Eastern Chāluksya, 95, 97, 93, 99, 100, 102, 266, 270; — also used by Pulkāsīn II, 9
Mahārājadāthārā, a paramount title; earliest instance of its use by the Eastern Chāluksya, 160
Mahādaya, a name of Kānauj, 188
Makara (= Capricornus), Jupiter in, 287; — the moon in, 132, 212
Mahāsuni Agrahār, a note on the, 339
Makundpur, mention of an inscription at, apparently dated Chēla-Sāivat 772, 85
Malabar District, an inscription from the, edited, 285
Malaiyampalli, an ancient place, 292
Malaparej-gaṇḍa, a legend on a Hoysala coin, 304 n.
Mālkhej burnt by Guṇaka-Viṣṇu-Vāditya III, 102
Mallapāda, a descendant of Bēta-Viṣṇu-Vāditya V, 268, 283
Mandadoru agrahār, 285
Mangi, a king, perhaps Chēla, conquered by Guṇaka-Viṣṇu-Vāditya III, 102, 103
Mangi-Yuvakā (East. Chal.), 12, 13, 96 n., 98, 104, 283; — a grant of his, edited, 104
man-god = king-priest among savages, 46 ff.; — his power to compel nature to conform to his will, 46, 47; — partial power only over departments of nature, 47; — his powers = those of spirit of wood, 47; — is the original form of the spirit of the wood, 47; — protected by tabu, 47 ff.; — mortality of, 50; — origin of the custom of killing the, 50; — universality and antiquity of the custom, 50; — various forms of it, 50
manjī, a burning-glass, 295
manthana-yuntra, a fire-implement, 294
marriage amongst the ancient Persians, notes on, 118, 119; — a necessary preliminary to performance of full Hindu rites, 323, 324; — the impossible task, a preliminary in folktales to, 323, 323; — conditions of, folktales, 111; — postponement of, in folktales 186
marriage customs, among the Moors of Ceylon, 120; — rice throwing, 90; — the use of the sword in Indian, 423
marubān preserves the old Persian pāde, 45
Matsya (?) family, 16, 96
Mattamayura family, 85
Mattilinaḍu viṣaya, an ancient territorial division, 271
INDEX.

May-day, origin of ........................................... 47
May-pole, origin of ........................................... 47
Mējasamāra, a general of Vira-Chōladēva .............. 384
medicine, folk in Madras .................................. 192
Mējasambā, wife of Kollabigaṇḍa-Vijayādīyita IV .... 104, 283
Merv, a rich field for numismatic research. 86, 87
metempsychosis, its effect on conduct, in
folktales .................................................. 316
midsummer fires; reasons for the custom .......... 198
Mirí, the celebrated Afgān bard ......................... 340
miracles, the power to perform, indicates perma-
ment endowment with divinity in man .......... 46
Mīrā Ḍānār, the Afgān poet ................................ 339
mistletoe — the ‘soul’ of the oak, 199; — connec-
tion with fire-festivals ................................ 199
nāti used in a date of the fourteenth century A.D. 138
months, Hindu lunar (see also intercalary,
and lunar); names of them as used in record-
ed dates —
  Ṛṣi, = Aśvayuja (Sept.-Oct.) .................. 151
  Aśvayuja (Sept.-Oct.) ......................... 151
  Aśvina (Sept.-Oct.) ............................. 421
  Bhādra (Aug.-Sept.) ............................ 138
  Bhādhrapada (Aug.-Sept.) .............. 84, 156, 151, 153
  Chaithra (March-April) ................. 13, 124, 141, 153
  Jyēshtā (May-June) ......................... 422
  Kārttika (Oct.-Nov.) ......................... 83, 130, 151
  Madhū, = Chaitra (March-April) .......... 127
  Māgha (Jan.-Feb.) ................. 127, 128, 314
  Mārga (Nov.-Dec.) ........................... 88, 212, 311
  Mārgastrāla (Nov.-Dec.) ............... 141, 312
  Paun, = Pausha (Dec.-Jan.) .............. 152
  Pausha (Dec.-Jan.) ......................... 133
  Phāguna (Feb.-March) ...................... 130
  Phāguna (Feb.-March) .............. 85, 129, 132, 137
  Śrā, = Śrāvaṇa (July-Aug.) .............. 153
  Śrāvaṇa (July-Aug.) ....................... 16, 84, 492
  Vai, = Vaiśākha (April-May) .......... 152
  Vaiśākha (April-May) ...... 83, 129, 133, 137,
                                      141, 152
months, Hindu solar; Chaitra indicated by
the sun being in Māna (Pisces), 287; — and
Pausha, by the sun being in Chāpa or
Dhanu (Sagittarius) .................................. 288
monumental slabs of heroes; an inscription
on one, edited ......................................... 69
moon, the, mentioned as being in Makara
(Capricornus) ......................................... 132, 212
Moors of Ceylon, origin of the, 120; — origin
of the name, 120; — divisions of the .... 120
Mīrī grant of Jāhīka; the final determina-
tion of the English equivalent of the date ... 381
Morās, see Moors of Ceylon ......................... 120
Mōsarabas, Dr. Simonet on the ...................... 429
Moses, an oriental story of ......................... 89
mother of the corn, barley, rye, &c., enquiry
into the cult of the ................................ 51, 52
mothers of mankind, the ......................... 96 n.
Mōrt Singh, his dispute with Jawāhir Singh .. 219
Mōtkī, the battle of .................................. 77
Muhammadpur inscription, noticed ............. 84
Mōla-Saṅgha, the Original Community,
found by Mahāvīra; it included the Saras-
vatī-Gachchha ....................................... 343, 347
Mūlikkajam; an ancient place .................... 292
Mūrāj of Multān, his rebellion ................... 215, 216
multiplication, the Burmese system explained,
50 ff. — a method of checking Burmese 66, 67
murder of predecessor, a rule of priestly
succession .............................................. 121
Nāgāpoṭi, mother of Gāmakāmbā ................. 103
Nāgarjuna hill cave-inscriptions of Deśaratha,
edited .................................................. 361
Nāgas, possibly mentioned as defeated by
Nārāṇḍraāgarāja-Vijayādīyita II .......... 101
Nāgasēna, the fifth Dvāra-Pārīvin .................. 348, 358
Nāgr line, the, of the Sarasvatī-Gachchha ... 355
nails, origin of the sanctity of the, 49; —
consequent customs .................................. 49
nāṣhtrā, ‘a lunar mansion;’ names of the
nāṣhtrās, as used in recorded dates —
Anurādhā ........................................... 422
Ardrā .................................................. 181
Hastaka ................................................. 182
Pūrva-Bhādrapada .................................. 141
Rāvati ................................................. 141
Rōkṣā .................................................. 287
Śrāvaṇa ................................................ 153, 212
Śvāti ................................................... 288
Tikṣa .................................................... 152
Vaiḍūryapātā (= Śrāvaṇa) ......................... 312
names, personal, as contrasted with dynastic
titles ................................................... 96 n.
Nandī-Āmmāya and Nandī-Saṅgha, other
names of the Sarasvatī-Gachchha ............... 342
Nandīmitra, the second Śrāta-Kēvalī ........ 347,
348, 358
Napier, Sir Charles, has an interview with
Guṇāb Ṣingh ........................................ 218
fire festival. 199

oak, the, the victim at the fire festivals. 199

oja, oja, or ojha, a Kanarese and Telugu word, meaning 'a priest, tutor, master,' is a corruption of the Sanskrit upādhyāyā through the Pāli form upajjha. 393 n.

old man,' an enquiry into customs connected with the. 52

ōha, Prof. Bloomfield on the etymology of. 148

Orissa, a Gajapati king of. 309

Osēphořika, note on the Armenian Apocrypha known as the. 427

Oude Province, an inscription from the, edited. 123

ex, the, as a sacred Hindu metaphor. 339

packet, the inexhaustible, in folktales. 81, 82

Padukaluru, a village in the Pennatavdi. vishaya. 271

padanta-field. 106 and n.

padbhis, Prof. Bloomfield on the Vedic instrumental. 148

padisah preserves the word pati in modern Persia. 45

Pāγunavara vishaya, an ancient territorial division. 270

Pahlavi pagyri found in Egypt, notes on. 428

Pakhtūn, = Afghān, derivation of the term. 339

Paktyeș, = (?), Farsûti, 339; = derivation of the word. 339

Pāghat, i.e. Pākkhādu, mentioned by the ancient name of Pusagijāṇḍu. 286, 289 and n.

Pāllavāda, a village in the Arutukūr arāga. 287

Pānbarū, a village in the Gudrāvārā vishaya. 271

Pammatva, mother of Ballāladēva-Vēḷākkāta. 271

Pānara family. 270

paṇcāchamahādiśa mentioned among the insignia of the Eastern Chalukyas, 273 and n.; = connected with paramount sovereigns. 38, 310

Paṇhasiddhāntikā, the sines of arcs in the. 229

Paṇchavattak, the; English equivalent of the date of a MS. of it, of the time of Jayaśinhabēva. 130 and n.

Paṇḍīt Charan Dās, his mission to Lāhōr. 72

Paṇḍūt Jallā, Minister to Dalip Singh, his unpopularity, 71; = his intrigues with Bīb Chandan. 73; = his death. 73

Pāṇḍurāṅga (perhaps for Pāṇḍurāja), an officer of Gunaka-Vijayāditya III. 103

Pāṇḍūravindavā, Mahādēṃṭa, predecessor of Balavindavā. 123

Pāṇḍyas mentioned in the Asoka inscriptions. 239, 240, 249

Parahitāraja, a Chalukya chieftain. 69, 70

paramahattārak-śrī-śūri-rajya. 314

Paramākara, a paramount title; earliest instance of its use by the Eastern Chalukyas. 269

Paramēkara, a paramount title; earliest instance of its use by the Eastern Chalukyas. 100

Pār̥bati as des ev machin in folktales. 31 ff.

Pārijātā-Gachchha, another name of the Sarasvatī-Gachchha. 343

pargu (see also pargu, barga, and gargu), a termination of village-names, in Atōgāpurgu, 418; = Korrapu. 101, 417; = Vānapu. 418; = Vānapu. 418; = Vangipu. 418

Pārsīs still living in Persia, note on the. 426

Parsyetai, = (?), Paktyeș. 339

Partīb Singh of Kaśmir, his birth. 218

parī (see also pargu); a termination of village-names in Peṇupaṇḍu, 97; = Nūtalupuṇḍu, 99, 106.
INDEX. 445

99, 106 and n.; and Trandaaru, or Trandaaru 103

Paaliputra was the royal residence of Aśoka. 247

pati, 'lord,' traces of, in modern Persian 45

Paśa inscription of Sinhaśandra II., of Saka-Sahvat 1128 (for 1129); examination of the date 422

paśa, two, of the Sarasvati-Gachchha 344

Paṇṭhavardhika lineage 274

Paṇṭhavardhini family 95, 104, 267, 271, 272 n.

pava, = old Persian 'lord,' traces of in modern Persian 45

Pedda-Vegi, a village in the Godavari District, the representative of the English 93

Peçu, a French description of, in the 18th Century 91

Pennaṭavājī viṣaya, an ancient territorial division 267, 271

Penpaṇḍuru, an ancient town or village 467

Penukāpura, a village in the Gudrahāra 97

Perumāli, a god at Tirunelli, a form of Viṣṇu 291

Pēshārā Singh rebels and is captured, 71; — his death 76

Petēnīka, name of a people mentioned in the Aśoka inscriptions, 239, 240, 247; — they are the inhabitants of Pratishtāna or Paṇṭhā 248

pig, the, as representing the spirit of the corn 193, 194

Ping-ki-lo, supposed to represent Vēngi 94

Piyadas, a name or title of Aśoka... 168, 170, 231, 232, 263, 364

Piyarājā-sāha, = Sultān Firuz Shāh 313

Podengu, an ancient town or village 418

Ponduvagrama, a village in the Sāvatīlī dēva 285

Pongal Festival, notes on, the... 430

'possession' indicates temporary endowment with divinity in man 46

Pōṭṭhalu, = Prasāhait 348

pot, the inexhaustible, in folktales 109, 110

pradēśa, title of a class of Aśoka's officials 251

Prakrit dialects employed in a Sanskrit play 204

Prasāntāṣaiva, a sage 85

prāsānāti applied to an inscription on stone 313

pratiṣṭedaka, title of a class of Aśoka's officials 252

pregnancy, folk medicine during, in Madras 192

priest = king in many cases among savages. 48 fr. priesthood, murder an authorized means of succeeding to the, 45, 46; — enquiry into preliminaries necessary to make the murder authorized, 46; — rule of the Aryan 45

Prithvirāpallavapraṇa, an ancient town 102

Prithvīdeva II. of Ratnapur; an inscription of his, at Kugda, noticed 84, 85

Prithvirāja (Chāhumāna); see Hānsī 132

Prithvivāra, father of Bhaṇḍanāditya 104

prophesy in folk-tales 31

Frosterpine and Demeter, explanation of the myth 51

Frōshthila, the second Daśā-Pūreīn 348, 358

Ptolemies Philadelpus was a contemporary of Aśoka 242

puberty, initiatory rites of boys at, explained 200; — the age of, among girls, in Sallecette 333 n.

Pukhtā, the dialect of North Afghanistān 338

Pāki (?) viṣaya, an ancient territorial division 15, 17, 96

Pulikēnī (Western Chalukya) commenced to reign in A.D. 609 or 610 3

Pulindas mentioned in the Aśoka inscriptions 239, 240, 247

Pundrācāda, the divisions of, according to the Brahmāṇḍa section of the Bhavishyat-Purāṇa 419

Pungahē, the Madras Gotham, tales of, 78ff. 221ff.; — folktales about 79 ff.

Purāṇa, = ancient name of Pālakkādu, i.e. Pālghat 286, 291 and n., 292

purulas, title of a class of Aśoka's officials 249

Pushtā, the dialect of South Afghanistān 338

Quadragesima Sunday, customs connected with 198

r., Prof. Whitney on the writing of Sanskrit roots containing 148

Rāhatgad inscription of Jayasimhadeva, of Vikrama-Sahvat 1312; noticed, 83, 84; — English equivalent of the date 136 and n.

rahatta or raua means 'a horseman' 390 n.

Rāhuttarāya, or Rautarāya, a surname of Gauḍādēva 390, 393

Rāja-Bhima, = Chāluṣyabhima-Viṣṇuvardhana VII. 269

Rāja-Mahendra, a bīruda of Amma-Viṣṇuvardhana VI., 266, 283; — and of Amma-Viṣṇyāditya VI. 270, 283

Rāja-Mārtaṇḍa, a bīruda of Chāluṣyabhima-Viṣṇuvardhana VII. 269

Rāja-Nārāyaṇa, a bīruda of Kalātunga-Chhindadēva I. 276

Rāja-Paramārvāra, a paramount title 284

Rāja-guḍhīrī, a paramount title 270

raja-vultula, a 'royal family' 123

Rājamahendrapuram, the later capital of the Eastern Chalukyas 94, 266

Rājamayya, a king slain by Chāluṣyabhima-Viṣṇuvardhana VII. 270
INDEX.

Rājarāya of Kālināgaragā (Gaṅga) .................. 276
Rājarāya (East. Chal.), viceroy of Vengi ... 273
Rājarāya II. (East. Chal.), viceroy of Vengi .. 283, 284
Rājaśundari, wife of Rājarāya of Kālināgaragā 276 and n.
Rājendrā-Chāda, the original appellation of Kulottunga-Chāhadēva I. 276, 281
Rājoga = Rājendrā-Chāda, = Kulottunga-Chāhadēva I. 276, 281, 282 and n.
Rājoga-Chāda, probably = Kulottunga-Chāhadēva I. 276
rajaśīka, title of a class of Aśoka's officials 250, 253
Rāmâyana, Prof. Bōhtingk on the textual criticism of the .. 117
Rāmēśvara .......................... 102
Rām Singh, his rebellion at Nūrpūr ... 216
Rām Singh Chhāpāwālā, his deeds at the battle of Gōjār ... 217
Rānbour Singh of Jammūn adopted by Gūlāb Singh, 71; — his first appearance under arms, 73; — governs Jammūn, 217; — granted arobe of honour by Lord Dalhousie, 48; — administers Kasmir during last illness of Gūlāb Singh, 219; — proclaimed successor to Gūlāb Singh, 220; — helps the British in the Mutiny .. 220
Rānbour Singh of Jammūn sent to Lahor, 73; — his death ...... 73
Rānbour Singh of Jammūn, a collection of Buddhist tales .. 118
Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Mālkheṇḍ, 55; — wars of the, with the Eastern Chalukyas ... 101, 102, 103, 114, 206, 270
Rāṣṭrīya (sometimes read Rāṣṭika), a people mentioned in the Aśoka inscriptions, 239, 240, 247; — they may be the Mahārāṣṭrī or Marāṭhīs of the Dekhān .. 248
rathī, a termination of names, in Bhairavīthi and Kurumarāthī .. 96
Ratnadēva (Kalačhuri of Ratnapur) .......... 84, 85
Ratnapur, Kalachārius of .......................... 84, 85
Raṭṭa-Kandarpa, a biruda of Indrārāja (Rāṣṭrakūṭa) .. 35
Raṭṭas, = Rāṣṭrakūṭas ................. 101, 148
Rāyūr, an ancient village ................. 118
red, a lucky colour among the Mūsalmāns in Northern Madras .. 337
reflection, the human, contains the soul ...... 48
regnal years; instances of the use of them 17, 106, 123, 287, 289, 991
religion, comparative, a study of .. 45 ff.
re-marriage of widows in Madras .................. 423
Rén grant of Gōvindachandradēva; English equivalent of the date ........ 130 and n.
resurrection, an origin of the belief in the, 195; — Fārsi belief in the .......... 396
Revadistana, an ancient site .................. 106
Rex Nemorensis, explained, 46; — his 'soul' lay in the Golden Bough .... 50
reyrū, a village in the Karmārāhtra .............. 98
rice, cold, the custom of eating in Madras .. 147, 148
rice-throwing at marriages, a Chinese custom .. 90
riddles, a form of divination, 196; — an explanation of the use of, in folktales .. 196
Rāṣṭika; see Rāṣṭika .................. 248
sacrament, object of, among savages, 194; — of eating the god, an origin of, 194; — of bread, an origin of .. 194
sacrifice in Persia .......................... 148
Sadāśivārya of Vījayanagaragā; his coins, 306, 307
sāddhāraṇa used in the sense of lāṃbāka .. 412
Sagara, a Jaina version of the legend of .. 294
Sahasrāra rock edict of Aśoka, edited .. 154
Sākaṭambhara .......................... 202, 203
Sākaṭātyana; his Lingāmukhāna is later than that of Varamaṇī .. 119
sākhā, a Vedic school; names of sākhās mentioned in records: —
Kauṭumpha-Chhāhānagā .......................... 123
Tāttirītya .......................... 106
Vājasanēyi-Mādhayāmīna .......................... 123
Yajus .......................... 392
Saktivarman (East. Chal.) .. 12, 13, 273, 288
Salones, see Selunga .......................... 92
'Salsette Christian,' defined .................. 183 n.
saṅk, an abbreviation; used in composition with Vikrama, 137; — used without any appellative in composition, to denote years of the Saptarāhi era, 153; — and of the Vikrama era .. 84
Samāpā, a town mentioned in the Aśoka inscriptions ................. 247
Samarasāhūha of Mēvād; see Chitīrgadī .. 137
sāmanabhūvānāraṇa, an epithet of Nārēndragarāj-Vījāyādīma II. 100, 415; — of Vījāyādīma II. 100, 415; — of Amma II. .... 270
Sambu, = Sambhu, a Saiva ascetic .. 69, 70
Sankarī-Kōdavārman of Purāgajānādī, a feudatory of Bhāskara-Ravivārman .. 208, 291
sankrānti, 'the passage of the sun into a sign of the zodiac'; the current tithi is usually quoted with a sankrānti .. 413.
INDEX.

— names of the sankrántis, as used in recorded dates: —
   Mēṣha (Aries) ........................................ 152
   Uttarārāyaṇa (winter solstice) ..................... 108

suṣūṣa, an abbreviation; used as a declinable base, 141; — used in composition with Saptarashi, 151; — with Sāstra, to denote the Saptarashi era, 152; — and with Vikrama, 129; — used without any appellative in composition, to denote years of the Kalachuri era, 85; — of the Saptarashi era, 151, 153; — and of the Vikrama era, 152, 153, 154; — in 142, 212, 311, 314; — used in the same way to denote a regnal year ............. 124

Śākha, a Burmese book for calculating fortunes .......... 54
saṃsāra, = saṃsāra ...................................... 342 n.
Śāntidērā, notices of .................................. 85, 86
Santōkh Singh, Thānādār of Gūlīgūl, rebels ............. 219

Saptarashi era, examination of dates in the, by Prof. Kielhorn, 148 to 154; — the equations for converting Saptarashi years into Kaliyuga, Saka, Vikrama, and Christian years, 151; — the era called the Sāstrasāntasāra and Śāstra-saṃsveta, 152; — the years are to be taken as commencing with Chaitra, 150; — and, when unqualified, as current years .......... 150, 153, 154

Saraj, the capital of the Golden Horde, a geographical note on .......... 86
Śāmāngadēva (Vaghnā); English equivalent of the date of his inscription of Vikrama-Saṃsveta 1335, 137 and n.; — and of the Čintā pravatā of his time ................................ 137 and n.
sarang, = sarhang, = sarhang, = sarāhāng, = 'a leader' .......... 45

Sarasvatī-Gachehē of the Digambara Jains, two pāṭḍavats of the, 341; — other names of it are, Kandalanadhaya, Nandisāṅgha, Nandi-Amāyā, Balātākara-Gana, and Parijātā-Gachehē, 342, 343; — it is a branch of the Māla-Saṅgha, 343; — the Tables of it, 351 to 355; — chronological notes on it .......... 357

Sardār Jawāhīr Singh, his acts against Gullīb Singh .......... 74, 75, 76
Sardār Lahnā Singh, his retirement from public life .......... 71
sarjāg, sarjāj, modern Persian, a corporal 45
Sars, ethnographical notes on the .................... 429, 430
satrap, derivation of ................................... 45
sarveśvarāya, 'asylum or refuge of all mankind,' an epithet of, apparently, Viśhu-vardhana II., 98; — of Mangī-Youvarāja, 98, 104, 106; — of Viśhu-vardhana V., 102; — of Amma I., 266; — of Chālukya-Bhima II., 269; — of Rājarāja I., 273; — and of Viśa-Chaṇḍadeva ........................................ 284
Sarvasiddhi, a biruda of Jayaśimha I. ........................ 97
śādura, 'a royal edict,' defined in the law-book of Brihaspati .......... 424
Śāstra-saṃsveta, and Śāstra-saṃsvetara, names for the Saptarashi era .......... 152
Satīyaputa, a king or prince mentioned in the Aṣokā inscriptions .... 240, 249
Saturday, an unlucky day for fever in Madras .......... 430
Satyārāya, son of Bēta-Vijayañītīyā V. 268, 283
Satyārāya, Mahārāja, = Pulikēsin II. .......................... 17
Śaṅca-Kandarpa, apparently a biruda of Chālukya-Bhima I. ..... 103
Savattīlī dēsā, an ancient territorial division .......... 285
Śāvāv Mall of Multān .................................. 215
Śāvānv, the old woman, 'origin of the custom .......... 57
Sa'yid-al-Fayūmī, Dr. Harkavy on the biography of ............. 427
scape-goat, an origin of the, 195, 196; — the origin of the custom of transferring disease .......... 196
seals of grants, emblems and legends on .......... 104, 414
seclusion at puberty, the origin of .......... 197
Selungs, see Selungs .......... 92
self-immolation by burning; an epigraphical instance .......... 69
Selung Language Primer, 1864, a note on the .......... 92
Selungs, of the Mergui Archipelago, a notice of the .......... 92
Śena-dēva; see Ajanēri .......... 423
serītp, the modern use of the word, 45; — sar + tip, 45; — not derived from satrapēs 45
seven son, adventures of the, in folktales 183 ff.
shadow, the human, contains the soul .......... 48
Śāhībāzgārhī version of Aṣokā's Edicts, Dr. Bühler on the epigraphy of the .......... 117, 118
shahr-bādi = kahathrapati .......... 45
shahrībānī preserves the old Persian pēdan .......... 45
Shamanism among the Buriats, note on .......... 429
sheep, sacrificing, in Persia averts danger .......... 148
Shemjahak's Judgment, a Persian version of the old Russian tale of, 426; its origin in the Jātakas .......... 426
Sheē Singh Aṭāriwālā, his share in the capture of Multān, 215; — deserts to the rebels at Multān, 317; — defeated by General Nicholson .......... 217
shōfar, notes on the musical instrument known as .......... 148
Śiddhārtha, the sixth Daśa-Pāriva ................................ 348, 358
Śīkhasamuchchaya, the, of Śāntidēra, noted .......... 85 n., 86
silver, a shower of, indicates birth of a daughter in folktales .......... 45 ff.
Simhabala, maternal uncle of Viṣṇurāja .......... 202
Simhapuri, an ancient town .......... 85
INDEX.

sines of arcs in the Pañchaisiddhāntikā 228
Singhana II. (Yadava of Devagiri); see Pātvā 422
Siyaśarman, an officer of Jayasimha I. 97
Sndratpāñchatikā; see Udayaśagara 399 n.
Solar Race, the, 288; it included the
Chōlas, 276, 279; and the Gajapati kings of Oriassa 390, 392
Śomādeva (see Lāṭita-Vīrāharāja) 202
Śrāvasti, father of Pratipiyārāja 104
Śrāvakas, the; (see Lunar Race), 268, 274,
279, 285
Sūmāsvarā (Chāhuṇā); see Bīhāli 133
son, in old age, in folktales 316, 317
sorcerers, an origin of the belief in
'soul' as understood by the savage, 48;
contained in the human shadow, 48; in
the human reflection, 48; in the blood,
49; in the head, 49; its presence means 'life'; its absence 'death', in savage
belief, 48; its temporary absence from the
body, 48; the spiritual and physical
dangers to which it is exposed, 48; in-
jured by food, 49; by the remains of food
after eating, 49; notions of the in
North America, 119, 120; transferring
the, 199; the external soul discussed,
199; of the oak — the mistletoe, 199; of
trees 47
spirits, capable of being wounded by sharp
instruments 49
spirits, the, of trees, 47; of woods, their
power and nature, 47; of groves, 47;
of the corn, 52; as an animal, 193;
various animal forms of the 163
spurious copper-plate grants, a general remark
in connection with 410
st-Tribhuvandikā, a legend on the seals
of the Eastern Chalukya grants 100, 266,
269, 270, 273, 284, 325, 414
st.Vijayaśidhikā, a legend on a seal 104
Śrīnābā, an ancient territorial division
Śrīprīthivīvallabha, an epithet of Vishnu-
vardhana I. 96
Śrūte-Kēvaline, names of the five, according
to the purāṇa of the Sarasvatī-Gachchha
347, 358
Sitānu-Ravignupta, a king 287
strangers, dread of, amongst savages, explain-
ed 48
śu, an abbreviation, used with the number of
atīthi or a civil day, and without di or tī 84, 136
substituted persons in folktales; the bride-
groom, 112, 113, 321 ff.; children, variants
of the idea 45 ff.
subtraction, the Burmese system of, explained 56 ff.
succession, a peculiar custom of 422
Suchēt Singh raises Dalip Singh to the throne, 71; his various intrigues, 71; his
death 72
Sudhamma, Sudharman, the second Keśa-li 347, 358
suffixes, a peculiar class of, in Nicobarese, re-
ferring to parts of the human body 300
sun, warding off the light of, the rule of, 197;
impregnation by the, the belief in 197
Śunak grant of Karṇadēva, of Vikrama-
Sañvat 1148; English equivalent of the date
129 and n.
Styavamsā, the; see Solar Race 298, 276,
279, 390, 392
stuti (see also vati), used to denote 'the bright
fortnight' 149 and n., 152
stūtra, 'a manual of religious ritual, &c.'; names of stūtras mentioned in records —
Apatamba 106, 416 n. 418
Hiranyakāśīna 418
Śrāvasamuchchayya, the, of Śantidēva, noted
svarga, and not nirvāṇa, is always spoken of
by Aśoka in his inscriptions 265
svayānācara, in folktales, 111 ff.; a reversal
of the custom, in folktales 392 ff.
sword, the use of the, to represent the bride-
groom at marriages 428
tabu, doctrine of, explained 47 ff.; its effects
on customs, 48; object of, to protect the
man-god, 47; the object of establishing it
generally, 48; is set up generally to
protect the 'soul,' 48; various methods of,
48; origin of the tabooed person, 49;
origin of tabooed things, 49; its effect on
the Nicobar language 297, 298
Tālaka (Eastern Chalukya) 12, 13, 268, 283
Tāla, a variant of the name of Tālaka 283
Takshasāla mentioned in the Aśoka inscrip-
tions 247
Tāla, a variant of the name of Tālaka 288
Tālaka, Tālaka, variants of the name of
Tālaka 288
Tārāparni river mentioned in the Aśoka inscrip-
tions 239, 240
task, the impossible, in folktales, a variant of
tūk, 111 ff.
Tataibikki, a king slain by Chālukyabhūma-
Vishnuvardhana VII. 270
Tataibikya, a variant of the name of Tata-
ibikki 270
Tchelebi = Christian; Baron V. Rosen on
the word 429
Tēwar inscription, noticed 85
Thiyākavalli, wife of Kulottungas-Chōdādēva I. 290
thē-thauk, a Burmese custom, explained 423, 424
INDEX.

tiger, folklore origin of the strength of the... 192

Tirumalārya of Vijayamangala; his coins... 307

Tirunellī, a village in the Malabar District; the grant of Bhāskara-Rāvinvar, edited, 285; — examination of the date... 286 to 289

Tirunellī-Ayvān ('the governor of Tirunellī')... 293

Tirunellī-Perumāl, a god, a form of Vishnu... 291

Tiruppāvānam grant of Kulaśekharādeva; examination of the date... 288, 289

tithi, 'a lunar day'; the tithi of Kanakapati (Vishnu), 288 and n.; — repeated tithis, 413; — the current tithi is usually quoted with a sanā śkṛt... 413

tobacco, some South-Indian verses on... 297

Tūrānas of Delhi... 202 n.

Tosāli, a place mentioned in the Āśoka inscriptions... 247
totemian, an origin for sex... 199, 200
tree-spirit, 47; — their power to make the crops grow... 47
tree-worship, enquired into... 47

Trikalinga country (see also Kalinga), conquered and held by the Eastern Chalukyas 104, 269

Tripurīya-chatukātpa... 85

Trishubhī and Jagati metres in the Mahābhārata... 296

'tug-of-war' as a ceremonial custom, origin of... 196; — as a rain charm... 196

Tughlaq, a proverb illustrating the cruelty of the... 79

Tumāśa dēśa, an ancient territorial division... 85

Tundaparā, or Trandaparā, a village in the Gudravāra vīshāya... 103

Turamāya, = Ptolemy... 241

twice-born,' an explanation of the phrase... 200

Udālāsvara, a god... 88

Udānapurā, an ancient town... 313

Udayāditya of Mālava; an inscription of his, at Udaypur, noticed... 83

Udayapura, a town of Jayasimha I... 97

Udayapura, = Udaypur in Gwalīor... 83, 84

Udayasagara really composed his Sānti-trīpa-rāja in A. D. 1743;... 399 n.

Udaypur, inscriptions at, noticed; of Deśa-pāladēva, 83; — English equivalent of the date, 155 and n.; — of Harirājadēva, 84; — of Jayasimhādeva, 84; — and of Udāmayāditya... 83

Uigur; a note on the alphabet of the 8th Century, 425; — Khāns, Chinese titles of the... 425

Uigurs, the, their probable dialect... 425

Ujjayinī mentioned in the Āśoka inscriptions 247

'uncleanness' a form of sanctity... 197

Undapura, an ancient town... 310

upējha, an intermediate form between upējha and ojha... 393 n.

Uparāhādā (†) mandala, an ancient territorial division... 84

Urāsa, an ancient country; it corresponded pretty nearly with the modern Hazara... 336

Urūm Bāk, a note of an elegy on... 86

Urupātrah, an ancient village... 418

radi used to denote 'the dark fortnight'... 152

Vādīnagar prākāsti, the date of the renewal of it; English equivalent... 141 and n.

vagaira, 'and so forth,' used in the Tirunellī grant... 291 and n.

Vājījaya, of the Pānar family... 276

Valabhi era, the (see Gupta-Valabhi era); two miscellaneous dates in it... 384 n.

Valaga, see Dhalaga... 270

Valabhārī-Valabharājā (Kalachūri of Ratnapur) 84, 85

Valācheri, an ancient town or village... 418

Vāmapurā, or Vānapurā, an ancient town or village... 418

Vanaprīṣeṣu, or Vanaprīṣeṣu, a village in the Kandaravādi vīshāya... 101

Vānaraśīvāda (†); see Gayā... 137

Vānajāpedayu, an ancient town or village... 418

Vānigapurā, an ancient town or village... 418

Varanuchī, his Liṅgādāsana is earlier than those of Harshavardhana and Sañkatāyana... 119

Vardhābhūmi, a division of Pundrādeśa... 421

Vardan, notes on the American author... 427

Vardhamāna, a division of Pundrādeśa... 421

Varṇarāja, a division of Pundrādeśa... 420

Varāvārasvāmin, a form of Siva... 123

vārī (see also bārī and pārī), a termination of village-names, in Elavāra... 271

Varuṣhappara, the Tamil New Year's Day... 430

Vasanāpatāla, a prince; perhaps one of the Tūrānas of Delhi... 202 and n.

vāti (see also viṇī), used to denote 'the dark fortnight'... 149 and n., 151, 152, 153

Vāṭṭeḷutti characters... 286 and Plate

Vāvērā, a place; perhaps = Vāyāghrāka, the modern Bāghēra... 202 and n.

Vādāntasūtras, the, with the commentary by Śamkarāchārya; notice of Dr. Thibaut's edition... 396

Vēganāndā, an ancient river... 123

Venōvān, a place; an origin for the custom... 49

Velāṇāṇu, vīshāya, an ancient territorial division... 271
INDEX.

Vendasāda, Dr. Horn's translation of the, noted 117
Vengi, the country of the Eastern Chalukyas, 93, 94, 95, 101, 102, 103, 104, 287, 288, 269, 270, 271, 276, 277, 278, 281, 292, 283; — the earliest connection of it with them, 94; — the country described as being without a ruler for twenty-seven years, 272; — viceroys of Vengi, 276, 284; — its capital is supposed to be mentioned by Hiuen Tsang as Ping-ki-lo 94
Vengānaṇu viśāya, an ancient territorial division 93, 271
Vengipura, an ancient town 94
Vengaraka, an ancient territorial division. 94
Venkata of Vijayanagara, his coinage 307 to 309
Venmin, the object of propitiating among the illiterate ... 195
Vigrāḥkara of Sākaprabhā (see also Harakālīndaka) 262, 203
Vijaya, the eighth Daśa-Pūrṇa ... 348, 358
Vijayāditya, grandson of Bēta-Vijayāditya V 268, 283
Vijayāditya, a descendant of Bēta-Vijayāditya V 268, 283
Vijayāditya I, Bhaftāraka (Eastern Chalukya) 12, 13, 99, 283, 417
Vijayāditya II, Narēndramārgarāja (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 100, 283, 417; — a grant of his, edited ... 414
Vijayāditya III, Guṇaka (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 102, 283
Vijayāditya IV, Kollabipragada (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 103, 283
Vijayāditya V, Bēta (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 95 n., 267, 280
Vijayāditya VI, Amma II (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 270, 283
Vijayāditya VII, (East. Chal.), viceroy of Vengi 276, 283
Vijayavahārā, wife of Vijayāditya 268, 283
Vijayānagara, coins of the kings of 301
Vijayānadhi, a bīruda of Mangī-Yuvārāja 98; — and apparently of Bhattāraka-Vijayāditya I 99
Vijayāvāda, ancient form of the name of Bēzañga 101, 415, 418
Vikrama, the traditional founder of the Vikrama era; notes on his history, as represented in the pattāvalik of the Saravati-Gachehha ... 361
Vikrama era; continuation of Prof. Kielhorn's examination of questions connected with this era, 124; — general chronological list of Vikrama dates, 125; — summary of results, 397; — percentages of dates examined, 397; — current and expired years; current years are quoted only exceptionally ... 398; — northern and southern years; the reckoning by southern (Karttikāda) years was from the beginning intimately connected with the era, 399; — down to about the fourteenth century of the era, both kinds of years were used over exactly the same tracts of country, 400; — the pāramāṃṣata and anāṃsa schemes of the lunar months; neither scheme is necessarily and exclusively connected with either the southern (Karttikāda) or the northern (Chaitrāda) year, 401; — locality and names of the era, 401; — where and by which dynasties the era was used up to about A. D. 1300, 402; — names of the era; the Mālava era, and the Vikrama era, 404; — the latter name means the autumn as the poets' 'war-time,' and was simply transferred from the autumn to the year, 409; — some matters of detail regarding the calculated dates, 409; — irregular dates, 409; — years of other eras, quoted along with the Vikrama years, 410; — Jupiter years quoted along with the Vikrama years, 410; — intercalary months, 411; — laubika months, 411; — nākpatras, 412, 412; — solar and lunar eclipses, 412; — sanisrādīs, 412; — other holy or festive times, 413; — repeated tithis, 413; — suggestions for calculating dates ... 413
Vikrama-Chōja (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 282, 283
Vikrama-Rāma, a bīruda of apparently Bhaftāraka-Vijayāditya I ... 99
Vikramāditya I (East. Chal.) 103, 283
Vikramāditya II East. Chal.) 12, 13, 269, 283
Vikramāditya VI. (West. Chāl.); his wars with the Chōjas and the Eastern Chalukyas, 280, 281, 282; — doubt about the exact date of his pattabandha ... 282 n.
Vikramaśākavacharita, the, of Bilhana; historical matters in it ... 278, 280
Vimalāditya (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 273, 283
Vimalāraka, a variant of the name of Vimalāditya 273
Vimaladāsārman, an officer of Guṇaka-Vija- yāditya III 103
Vindhyapārā, a division of Pundrādēśa ... 421
Vīṇukumāra, = Vīṇakumāndin ... 347, 348
Vīra-Chōjādeva, Vīṇuvvardhana IX (East. Chal.), viceroy of Vengi 283, 284
Vīra-Rāghavakhravartin, a king ... 287
Vīra, a Jain technical word ... 344
Vīrīn, the cult of, 45; — represented by the horse ... 194
vīrādes or vīra-kalas, 'monumental slabs of heroes,' an inscription on one, edited ... 69
Vīsā, name of a people mentioned in the Asāka inscriptions ... 239, 240, 247, 248
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visākhā, the first Daśa-Pārvina</td>
<td>348, 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visākhačārya, a name of Guptigupta</td>
<td>342, 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishamasiddhi, abīrāda of Vishnudvārāhānī</td>
<td>15, 17, 95; and of Vishnudvārāhānī II., 98; and apparently of Vishnudvārāhānī V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnu, the god, compared to rajas, 119; and to cold rice</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnunandīnā, the first Śrūṭa-Kēśalīn</td>
<td>348, 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnurāja = Vishnu-dvārāhānī II., 98; also = Vishnu-dvārāhānī III., 99; also = Vishnu-dvārāhānī IV.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā, great-grandson of Bēta-Vijayādītīya V.</td>
<td>268, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā, a descendant of Bēta-Vijayādītīya V.</td>
<td>268, 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā, son of Bhima of the Solar Race</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā I., Kubja = Vishnudvārāhā (East. Chal.), 12, 13, 15, 94, 95, 96, 283; determination of the initial point of his years, in A.D. 615, 3 to 5; his Chitpurāpale grant, edited</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā II. (East. Chal.), 12, 13, 98, 106, 283; determination of the initial point of his years, in A.D. 663</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā III. (East. Chal.), 12, 13, 97, 283</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnu-dvārāhā IV. (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 100, 283, 417</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā V., Kali-Vishnudvārāhā (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 102 and n., 283</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā VI., Amma I. (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 95 n., 266, 283</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā VII., Chālukya-Bhima II. (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 95 n., 266, 283</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā VIII., Rājarāja I. (East. Chal.)</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vishnudvārāhā IX., Vira-Chōjādēva (East. Chal.), viceroy of Vengi</td>
<td>283, 284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vishnudvārāhā-Vijayādītīya, Mahāprāgya | 278 |

Vizagapatam District, an inscription from the, edited | 15 |

Vow to obtain children, 80ff.; result of violation of | 35 to 45 |

Vṛṣṇi, name of a people mentioned in the | 239, 240, 247, 248 |

Vṛṣṇi, a prince | 313 |

Vṛṣṇi, a place; the modern Bāghera 201 n. | 292, 293 |

Vṛṣṇi, the different meanings of, in addition to denoting the yōga of that name | 292, 293 |

Warren's Kalaśānkalita, examination of some errors in | 239, 240, 247 |

Weber's Sacred Literature of the Jains; translated by Dr. Smyth; continuation ... 18, 170, 285 |

Women, position of in medieval Arabia | 285 |

Yāhiṣṭīnā, a note on the term | 339 and n. |

Yamilyā; see Gaṅgā | 327 |

Yavanās mentioned in the Aśoka inscriptions | 239, 240, 247 |

Yavanas, i.e. Musalmānās, cities of the, in | 239, 240, 247 |

Yōga, an astrological element; names of yōgas used in recorded dates:— | 239, 240, 247 |

Harsamana | 212, 312 |

Siddha | 422 |

Vṛiddhi | 132 |

youngest daughter-in-law, in folktales | 133ff. |

Yuddhamalla I. (Eastern Chalukya) | 103, 283 |

Yuddhamalla II. (East. Chal.) 12, 13, 269, 270, 283 |

Yunnan, notice of French journeys to, from | 239, 240, 247 |

Tongking | 291 |

Yāṣṇa and Zulaikāha, notes on Firdōsī's | 116, 117 |
ERRATA IN VOL. XX.

p. 170, lines 10, 11, for ḫ ḫ, and concludes a sentence, read ḫ ḫ, and concludes a sentence.

p. 208, lines 33, 34, the words t-tāvakāhiḥ kṛityaṁ anyat Ṛṣi 32 should lie in line 32 opposite the numeral 27.

p. 287, No. II., Text, line 1, for ārī-Vīra, read ārī-Vīra-; and Translation, line 3, insert a comma at the end of the line.

p. 288, line 7 from the bottom, for Saṅikiṣaṭāmaṇam, read Saṅikiṣaṭāmaṇam.

p. 311, text line 2, for jādyā 9. ōmō, read jādyā 9. ōmō.

p. 314, text line 2, for gra[hair ? 11*], read gra[hair ? *].

p. 344, line 3, for paṭṭāvalī, read paṭṭāvalī.

p. 370, line 9, for Mahāraja, read Mahāraja.